

Art Teacher Barbie: Friend or Foe?

Lorrie Blair

In this article, I have revealed the meanings embodied in Mattel's production and marketing of Art Teacher Barbie, and compared Mattel's vision of art education to that of leaders in the field. I began with the assumption that Art Teacher Barbie participates in the cultural construction of women who teach art, and I explored what Mattel teaches children and their parents about art and art education. I conclude that Mattel's products are educational sites that reinforce a stereotypical vision for girls and are detrimental to art education.

Key words: corporate sponsorships, gender stereotypes, teachers in popular culture

Dans cet article, l'auteure décrypte les sens véhiculés dans la production et le marketing de la poupée « *Barbie Prof d'arts plastiques* » et compare la vision de l'éducation artistique de Mattel à celle des leaders dans le domaine. Partant de l'hypothèse que Barbie Prof d'arts plastiques participe à la mise en place du modèle culturel de l'enseignante en arts plastiques, l'auteure explore ce que Mattel enseigne aux enfants et à leurs parents au sujet des arts plastiques et de l'éducation artistique. Elle conclut que les produits de Mattel sont des sites éducationnels qui renforcent une vision stéréotypée des filles et ont un effet nuisible sur l'éducation artistique.

Mots clés : commandite d'entreprise, stéréotypes sexistes, enseignants et culture populaire.

Throughout their history, fashion dolls have played a complex role in the socialization of girls (Mitchell & Reid-Walsh, 2002). As such, these dolls can be viewed as a form of cultural pedagogy, suggesting that education takes place in a variety of social settings, including but not limited to schools (Steinberg & Kincheloe, 1998). By playing with these dolls, children, primarily girls between the ages of three and eleven, learn important lessons about how they are supposed to perform their gender

roles. Although little girls often subvert any intended meaning of their dolls, Barbie, the most popular fashion doll ever introduced, represents an adult world designed and promoted by adult producers (Kline, 1993). Initially, Ruth Handler conceived Barbie as a doll to encourage and allow little girls to use their individual fantasies when playing. She avoided assigning a specific personality to the doll because she wanted little girls to be active participants in their play with Barbie (Handler & Shannon, 1995). Handler's marketing strategy proved successful and Barbie was a top seller for over twenty years (Stern & Schoenhaus, 1991). By 1989, declining sales of Barbie dolls caused Mattel to rethink its marketing strategy. Rather than leave Barbie's personality and identity up to little girls' imaginations, Mattel conceded that marketing might be more successful if Barbie's identity were researched and designed by marketing experts (Kline, 1993). Today, Barbie's identities and accompanying storylines are carefully scripted, pre-tested, and monitored to ensure sales.

My interest in Barbie began in 2002, when the Mattel Corporation announced it would create "relevant products that expose girls to the wonderful world of arts education and creative exploration" (Mattel, 2002) (www.shareholder.com/mattel/news/20020405-76639.cfm). These products included an Art Teacher Barbie Doll, an interactive website dedicated to art education, and an animated film starring Barbie as an artist titled *Barbie as Rapunzel* (Hurley, 2002). Additionally, Mattel announced that it would join with the Entertainment Industry Foundation (EIF) and conduct an art teacher of the year search. As an art educator, I am concerned about what happens when corporations such as Mattel create and distribute representations that help construct the social reality of teaching art. Is the Mattel Corporation an appropriate advocate for art teachers? Does the Mattel Corporation contribute to high quality art education or does it simply exploit art teachers to sell products? I am joined in my concern by another art educator, Tom Schantz (2002), who, when learning of the product, mused, "What notions of our profession, of our curricula, and of ourselves do these dolls suggest?" (p. 52).

I answer these questions by interrogating Mattel's marketing strategy for Art Teacher Barbie and by examining its corporate activities.

I take by a cultural studies approach to analyzing visual culture by looking at how images and activities are produced, circulated, and consumed. This approach, described by Lister and Wells (2001), centres on “the study of the forms and practices of culture, their relationships to social groups and power relations between those groups as they are constructed and mediated through culture” (p. 61). I accept Steinberg and Kincheloe’s (1998) notion that it is “our parental, civic, and professional responsibility to study the corporate curriculum and its social and political effects” (p. 5). They further maintain that educators must hold corporations accountable for the pedagogical features of their products and activities. At the onset, however, a caveat is in order. Although my goal is to present a critique of Mattel’s corporate sponsorship, I do not want to detract from the winners of the contest, who are deserving of any praise and financial support. My comments in this article are in no way directed toward any teacher or student who participated in the contest.

ART TEACHER BARBIE

Since her conception in 1959, Barbie has modeled over 90 careers, including a doctor, dentist, paleontologist, and corporate executive. Barbie has been marketed as a teacher many times, starting in 1965 as a student teacher. By 1985 she was portrayed as an elementary school teacher. Her clothing and teaching paraphernalia were updated in 1992 and again in 1996, when she taught lessons on dinosaurs, music, and geography. In 1999, Barbie was a teacher of sign language (Barbies history, 2003. <http://groups.msn.com/BarbiesSecret/barbiesmanycareers.msnw>).

Art Teacher Barbie differs from the previous teachers only in the way she is dressed. As an elementary teacher in 1985, she wore a pale blue dress, which fell just below her knees. The dress was covered with a short vest. In comparison, Art Teacher Barbie is dressed much sexier. She wears a short printed mini skirt with red high heels and matching belt. She also wears a form fitting yellow top and pink scarf. Dolls come with one student, Kelly, who wears an identical outfit. Art Teacher Barbie can be purchased as African American, Asian, Caucasian, and Hispanic, and is twinned with a Kelly doll of the same ethnicity. Additionally, on the

back of the each package, Mattel illustrates with a girl playing with the doll: an African American girl plays with an African American Barbie, and so on (Schantz, 2002).

Barbie also comes with a drafting table and stool for Kelly, a red hairbrush, a colour wheel, some art supplies, and three sheets of blank paper. The suggested art activities include a rubbing activity and filling in five contour line drawings with supplied watercolors.

THE BARBIE ARTS TEACHER OF THE YEAR SEARCH™

Mattel held the Barbie Arts Teacher of the Year Search award in 2003 and 2004.¹ To nominate their teachers, Mattel required schoolchildren aged 6-12 to visit the Barbie website, where they were asked to write short essays about their teachers. Children needed parental permission to enter the contest. Twenty regional winners received \$5000, and the overall winner received an additional \$10,000. Moreover, winners received art supplies from RoseArt Industries, and students who nominated a winning teacher received Mattel toys worth \$100. The Entertainment Industry Foundation (E.I.F.)² announced in 2003 that it awarded \$110,000 in school grants and \$80,000 in art supplies to regional winners (Entertainment Industry Foundation newsletter, Vol. 1, 2003). This amount represents less than .001% per cent of Mattel's earnings, which in 1995 totaled more than \$1.1 billion (Amerman, 1995).

Regional winners of the contest included teachers of dance, music, drama, and the visual arts. Ms Jean Sullivan, a visual arts teacher at Timberstone Junior High School in Sylvania, Ohio, was the overall winner for 2003. After reading an article about local foster-care children who carried their personal belongings in trash bags, Ms. Sullivan had her seventh grade students paint second-hand suitcases to give to these children. Katie Bader, the 12-year-old student who nominated her, wrote, "This year, we have witnessed some frightening events, and we are proud of Miss Sullivan for showing us how our creativity can reach out to people and maybe make their lives a little more bearable." Mattel announced the project as "Love Luggage: Mixing Creativity with Charity." In reference to winning \$15,000, Ms. Sullivan stated, "This is more money than my art program received in four years." In addition, Ms. Sullivan was given art supplies donated by the RoseArt company.

(Entertainment Industry Foundation newsletter, Vol. 1, 2003). Tom Hall, a music and choir teacher from the Bronx, New York, was the winner for 2004 (Mattel, 2004b) (http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/parents/arts_teacher/new_main.asp.)

www.barbie.com/

Mattel posted facts about art education on the webpage devoted to Barbie. This website also contains two interactive art education features. In one, visitors may view five reproductions of paintings and learn the name of the artist, the title, and the date of each. The paintings feature young girls as ballerinas and all are by male artists (Mattel, 2003a). (<http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/activities/arts/paintingplace/>). Two paintings, *Dancer on Stage* (1878) and *The Dance Class* (1874) are by French painter, Edgar Degas. Mattel has created "Lighter than Air Barbie," a ballerina doll made of bisque porcelain inspired by Degas' painting. The doll is part of the Mattel's Prima Ballerina Collection and sells for around \$150. The second feature of the website is simply a colouring activity where visitors select between two landscapes and two interiors, and fill in sections of the drawing with colour.

BARBIE AS RAPUNZEL

Increasingly, toy companies recognize the importance of integrating their product with the entertainment industry to add life to their product, and toys now need a film to survive (Lindstrom, 2003). Mattel answered this need with *Barbie as Rapunzel* (Hurley, 2002). The animated film was not released in movie theatres, but was released directly on DVD. This decision is significant because films having a theatrical release must have a subplot to attract parent interest and most children will view the film with adults. Some DVDs are marketed directly to children, who will most likely watch the DVD alone or with friends. This saves the producers money in production and distribution, and allows them to speak directly to children without parental filters. In the main feature of the DVD, Barbie retells the traditional fairy tale of Rapunzel to Kelly. Unlike Rapunzel who used her hair to escape the oppression of the evil step-mother/witch, Barbie used her imagination and magic paintbrush. In the end, she married a handsome prince and was reunited with her

father.

A second section features an interview with Amanda Dunbar³, a 19-year-old painter. She is confident and radiates enthusiasm for the arts. She is shown with a large group of children in her studio, where all are painting and talking about how exciting and fun art can be. The last feature is an interactive game where players help Barbie hang nine paintings on the castle wall. Like the website, all paintings used in this DVD are by male artists such as Da Vinci, Botticelli, Caravaggio, and Reubens. Barbie tells a story about each painting and directs the viewer's attention to parts of the painting.

Corporate Advocacy

Values, beliefs, and ideas are mediated through the cultural objects and activities, but inherent meanings are not always apparent. In this section, I have examined Mattel's art education agenda within the wider social, political, economic, and global context to uncover these meanings

Mattel's art teacher contest, which identifies and financially rewards selected art teachers, is a form of cause-related marketing. Cause-related marketing is not a charitable donation. It is a strategically planned marketing effort designed to increase a company's sales or improve its position in the market place through actions that also benefit a charity. Increasingly, large companies who wish to appeal to adolescents have initiated a cause-related marketing program as part of their brand-building strategy (Lindstrom, 2003). Market researchers have found that concern for charity not only impresses parents, but is also valued by tweens, a strategy that works best when the areas of concern are related to children's issues. This strategy is demonstrated by the McDonald Corporation, which helps families stay close to their seriously ill children by donating a percentage of the revenue from each Happy Meal to Ronald McDonald Houses. Interestingly, tweens will not pay extra for a product or service, but they will choose one similarly-priced brand over another if they see that brand as doing charitable work (Lindstrom, 2003).

On the surface, Mattel's cause-related marketing appears to have some positive outcomes. Mattel highlights the work of exemplar art teachers in ways that art teachers themselves cannot. Art teachers simply

do not have the resources or media access. Because of Mattel's efforts, art teachers' involvement with students and concerns for social issues are made known to a larger public and several are financially rewarded for their programs. Their profession may benefit because art teachers may be viewed as significantly contributing to needs of society. Improving public perception of elementary art teachers is vital if they are to survive as a profession.

However, this public advocacy comes at a cost. Under the guise of a contest, Mattel has created a means to provide the corporation with the names, addresses, and personal information of thousands of art teachers and their students. The contest is in effect a market survey that enables Mattel to create products specifically for this target audience. By requiring parental permission for students to nominate their teachers, Mattel ensures that parents will visit the website with their children, where they will see the latest Barbie products sold on-line. Mattel's website targets not only children, but also adult collectors of the more expensive dolls, such as the porcelain ballerina doll. Only a small part of the site is devoted to art education, and it is little more than an on-line catalogue for Barbie products, which include electronics, software, fashion, home décor, and outdoor and sporting goods. The site also provides links to websites for Wal-mart and Toys "R" Us.

Mattel provides no information about how they select winners, nor do they reveal who judged the contest. It appears that Mattel personnel selected art teachers who best serve the corporation's goals. For grant money and art supplies, Mattel buys and brands an art teacher as a Barbie Art Teacher. These teachers become unpaid Mattel spokespersons, serving in the same manner as a highly paid celebrity who is hired to endorse a product. Just as a product, such as perfume, takes on the attributes of the celebrity who endorses it, Mattel's corporate image benefits from its association with hard working, selfless, caring teachers. This is especially helpful for Mattel, who since 1959, has faced criticism that Barbie dolls contribute to girls' poor body image and "supports unbridled consumerism as a reason for being" (Steinberg, 1998, p. 217).

Schools represent a cost-effective and less competitive alternative to saturated markets and advertising channels; and provide an opportunity

to enhance corporate image (Kenway & Bullen, 2001). Mattel's image was damaged in 1996, when Dateline NBC reported that in Indonesian factory girls as young as 13 were making Barbie doll clothes for two dollars a day (Dateline, 17 December 1996). Similar scandals involved other corporations such as Nike, Wal-mart, and Disney, and prompted parents and children to stage boycotts and protests. Teacher Bill Bigelow (1998) created lesson plans dealing with child labor and other sweatshop labor practices of large toy and clothing manufactures. In his article, "The Human Lives Behind the Labels: The Global Sweatshop, Nike, and the Race to the Bottom," Bigelow (1998) described how he made his students aware of economic globalization, where corporations maintain low-wage/weak union havens and do not press environment concerns.

In 2004, Mattel allowed an independent audit by the International Center for Corporate Accountability (ICCA) to be published on the Internet. Disney and Wal-Mart refused to make their audits public. The report, which examined working conditions in Mattel's factories in Asia and Mexico, indicated some workers had complained about a hostile work environment toward female employees by fellow workers and some workers in the maintenance department were required to work excessive overtime. The audit indicated that Mattel has since modified its practices and has taken steps to improve working conditions. ([http://www.mattel.com/about_us/ Corp_Responsibility/cr_mimco.asp](http://www.mattel.com/about_us/Corp_Responsibility/cr_mimco.asp)). However, it is important to note that Mexican labor law does not place any limitations on the maximum number of hours that workers may work in a specific time period, and, according to the audit, Mattel requires some workers to work up to 72 hours per week when needed (p. 8). Similarly, the audit showed that the average workweek in China is between 64 and 72 hours. Additionally, auditors found that some workers in China were paid 4.4 per cent below minimum wage. Although Mattel did receive a waiver from local governments to pay below minimum wage, the audit urges Mattel to revisit its salary structure "if not on legal grounds, then on the basis of compassion and fair treatment of workers" (International Center for Corporate Accountability, 2004, p. 19). Moreover, the audit may show only a partial picture because workers and factory managers may be reluctant to report damaging information about Mattel for fear of reprisal. Klein (2000)

discovered, "Fear pervades the zones. The governments are afraid of losing their foreign factories; the factories are afraid of losing their brand-name buyers; and the workers are afraid of losing their unstable jobs" (p. 206). According to Klein, the vast majority of workers are women. This is confirmed by the audit of factories in China where women comprise 90 per cent of the work force (see http://www.mattel.com/about_us/Corp_Responsibility/cr_mimco.asp).

Educators need to be vigilant about the practices of corporations because as art educators Zuk and Dalton (1999) suggest, "In forming an alliance we may be seen to offer our seal of approval on what companies do and how they do it" (p. 71).

BARBIE'S HIDDEN CURRICULUM

Although Mattel's marketing activities inform little girls that art teaching is a viable career choice, I am concerned that art will be seen as female activity, and boys will avoid participating in art activities. A golden rule of marketing is not to sell boys' toys to girls or girls' toys to boys. Moreover, marketing researchers, such as Lindstrom (2003), Kline (1993), and Sutherland and Thompson (2003), have found that girls will watch movies with leading male characters, such as *Finding Nemo*, but that boys will not watch movies with leading girl characters, such as *Lilo and Stitch*. Kline (1993) states, "Despite the theories about the need for non-sexist socialization, the pragmatics of marketing lead advertisers to rely on children's strictly gendered notions of peer play" (p. 249). Toys for boys deal with battle, action, and power, with the word "power" used 50 per cent of the time in ads (think Power Rangers.) Toys for girls deal with nurture, glamour, and domesticity (Kline, 1993). These values are illustrated in the Mattel's DVD segment showing Barbie concerned with decorating her new castle with valuable artworks. Here, Barbie embodies the characteristics of upper-middle class glamour, domesticity, and consumption.

The paradox of Barbie's teaching philosophy is evident in her choices of exemplars from art history. Although Mattel's motto is "We girls can do anything, right Barbie," the message is otherwise. All art is by male artists. In the decorating segment, Mattel has reduced art to a commodity, perhaps mirroring Barbie herself.

Mattel's support for the arts is undermined by the fact that Mattel has launched numerous copyright suits against artists and musicians (Klein, 2000). Like other corporations such as McDonald's, Mattel has the financial means to take legal action against anyone who copies or parodies Barbie's name or image. For example, Mattel successfully blocked a riot girl zine called *Hey There, Barbie Girl, and Miller's*, a magazine for Barbie collectors. *Miller's* editors believed Mattel sued them because they were critical of Mattel's high prices and that they ran old photographs of Barbie posing with packs of Virginia Slim cigarettes (Klein, 2000). By restricting the definition of art education to individual self-expression, study of old masters, and decor, Mattel has unwittingly provided a springboard to art educators who wish to explore broader definitions and to question the hegemony of Barbie through an issues-based art education that deals with culturally relevant issues such as violence, racism, sexism, and body image (Gaudelius & Speirs, 2002; Keifer-Boyd, Amburgy, & Knight, 2003).

Art teacher Barbie is marketed as African American, Asian, or Hispanic. However, on the Internet and in the DVD *Barbie as Rapunzel*, Barbie is Caucasian and blonde. Gilman (2000), for example, criticized Mattel's efforts at diversity as doing nothing more than reinforcing the status as "other." Reflecting on her own childhood experiences of playing with Barbie, she writes, "We urban, Jewish, black, Asian and Latina girls began to realize slowly and painfully that if you didn't look like Barbie, you didn't fit in...You were less beautiful, less valuable, less worthy" (p.17). Art educator, Wagner-Ott (2002) has pointed out the detrimental effects of this hegemonic market strategy, "The perpetuation of white, heterosexual, middle-class values of the fashion conscious Barbie icon has submerged heterosexual, racial, class, and ethnic identity themes" (p. 254).

MATTEL, through its Art Teacher Barbie products and suggested activities, reinforces the gendered stereotype of elementary teachers and links teaching young children with images of idealized, middle-class mothering. Educators Mitchell and Weber (1998) warn, "The stereotype of primary teacher as maternal feminizes the staffing of elementary schools, discouraging men who wish to teach at that level. But women too suffer from the tyranny of this stereotype" (p. 161). Moreover,

educators Goldstein and Lake (2000) found that preservice teachers enter the field with “idealistic, romantic, and oversimplified beliefs” about the relationships between teaching and caring. They argued that these preconceptions are shaped by pervasive portrayals of teachers in popular culture, which conflate caring and elementary school teaching. Goldstein and Lake call for instructional strategies to prevent caring teachers from succumbing to the burnout and exhaustion that accompanies a commitment to caring (p. 863).

Mattel’s curriculum further damages the image of elementary art teachers by emphasizing creativity over art knowledge and technical skills. Mattel’s website defines art teachers’ work as, “An art teacher teaches creative expression through color, composition, lighting, painting, drawing, sculpting, and more” (MATTEL, Inc. 2003c. http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/parents/products/products_icanbe2.asp?d=1). The site does not acknowledge any well-known scholars or art consultants in the field of art education. However, few art educators would approve of the art activities that Mattel has suggested, such as filling in coloring books and copying activities (Kindler, 1993; Schantz, 2002). Those activities do support the goals of RoseArt, the number one manufacturer of arts and crafts products in the United States. The company is also the second largest manufacturer of crayons and has strong market shares in message boards and markers (Roseart Industries, 2004) <http://www.roseart.com/about.html>. Winners of the art teacher contest receive art supplies, ensuring free product placement for RoseArt. Lindstrom (2003) has reminded educators, “Wherever you will find a product placement, you will find a school system short of money” (p. 220).

Through its products and marketing, Mattel suggests that indeed anyone can make art and teach others to make art, and that neither activity requires specialized training. This conceptualization is reinforced on the webpage where Amanda Dunbar, on the Rapunzel DVD, is quoted, “I think being a painter is the best job on the face of the earth because all you get to do is play and paint, and you actually get paid for doing it. People actually buy what you play with all day” (Mattel Inc., 2004a) (http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/Activities/Calendar/a_dunbar/dunbar.asp). The section of the DVD that features her implies she did not

need university training to become a successful teacher. Mattel's market strategy infers that anyone can tell a story, distribute art supplies, and encourage students to express themselves. Art is synonymous with recess. This thinking is especially detrimental to art teachers because often they are not viewed as essential to the school curriculum. When school budgets are cut or educational policies place emphasis on the basics, such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, they lose their jobs. The current condition in the United States, where school districts embrace the "No Child Left Behind" policies, can serve as a warning for Canadian educators. Art Educator Chapman (2004) warns that arts programs are especially vulnerable to cuts in the many states already in financial trouble, and in public schools where 35 per cent or more of students are at risk for academic failure. Mattel's market strategy reinforces the idea that art is self-expression and play, not a subject worthy of serious study.

CONCLUSION

Certainly the field of education needs and welcomes advocates for art educators. However, I agree with Zuk and Dalton (1999) who have stated,

As a fundamental principle, teachers should not have to raise money for basic material needs in running their programs.... Further, parents have a right to expect that their school boards will allocate sufficient resources to support the education of their children. (p. 69)

Moreover, educators need to question why schools do not receive adequate funding. For Saltman (2002), the answer is obvious: "The corporate tax drain caused by successful corporate lobbying against taxes and social spending has contributed to public schools – particularly urban and non-white public schools – being incapable of raising sufficient funds" (p. 61). The most injured parties of the corporate pursuit of profit are the first to be targeted for profiteering in the form of partnerships. Mattel is one of many corporations interested in schools, and researchers at the Commercialism in Education Research Unit⁴ found that commercial activities now shape the structure of the school day, influence the content of the curriculum, and determine whether children have access to a variety of technologies (Molnar, 2003). Saltman

(2000) posited that activities “take advantage of children by depriving them of meaningful education and by not only often promoting unhealthy products and misinformation but by also pushing crass consumerism” (p. 59).

Teachers who choose to enter into any partnership must inform themselves about that corporation. They must be aware that not all corporations share their cultural values or teaching philosophy. Such an example is an ad campaign by Skechers, a shoe company. In the “Naughty and Nice” ads, singer Christina Aguilera portrays both a nurse and patient; a teacher and student; and a police officer. The ads display a strong element of sexual fantasy and sado-masochism (Media Wath, 2004). (<http://www.mediawatch.com/gallery/ads/aguilerashoead>). Nurses opposed the ads because they believed they mocked professional women and portrayed nurses as sex objects, thus undermining their value in the workplace. They sent Skechers 3000 e-mail messages, reminding the company “there are three million registered nurses in North America alone, all are working age adults, the vast majority are female (who do most purchasing), and many of their family members and friends are also consumers of Skechers products” (Center for Nursing Advocacy, 2004a, 2004b) (www.nursingadvocacy.org/news/2004aug/17_skechers.html). Skechers got the message, discontinued the ads, and issued an apology to nurses. The Center for Nursing Advocacy developed a website for increasing public understanding of nursing and has directed visitors to nurse friendly films, products, and corporate sponsors. They encourage nurses and nurse-friendly individuals to create art and other media works that recognize the real-life contributions of nurses (<http://www.nursingadvocacy.org/create/create.html>). The Center also sells a male nurse action figure. Although I am not suggesting art teachers take action against Mattel, I do think they can learn a lesson from nurses. Art teachers likewise must join together to be proactive in their own advocacy.

In all corporate alliances, educators must remember that corporations create cultural products for economic reasons, not necessarily to educate or enlighten children. Bakan (2004) has reminded us, “Corporations become involved with schools for the same reason

they do everything else – to promote their own and their owners’ financial interests” (p. 129). Educators can no longer view themselves as passive consumers or mere recipients of charity. Art teachers must ask why art education for all children is not adequately funded. If the cause is the direct result of corporate greed, then they must refuse to be co-opted and branded by the very same corporations that undermine their curriculum and provide material benefit for a select few.

NOTES

¹The contest has been discontinued.

²The E.I.F. funds programs in a variety of areas, including education and children’s services, the arts, community service, the environment, AIDS, and literacy.

³Dunbar was born in 1982 in Thunder Bay, Ontario, and now lives in Texas. Her artwork can be seen at www.amandadunbar.com/

⁴The Commercialism in Education Research Unit, directed by Alex Molnar, conducts research about commercial activities in schools. It is located at Arizona State University and can be visited at the following website: <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/ceru.htm>

REFERENCES

- Amerman, J. (1995). *The story of Mattel, Inc.* Publication, Number 1454. New York: Newcomen
- Bakan, J. (2004). *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power.* Toronto: Penguin Book.
- Barbie’s History: She works for her money. (2004). Retrieved December 31, 2005 from <http://groups.msn.com/barbiessecret/barbiesmany careers.msnw>
- Bigelow, B. (1998). The human lives behind labels – The global sweatshop, Nike, and the race to the bottom. In W. Ayers, J. Hunt, & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. 21-38). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chapman, L. (2004). No child left behind in art? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 106(2), 3-17
- Center for Nursing Advocacy. (2004a). Create and support nurse-friendly media and art. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from <http://www.nursingadvocacy.org/create/create.html>
- Center for Nursing Advocacy. (2004b). Skechers pulls Christina Aguilera “nurse”

- ad after receiving more than 3,000 letters from nursing supporters. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from http://www.nursingadvocacy.org/news/2004aug/17_skechers.html
- Entertainment Industry Foundation newsletter, 2003, Vol. 1. EIF plays an instrumental role in arts education. Retrieved September 12, 2004 from www.eifoundation.org/new/pdf/EIF.Newsletter18.pdf
- Gaudelius, Y., & Speirs, P. (2002). *Contemporary issues in art education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gilman, S. J. (2000). Klaus Barbie and other dolls I'd like to see. In O. Edut (Ed.), *Body Outlaws: Young women write about body image identity* (pp.14-21). New York: Seal Press.
- Goldstein, L., & Lake, V. (2000). "Love, love, and more love for children": Exploring preservice teachers understanding of caring. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 16 (2000), 861-872. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from <http://www.ece.uncc.edu/succeed/journals/journal01.html>
- Handler, R., & Shannon, J. (1995). *Dream Doll: The Ruth Handler Story*. Stamford, CT: Longmeadow Press.
- Hurley, O. (Director). (2002). *Barbie as Rapunzel*. [film animation]. Los Angeles, CA: Family Home Entertainment.
- International Center for Corporate Accountability. (2004). *Audit report for Factories in China*. New York. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from <http://www.icca-corporateaccountability.org/>
- Keifer-Boyd, K., Amburgy, P., & Knight, W. (2003). Three approaches to teaching visual culture in K-12 school contexts. *Art Education*, 56 (2), 44-51.
- Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2001). *Consuming children: Education-entertainment-advertising*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Kindler, A. (1993). Worship of creativity and artistic development of young children. *Canadian Society of Art Education*, 12(16), 12-16.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No logo: Taking aim at the brand name bullies*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Kline, S. (1993). *Out of the garden: Toys, TV, and children's culture in the age of marketing*. London, UK: Verso.
- Lindstrom, M. (2003). *Brandchild: Remarkable insights into the minds of today's kids*

and their relationships with brands. London, UK: Sterling.

- Lister, M., & Wells, L. Seeing beyond belief: Cultural studies as an approach to analyzing the visual. In T. Van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 61-91). London, UK: Sage.
- Martin, C. (Producer). (1996, December 17). Toystory. *Dateline*. New York: National Broadcasting Corporation.
- Mattel, Inc. (2002). Barbie brand adds color to the campaign for better-quality arts education through supporting "Barbie cares supporting children in the arts." Retrieved December 31, 2005, from <http://www.shareholder.com/mattel/news/20020405-76639.cfm>
- Mattel, Inc. (2003a). My painting place. Retrieved August 4, 2004, from <http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/activities/arts/paintingplace/>
- Mattel, Inc. (2003b). Parents. Retrieved December 12, 2003, from http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/parents/products/products_icanbe2.asp
- Mattel, Inc. (2003c). What kind of artist can I be? Retrieved August 4, 2003, from http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/parents/products/products_icanbe2.asp?d=1
- Mattel, Inc. (2004a). Meet Amanda Dunbar. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/Activities/Calendar/a_dunbar/dunbar.asp
- Mattel, Inc. (2004b). Music instructor named 2004 Barbie Art Teacher of the Year. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from http://barbie.everythinggirl.com/parents/arts_teacher/new_main.asp
- Media Watch. (2004). Hall of shame image archives. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from <http://www.mediawatch.com/gallery/ads/aguilershoead>
- Mitchell, C., & Reid-Walsh, J. (2002). *Researching children's popular culture: The cultural spaces of childhood*. London, UK: Routledge
- Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (1998). *Reinventing ourselves as teachers: Beyond nostalgia*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Molnar, A. (2003). Sold out: Corporate marketing in America's schools. Retrieved August 4, 2004, from <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/CERU/Documents/CERU-0310-177-RW.doc>
- RoseArt Industries. (2004). The RoseArt story. Retrieved December 31, 2005, from

<http://www.roseart.com/about.html>

- Saltman, K. (2000). *Collateral damage: Corporatizing public schools – A Threat to democracy*. Landhem, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Schantz, T. (2002). Art Teacher Barbie & Kelly: Some observations. *School Arts*, 102(4), 52-53.
- Steinberg, S. (1998). The bitch who has everything. In S. Steinberg & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood* (pp. 207-218). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Steinberg, S., & Kincheloe, J. (1998). No more secrets—Kinderculture, information saturation, and the postmodern childhood. In S. Steinberg & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood* (pp. 1-30). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stern, S., & Schoenhaus, T. (1991). *Toyland: The high-stakes game of the toy industry*. Chicago: Contemporary Books.
- Sutherland, A., & Thompson, B. (2003). *Kidfluence: The marketer's guide to understanding and reaching generation Y-kids, tweens, and teens*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wagner-Ott, A. (2002). Analysis of gender identity through doll and action figure politics in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 43(3), 246-263.
- Zuk, B., & Dalton, R. (1999). Buying in or selling out: Corporate alliances in art education. In B. Hanley (Ed.), *Leadership, advocacy, communication: A vision for arts education in Canada* (pp. 66-81). Victoria, BC: The Canadian Music Educators Association.