



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2017

Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations in History: A Phenomenological Study

Joshua C. Tipton

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tipton, Joshua C., "Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations in History: A Phenomenological Study" (2017). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3180. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3180>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations in History:

A Phenomenological Study

A dissertation

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

by

Joshua Charles Tipton

May 2017

Dr. Pamela Scott, Chair

Dr. Cecil Blankenship

Dr. Bill Flora

Dr. Stephanie Tweed

Keywords: Indigenous, American exceptionalism, Multiculturalism, Social justice education,
Tribal Critical Race Theory

ABSTRACT

Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations in History:

A Phenomenological Study

by

Joshua C. Tipton

This qualitative study addresses teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples representation in United States history. This phenomenological study was conducted within a school district in East Tennessee. For the purpose of this study, teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history were defined as teacher beliefs towards the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in United States history. To gather data, both one-on-one and focus group interviews were conducted from a purposeful sample of United States history teachers from the high schools in the school district. Through an analysis of data derived from interviews and qualitative documents the researcher was able to identify themes such as systemic challenges to multiculturalism within state course standards and textbooks, teachers' perceived self-efficacy in teaching their students using indigenous perspectives, and the perpetuation of indigenous stereotypes. Furthermore, the qualitative data derived from the study reveals that U.S. history courses in the district perpetuate both the notion of indigenous peoples as historical bystanders and the racial stereotypes of Native Americans. Findings from this study will be useful in evaluating both teacher training and instructional practice in regard to indigenous representations in history.

Copyright © 2017

Joshua C. Tipton

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

For T.N.T and J.R.T

Hope has two beautiful daughters.

Their names are anger and courage;

anger at the way things are,

and courage to see that they do not remain the way they are.

- SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my wife Brittany A. Tipton for her unwavering support, encouragement, and inspiration throughout this academic pursuit. I would also like to thank my parents who raised my siblings and me to believe in the importance of education, the transformational power of love, and respect for all of God's creation. Additionally, I would like to thank my brother Caleb C. Tipton for accepting the challenge to endure this experience with me each step of the way. To all of my family, representing both the Cherokee and Muscogee (Creek) Nations, thank you. Finally, I must express my deep gratitude for the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Pamela Scott (Chair), Dr. Bill Flora, Dr. Stephanie Tweed, and Dr. Cecil Blankenship, for their direction and guidance. Shalom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION.....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
LIST OF TABLES	10
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
Statement of the Problem.....	13
Significance of the Study	15
Research Questions	17
Limitations and Delimitations.....	17
Definition of Terms	19
Overview of the Study	20
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	22
Introduction.....	22
Systemic Challenges to Indigenous Representations in History.....	24
American Exceptionalism.....	35
Perpetuation of Indigenous Stereotypes in the Classroom	41
Pedagogical Barriers to Indigenous Representation.....	45
Culturally Responsive Teaching, Multicultural Education & Tribal Critical Race Theory.....	55
Culturally Responsive Teaching.....	55
Multicultural Education.....	58
Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory	61
Social Justice Education	63

Summary	65
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	67
Introduction	67
Research Questions	67
Qualitative Research Design	68
Phenomenology	69
Role of the Researcher	70
Ethical Considerations	71
Setting	72
Population	73
Sampling Strategy	74
Sample	75
Data Collection Procedures	76
Measures of Rigor	77
Data Analysis	78
Summary	79
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	81
Introduction	81
Data Collection	83
Participant Profiles	83
Researcher's Notes and Memos	90
Interview Results	94
Research Question 1	94
Differentiation Between Personal and Professional Perception	94
Inclusion versus Addition	99

Research Question 2.....	102
A Culture of Curricular Constriction.....	102
Stick to the Script	107
Research Question 3.....	115
Perpetuation of Stereotypes	115
The Vanishing Indian	118
Research Question 4.....	122
Victimized and Marginalized.....	122
Summary of Data Analysis	126
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	128
Introduction.....	128
Conclusions	128
Research Question 1.....	129
Research Question 2.....	132
Research Question 3.....	134
Research Question 4.....	135
Recommendations for Practice.....	137
Recommendations for Further Research.....	138
Concluding Summary	140
REFERENCES	142
APPENDICES	164
Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter.....	164
Appendix B: Informed Consent	166
Appendix C: Focus Group Interview Protocol and Alignment.....	169
Appendix D: Individual Interview Protocol and Alignment.....	170

VITA..... 171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Research Questions and Data Collection Alignment	68
2. Frequently Used Terms in Participant Responses Corresponding to RQ4.....	123

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

According to the 2010 national census 5.2 million people identified themselves as American Indian and Alaska Native either alone or in combination with one or more other races (United States Census Bureau, 2012). There are currently over 566 federally recognized American Indian tribes in the United States (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2014). There are hundreds more non-federal and state recognized tribes that each represents the unique cultural, lingual, and historical traditions of the indigenous people living in our country (Keene, 2015). These statistics are illustrative of both the diverse population and the diversity of historical representations present within the United States. The voice of indigenous people is not typically heard by the millions of students who are required to take courses in American history as part of their basic graduation requirements within public school systems across the country. Studies of indigenous representation within state curriculum standards have revealed that the historical discourse on Native peoples is consistently cast from the Eurocentric view of Natives as the uncivilized, victimized and oppressed relics of a distant past (Chandler, 2010; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Loewen, 2010; Rains, 2006; Shear et al., 2015). Studies of history textbooks promote a narrative rife with negative and stereotypical representations of indigenous peoples (Aldridge 2006; Fleming, 2006; Loewen, 2010; Marino, 2011). Although a review of curricular standards and course texts cannot adequately portray the representation of indigenous peoples in classroom environments, there is no doubt that they strongly influence teachers' curricular decisions, and therefore, student learning (Apple, 2004; Mathison & Freeman, 2004; Shear et al., 2015). The 210 curriculum standards for United States history in the state of Tennessee, which would include instructional standards for 8th grade social studies and high school United States history and geography and encompass a historical timeframe from 1600 to the present, contain

only 17 indicators pertaining to indigenous people (Tennessee State Department of Education, 2016). Of the 17 indicators that refer to indigenous people, there is no mention of indigenous cultural practice beyond the colonial period, no reference to the historical significance of an individual American Indian after 1890, and only two standards identify a specific tribe. In contrast, 15 of the 17 course standards for teaching United States history in Tennessee represent indigenous people within the context of conflict, colonialism, and oppression. As such, the representation of indigenous peoples in the teaching curriculum of United States history diminishes student understanding of the historical significance of Natives to the story of America. As Portillo (2013) argues, “It is integral for students to realize that Native American history is not simply a story of victimization, but rather a story about survival, resistance, transformation, and healing (p. 160).

As a result of educational reform, an overabundance of curricular standards, and reliance upon monotonous, American exceptionalist textbooks, the teaching of United States history has become burdensome for educators and boring for students (Loewen, 1996; Maranto, 2015; Rabb, 2004; Spring, 2011). The lack of multiple historical perspectives found in United States history curriculum standards and course texts leads students to believe that the story of their country holds no relevance to their lives, diminishing their ability to think critically about the past and its connection to the present (Gay, 2004; Loewen, 2010; Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012). The dominant historical narrative of the United States to which students are exposed fails to adequately represent the many voices of the American past; voices that students need to hear in order to become more engaged in historical study and actually develop historical knowledge. In fact, it has been argued that the authoritarian voice so commonly found in history textbooks “might actually inhibit students’ learning of history” (Paxton, 1999, p. 315). James Loewen

(2010) states, “Indeed, in my experience, the more history a student has taken in high school, the less able s/he is to think sociologically. Some college history professors agree...In no other discipline do college professors prefer students with less preparation!” (p.9). History teachers and students should be afforded the opportunity to truly study the story of America, and this means teaching and learning the story from multiple perspectives. At present, the neglect of the significance of indigenous peoples to the story of the United States is a disservice for students and teachers. Native Americans, although they are iconically depicted as symbolic of American heritage and culture, are arguably the most misunderstood ethnic group in the United States, which can directly be attributed to current methods of teaching and learning (Fleming, 2006; Morgan, 2009). In her work, *American Indians: Stereotypes and Realities*, Choctaw historian and writer Devon Mihesuah (1996) proposes that “no other ethnic group in the United States has endured greater and more varied distortions of its cultural identity than American Indians” (p. 13). Indigenous peoples are presented far too often as bystanders to the narrative of United States history rather than active participants, impacting students’ and teachers’ perceptions of Native peoples. The lack of emphasis upon the historical significance of indigenous peoples to America’s past influences how they are perceived in the present.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with the current curricular focus of United States history in American public schools is that students are, in many cases, only exposed to historical accounts that “portray the dominant narrative of those who hold power in society, serve the purpose of political indoctrination, and marginalize non-Whites, women, the poor and working classes among others” (Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012, p. 306). This can severely undermine the educational experience of students in history classes because “the teaching of history, more than

any other discipline, is dominated by textbooks” (Loewen, 1996, p. 13). Studies have shown that the reliance upon textbooks and curriculum standards that lack diverse perspectives can greatly impact students’ understanding of, and desire to learn, history (Gay, 2004; Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012; Loewen, 1996; Spring, 2011; Woodson, 2015). Furthermore, while social studies would seem to be the most appropriate school subject for exploring issues of race, power, inequality and social justice, principles of multicultural education have not widely been implemented in the teaching of history outside of generalized and simplistic discussions of diversity (Chandler, 2010; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Howard, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Martell, 2013; Wills, 2001).

Indigenous peoples, who undoubtedly played a tremendous role in the narrative of the United States, receive little attention within United States history courses other than as a historical footnote to the successes of colonialism and Manifest Destiny. Grande (2004) argues that indigenous representations in American history are most often framed as good versus bad and promote “distorted myths that invisibilize American Indians in the 21st century” (p.103). Recent studies of textbooks in the United States have revealed that “87 percent of references to American Indians in all 50 states’ academic standards portray them in a pre-1900 context” and that “all 50 states lack any content about current Native events or challenges” (Landry, 2014, para. 16). For example, textbooks in the state of Nebraska continue to refer to Natives as “lazy, drunk or criminal”, and only 10% of manuscripts focused on the stories of Native peoples are actually authored by Native writers (Landry, 2014, para. 23-24). Examinations of textbooks in California and Texas reveal that indigenous peoples are represented in such a way that students could perceive Native Americans as savages responsible for their own demise due to their resistance to white encroachment and settlement (Gesener, 2011; Trafzer & Lorimer, 2014).

Consequently, perceptions towards indigenous peoples are likely influenced by the historical indifference and stereotypes that characterize the portrayal of native peoples in United States history curriculum and textbooks. While the content of history textbooks and state curriculum standards do not represent the pedagogical depth and portrayal of indigenous perspectives taught in United States history courses, they do promote the notion of what knowledge is deemed important enough for classroom teachers to teach their students. Thus, current texts and curricular standards would indicate that the historical significance and representation of Native Americans is best relegated to the triumphs of colonialism, which promotes stereotypical views of indigenous peoples and omits their historical voice. As Shear et al. (2015) put it, “Even though textbooks and standards may not necessarily characterize what is actually taught in the classrooms, they often represent a societal misperception about Indigenous Peoples that teachers may themselves perpetuate” (p.73).

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in the study of United States History within a school district in eastern Tennessee. For the purpose of this study, high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history will be defined as teacher beliefs towards the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples, the peoples and cultures native to North America prior to European colonization, in the teaching of United States history.

Significance of the Study

This research is significant in that it strengthens the body of knowledge in regard to indigenous representations in history. The research findings will further the field of educational research on the influence of curricular standards and course texts on teacher perceptions of multicultural education and marginalized populations. The focus of this study is to examine

teacher perceptions towards indigenous representation in the study of United States history within the school district in order to gauge how these historical representations, or the lack thereof, influences the perception of the historical significance of Native Americans and their current place in American society. This study directly addresses the need for scholarly research on the systemic challenges to teaching diverse historical perspectives in the current educational climate, which emphasizes standardized instruction and testing as a means of accountability for schools and educators.

An additional significance of this study is that it may serve to provoke further consideration of teacher training and preparation, especially in the teaching of social studies, so that educators are more readily able to draw connections between societal issues in the past and present. As Haynes-Writer (2008) proposes, “The careful preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers with a MCE (multicultural education) as social justice framework promises to extend a deepened and socially just education to students, and ultimately our citizenry” (p. 8). Limiting the teaching and learning about indigenous peoples to the distant past in the study of United States history not only robs students of historically significant perspectives, it perpetuates misconceptions and stereotypes of Native Americans (Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Morgan, 2009; Portillo, 2013). Furthermore, the omission of the historical voice of indigenous peoples in the teaching of the more recent past diminishes the voice of indigenous communities in the present. Curricular standards and course texts that firmly place Natives outside the realm of modern history effectively remove indigenous peoples from the modern consciousness of social discourse by covertly implying to teachers and students that Native representations are not necessary to understanding modern America. “The everyday experiences of American Indians, the Indigenous inhabitants of the Americas, have essentially been removed from the awareness

of dominant members of U.S. society. These viable images have instead been replaced with fixed images from the past of what American Indians once were” (Brayboy, 2005, p.431). Greater emphasis upon the role of native peoples to the story of the United States will not only help to create more knowledgeable and culturally aware students, it would serve to highlight the strength and value of Native American cultures, which is critical to the development of a more informed understanding of indigenous peoples in the United States today. As Keene (2015) puts it, “If Native peoples are only situated in the imaginations of the public, we will never have the support and understanding we need to move our communities forward” (103).

Research Questions

This study will be guided by the following general research questions:

1. What are high school teacher perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?
2. What are high school teacher perceptions of challenges to teaching United States history from the perspectives of indigenous people?
3. What are high school teacher perceptions of the historical representation of indigenous people in United States history curriculum?
4. What are high school teacher perceptions of indigenous people?

Limitations and Delimitations

The phenomenological nature of this study requires that the researcher emphasize the textual descriptions of the participants’ experiences in order to create a narrative of the “essence of the experience” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014, p. 411). Qualitative data derived through interviews, observations, and artifacts must provide the audience with a fair representation of the participants’ perceptions in regard to the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives

in the study of United States history. To ensure trustworthiness, the researcher will implement the use of thick description derived from face to face interviews and focus group interviews. In order to help mitigate bias and increase credibility, especially in regard to self-reported qualitative data, the use of participant review or member checks were applied (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Shenton, 2004). The researcher's own influence as a former administrator and history teacher could create reliability issues through the interview process and requires attention to reflexivity (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). Participation in the study was voluntary, participants were presented with an informed consent agreement, and individual schools, teachers, and students will remain anonymous as a means of not only bolstering the trustworthiness of the data, but also ensuring anonymity and safety for participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Shenton, 2004).

Limitations for the study include the sample size and sampling method. The qualitative method's emphasis upon rich, detailed descriptions within a naturalistic setting demands that the researcher employ sampling methods that adequately meet the needs of the inquiry (Creswell, 2014; Marshall, 1996; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Patton, 2015). The inductive nature of this study requires the implementation of purposeful sampling and the careful selection of participants. As Marshall (1996) puts it, purposeful sampling techniques provide the researcher with the ability to select "the most productive sample to answer the research question" (p.523).

The fact that both the participants of the study and the researcher are non-indigenous must be mentioned as a limitation of the study due to the historical complications derived from non-indigenous writers producing works focused on indigenous topics (Shear et al., 2015; Wilson, 1996). Furthermore, the participants' personal background and experience, in addition

to, their own educational experiences could limit their ability to provide in-depth, rich responses to each research question.

This study was delimited to a school district in East Tennessee and a purposeful sample population of high school teachers who primarily teach United States history. Although other social studies teachers within the school district could potentially provide valuable data for this study, the selected sample could best provide a descriptive essence of the phenomenon due to their lived experiences teaching United States history. The participants of the study possess the greatest knowledge of the subject area, curricular standards, and textbook content, making them better suited to define their own perceptions of indigenous representations in history.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study.

1. American Exceptionalism: The belief that United States history has been divinely guided “by the hand of a Christian God and that the country’s unique superior set of republican values should be spread around the world” (Spring, 2011, p. 120).
2. Colonialism: The process of European-American establishment of power structures over land, resources, and society, which innately led to the subjugation and oppression of indigenous populations and culture, including the relationship between indigenous peoples and education (Brayboy, 2005; Portillo, 2013).
3. Indigenous Peoples: For the purpose of this study, indigenous peoples follows the definitions put forth by Haynes-Writer (2008) and Shear et al. (2015), who employ the terms indigenous and indigenous peoples to be inclusive of all Native/Native American groups. It is important to note that many terms used to identify indigenous peoples are derivative of Eurocentric imposition. Using the term Indigenous Peoples, which is rooted

in the civil rights movement, allows the researcher to respect the current discourse around identity, sovereignty, and naming (Shear et al., 2015; Smith, 1999).

4. Multicultural Education: A pedagogical approach that emphasizes critical thinking in regard to diversity and equity with the aim of employing educational contexts as a means for the transmission of social justice (Haynes-Writer, 2008). For the purpose of this study, Nieto and Bode (2008) provide the most appropriate definition of multicultural education, describing it as an approach to curriculum and instruction that “uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (praxis) as the basis for social change, multicultural education furthers the democratic principles of social justice” (p.44).
5. Social Justice: The promotion of the equitable distribution of resources, physical and psychological security for all members of society, self-determination, and “a sense of social responsibility toward and with others and the society as a whole” (Bell, 1997, p.3). Of further use to this study is Haynes-Writer’s (2008) argument that multicultural education as social justice “requires the study of historical issues and events to understand the manifestations of oppression in its present form” (p. 5).

Overview of the Study

The aim of this study is to explore teacher perceptions towards indigenous peoples in the teaching of United States History within an East Tennessee school district by examining their reported experiences in regard to the inclusion and representation of the historical perspective and significance of indigenous peoples. Thus, the central question of the research, “What are high school teachers perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?”, will allow the opportunity for the participants’ to provide the

researcher with rich, in-depth descriptions of their experience of the phenomenon under study. This study includes five chapters. Chapter 1 identifies the need for this research via an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the research questions, definitions of significant terms, and a review of the limitations and delimitations of the research study. Chapter 2 presents a review of literature that includes the themes within the scholarly research that supports the objective of the study. Chapter 3 contains a thorough description of the research methodology and design. Chapter 4 provides the reader with the researcher's interpretation of the qualitative data derived from the study, the coding of descriptive data, and the research findings. Chapter 5 concludes the study with a presentation of the summary of the findings, the study's conclusions, and implications for practitioners and further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

While there is a gap in the literature specifically focused upon teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples in history, there is a rather large body of research that emphasizes the inclusion of diverse perspectives within classroom instruction, especially in the academic areas of social studies and history, as a means of producing positive educational outcomes for all students (Aldridge, 2006; Epstein et al., 2011; Gay, 2013; Loewen, 2010; Terenzini et al., 2001; Zirkel, 2008). The inclusion of diverse historical perspectives in the teaching of history, in conjunction with instructional attention to notions of race and power, not only produces higher levels of student engagement (Epstein et al., 2011; King & Chandler, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Martell, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Zirkel, 2008), it can also impact students' own notions of self-worth and efficacy (Brown & Brown, 2010; Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Keene, 2015; Woodson, 2015). Additionally, there is a breadth of research evidence that indicates that the instructional behaviors of teachers in regard to the inclusion and representation of diverse perspectives within the classroom are influenced by their own perceptions towards diversity (de Waal-Lucas, 2007; Gay, 2013; Journell, 2009; King & Chandler, 2016; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). As Gay (2013) puts it, "Positive attitudes about ethnic, racial, and gender differences generate positive instructional expectations and actions toward diverse students, which in turn, have positive effects on students' learning efforts and outcomes. Conversely, negative teacher beliefs produce negative teaching and learning behaviors" (p. 56).

What is clear within the review of literature relating to the implementation of multicultural representations and perspectives in the teaching of history is that the inclusion of

multiple voices, especially the voice of indigenous peoples, is hindered by systematic, sociopolitical, and pedagogical barriers. The systemic challenges to teaching indigenous perspectives within current educational practices, which would include the emphasis on state curricular standards and standardized testing as a means of measuring school and teacher effectiveness, constrain classroom instruction to standardized topics of study and test preparation. A historical examination of the problematic relationship between public education policies and practice and Native Americans illuminates long standing systemic issues that continue to impact both the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples within current school curriculum and Native students today. The strength of American exceptionalist ideology within history textbooks and the perpetuation of indigenous stereotypes within the United States stand as sociopolitical obstacles to multiculturalism in history classrooms due to their inherent promotion of the dominant, Eurocentric narrative of the past. Finally, pedagogical hurdles to the inclusion and accurate representation of indigenous peoples are identified throughout the literature and include the struggle to promote multicultural instructional practices with fidelity while addressing issues of race and power, educators' lack of knowledge in regard to multicultural teaching or the direct avoidance of instructional topics dealing with race or racism, and a lack of emphasis upon the teaching of history through a multicultural lens as a means toward social justice. For the purposes of this study, further attention to these systematic, sociopolitical, and pedagogical factors was warranted in order to address the phenomenon of teacher perceptions towards indigenous people in history. The literature reveals that these barriers influence not just the inclusion and representation of Native Americans in the teaching of history, but that they also impact the perception of indigenous peoples in both the past and present.

Systemic Challenges to Indigenous Representations in History

Since the 1983 report “A Nation at Risk”, science, math, and reading have become “the driving force behind education reform and the study of history was quickly relegated to a distant secondary status” (Maranto, 2015, p. 2). Subsequent educational reform programs such as President G.W. Bush’s “No Child Left Behind” in 2002 and President Obama’s “Race to the Top” differed in design, but both retained the emphasis on standardized testing as the primary method of measuring student and school success. With greater emphasis on standardized testing as a means of evaluating schools and increasing accountability for teachers, classroom instruction has become intensely focused upon state standards and textbooks, which, in the study of history, has led to a focus upon traditional Eurocentric historical perspectives and American exceptionalism rather than the multicultural emphasis that can make the study of the past more meaningful to students (Evans, 2001; Forbes, 2000; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Journell, 2009; Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012; Noboa, 2011; Spring, 2011). Bound by limited class time, test preparation, curriculum standards, and textbook content, teachers and students are often deprived of the opportunity to thoughtfully examine United States history from multiple voices and instead are relegated to teacher-centered activities that provide little room for critical thinking or analysis (Loewen, 2010). In fact, Levstik and Tyson (2008) report that social studies teachers are often “afraid to expand beyond test guidelines and textbook narratives” due to the emphasis on high-stakes testing as a means of measuring teacher and school effectiveness, citing the most common activities in current social studies classrooms as “filling out worksheets (87%), reading from a textbook (77%), and “memorizing material you have read” (61%)” (p.59).

Surveys of national and state standards performed by renowned educational researchers Marzano and Kendall reveal that “history and civics are by far the worst offenders” in regard to a proliferation of course standards and “benchmarks” that students are expected to learn (Loewen, 2010, p.21). Indeed, proponents of multicultural education have argued that the narrowing of history curriculum via course standards in order to adequately prepare students for state assessments and end of course exams is inherently constricting the instructional autonomy of educators under the guise of teacher accountability (Journell, 2009; Ross, 2006; Vogler & Virtue, 2007). Emphasis upon covering standards in the classroom rather than the pursuit of a critical understanding of history, severely limits the discussion of issues such as race, racism, and power, as well as the inclusion of alternate perspectives to the dominant historical narrative of the United States. The historical significance and representation of indigenous peoples is especially limited within current curriculum standards and textbooks, and what little attention Native Americans do receive in the study of United States history is relegated to the distant past (Bennett, 2007; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Rains, 2006; Shear et al., 2015).

Recent studies have shown that the historical voice of indigenous peoples in the story of the United States is largely neglected within current textbooks and state standards (Journell, 2009; Loewen, 2010; Shear et al., 2015). Shear et al.’s (2015) study of K-12 curriculum standards from all 50 states and the District of Columbia reveals the “systematic confining of curriculum about Indigenous Peoples to pre-1900 America”, finding that 86.66% of the curricular standards for either state or United States history courses place Native Americans in a pre-1900 context (p. 81-82). Most alarmingly, 17 states currently have no curricular standards that address indigenous peoples after 1900 (Shear et al., 2015).

Numerous other studies focusing upon state curriculum standards have revealed a limited emphasis on the historical experiences of people of color (Anderson, 2012; Anderson & Metzger, 2011; Journell, 2009; Loewen, 2010; Vasquez-Heilig, Brown, & Brown, 2012). The curricular coverage for indigenous peoples is especially sparse, even in comparison with the number of state standards that reference other groups of color such as Blacks or Latinos (Journell, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Rains, 2003; Shear et al., 2015; Vasquez-Heilig, Brown, & Brown, 2012). For example, Vasquez-Heilig, Brown, and Brown's (2012) review of curriculum standards in the state of Texas identified the representation of indigenous peoples in only 4% of course curricular standards focused upon the historical perspectives of non-whites. Studies such as these are valuable not only in regard to their provision of evidence for the critical examination of curricular treatment of people of color, but also provide an indication of how standardized curriculum symbolizes what knowledge is deemed worth learning in the classroom. As Good (2009) states, "Studying school curriculum is critical to understanding how society's status quo is maintained" (p. 52).

The limited number of course standards that do actually provide attention to indigenous peoples are dominated by portrayals of Native Americans as the victims of oppression and bystanders to colonialism, typically focusing most heavily on topics such as the Trail of Tears and the Indian Removal Act (Journell, 2009; Portillo, 2013; Shear et al., 2015). Additionally, there is no widely accepted canon of significant indigenous historical figures or Native American contributors to American society. As Journell (2009) puts it, "Moreover, there appears to be no single American Indian that all of the states deem salient for an understanding of American history" (p. 24). In fact, one of the few historical figures discussed within almost all of the state curriculum standards focusing on indigenous perspectives is Andrew Jackson, essentially

reinforcing the dominant, Eurocentric view of United States history that Native Americans were not active participants in the story of our nation, simply just an unfortunate historical example of the oppression of minorities (Journell, 2009). Again, because the teaching and learning of United States history leans so heavily upon curriculum standards and textbooks, the version of history that many students are taught reinforces negative stereotypes of indigenous people and diminishes the historical significance of Native Americans (Aldridge, 2006; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Marino, 2011; Shear et al., 2015).

The emphasis upon the measurement of school and teacher effectiveness via prescribed course curriculum standards and standardized testing has not only been argued as a systemic challenge to the inclusion and representation of diverse perspectives in the classroom, it has also been shown to influence indigenous community schools directly responsible for the education of indigenous students (Beaulieu, 2006; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002). Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) provide a critical overview of the contradictory practices of the American system of public education versus the sovereignty and rights to self-determination provided for American Indian tribes within the United States Constitution and subsequent legislation such as the Indian Education Act of 1972, which federally supported the development of indigenous bilingual education materials and teacher preparation, and the passage of the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act, which formally established protocol for “tribes and indigenous communities to contract to operate social and educational programs” (p. 291). McCarty (1997) argues that the United States government’s legislative creation of the Indian Education Act and Indian Self-Determination Act, coupled with the 1968 Bilingual Education Act, constructed a legal and financial structure for indigenous communities to control educational policies and practices at the local level. The research on community schools for

indigenous students suggests that the inclusion and representation of local tribal languages, local cultural practices, local community support, and an understanding of localized ways of learning can lead to increased student success and value of self for indigenous students (Beaulieu, 2006; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003; Lewthwaite & McMillan, 2010; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Rosier & Farella, 1976). Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) state, “Supported by federal legislation and policy—much of it influenced by the leadership of community-controlled schools—Indigenous communities across the nation were producing a corps of local teachers, a corpus of Native language teaching materials, and evidence of substantial student benefits” (p. 292).

Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist’s (2003) comparative study of state run and indigenous community-controlled schools in the U.S. and Australia concluded that indigenous schools provide for the social and academic success of their students by emphasizing a curriculum that “adopts a ‘both ways’ approach, meaning that there is a balance of indigenous and non-indigenous content” (p. 11). Hare and Pidgeon’s (2011) research on indigenous students in Canada found that indigenous students’ academic success and perceptions toward school were improved when they encountered supportive educational environments in community-controlled schools or on-reserve alternative school programs where “cultural identities can be fostered, their lived realities recognized through relevant curriculum and flexible programs that accommodate their needs” (p. 103). Educational research in the United States also provides evidence that Native American students experience higher levels of academic success and are more likely to attend school when school curriculum and extracurricular activities integrate Native culture (Apthorp, 2016; Fenimore-Smith, 2009; Powers, 2006; Tharp, 2006). For example, studies of indigenous students in Alaska and Hawaii have revealed that exposure to academic curriculum

that is aligned to state content standards and also includes an emphasis on Native culture leads to a statistically significant improvement in academic achievement compared to indigenous students whose educational experience does not include indigenous cultural perspectives (Kisker et al., 2012). Both regional and national policymakers within the United States have promoted a broader incorporation of indigenous language and culture within the classroom as a means of improving academic attainment for Native American students (Archambault, 2015).

Although the literature plainly indicates the successes of indigenous community-controlled schools, those successes are underscored by the systemic challenges for these schools to adequately include indigenous representations within the curriculum due to a financial dependence upon state and federal educational programs to secure grants for school funding. The current educational emphasis on equity via curriculum standards and testing has reinforced school curriculum that is innately unequal (Beaulieu, 2006; Loewen, 2010; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Rector-Aranda, 2016; Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007). College and career readiness and human capital ideologies have prioritized mechanized, factory-like education above all other educational values (Feuerstein, 2013; Giroux, 2011; Spring, 2011). The frequent financial constraints of marginalized indigenous populations have forced even schools operated by indigenous communities to comply with national curriculum standards and standardized testing initiatives. “Congress and the BIA require grant schools to meet standards determined not by local school boards, but by national or regional accrediting boards. Indigenous schools and educators have been forced into the treacherous terrain of standards, accountability, and high-stakes testing” (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002, p. 294-295). As a means of securing the necessary funding to operate their schools and meet the mandated requirements of career readiness or entry to post-secondary institutions, schools locally operated by indigenous

communities or reservations have been compelled to forsake the use of curriculum that includes representations of indigenous peoples. As Beaulieu (2006) puts it, “Yet, despite the fact that schools under tribal control can develop their own standards, all have adapted the educational standards of the state educational authorities” (p. 53). Recent national reports have described Native education as being in a state of emergency, and have sited the cause as the enactment of federal policies that have led to a lack of tribal control over Native education, lack of curriculum that includes Native languages and culture in schools, and insufficient funding (Archambault, 2015). Thus, the systemic challenges to the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives in classrooms throughout the United States remain an obstacle even for indigenous students attending schools in their own communities.

The proliferation of standards that provide for no historical connection to the narrative of the United States into the 20th century systemically forces teachers to “ignore the history of an entire people or develop instruction on a topic which they may have little knowledge” (Journell, 2009, p. 26). Additionally, research has shown that educators are often hesitant to “stray” too far from curriculum standards due to time constraints and general resistance to change in practice (Garrett & Segall, 2013; Gay, 2013; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Maranto, 2015; Marino, 2011; Rabb, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The current measures of educator accountability and effectiveness demand that teachers focus classroom instruction on the content of curriculum standards and the most readily available instructional materials. Even indigenous teachers responsible for educating indigenous students in schools operated on reservations or in indigenous communities are often as reliant upon standardized instructional materials and course curriculum guides in order to prepare their students for standardized tests (Beaulieu, 2006).

Educators' adherence to course curriculum standards can deny students of United States history the opportunity to understand the true historical significance of Native Americans in the development of our nation, which leaves them unable to think critically about the past and consider the modern contributions and issues of indigenous peoples. In regard to the impact of standardized curriculum on contemporary student understanding of indigenous peoples, First Nations scholar Margaret Kovach (2013) states, "This is imbued with multi-layered assumptions, both by dominant culture and those internally colonized, about Indigenous peoples whereby much time is spent explicating who we are in contrast to a frozen in time identity" (p. 114). As Shear et al. (2015) put it, "The narrative presented in U.S. history standards, when analyzed with a critical eye, directed students to see Indigenous Peoples as a long since forgotten episode in the country's development" (p. 89). As such, the systematic challenges to the representation of indigenous peoples in the study of United States history embedded within course standards and the demands of standardized test preparation for students, limits the perceived value of indigenous voices. In this sense, the content of course standards communicates to both teachers and students that knowledge of the historical significance and contributions of indigenous peoples is unimportant (Anderson, 2012; Good, 2009; Journell, 2009; Shear et al., 2015).

Another consistent theme within the review of literature focused upon the systemic challenges to the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives in current curriculum standards is the problematic nature of the relationship between the American educational system and Native American communities and culture. Although a complete summarization of the history of schooling for Native American students is beyond the realm of this study, the literature suggests that the ideological initiatives of American public education, which have traditionally promoted the cultural, political, and educational aims of white, European society, have

historically been used as a tool for the suppression of indigenous peoples and culture (Beaulieu, 2006; Fenimore-Smith, 2009; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Kovach, 2013; Portillo, 2013). Armitage (1995) argues that the educational institutions of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States have served as a medium for the exertion of colonial oppression toward indigenous peoples. Hare and Pidgeon (2011) state, “Education has been the primary vehicle of assimilation for Indigenous peoples, historically masking religious and government efforts to do away with Indigenous peoples in their own lands thereby reducing Indigenous threat to national unity and modernity” (p. 95). Various educational initiatives directed at Native Americans in the United States such as Indian boarding schools and agricultural training programs were enacted as a means of replacing traditional indigenous cultural practices and values with the values of the dominant white culture (Haynes-Writer, 2008; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Pewewardy, 2002; Portillo, 2013). “Westernized education advanced the agenda of the “superior” European Americans. As such, education cleared the path to creating a mythical state of harmony between Native Americans and whites, but it was the whites who were accommodated in the process” (Haynes-Writer, 2008, p. 6). Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) argue that the history of American Indian education should be viewed as a “grand experiment in standardization” where policy makers have actively sought to limit the influence of indigenous culture with public education as a means of determining the “safe” elements of indigenous life versus the “dangerous”, which were deemed threatening to American democratic principles (p. 282).

The historical aims of assimilation and colonization through education have long promoted curriculum that not only neglected indigenous perspectives, but actively sought to diminish the historical significance and culture of Native Americans by depicting them as the antithesis to civilized whites and as a deterrent to national progress (Arrows, 2013; Brayboy,

2005; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Pewewardy, 2002). “Given the American infatuation with the notion that social change can best be effected through education, schools have been the logical choice as the institutions charged with the responsibility for Native American cultural genocide” (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002, p. 282). Current educational policies that firmly establish the supremacy of standardized curriculum within American public schools reinforce the systemic barriers to the inclusion and representation of diverse perspectives within the classroom and perpetuate the exclusion of indigenous peoples to the story of the United States in both the past and present (Haynes-Writer, 2008; Journell, 2009; Shear et al., 2015; Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005).

The hegemonic nature of curriculum standards continues the oppression of Native Americans and other minority groups via the promotion of educational equity from the point of view of the dominant white culture (Mann, 2013; Shear et al., 2015). The educational standard established through standardized curriculum has effectively created a whitewashed school curriculum that inherently privileges white, European culture and fixes racial minorities as the ‘other’ (Apple, 2006; Banks, 2008; Chandler, 2009; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Smith, 2014). Four Arrows (2013) argues that the standardization of curriculum, which continues to neglect indigenous peoples, is “designed to maintain status quo benefits for a ruling elite” and is “by definition a form of anti-Indianism” (p. 20). Smith (2014) states, “Acts of dominance historically, however, are not confined to colonial relations. Neglecting the experiences of other groups would be a reflection of exclusionary practices themselves” (p. 69). Other scholars have argued that the standardized educational initiatives of legislation such as No Child Left Behind are not only barriers to the representation of multicultural perspectives in school curriculum, but that they are also directly harmful to indigenous students and undermine the rights to self-

determination and sovereignty that have been established through hundreds of treaties between the United States government and tribal nations (Balter & Grossman, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; McCarty & Lee, 2014).

The systematic challenges to the inclusion of indigenous voices in the classroom through standardized curriculum are reflective of the broader historical and social barriers to equality for indigenous peoples. As Castagno and Brayboy (2008) put it, “The increased emphasis on standardization and high-stakes accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) seems to have resulted in less, rather than more, culturally responsive educational efforts and more, rather than no, Indigenous children left behind in our school systems” (p. 942). Standardized course curriculum and testing as a means of measuring school and teacher effectiveness and student college and career readiness, has only served to reinforce historical, social, and educational obstacles to teaching and learning through diverse perspectives in the classroom. This is especially impactful for the representation of indigenous peoples in United States history courses, who are portrayed within course curriculum standards in a way that “reinstates the marginalization of Indigenous cultures and knowledge” (Shear et al., 2015, p. 90). Kovach (2013) summarizes the influence of this phenomenon on contemporary understanding of indigenous peoples stating, “The lack of understanding within majority culture is indicative of an educational system that has responded to Indigenous experience with: a) active suppression or b) chronic apathy” (p. 113). Curriculum standards that depict indigenous peoples and culture as largely vanished historical characters perpetuate racial stereotypes of Native Americans and hinder both the acknowledgement of the historical significance of indigenous peoples to the story of the United States as well as current issues of equality and justice for indigenous communities (Journell, 2009; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Keene, 2015; Smith, 2014).

American Exceptionalism

Noticeably within the literature, there exists an inextricable connection between the systemic barriers to the representation of indigenous peoples in history within curriculum standards and the sociopolitical barriers to honest and accurate representations of the historical significance of Native Americans exemplified by the ideology of American exceptionalism, which dominates the content of United States history textbooks. According to Joel Spring (2011) in his work *The Politics of American Education*, there are three primary questions that are “at the heart of the politics of education”: What knowledge is most worth teaching, what are the best methods and school organization for teaching this knowledge, and what should be the cost of disseminating this knowledge? (p.14). Additionally, Spring (2011) points out that the education business is “the second largest U.S. economic sector after health care” and that for-profit education businesses, including textbook publishers, have a great deal of influence over educational politics and policy-making (p.150). Numerous studies focused upon textbooks have also highlighted the connection between the content of the text, industry, and political interest (Apple, 1992; Loewen, 1996, 2010; Marino, 2011; Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012; Noboa, 2011; Rector-Aranda, 2016; Sewall, 2004).

Undoubtedly, the economic influence and clout of textbook companies can wield a great deal of power over what knowledge is believed to be most worth teaching in American public schools. Marino (2011) argues that textbook research supports the notion that educators use textbooks as not only a guide for selecting and sequencing topics for study in their classrooms, but also to shape their curriculum. “The textbook can thus play an important role in shaping the direction of a history or social studies class, influencing what teachers decide to teach” (Marino, 2011, p. 424). This influence can not only ensure the further sell of these companies’

educational products, but also impact the decision making processes that determine what students learn from their textbooks (Spring, 2011, p. 178). Therefore, the political leanings of state boards of education, politicians, and self-interest groups can play a key role in what is published in United States history textbooks, in many cases allowing the historical narrative presented within the text to be manipulated by numerous influences other than a true desire to provide students with an unbiased and unaltered historical account.

Due to the fact that many high school history students in American public schools “learn from textbooks, which are mass-produced by an elite group of corporate educational publishers”, students are often led to believe that their textbooks “represent the omniscient voice of history and speak with an authority convincing most students they are simply the facts” (Martell & Hashimoto-Martell, 2012, p. 306). Textbooks present the narrative of the past in an authoritative tone, containing, as Marino (2011) puts it, “an aura of omniscience about them” that causes teachers to be “reticent to question the interpretations found in texts and to become overly reliant on the factual content they contain” (p. 422). Good (2009) argues that textbooks provide “the structure and content for many history courses at all levels of schooling” and have a “symbolic power” in addition to their “pedagogical power” (p. 49). As a result, reliance upon textbooks in the teaching of U.S. history produces students who are not only disconnected from aspects of the historical narrative that are relevant to their lives, they are presented with a version of history that does not require the development of young scholars who are able to engage in historical discourse and think critically about the past (Bain, 2006; Curwen, 2011; Loewen, 2010; Marino, 2011; Paxton, 1999). In fact, it has been argued that the authoritative and monotonous voice commonly applied to history textbooks is prohibitive to student engagement and learning (Aldridge, 2006; Loewen, 2010; Paxton, 1999; Woodson, 2015). This can be especially harmful

in regard to the representation of multiple perspectives within history courses because the voice of minorities and the marginalized are eclipsed by the Eurocentric dominant narrative (Aldridge, 2006; Apple, 1992; Banks et al., 2001; Chandler, 2010; Epstein, 2009; Good, 2009; Journell, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Loewen, 2010; Rains, 2003, 2006; Woodson, 2015).

Loewen (2010) argues that the reliance upon textbooks actually contradicts the purpose of historiography by leading teachers and students to believe that all the important questions of the past have already been answered within the text. In Martell and Hashimoto-Martell's (2012) article *Throwing Out the History Textbook*, the authors propose that students should be exposed to critical history education that discontinues reliance on the textbook and teaches students "not what to think, but encourages them to think" (p. 308). In order to accomplish this feat, however, teachers and students must either supplement their study of history with more accurate and diverse historical documents, or textbook publishers must break away from the influence of American exceptionalism that permeates the content of the text and manipulates curricular practice. Thus, the literature suggests that textbook content stands as a sociopolitical hurdle to not only the representation of indigenous peoples, but also to "an accurate picture of the complexity and richness of American history" (Aldridge, 2006, p. 662).

According to Spring (2011), it is the policy-making dominance of self-interest groups, politicians, and wealthy power players that support cultural conservatism and American "exceptionalism" that have traditionally exercised considerable sway over the content of history textbooks (p. 120). Spring (2011) characterizes American exceptionalism as the belief that "the history of the United States has been guided by the hand of a Christian God and that the country's unique and superior set of republican values should be spread around the world" (p.120). Similarly, James Loewen (1996) suggests that United States history textbooks are

unique from all other teaching materials in that their content is so powerfully influenced by notions of nationalism, causing the text to be “muddled by the conflicting desires to promote inquiry and to indoctrinate blind patriotism” (p.14). The problem is that this version of the narrative of the United States is both untrue and it fails to adequately represent the many voices of the American past, especially the voice of indigenous peoples. Ladson-Billings (2003) argues that United States history textbooks perpetrate an “erasure” of Native Americans, stating, “After the “Trail of Tears” American Indians disappear from the pages of our textbooks and the curriculum. For our students American Indians are museum exhibits” (p. 3). Chandler’s (2010) study of the treatment of Native Americans in social studies textbooks proposes, “Native Americans are seen as having cordial relations with whites, being obstacles for Manifest Destiny, and eventually succumbing to white progress, never to be discussed again, as though they never existed” (p.30).

Fryberg and Stephens (2010) and Grande (2004) suggest that Native Americans are not just underrepresented within schools via textbooks, but that the underrepresentation is so extreme that indigenous peoples are essentially invisible. Portillo (2013) views this sentiment as the residual effect of colonialism asserting, “The relationship between Native American communities and academia has historically been contentious and, therefore, these tensions must also be emphasized since classes are taught within the confines of the academy, and, therefore within an institution that has historically (mis)represented or outright silenced the voices, stories and histories of American Indians” (p. 170). The culturally conservative fear of multicultural representation and perspectives in the history classroom has repeatedly led to the production of textbooks that are too long, too monotone, and too one-sided. Studies highlighting the curricular focus of social studies courses in particular, which would include an examination of textbook

content, have revealed the promotion of privileged notions of white, European culture in contrast to the exclusion of racial minorities (Loewen, 2010; Smith, 2014). Most significantly for the purpose of this study, the literature shows that not just the content of, but also the language used in history textbooks undermines the historical significance and representation of indigenous peoples and confounds meaningful discussions of issues that run counter to the dominant narrative of American history.

Julio Noboa (2011), who served on the state standards writing committee for U.S. history in the state of Texas, a major battleground in the debate over the content of history textbooks, asserts that ideologies such as “American exceptionalism” promote a “reincarnation of that old ‘Manifest Destiny,’ that ‘chosen people’ delusion, which justified much conquest, slavery, and genocide “from sea to shining sea” (p.44). Without a doubt, this diminishes the perception of history for minorities, women, and indigenous peoples because their stories are not as well represented within history textbooks, or if they are, they are presented far too often as bystanders to the narrative rather than active participants. Studies of United States history textbooks reveal that topics and terms are often presented through language that is simplistic and sterile as a means of avoiding controversy (Gordy & Pritchard, 1995; Holt, 1995; King & Chandler, 2016; Lee, 2014; Loewen 1996, 2010; Marino, 2011). A 2010 study of elementary and middle school social studies textbooks found that although some textbooks provided in depth details of topics such as slavery, they often gave no attention to the long-term impact of institutionalized racism towards minority groups in American history (Brown & Brown, 2010). In contrast, it has been shown that textbook coverage of issues such as racism and sexism are commonly depicted as a viewpoint of a fringe few situated in the past rather than widespread sociocultural beliefs that can

still impact the lives of students today (Aldridge, 2006; Chandler, 2010; Curwen, 2011; Loewen, 2010; Woodson, 2015).

Obviously, even the change of terms used in a history textbook can have a great influence on a student's perception of the historical narrative. This also reveals a direct attempt to diminish multicultural viewpoints and multicultural historical discourse. Some United States history textbooks, such as the ones most recently approved by the Texas State Board of Education, have even replaced terms that could be considered against the core values of American exceptionalism. For example, the term "imperialism" was replaced with "expansionism" and, most notably, references to the "slave trade" were exchanged for "the Atlantic Triangular trade" (Noboa, 2011, p.44). Noboa (2011), again using history textbooks in Texas as his example, points out that not once does the term "Latino", "Hispanic", "Mexican American", or "Chicano" appear in previous history textbooks in the state (p.45).

Native Americans, who undoubtedly played a tremendous role in the narrative of the United States, unfortunately receive comparable treatment, with many students only learning about indigenous peoples as an historical aside in discussions of Columbus, the Age of Exploration, westward expansion, and Manifest Destiny, primarily relegating formal instruction on indigenous perspectives to discussions of pre-20th century America (Chandler, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Rains, 2002; Shear et al., 2015). The literature clearly suggests that indigenous perspectives continue to be neglected within the pages of U.S. history textbooks in American public schools. How inconceivable is that many of our students will only gain knowledge of Native Americans via their own individual studies or what they learn from television or movies? Indeed, how disenfranchised must indigenous students feel when their U.S. history textbooks basically tell them that they, and their ancestors, are essentially historically insignificant? As

Loewen (2010) puts it, multicultural views in U.S. history textbooks “can help students understand that racism in the United States has not typically been the province of the few, but of the many; not just the South but also the North. Today, too, the discrimination facing African Americans (and to a degree, other groups, such as Native Americans and Mexican Americans) does not come from a handful of extremist outcasts late at night” (p. 17). In this sense, the omission of indigenous perspectives within American exceptionalist textbooks, only serves to propagate stereotypical depictions of Native Americans that further influence perceptions of indigenous representation in both the past and present. Although research in regard to the content of state curriculum standards and history textbooks does not necessarily portray what is actually being taught in individual classrooms, they do provide a strong indication that not only is the perspective of indigenous peoples neglected, but that the perception of indigenous peoples as the other is promoted (Haynes-Writer, 2008). Thus, the perpetuation of indigenous stereotypes within the teaching of United States history is yet another theme commonly found within the literature on this topic.

Perpetuation of Indigenous Stereotypes in the Classroom

The literature focused on representations and attitudes towards indigenous peoples within the study of United States history reveals that current course curriculum standards and textbooks perpetuate beliefs of inequality and negative stereotypes of indigenous peoples (Keene, 2015). A number of studies argue that Native Americans are the most misunderstood and misrepresented ethnic group in the United States (Fleming, 2006; Miheuah, 1996; Morgan, 2009; Portillo, 2013). Journell (2009) states, “Studies have shown that students enter public education conceptualizing American Indians as warlike, half-naked savages, a depiction stemming from cartoons and Hollywood productions” (p. 20). Although research has shown that student

understanding of indigenous peoples does become more sophisticated through formal schooling, it also indicates that a student's depth of knowledge of Native American culture progresses little beyond what they learn in elementary school (Brophy, 1999; Journell, 2009). "In fact, research suggests that the only exposure to Native American history that our students receive in their formal schooling is found in the first two or three days of a semester, which is usually couched in discussions of the Age of Exploration" (Chandler, 2010, p. 42). Additionally, the fact that many students have accepted stereotyped perceptions of indigenous peoples is derivative of what is being taught in classrooms (Chandler, 2010; Loewen, 2010; Meyer, 2011; Morgan, 2009; Portillo, 2013).

With little to no emphasis on understanding indigenous peoples in the present due to their nonexistence within course standards and textbook chapters dealing with the modern era, perceptions of Native Americans are essentially stuck in the past, or even worse, shaped by Hollywood depictions and imagery promoted by the use of Native Americans as mascots for sports teams or caricatures for advertisements (Fleming, 2006; Fryberg, Markus, Oyserman, & Stone, 2008; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015). Even these depictions of indigenous peoples are extremely limited in scope. In an analysis of primetime television series and character portrayals between the years 1989 to 2009, Tukachinsky, Mastro, and Yarchi (2015) discovered that the depiction of Native American characters ranged from 0.0%-0.6%, which would equate to the representation of only three Native characters in a primetime television series over a period of 20 years. Cherokee scholar Dr. Adrienne Keene (2015) states, "More recent research on Native representations has demonstrated that Native peoples are not just misrepresented in the media; we are completely invisible" (p. 103). Without adequate representation of indigenous peoples in the classroom, and exceedingly rare positive depictions of Native Americans in popular media,

non-indigenous students' understanding of indigenous peoples will remain limited to stereotypical and historically inaccurate representations while indigenous students themselves will continue to face racial stereotypes in their own educational experiences (Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Keene, 2015; Kovach, 2013).

The depiction of indigenous peoples as bystanders, savages, or victims to the story of the United States shapes societal perceptions of Native Americans today, especially with few positive or accurate representations of indigenous peoples in either the classroom or the media. Chandler (2010) states, "This lack of exposure to the interactive nature of Native and European interaction leaves students with a conceptual void that is filled with the stereotypes and caricatures of the real people who called North America home before the arrival of Europeans" (p. 42). Ladson-Billings (2003) argues, "At most, our national discussion of American Indians focuses on gambling, casinos and alcoholism" (p. 3-4). Fryberg's (2003) content analysis of national newspapers and major films revealed that representations of Native Americans were dominantly portrayed as spiritual, warlike, or depicted as examples of alcoholism, suicide, and poor educational outcomes. Haynes-Writer (2008) has proposed that most Americans understanding of Native Americans today are built upon stereotypes that promote indigenous peoples as "innocent children of nature, not capable of higher thought, and that all Native people receive government checks and spend their time at casinos" (p. 8).

As a result of the confinement of indigenous peoples to the distant past in the study of United States history, stereotypes of Native Americans are both overtly and covertly promoted within the classroom. Research has shown that this not only influences students' understanding of the historical significance of indigenous peoples, it also can have a negative impact on modern Native American communities and Native students (Fryberg et al., 2008; Fryberg & Oyserman,

2010; Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Keene, 2015; Landry, 2014; Meyer, 2011). As Fryberg and Stephens (2010) put it, “Historical representations of American Indians are a type of invisibility because, in the absence of a variety of contemporary representations, they communicate that American Indians do not exist in contemporary American society” (p.117). Others have argued that negative stereotypes of indigenous peoples coupled with their lack of representation in educational curriculum and media portrayals exposes Native students to overt racism in schools and diminishes their own feelings in regard to self-efficacy and future aspirations (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Keene, 2015). Hare and Pidgeon (2011) state, “Racism directed at Indigenous students takes various forms ranging from verbal and psychological abuse to low expectations and policies and procedures that limit education and employment opportunities” (p. 96). The large body of research focused upon the academic achievement gaps for Native American students compared to other students within the United States also indicates that the systematic and sociocultural barriers to the inclusion and representation of indigenous culture and perspectives within educational curriculum may contribute to the lack of educational success for indigenous students (Apthorp, 2016; Balter & Grossman, 2009; Beaulieu, 2006; Brayboy, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; McCarty & Lee, 2014; Pewewardy, 2002).

The literature on the impact of stereotypes upon Native American students and communities also emphasizes the potential influence that the persistence of indigenous stereotypes may have on public policy. Former Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation Wilma Mankiller, in a keynote address at the 2003 American Indian Studies Consortium, warned that the historical inaccuracies and stereotypes commonly taught in American public schools pose a potential threat to the sovereignty of tribal nations due to the fact that “public perceptions fuel

public policy” (Haynes-Writer, 2008, p. 8). Haynes-Writer (2008), citing Mankiller, states, “That is, students eventually become voters and vote according to their beliefs about Indigenous People, approving legislation that affects Indigenous People...Belief becomes practice” (p. 8). The failure to provide students with accurate representations of indigenous peoples in the modern world is a direct result of the systemic and sociocultural barriers to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in classrooms across the nation. This study seeks to add to the literature by examining how teachers perceive the value of teaching accurate and appropriate indigenous perspectives and the instructional challenges derived from curriculum standards, texts, and stereotypes.

Pedagogical Barriers to Indigenous Representation

In addition to the systemic and sociocultural barriers to indigenous representations in history, the literature also addresses pedagogical barriers to the teaching of diverse perspectives. An examination of the literature focused upon teacher instructional practices and the representation and inclusion of multiple perspectives in the classroom reveals some dominant themes. Some studies have argued that teachers are not well enough equipped to employ a multicultural or culturally responsive approach to curriculum standards and course texts due to a general lack of subject area expertise and inadequate preparation in teacher training programs (Banks et al., 2001; Barnes, 2006; Brown, 2011; de Waal-Lucas, 2007; Fujiyoshi, 2015; Gay, 2002, 2013; Haynes-Writer, 2008; King, 2014; King & Chandler, 2016; Loewen, 2010; Love & Kallam, 2007; Pewewardy, 2002; Portillo, 2013; Taylor, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Wills, 2001). Although the ever-increasing diversity within American public schools has demanded that teacher education programs include courses on multicultural education or culturally responsive teaching, research has shown that a pre-service teacher’s exposure to such courses are

either optional (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), limited to isolated courses that are often disconnected from the curriculum of other teacher-training courses (Gay, 2013; Loewen, 2010; Szabo & Anderson, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2002, Williams et al., 2016), or promote an additive view of multicultural teaching (Banks, 2004; Good, 2009; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Taylor, 2010), which “have interpreted infusion narrowly to mean the sprinkling of disparate bits of information about diversity into the established curriculum, resulting in the superficial treatment of multicultural issues” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 21). For example, Gorski’s (2009) analysis of multicultural teacher education courses through the examination of course syllabi for undergraduate and graduate education programs found that the majority of courses devoted to multicultural education primarily focused on preparing teachers to exercise tolerance or expand cultural competence and sensitivity, which are not aligned with the fundamental principles of multicultural education. Gorski (2009) states, “In other words, most of the syllabi analyzed for this study failed to frame multicultural education as a political movement concerned with social justice, as an approach for comprehensive reform, as a critical analysis of power and privilege, or as a process for eliminating education inequities” (p. 17).

Related studies have also suggested that teachers in schools where there are few students who are not of European descent may lack both the understanding of the value of multiculturalism in history education and the necessary training and knowledge to accurately and effectively implement indigenous perspectives in the classroom (de Waal-Lucas, 2007; Journell, 2009; Haynes-Writer, 2008). Simply put, some teachers may not have the essential depth of subject knowledge to adequately teach from a multiculturalist perspective. “History has more teachers teaching out of field than any other subject” and according to a national survey a mere 40% of history teachers actually majored in history or a “history-relevant discipline” (Loewen,

2010, p.10). Few social studies or history teachers are exposed to positive and accurate depictions of indigenous peoples through courses that focus upon Native American history and culture (Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003). Instead, teachers without the subject area expertise to interject indigenous perspectives into their curriculum inadvertently perpetuate the stereotypical misrepresentations of Native Americans they have been exposed to through their own educational and personal experiences (Good, 2009; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Lewthwaite & McMillan, 2010; McCarty & Lee, 2014; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Shear et al., 2015). Clearly, this could be a major reason why so many history teachers are forced to go by the book in the courses they teach and fail to understand the value of presenting the narrative of the United States from multiple historical voices.

The literature suggests that the lack of training and knowledge to effectively engage students in multicultural education may be compounded by the fact that the teaching profession, especially in the area of social studies, is overwhelmingly made up of white educators who most naturally identify with the dominant historical narratives within social studies curriculum (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Gay, 2013; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Picower, 2009; Taylor, 2010; Vaught & Castagno, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Williams et al., 2016). Numerous studies have focused upon the struggle for white educators to critically reflect upon their own racial privilege and move towards a multicultural curriculum that challenges the institutional racism maintained within the curricular status quo (Chandler, 2009; Gay, 2013; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003; King & Chandler, 2016; McDonough, 2009; Picower, 2009; Rector-Aranda, 2016; Segall & Garrett, 2013; Vaught & Castagno, 2008; Williams et al., 2016) As Bryan Smith (2014) puts it, “The classroom space is one of whiteness, one in which racializations can fester as something “they” are but not “us”, the neutral whites

who are not confronted with our own racialized identifications” (p. 65). Garrett and Segall (2013) argue that there are two dominant themes found within teacher education literature related to the topics of race and multicultural education; ignorance, which not only implies a lack of knowledge in regard to issues of race and multiculturalism, but also includes an intentional avoidance of such topics, and resistance, which underscores teacher candidates’ common refusal to actively challenge institutionalized racism and engage in meaningful discourse on race within the classroom. Similarly, Castagno and Brayboy (2008) state, “The awareness, knowledge, and skills required are not often the focus of typical teacher education programs, nor have most of the White, middle-class women who become teachers in the United States grown up with this background” (p. 947).

Yet another pedagogical challenge to the inclusion of multiple voices and perspectives within the teaching of history found to be a dominant theme within the literature is the promotion of colorblindness in the social studies classroom. Numerous studies suggest that although teachers reportedly value instructional methods that incorporate multiple perspectives they implement only generic and cursory discussions of race, such as integrating a discussion of indigenous peoples’ cultural practices as an aside to lessons around the Thanksgiving holiday, or attempt to outright avoid topics such as race, racism, and power altogether, promoting a colorblind version of the past (Aldridge, 2006; Chandler, 2009; Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Gay, 2002, 2013; Milner & Ross, 2006; Rains, 2003; Rector-Aranda, 2016; Segall & Garrett, 2013). Frankenberg (1993) defined colorblindness as “a mode of thinking about race organized around an effort not to see, or at any rate not to acknowledge, race differences” (p. 143). King and Chandler (2016) refer to the instructional practice of avoiding the inclusion of topics on race or racism as the non-racist approach to social studies instruction.

Rector-Aranda (2016) posits that the attempt on behalf of educators to remain neutral in regard to discussions of race covertly reinforces institutionalized racism within the curriculum and is counterproductive to equity in education. Leonardo (2009) argues, “When it comes to official history, there is no paucity of representation of whites as its creator...However, when it concerns domination, whites suddenly disappear...Their previous omnipresence becomes a position of nowhere, a certain politics of undetectability” (p. 88). The related literature on the construct of colorblind social studies curriculum indicates that not only does this approach obstruct the authentic inclusion of diverse perspectives in the classroom, but that it also fails to adequately prepare today’s students to address topics such as racism, which continues to be a substantial social issue even in multicultural societies like the United States (Aldridge, 2006; Chandler, 2009, 2010; Chandler & McKnight, 2009; Fyberg & Stephens, 2010; Gay, 2013; King & Chandler, 2016; Loewen, 2010; Noboa 2011).

Ladson-Billings (2003) argues that although “race is an ever-present concept in the social studies”, most social studies and history textbooks, and even the NCSS (National Council for Social Studies) standards “avoid the term “race” altogether” (p.2). Nelson and Pang (2006) propose that although social studies courses are well suited for discussions of race, the curriculum, textbooks, and teacher training programs force controversial topics such as race and racism to the periphery of instructional practices. Bryan Smith (2014) acknowledges the curricular and social hurdles to teaching social studies in a way that challenges the dominant cultural narratives of traditional course curriculum stating, “Social studies, burdened with the responsibility of elucidating the complexity of the cultural and social world of the student, inherits from its disciplines (history, geography, civics) a legacy of racialization and exclusion” (p. 64) Haynes-Writer (2008) suggests that multicultural education, especially in regard to the

representation of indigenous peoples, has been relegated to little more than “food, fun, festivals, and foolishness” (p. 4). Crow Nation citizen Janine Pease-Windy Boy (1995) states, “All too often, the mainstream educational institutions regard cultural diversity as a few learning units that are cosmetically brown or black in complexion or as a few festivals that celebrate the food, clothing, or dance of minorities” (p. 399). When the practice of colorblindness infiltrates the classroom curriculum, topics that include multicultural perspectives or address issues such as racism are often relegated to a focus on superficial features such as food and music (Taylor, 2010), or discussions of safe, uncontroversial perspectives such as the racial inequality perpetrated by the institution of slavery or segregation (Gay, 2013; King & Chandler, 2016; Loewen, 2010).

Other related studies on the promotion of colorblind ideologies in the classroom have suggested that these curricular approaches not only hinder initiatives that are designed to bring about educational equity, but that they can also have a significant psychological impact on minority students (Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Keene, 2015). Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist (2003) argue, “White blindness to the difference race makes in people’s lives has a powerful effect on schools and other institutions in white dominant societies” (p. 3). Because most students in American public schools are being taught by white educators, who are following curricular standards dominated by Eurocentric culture, colorblind pedagogy fails to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. Fryberg and Stephens (2010) state, “In a colorblind world, Whites, who are unlikely to experience the negative effects of race, can actively ignore the continued significance of racism in American society, justify the current social order, and feel more comfortable with their relatively privileged standing in society” (p. 115).

Colorblindness in the classroom can have an especially harmful influence upon the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples (Chandler, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Portillo, 2013; Rains, 2003). Fryberg et al.'s (2008) study of Native American students' exposure to stereotypical imagery of indigenous peoples through the use of American Indian Mascots revealed that such stereotypes resulted in the students reporting lower levels of self-esteem as well as a diminished view of their own communities and future possibilities. Even positive stereotypical associations such as Disney's portrayal of Pocahontas, have been shown to negatively impact Native American students' self-esteem and sense of community worth (Fryberg et al., 2008; Keene, 2015; Portillo, 2013). The literature suggests that although the use of Native American stereotypes for school or team mascots may not be intended with negative consequences, they remain harmful to Native American students because "in the contexts in which they appear, there are relatively few alternate characterizations of American Indians" (Fryberg et al., 2008, p. 216). As Fryberg and Stephens (2010) put it, "When the world is colorblind, American Indians are invisible" (p. 116).

Other studies of teacher instructional practices in regard to discussion of race within the study of history indicate that some educators avoid the inclusion of topics addressing racism due to their own identification with the dominant culture and an inability to critically reflect upon their own white privilege or to address feelings of fear, historical remorse, or regret (Branch, 2003; Chandler, 2010; Chandler & McKnight, 2011; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Kovach, 2013; Loewen, 2010; Picower, 2009; Smith, 2014). The avoidance of unpleasant topics out of historical remorse can be especially problematic to the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in classroom curriculum because they have so often been the victim of policies designed to either assimilate or exterminate Native culture (Lomawaima & McCarty,

2002; Portillo, 2013; Pewewardy, 2002; Zinn, 2003). Fixico (1998) states, “Historians, in particular, wrote Indians out of their textbooks for whatever insecure reasons of justifying the past actions of America’s heroes, racial bigotry, or White guilt” (p. 86). James Loewen (2010) suggests that both teachers and students who identify with white, European culture find it difficult to challenge American exceptionalist notions that their ancestors, in spite of their recognition of clear oppression of racial minorities through the institution of slavery or events such as the removal of Native Americans from their ancestral homelands, were responsible for such historically significant progress that this “legitimizes ignoring anything bad Americans ever did, because in the end it turned out all right; indeed, our history led to the most progressive nation in the history of the world. In this view, progress is what doomed the American Indian, for example, not bad things ‘we’ (non-Indians) did” (p. 78).

Some studies have argued that teachers avoid discussing race related issues in their classrooms because they are fearful of offending their students, angering parents, or potentially being accused of being racist themselves (Branch, 2003; Chandler, 2007, 2010; Loewen, 2010; McKnight & Chandler, 2009; Segall & Garrett, 2013). Due to the fact that non-white students are predominantly being taught by white teachers (Garrett & Segall, 2013; Gay, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Picower, 2009; Vaught & Castagno, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2007), the curricular and instructional avoidance of addressing issues of racism in the classroom harms students of color who “have firsthand, daily experiences with race and its impacts” (Chandler, 2010, p. 40). This can especially influence contemporary understandings of indigenous peoples, who are not only racially, but also politically, geographically, and economically marginalized (Fryberg et al., 2008; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003; Pewewardy, 1995). “Non-Indigenous educators may so fear being offensive that avoidance of Indigenous questions becomes the

‘moral’ way of avoiding addressing the Indigenous-settler relationship” (Kovach, 2013, p. 118). Thus, the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples within American classrooms remains relegated to stereotypes, misconceptions, and strict adherence to curriculum standards and textbook content.

Studies related to educator avoidance of teaching about race and racism also indicate that the teacher’s own perception of minorities can influence the inclusion and representation of multiple cultural perspectives in the classroom. The deficit theories of education, which have traditionally promoted the idea that minority students are less capable of academic success, have long played a role in the development of school curriculum and accountability measures for students (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Hare & Pidgeon, 2011; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Loewen, 2010; Pewewardy, 2002; Picower, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). The inclusion of multicultural historical voices has sometimes been regarded as only necessary to meet the needs of students of color (de Waal-Lucas, 2007; Howard, 2003; Lipman, 1997). More controversially, the literature also suggests that the resistance to multicultural curriculum is precipitated on the notion that students of color must learn and know what is deemed significant by the white, dominant culture in order to be more successful living in a society that is dominated by white culture (Brown, 2007; Gay, 2002; Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003; Lewthwaite & McMillan, 2010). “Some advocates of this view justify it by arguing that knowing the language and culture of the dominant society would give minority students a better chance of social mobility” (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003, p. 17).

Yet another prominent theme within the literature in regard to the pedagogical barriers to the inclusion of diverse perspectives within the classroom is the perception of social studies education as a means of instilling students with patriotism and national pride, ultimately

preparing them to be loyal, productive citizens. Chandler (2010) states, “The social studies, more than any other school discipline, has been historically charged with creating active, democratic citizens” (p. 33). The social studies classroom has traditionally been viewed as a medium for the maintenance of conservative American culture and values, which influences both curriculum and instruction. Loewen (2010) suggests that “Too many teachers of U.S. history believe they need to present a course that gets their students to think well about their country” (p. 35). Ross (2006) argues that “conservative cultural continuity is the dominant approach practiced in schools” (p. 231). This perspective of social studies education prevents the inclusion of diverse perspectives within the classroom and allows teachers and students to avoid more controversial aspects of history such as institutional racism. The curricular reliance upon American exceptionalist ideology, which conveys a non-racist, colorblind approach to social studies curriculum, is regarded as a method of ensuring the transmission of the dominant cultural views of citizenship and nationalism (Banks, 2008; Chandler & Branscombe, 2015; Loewen, 2010; Noboa, 2011; Spring, 2011).

Current curriculum standards and textbook content limit the inclusion of multiple historical perspectives as a means of supporting a unified master narrative of the United States, presenting teachers and students with a sanitized version of the past intended to solidify notions of national identity (Aldridge, 2006; Gillborn, 2006; Good, 2009; Shear et al., 2015; Smith, 2014). “That is, they seek to pass down a version of ‘our story’ that, due to our specialness as a nation, cannot be tainted by the sin of institutional racism” (King & Chandler, 2016, p. 11). As a result of the emphasis upon the social studies classroom as an environment intended for the dissemination of a narrative that highlights the good aspects of United States history and culture, the voice of minority groups is neglected. Diverse historical perspectives are avoided because

they would contradict the dominant, white narrative of the past. Good (2009) points out that the permanent fixture of a master historical narrative for teachers and students in United States history classrooms “promotes this singular idea of America by privileging certain epistemologies and voices, often to the total exclusion of others” (p. 51). Thus, the view of social studies education as the curricular foundation of national identity and unity leads to the neglect of diverse historical perspectives that could undermine what Huntington (2004) refers to as, “the remaining central elements of American identity, the cultural core, and the American Creed” (p. 18). The maintenance of the dominant Eurocentric status quo in current curriculum standards and textbooks in order to promote notions of citizenship and patriotism is especially harmful to the inclusion of indigenous representations in history, further relegating the perspectives of Native Americans to a pre-modern context and innately securing stereotypical perceptions of indigenous peoples (Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Good, 2009; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Portillo, 2013; Shear et al., 2015).

Culturally Responsive Teaching, Multicultural Education & Tribal Critical Race Theory

Much of the literature on the topic of indigenous representations in the teaching of social studies and history emphasizes the conceptual frameworks of culturally responsive teaching, multicultural education, Critical Race Theory, or Tribal Critical Race Theory. Although there is a great deal of overlap within each of these frameworks, a brief description is warranted for the purpose of this study.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

Gay (2002) defines culturally responsive teaching as an instructional approach that employs “the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (p.106). The basic premise of culturally

responsive teaching is that educators can better meet the needs of diverse students when greater value is placed upon each student's individual experience and frame of reference. Gay (2002) argues that by situating academic knowledge and skills within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, higher levels of motivation, interest, and learning will occur. Culturally responsive teaching is viewed as counter to the traditional structures and pedagogical standards of the American educational system that often contribute to poor academic outcomes for diverse students. Gay (2013) states, "It is an equal educational opportunity initiative that accepts differences among ethnic groups, individuals, and cultures as normative to the human condition and valuable to societal and personal development" (p. 50). Thus, culturally responsive teaching is aimed at providing equitable academic opportunities for all students by incorporating the cultural values and experiences of all students.

The literature focused upon culturally responsive teaching portrays this pedagogical approach as a practical response to both the growing diversity of the student population in American public schools and growing concern in regard to the lack of academic success of diverse students (Brown, 2007; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Erickson, 1987; Howard, 2003; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Taylor, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Numerous studies have argued that the incorporation of culturally relevant teaching can help establish stronger connections between students and schools by connecting academic knowledge with students' lived experiences, resulting in higher academic achievement for ethnically or racially diverse students (Brown, 2007; Gay 2000, 2002; Howard, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Taylor, 2010; Williams et al., 2016). The impetus within teacher education to prepare educators to be culturally responsive teachers has also been predicated upon the fact that many students of color will be taught by white teachers who must become more culturally aware in order to meet the

needs of students who experience a different cultural context (Gay, 2002, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Picower, 2009; Taylor, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Williams et al. (2016) state, “Preparing pre-service teachers for an ever increasing diverse student population is recognized as a priority by many in the educational community” (p. 2). The initiatives for the development of culturally responsive teaching in regard to meeting the needs of diverse students has also extended to a body of literature that recognizes culturally responsive teaching as essential to the academic success of indigenous students (Balter & Grossman, 2009; Beaulieu, 2006; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Demmert & Towner, 2003; Fenimore-Smith, 2009; McCarty & Lee, 2014; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003).

Although a discussion of the numerous definitions of culturally responsive teaching is beyond the realm of this study, a brief description of the most commonly accepted frameworks for culturally responsive teaching is warranted. Howard (2003) suggests that culturally relevant teaching requires that educators respect “the intricacies of cultural and racial differences” and through a process of critical reflection, which includes an examination of how race, culture and social class might influence their own perceptions of students in addition to how these factors might shape students’ understanding of the world, “construct pedagogical practices in ways that are culturally relevant, racially affirming, and socially meaningful to their students” (p. 197). Beaulieu (2006) simplifies the construct of culturally relevant teaching to two goals; the provision of effective and meaningful educational programs that acknowledge and incorporate the values and “collective experience” of the students and local community (p. 52). Ladson-Billings (2001) identified three principals for culturally responsive teaching, emphasizing a focus on individual students’ academic achievement, the personal development of cultural and sociopolitical competence, and the desire to help develop students’ cultural competence. Gay

(2002) proposes five characteristics of culturally responsive teaching; the development of a culturally diverse base of knowledge, designing culturally relevant curriculum, demonstration of cultural caring in the classroom, the use of cross-cultural communication, and the establishment of congruity in classroom instruction. Villegas and Lucas (2002) put forth six elements of culturally responsive teaching, which included sociocultural consciousness, holding affirming views for all students, understanding how students construct knowledge, designing instruction that builds upon a student's personal experience and prior learning, taking responsibility for a school climate that promotes cultural responsiveness, and developing an understanding about the personal lives of students.

The fundamental concept of each of the aforementioned frameworks is the same. Meeting the needs of a diverse population demands that teachers, who are most often white, take an active role in the development of curriculum and instructional practices that build upon the personal cultural knowledge and lived experiences of their students, while also becoming reflective practitioners who consider their own racialization and what implications their own cultural understandings may have upon their ability to authentically include multiple cultures and perspectives into the classroom (Howard, 2003; Taylor, 2010). Thus, becoming a culturally responsive teacher entails both a personal interest in the lived experience and culture of each student, but also an understanding of how personal history and experiences may influence an educator's relationship with their students. As Taylor (2010) puts it, "Culturally responsive teachers believe that culture deeply influences the way children learn and, when given the responsibility of teaching students from diverse backgrounds, their attitudes reflect an appreciation of the cultural, linguistic, and social characteristics of each of their students" (p. 26).

Multicultural Education

Multicultural education was originally derived from elements of the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s (Haynes-Writer, 2008). Similarly to culturally responsive teaching, the aim of multicultural education is to provide academic fairness, and therefore equitable academic achievement, for all students by removing the systemic and sociopolitical barriers to learning for diverse populations (Brandt, 2007; Zirkel, 2008). According to Banks (2004), there are five key characteristics to multicultural education: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture. Nieto and Bode (2008) suggest that there are seven core principles of multicultural education, stating that multicultural education is basic education, important for all students, pervasive, a process, antiracist, education for social justice, and critical. Additionally, de Waal-Lucas (2007) encapsulates the varying definitions of multicultural education by pointing out that the literature agrees that multicultural education should include learning about people of different races, cultures, social classes, sexual orientations, and religious beliefs by examining the similarities and differences in cultures and perspectives, understanding how diverse students learn, critical thinking in regard to the nature of power and oppression, and understanding equity and social justice. Like culturally responsive teaching, multicultural education promotes the goal of incorporating the unique cultural values and lived experiences of students as a means of producing higher academic achievement, but it also specifically promotes the notion that traditional structures that innately promote oppression, racism and power be addressed within the classroom as a means towards social justice.

Bennett (2001) proposed that the numerous approaches to multicultural education can be summarized into four overarching genres of research in multicultural education; curriculum reform, societal equity, equity pedagogy, and multicultural competence. Gorski (2009), building on the works of Nieto (2004), Sleeter (1996), Banks (2004), and Grant and Sleeter (2006),

developed five defining principles of multicultural education found within existing research. These five principles include the following: multicultural education is a political movement and process aimed at securing social justice for underserved and marginalized students, social justice is institutional and can only be achieved through comprehensive school reform, comprehensive school reform must be predicated upon a critical analysis of current systems of power and privilege, multicultural education's ultimate goal is educational equity, and multicultural education will produce academic and social benefits for all students (Gorski, 2009). What is clear within a review of the literature on multicultural education is that current educational practices do not adhere to these core principles of multicultural education with fidelity.

The literature centered upon multicultural education predominantly argues that current curricular and instructional initiatives fall well short of the intended promotion of multicultural education as a means toward social justice (Gorski, 2006). Much of the literature contains a common theme that suggests that the typical implementation of multicultural teaching in American classrooms rarely goes beyond an additive or contributory approach, which only includes generic discussions of multiple cultural perspectives as an extension to a pre-existing learning unit or standard (Fenimore-Smith, 2009; Good, 2009; Haynes-Writer, 2008; Taylor, 2010). In this sense, multicultural education has typically reinforced the traditional hegemony within school curriculum rather than creating a more equitable curricular framework (Good, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2005; McLaren, 1994; Rector-Aranda, 2016; Santamaria, 2013). Gorski (2008) argues that what generally passes for multicultural education in schools and teacher preparation programs tends to focus on little more than "celebrating diversity or understanding the cultural other" (p. 2). As such, some proponents of multicultural education have called for a move towards critical multiculturalism, which seeks to connect the original goals of multicultural

education to providing teachers and students with the knowledge to reexamine the role of racism, power, and privilege within current curricular standards (Good, 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010; McLaren, 2003; Santamaria, 2014).

Related research on multicultural education has specifically focused upon the obstacles to the success of multicultural curriculum and pedagogy. Although multicultural educational practices have shown to be academically beneficial for all students (Zirkel, 2008), there remains a consistent theme of inadequate or superficial implementation. Some research points to the difficulty for predominantly white teachers to develop a reflective cultural understanding of their minority students (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Chu, 2011; Gay, 2013; Parameswaran, 2007; Picower, 2009; Williams et al., 2016). Other studies have emphasized the assimilationist nature of the American public education system, suggesting that traditional educational ideologies have sought to subjugate minority groups to mainstream democratic values and culture (Aldridge, 2006; Banks, 2008; Good, 2009; Loewen, 2010). Banks (2008) argues that opponents of multicultural education “define the interests of dominant groups as the ‘public’ interest and those of people of color such as African Americans and Latinos as ‘special’ interests that endanger polity” (p. 132). Spring (2011) suggests that resistance to multicultural educational policies is precipitated by politically and culturally conservative interest groups who have both the financial and political power to influence educational policy makers, ensuring the continued strength of American exceptionalism within public schools. In response, some researchers have argued that teacher preparation programs must address current practices to better equip future teachers to meet the needs of a growingly diverse student population (Brown, 2007; Chandler, 2009; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Gay, 2013; Gorski, 2009; King & Chandler, 2016; Taylor, 2010).

Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory

The conceptual frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory are also commonly found within the literature related to indigenous representations in history. Both of these conceptual frameworks hinge upon the notion that traditional institutional controls within academia present obstacles for learning and academic achievement for students of color (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Critical Race Theory, which came about in the 1970s as a response to the Critical Legal Studies, proposes that racism is endemic both within society and in education, and that racism has been so much a part of the narrative of American society that it has become engrained even within methods of teaching and education (Brayboy, 2005; Haynes-Writer, 2008). Critical Race Theory seeks to confront racism and oppression by addressing notions of white privilege, which can exist in traditional views of education (Brayboy, 2005). Similarly, Tribal Critical Race Theory, which is specifically aimed at the inclusion of the voice of indigenous peoples, proposes that Native Americans are subjected to educational policies and practices that are innately linked to colonization, white supremacy, and assimilation (Brayboy, 2005). Much like the conceptual frameworks of culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education, Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race theory emphasize the role of education in social justice. As Haynes-Writer (2008) puts it, “CRT (Critical Race Theory) and TribalCrit generate truths about colonization in larger social and structural contexts, facilitating change” (p. 3). In this sense, the frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory are not merely methods of conceptualizing educational practices, but rather a means of promoting activism through educational practices.

Both Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory are prominently discussed within educational research as essential frameworks for multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching (Brayboy, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Good, 2009; Haynes-Writer,

2008; Rector-Aranda, 2016). Related literature has employed the tenets of Critical Race Theory or Tribal Critical Race theory to challenge both the current standard for multicultural education in American public schools and the existence of white privilege within current curricular standards and measures of academic accountability (Brayboy, 2005; Chandler, 2009; Gillborn, 2013; Leonardo, 2004; Picower, 2009; Rector-Aranda, 2016). What is clear within a review of literature on each of these theories is that there is widespread agreement that people of color continue to be underrepresented within school curriculum and that students of color continue to be exposed to dominant educational practices that do not best suit their needs. Rector-Aranda (2016), applying Critical Race Theory to an examination of contemporary public schools and educational reform efforts, argues that educational equity remains an unattained objective for students and communities of color, which prevents these students from adequately understanding the world in which they live by “allocating their racial identities to the dustbin of human awareness, and requiring them to either consciously or unconsciously deny their histories, cultures and lived experiences of racism in order to get by in schools (p. 6). Due to the fact that indigenous peoples are typically either misrepresented or invisible within current curriculum standards and textbooks, the ineffectiveness of school reform through the lens of Critical Race Theory or Tribal Critical Race theory underscores the need for further examination of teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history.

Social Justice Education

A review of the literature on indigenous representations in the teaching of history is rife with connections to the ideologies of social justice education. Not only is the study of history viewed as the most appropriate school subject for discussions of race, power, racism, etc., but it is also seen as uniquely conducive to the implementation of principles for antiracism and social

justice activism (King & Chandler, 2016). Ladson-Billings (2003) states, “The social studies can serve as a curricular home for unlearning the racism that has confounded us as a nation” (p. 8). Aldridge (2006) states, “Ultimately, we must remember that educating students about the history of their country has long been recognized as a vital aspect of preparing the next generation to participate in a democratic society” (p. 681). Haynes-Writer (2008) proposes, “Social justice requires the study of historical issues and events to understand the manifestations of oppression in its present form” (p. 5). Hawkey (2015) argues that history curriculum provides a medium for addressing issues of social justice. Ross (2006) suggests that social studies, the most inclusive subject taught in schools, are explicitly connected to the promotion of civics. Loewen (2010) asserts, “History can be a weapon. Students who do not know their own history or how to think critically about historical assertions will be ignorant and helpless before someone who does claim to know it. Students need to be able to fight back” (p. 12). Even opponents of the curricular reform initiatives of multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching have traditionally supported the ideology that social studies education should prepare students to participate in society (Banks, 2008; Good, 2009; Spring, 2011). Banks (2008) argues that current forms of citizenship education, which are predominantly housed within the social studies, must begin to include students’ home cultures and languages in order to prepare them to “function effectively within their cultural community” and help students “acquire the cosmopolitan perspectives and values needed to work for equality and social justice around the world” (p. 129).

Rather than students who are bored and uninterested in historical study, proponents of teaching history towards social justice propose that students will not only be more actively engaged in the classroom, but that they will also be better prepared to address issues of race and

racism in their own lives (Aldridge, 2006; Banks, 2008; Loewen, 2010; Rector-Aranda, 2016). As Chandler (2009) puts it, “Because all education is some form of indoctrination, the messages and discourses that we give life to should be in the name of social justice, not social reproduction” (p. 280). Hytten (2015) proposes that teachers play a significant role in both the intellectual and moral quality of students’ academic experiences. Education for social justice represents a means of empowering students to not only better their own lives, but also positively impact their communities and to a greater extent the global community in which they live. Teaching towards social justice, therefore, is viewed as an ethical responsibility for contemporary educators and education reform initiatives (Brown, 2007; Howard, 2003; Taylor, 2010). In regard to addressing the lack of inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in the study of history, a move towards social justice demands that teachers and policy makers must deconstruct the dominant narratives of the past and address the fact that current curriculum standards and textbook content represents the hegemony of “the views, interests, and desires of people in power” (Subedi, 2008, p. 414). Specifically addressing the portrayal of indigenous peoples in state standards and textbooks can provide educators with a clearer path to effective cultural responsiveness and social justice. “By critiquing the portrayal of Indigenous Peoples in state-level standards, we can further dismantle knowledge systems that act against the core foundations of social justice in the social studies” (Shear et al., 2015, p. 92). Social justice in the classroom is an ethical and active process that should include all stakeholders, not just classroom teachers. The successful transmission of social justice education from teachers to students will also require a shift in educational leadership and an examination of current practices in teacher education programs (Santamaria, 2014; Taylor, 2010).

Summary

An examination of teachers' instructional practices and beliefs in the study of United States history may provide a better understanding of not only the perceived challenges to teaching the perspectives of indigenous peoples, but also teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples, their historical representation, and the perceived value of the historical voice of Native Americans. The literature clearly indicates that there are systemic, sociocultural, and pedagogical barriers that often hinder not only the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in history, but also the accurate representation of indigenous peoples. The conceptual frameworks of culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education, in addition to the principles of Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory, can provide a foundation for evaluating teacher practice. The body of literature pertaining to this study suggests that in order for teachers to effectively meet the needs of diverse students and promote authentic multicultural or culturally responsive instructional practices, issues such as racism, power, and privilege must be critically examined and addressed within the classroom. Otherwise, attempts at multicultural or culturally responsive teaching are essentially maintaining the white, Eurocentric status quo that dominates American public schools and fails to move social studies education toward the goal of social justice. The maintenance of such a hegemonic system is especially harmful to students' understanding of indigenous peoples who continue to be invisible within current curriculum standards and textbook content and marginalized within American society. Such shortcomings also fail to equip all students with an understanding of institutional racism and how to address social justice issues in their own lives and communities.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in the study of United States History within a school district in East Tennessee. For the purpose of the study, high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history were generally defined as teacher beliefs towards the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples, the peoples and cultures native to North America prior to European colonization, in the teaching of United States history. Through the lens of theoretical frameworks such as multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, Critical Race Theory, Tribal Critical Race theory, and social justice education, this research sought to examine high school teachers lived experience and perception of the systemic, sociopolitical, and pedagogical barriers to the representation of indigenous perspectives in the teaching of United States history. The study focuses upon describing high school teacher perceptions of the value of, and challenges to, teaching indigenous perspectives, as well as teacher perceptions toward the representation of indigenous people within course curriculum and indigenous people themselves.

Research Questions

The research question that is central to this study is what are high school teacher perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people. To further explore this phenomenon, the study addresses the following general research questions as detailed in Table 1:

Table 1

Research Questions and Data Collection Alignment

Research Question	Interview	Focus Group	Documents
1. What are high school teacher perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?	X		X
2. What are high school teacher perceptions of challenges to teaching United States history from the perspectives of indigenous people?	X	X	
3. What are high school teacher perceptions of the historical representation of indigenous people in United States history curriculum?	X	X	X
4. What are high school teacher perceptions of indigenous people?	X		X

Qualitative Research Design

The application of the qualitative research methodology in educational research allows the researcher to look beyond statistics and numbers and attempt to identify the experiential narratives of teaching and learning. For the sake of this study, the depth and richness of qualitative inquiry and data are most applicable to the objective of producing a textual description of how teachers in United States history courses within the school district under study perceive the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives to the narrative of the American past. The purposeful nature of qualitative sampling and data collection methods grant the researcher with the ability to dig deeper into the phenomenon under study, which is necessary in order to accurately portray the experiences of participants. The natural, humanistic principles of the qualitative methodology emphasize the complexity of examining the experiences of real

people in the real world and challenge the researcher to focus their attention to data that are more personal than procedural (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002; Patton, 2015). The qualitative methodology considers context, encourages interpretation, and accounts for the emergence of new research questions or problems in the process of data collection. Because this study is focused upon the perceived experiences of teachers in real classrooms, and seeks to examine their perception towards indigenous perspectives in United States history courses, which could also illuminate their perceptions of indigenous cultures in the present, the philosophical promotion of open inquiry in qualitative research makes the qualitative methodology the most logical option for the researcher.

Phenomenology

An examination of the perceptions of teachers towards teaching from the perspectives of indigenous peoples in the study of United States history is most appropriately suited for the qualitative tradition of phenomenology. Phenomenological research is philosophically founded upon “capturing and describing how people experience some phenomenon” (Patton, 2015, p. 115). The essence of this qualitative tradition is that it seeks to discover how people with shared lived experiences perceive those experiences (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2015). “Phenomenological studies investigate what was experienced, how it was experienced, and, finally, the meaning that the interviewees assign to the experience” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014, p.382).

Phenomenology aims at providing an understanding of an experience through the viewpoint of the participants who have lived it (Mapp, 2008). For the purpose of this study, phenomenology provides the researcher with a methodological approach for understanding how high school teachers within a school district in East Tennessee not only perceive the value of teaching from the perspectives of indigenous peoples, but also how teachers perceive the challenges of the

inclusion of indigenous historical perspectives in United States history courses, by examining their beliefs about indigenous peoples and their historical representation.

Role of the Researcher

The application of qualitative inquiry demands that the researcher serve as the instrument of data collection (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). In contrast to a quantitative study, which requires that the researcher remain detached from their subjects, the qualitative researcher collects data in a natural setting through means such as observations, the examination of documents, or interviews with participants. As Creswell (2014) puts it, “They may use a protocol—an instrument for collecting data—but the researchers are the ones who actually gather the information. They do not tend to use or rely on questionnaires or instruments developed by other researchers” (p. 185). The role of the researcher in the qualitative tradition is personal. The researcher must essentially immerse themselves in the field in order to share in the phenomenal experience of the study participants. Patton (2015) states, “Qualitative inquiry documents the stuff that happens among real people in the real world in their own words, from their own perspectives, and within their own contexts...” (p. 12).

For the purpose of this study, the researcher sought to describe the experience of high school teachers in regard to their perception of indigenous representations in the teaching of United States history. Having previously established professional relationships with the participants through former service as a high school history teacher and administrator, the researcher’s personal experience and collegial attachment to the participants of the study provided a foundation of trust that strengthened focus group and face-to-face interviews. Because the nature of phenomenological research emphasizes the role of the researcher in providing an essence of the experience of participants through their own point of view, the

researcher's own professional experience working in the same school district and with the educators participating in the study allows for a deeper understanding of the systemic, sociopolitical, and pedagogical challenges to teaching from the perspective of indigenous peoples. However, the qualitative researcher must remain conscientious of the bias that is derived from personal experience. In this study, the use of member checks and peer review were applied to help the researcher maintain reflexivity. The implementation of such safeguards not only helps to reduce researcher bias by ensuring that the researcher's personal background and values do not bring the trustworthiness of the data into question, but also ensures that the study findings emphasize the meaning of the phenomenon for the participants not the perception of the researcher (Creswell, 2014).

Ethical Considerations

Prior to beginning research with participants, the researcher received IRB approval to conduct an investigation of the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in United States history. Additionally, participation in the study was voluntary, participants were presented with an informed consent agreement, and individual schools and teachers were granted anonymity as a means of ensuring confidence and safety for participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Shenton, 2004).

The personal nature of qualitative inquiry also demands that the researcher clearly articulate the purpose and intended audience of the study with participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). This information was specifically communicated in the informed consent documents, which can be found in the Appendix of the study, and was presented to participants prior to beginning research. The researcher sought to safeguard against potential harm and inconvenience to participants by meeting with participants at a time most conducive to their

schedule and in their own school buildings. The implementation of member checks helped to ensure the accuracy of qualitative data transcription and emphasis upon the reporting of participant language.

Finally, two important ethical considerations were reflexively considered throughout the study. First, the researcher's professional relationship with participants was noted as a foundational aspect in the establishment of trust between participants and the interviewer. However, the researcher has no supervisory authority over any participant and respected the privacy of colleagues by excluding any sensitive data. Additionally, participants were free to request that the researcher withhold any portions of interview or focus group responses from the study. The researcher also requested permission from school administrators at each high school to conduct face-to-face and focus group interviews with participants at each site and personally reviewed the intent and purpose of the study with the district's Director of Schools. Second, the researcher acknowledges that as a white male focusing upon topics that include indigenous peoples that I represent the dominant narrative of race and power in American history. An examination of the omission of indigenous voices in the study of United States history should not disregard indigenous perspectives on the subject. As such, the researcher has attempted to include an array of scholarship from indigenous authors and people of color.

Setting

Qualitative study occurs in natural settings (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). An examination of the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history requires that the researcher be granted access to the participants in their own school settings and classrooms, which was secured via request to school administrators at each district high school. For the purpose of this study, the researcher engaged in focus group interviews and

face-to-face interviews implementing open-ended questions in teacher classrooms at every high school within the school district. The emphasis upon voluntary participation in the study and engagement with participants in their own setting was useful in curtailing the existence of a power imbalance between the researcher and the participants (Creswell, 2014). Approaching the focus group and interview processes for the study as a means of engaging in open ended dialogue in regard to the representation of indigenous peoples in history provided rich, detailed description from participants.

The differences and similarities in the specific high school settings experienced by participants should also be noted. Although each district high school serves a student population of approximately 1100 students, the study includes a mixture of both rural and urban schools. The percentage of minority students within the school district is small, with no district high school reporting a total minority enrollment that exceeds 10%. The participants of the study do not reside, nor do they teach, in a community that is highly diverse.

Population

The population of this research study consisted of teachers who primarily teach the subject of United States history. The teaching experience of the participants ranged from 27 years of classroom teaching to only two years of teaching, but the average range of teaching experience for the participants who volunteered for the study was nine years. The study's population of 14 participants contained four female educators and 10 male educators and 13 of the 14 participants can be identified as white. Finally, the 14 participants had each earned at least a Master's degree and were well versed with the United States history curriculum for the state of Tennessee. The participants' high level of classroom experience and educational

attainment indicates that they clearly held the level of expertise necessary to provide an in-depth description of the phenomenon under study.

Sampling Strategy

Qualitative inquiry has a tradition of rich, detailed descriptions within a naturalistic setting, which demands that the researcher employ sampling methods that adequately meet the needs of the inquiry (Creswell, 2014; Marshall, 1996; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Patton, 2015). The inductive nature of this study required the implementation of purposeful sampling and the careful selection of participants. As Marshall (1996) puts it, purposeful sampling techniques provide the researcher with the ability to select “the most productive sample to answer the research question” (p.523). Due to the fact that the participants of the study would need to possess a certain level of expertise in order to respond to the questions posed by the researcher during focus group and face-to-face interviews, a random sampling method would have been inappropriate. In contrast, the use of homogenous or criterion sampling for this study provided the necessary means to identify teachers who could offer quality descriptions in regard to their perception toward the inclusion and representation of the historical perspective and significance of indigenous peoples in the study of United States history. A homogenous sampling method was used to identify participants for focus group interviews by enlisting volunteers within the school district who teach United States history courses and are familiar with the content of course curriculum standards and textbooks. Patton (2015) argues that homogenous sampling is appropriate when the researcher is focused upon “a particular type of person, organization, or place” (p. 283). This inquiry is specifically interested in examining the perceptions of teachers towards indigenous peoples in the study of United States history, thus, a

homogenous sample would provide the opportunity to identify subjects who would be the most applicable.

A criterion sampling method was implemented to specifically identify potential study participants based upon their course load, teaching experience, and academic experience. For example, the researcher chose to exclude potential participants who were certified to teach United States history courses, but were primarily responsible for teaching other social studies courses such as world history or world geography. In contrast, establishing the criteria that participants must teach the subject of United States history each semester of the school year led to a sample population with detailed experience of the phenomenon, a stronger grasp on the content of course standards and curriculum, and knowledge of the challenges and stress of teaching a state tested subject. The criteria of potential participants possessing a Master's degree was deemed necessary as a measure for further identifying teachers who would have a deeper depth of knowledge in regard to both course content and pedagogy. These criteria, along with the collection of data from multiple sites, not only provided the researcher with sample data that could be used to identify participants for in-depth interviews and focus group sessions, it provided ample variation from within the school system (McMillan & Schumacher 2014; Patton, 2015).

Sample

This study includes qualitative data from multiple sites and sources. Qualitative data was attained through face to face interviews and focus group interviews from teachers of United States history courses within the school district under study. This sample included U.S. history teachers from each of the district high schools. Because the aim of this study was not to generalize the sample to the larger population, but to provide an essence of the experience of

teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in United States history, the sample population was purposely selected based upon criteria established by the researcher to bolster the depth of qualitative data. Though a sample population of 14 teachers would seem small, the qualitative researcher is more interested in a sample consisting of “information richness” rather than the size of the sample (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014, p. 352). As Patton (2015) puts it, “The logic and power of qualitative purposeful sampling derives from the emphasis on in-depth understanding of specific cases: *information-rich cases*” (p. 52). The sample population of this study, consisting of 14 educators from the district high schools, granted the researcher with access to insightful and experiential descriptions of the phenomenon, which allowed for the emergence of rich contextual data.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to examine teacher perceptions toward the inclusion of indigenous voices in U.S. history courses within a school district in East Tennessee, this research study employed a variety of data collection methods. Because the qualitative methodology emphasizes the role of the researcher as the data collection instrument, the collection of teacher produced artifacts such as lesson plans and assessments, in depth face-to-face interviews, and focus groups provided the researcher with the rich personal descriptions, opinions, and responses needed to identify themes within the data (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2015; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). Furthermore, the application of multiple data collection measures from multiple data collection sites strengthens the credibility of the study via triangulation (Creswell, 2014; Shenton 2004). The collection of real-time data via audio recordings and written notes during one-to-one interviews and focus group interviews with teachers granted the researcher with essential data for understanding how teachers in the school district perceive the role and representation of

indigenous peoples in the teaching of United States history. The semi-structured face-to-face and focus group interviews followed the interview protocol highlighted in the Appendix of the study and typically lasted from 30 minutes to an hour in length. Data collection through the examination of documents such as the Tennessee State Standards for United States History, teacher created assessments, and class lesson plans gave the researcher valuable insight into the curricular framework that shapes the teaching and learning of U.S history and helped corroborate qualitative data from interviews and observations (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). The interviews and collection of artifacts were conducted during the months of August and September of the 2016-2017 academic year. Collection at a stage early in the semester was not only more conducive to participant schedules; it also coincided with the historical eras within the course curriculum that grant some attention to indigenous peoples in American history.

Measures of Rigor

To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, the researcher employed the use of thick description derived from face to face interviews, focus group interviews, and artifacts provided by participants. In order to help mitigate bias and increase credibility, the use of participant review or member checks was applied (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Patton, 2015; Shenton, 2004). The researcher's own influence as an administrator and former history teacher held the potential of creating reliability issues through the interview process and required attention to reflexivity (Creswell, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). The use of a peer debriefer and field log allowed the researcher to remain mindful of how personal background and experience may shape the interpretation of data (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2015). The clear presentation of research methods, the role of the researcher, and the description of the sampling, data collection strategies, and data analysis implemented provide for the transferability of the

study (Shenton, 2004). The dependability of the study has been strengthened by the use of “overlapping methods” of data collection such as focus group and individual, face-to-face interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004). Finally, each voluntary participant in the study was provided with an informed consent agreement and individual schools and teachers remained anonymous within the data as a means of not only bolstering the trustworthiness of the data, but also ensuring anonymity and safety for participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Shenton, 2004).

Data Analysis

Data analysis for qualitative research is interactive and highlights the qualitative methodology’s emergent design. “For example, the questions may change, the forms of data collection may shift and the individuals studied and the sites visited may be modified” (Creswell, 2014, p. 186). Upon the collection of face-to-face interview and focus group transcripts, in addition to a close review of artifacts such as lesson plans and teacher created assessments, the researcher coded the data into themes and categories. Creswell (2013) suggests that phenomenological studies allow the researcher to review the data and identify significant statements or quotes that can be organized into “clusters of meaning” to provide an understanding of the participants’ experiences (p. 61). Patton (2015) refers to the process of “bracketing” as a step in phenomenological reduction, which leads the researcher to capturing the essence of the phenomenon from the perspective of the participants. As themes and categories emerge, the research design was transformed to better suit the needs of the researcher to describe the phenomenon under study. The use of inductive and constant comparative analysis was applied throughout data collection and data analysis to allow the researcher to identify

trustworthy themes and categories based upon participant and researcher experience with the phenomenon (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014).

The phenomenological nature of this study requires that the researcher emphasize the textual descriptions of the participants' experiences in order to create a narrative of the "essence of the experience" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014, p. 411). Therefore, the qualitative data derived through face-to-face and focus group interviews, as well as artifacts was used to identify an emerging interpretation of the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in United States history. Data were coded and reexamined for recoding as needed. Member checks were implemented to ensure that the presentation of data elucidates the participants' own perceptions in regard to the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives in the study of United States history while clarifying the researcher's analysis of the deeper meanings of the lived experience for the participants. Patton (2015) states, "The purpose of analysis is to organize the description so that it is meaningful" (p. 606). Thus, the objective of the inductive data analysis techniques for this study is to accurately portray the experiences of the participants through the identification of common themes drawn from the multiple data sources.

Summary

The methodological framework and processes applied to this study support the phenomenological qualitative pursuit of an examination of teacher perceptions toward the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in United States history. The qualitative methodology requires "in-the-field experience" and the simultaneous processes of data collection and analysis, which naturally align with the phenomenological objective of presenting an essence of the experience through the lens of the participants (Luttrell, 2005). Simply put, I want to

know “how” and “why” teachers feel the way they feel about the inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives in the study of United States history. The collection and coding of face-to-face and focus group interview responses in addition to the close examination of qualitative artifacts provided the rich, personal descriptions necessary for illuminating the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in history from the lived experience of the participants.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to examine the phenomenon of high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in the study of United States history within a school district in East Tennessee. The essential question of the study, which was “What are teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in the study of United States history?” was informed by the four supporting research questions used to guide this qualitative study.

Findings of this phenomenological study were gathered through the process of qualitative inductive inquiry. Focus group interviews conducted at multiple data collection sites, which included each of the high schools in the school district, allowed participants to openly discuss their own perceptions in regard to indigenous representations in history and compare and contrast their personal experiences with their colleagues. The educators who voluntarily participated in semi-structured face-to-face interviews conducted using an interview protocol described their perceptions of indigenous representations in history, the challenges to teaching from the perspective of indigenous peoples, the historical representation of indigenous people in current United States history curriculum, and their individual perceptions of indigenous peoples. The study participants also provided detail in regard to how their perceptions informed instructional decisions, as well as how their own experiences both as educators and in their own academic training have influenced their perception of indigenous representations in history and their personal perception of indigenous peoples. The use of focus group and face-to-face in-depth interviews as a means of data collection provided the rich, thick description of individual experience that is essential to qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2015). The examination of lesson plans

and activities that included the representation of indigenous peoples was also collected from voluntary participants in order to further explore teacher perception of indigenous historical perspectives. The analysis of research findings from these multiple data collection measures are presented in Chapter 4.

To strengthen the credibility of this research study, data analysis included the triangulation of focus group and individual participant interviews, the examination of qualitative documents, the review of researcher notes, and member checks. The qualitative data derived from multiple data collection sites and measures were coded into categories and themes. The organization of data into clusters of meaning in order to accurately reflect each participant's individual experience was accomplished through constant comparative analysis and occurred prior to the use of member checks. Qualitative data analysis requires that the researcher interpret data reflectively in order to identify emergent themes that can be bracketed or categorized into a synthesis of participant experiences (Creswell, 2013; Patton 2015). The iterative use of inductive and constant comparative analysis was applied throughout data collection and data analysis to allow the researcher to identify trustworthy themes and categories based upon participant and researcher experience with the phenomenon (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). The two focus group interviews, which occurred during the month of October 2016, and the 14 semi-structured individual interviews occurring during the month of November 2016 produced the qualitative data used to interpret and analyze the phenomenon of teacher perception of indigenous representations in history. Each participant was given a copy of the written transcription of their interview and was asked to review the contents of the transcription to ensure accuracy and further strengthen the study's credibility. Ethical considerations for the study were addressed in accordance to the standards of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at

East Tennessee State University. Participants were provided with an informed consent document, which can be reviewed in Appendix B, and were advised of the interview process as well as their ability to cease participation in the study at any point. Study participants are identified using gender-specific pseudonyms and are identified as John, Bill, Bruce, Graham, Karl, Alice, Oliver, Donald, Wendy, Neil, Susan, Charles, Lauren, and Matt.

Data Collection

Data collection for the study took place during the focus group interviews and 14 in-depth individual interviews held in October and November 2016. The interview protocol for the focus group interviews and face-to-face interviews can be found in Appendix C and Appendix D. Both the focus group interviews and individual interviews were proctored by the researcher. All data collection for the study and the transcription of all interviews were performed by the researcher. Following the collection of data, interview transcriptions and qualitative documents were reviewed for the emergence of dominant categories and themes.

Participant Profiles

The study's 14 participants were all certified staff members within the school district during the 2016-2017 academic year, in which this study occurred. Each participant has taught United States history courses at the high school level, met the study's sampling criteria of having earned a Master's degree, and is familiar with current United States history curriculum. The range of experience for the study's participants is from two to 27 years of classroom teaching and the sample population consists of four females and 10 males. All but one of the participants can be identified as white and three of the participants are former students of the school system.

John is a second-career teacher who is in his fifth year in the school system. Prior to earning his teaching license, John worked as a project manager for a construction firm. He is

originally from Florida and his undergraduate degree was in theology. He also has a master's degree in curriculum and instruction and is certified to teach history, government, and geography. Most of his course load is spent teaching 12th grade government courses, but he also teaches one United States history course each semester. He also serves as the department head for one of the high schools used as a data collection site. John participated in both the focus group and individual interviews during the months of October and November 2016.

Bill is currently in his fourth year of teaching. He has experience teaching history at both the middle school and high school level. Bill is originally from the local area and is teaching in the same high school from which he graduated. He is the only non-white participant in the study. Bill's undergraduate degree is in political science and he has a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Bill is certified to teach history and geography. Bill is actively involved in professional development pursuits outside of the school day and took a number of Native studies courses in college. Bill participated in both the focus group and individual interviews during the months of October and November 2016.

Bruce is in his third year of teaching in the school system and teaches a combination of courses that include world history, United States history, and military history. Bruce is not originally from Tennessee, but previously taught in a nearby school district. His undergraduate degree is in history and he holds a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Bruce is certified to teach history, geography, and government courses. Bruce has a very dry sense of humor and often makes jokes at his own expense. He is also very critical of his own abilities as a teacher in spite of having earned high evaluation and achievement scores. Bruce is actively involved in a number of school clubs devoted to pet adoption and animal rescue. Bruce

participated in both the focus group and individual interviews during the months of October and November 2016.

Graham is a second-career teacher, originally working in classical studies at a nearby university. Graham has worked in the school system for 11 years, all of them spent at the same high school. He primarily teaches courses in United States history and world geography and also serves as the school's varsity soccer coach. Graham's undergraduate degree is in classical studies, but he has also earned a master's degree and educational specialist degree in curriculum and administration. Graham is from the local region, but was raised in an urban, economically disadvantaged neighborhood. He is actively involved in the local community and educators' association. Graham is also very interested in educational politics and policy-making, having a sibling who currently works as a lobbyist for the state teachers' union. Graham participated in individual interviews during the month of November 2016.

Karl is in his second year of teaching in the school system, having spent the first four years of his career teaching in an affluent private school in East Tennessee. Karl also attended a private high school as a student and is a member of an affluent family. Karl's undergraduate degree is in history and he has earned a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Karl is certified to teach history, economics, government, and geography, but primarily teaches courses in United States and World History. He is an avid outdoor enthusiast and has traveled extensively. He also helps coach the cross country team for one of the high school's involved in the study. Karl participated in both the focus group and individual interviews during the months of October and November 2016.

Alice is in her fifth year teaching in the school system and currently teaches a full course load of United States history and AP United States history. Alice is originally from New Jersey

and received her undergraduate degree in history from a highly respected university in the northeastern U.S. She also holds a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Alice took a wide variety of history courses in college and had a strong interest in westward expansion and the historical perspectives of women and Native Americans. She also tries to incorporate her own cultural experiences into her classroom as much as possible. Alice is very involved with school clubs and extracurricular activities. She has also been consistently one of the highest achieving U.S. history teachers in the school district in recent years. Alice volunteered to participate in the focus group interviews hosted in October 2016 as well as in an individual interview, which was conducted in November 2016.

Oliver is currently in his 11th year in the school district. Although Oliver is not originally from the local area, he was raised in a rural community in East Tennessee that shares many similar characteristics. Oliver earned a bachelor's degree in history and holds master's and educational specialist degrees in school administration. Oliver views his upbringing in a low-socioeconomic community and his ability to "get out" and become a successful professional as an important motivational tool for his students. Oliver is certified to teach history, geography, and government, but primarily teaches United States history and military history. Oliver often discusses his own family and heritage in class, which he has been told includes ancestry to the Cherokee. Oliver participated in individual interviews during the month of November 2016.

Donald is in his 10th year of teaching at the high school level in the school district, and is a graduate of one of the district high schools although he does not currently teach at his alma mater. Donald earned an undergraduate degree in history and also holds master's and educational specialist degrees in school administration. Donald is actively pursuing a career move from classroom teaching to school administration and serves as a substitute principal when

needed. He is certified to teach history and geography. Donald's course load consists of entirely United States history courses and he teaches all level of students from special needs to advanced placement. Donald is very involved with athletics at his school and is currently the head golf coach. He is also very active in curriculum meetings and leadership teams at the district and school-level. Donald takes pride in his family's lineage traced to the Cherokee, but he is not an enrolled member of the tribe. Donald participated in both the focus group and individual interviews conducted in October and November 2016.

Wendy is in her 13th year of teaching in the school district and has taught United States history at both the middle school and high school level. She has also worked as an academic coach in the school district. Wendy is from a small rural community in East Tennessee, but is not originally from the local area. Wendy has an undergraduate degree in geography and a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. She is also currently pursuing a Ph.D. focusing on elementary education and literacy. Wendy frequently works for the school district in helping develop teacher training and professional development workshops, and is also actively involved with state department of education committees for standards and assessment. Wendy participated in an individual interview in November 2016.

Neil is in his sixth year as a history teacher in the district, having taught only United States history courses at the middle and high school level. Neil is originally from Canada, but also spent much of his youth in Australia. He graduated from a Canadian university with undergraduate and graduate degrees in history. Neil frequently interjects his own cultural experiences into his classroom in an attempt to engage and interest his students. Neil routinely travels back home to Quebec to visit with his family, and his experience as a public school student included an extensive exposure to indigenous history and multicultural perspectives. He

often jokes about why school leaders have chosen a Canadian emigrant to teach United States history courses, but both his classroom evaluations and achievement scores exceed the state average. Neil participated in individual interviews during the month of November 2016.

Susan is in her 27th year as an educator in the school district. The bulk of her career has been spent at the middle school level, but she has taught United States history courses for middle and high school students. Susan is originally from the local region and attended a very affluent public school before moving away for college. She has an undergraduate degree in history and holds a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Susan is very active with curriculum planning committees and once supervised the school districts development of pacing and instructional guides for social studies teachers. She is an avid reader and is most interested in early-American and presidential history, having also visited the home of every president. Susan participated in an individual interview in November 2016.

Charles is in his 12th year in the school district and has teaching experience at the middle and high school level. Charles currently teaches courses in United States history, military history, and world geography. Charles is not from the local area, but was raised in a similar community in East Tennessee. He earned undergraduate and graduate degrees in history and holds an educational specialist degree in school leadership. Charles also works part-time as an adjunct United States history professor for a local community college. Charles' educational background exposed him to a wide variety of history courses and attending graduate school outside of the southeast broadened his cultural experiences. Charles' family also traces their ancestry to the Cherokee. He frequently attempts to introduce Native American perspectives into his classroom and prominently displays indigenous images and historical figures in his

classroom. Charles participated in a focus group interview in October and an individual interview in November 2016.

Lauren is in her fourth year in the school district and is a second-career educator. Prior to becoming a teacher, she worked as a social worker at a residential treatment facility for girls. Lauren is originally from East Tennessee, but not the local community. She holds an undergraduate degree in business and a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. She is certified to teach economics, government, and history. Lauren primarily teaches 12th grade economics courses, but she also teaches one United States history course per semester. Lauren is open about her own perceived lack of historical knowledge and much of her classroom instruction in United States history is designed by her colleagues in the social studies department. Lauren participated in both a focus group interview and individual interview in October and November 2016.

Matt is in his second year of teaching United States history at a district high school. Matt is from the local community, but does not currently teach at his high school alma mater. Matt has an undergraduate degree in political science and a master's degree in curriculum and instruction. He is certified to teach history and government. Matt's personal and scholarly interest in politics and government frequently influence his instructional practices in his United States history courses. Matt has also helped coach football at the high school and hopes to eventually move from classroom teaching to school administration. He is currently pursuing an educational specialist degree in school leadership. Matt participated in a focus group interview in October 2016, as well as an individual interview in November 2016.

Researcher's Notes and Memos

The researcher began collecting field notes and memos during the focus group interviews hosted in October 2016 and throughout the semi-structured individual interviews conducted during November 2016. In the process of transcribing audio recordings of the focus group and face-to-face interviews, the researcher compiled memos that included the researcher's thoughts and comments, which were coded and organized accordingly based upon the emergence of distinct themes and categories. The researcher's notes included the interaction and body language between teachers during the focus group sessions, as well as highly experiential, descriptive statements made by participants during individual interviews.

The researcher also collected field notes derived from the review of qualitative documents such as lesson plans or class activities used by participants, which included representations of indigenous peoples in United States history. The researcher found that six of the participants specifically created lesson plans and activities for their classes that emphasized the historical perspectives of Native Americans. Further review of these documents revealed that five of the six participants relegated indigenous representations to historical themes of conflict, oppression, or victimization. One participant also included representations of indigenous peoples in contemporary history and had implemented lesson plans that highlighted the resiliency and significance of indigenous cultures. The researcher noted that all six of these participants were deeply passionate in regard to the inclusion of Native American perspectives in the teaching of United States history and connected this passion either to their own academic experience or a personal connection to indigenous peoples through family ancestry.

The researcher's field notes from both the focus group interviews and individual in-depth interviews indicate that the participants were open and reflective throughout the interview

process. Memos from the interviews note that all 14 teachers provided responses to interview questions that strongly correlated to the dominant themes present within the review of literature in regard to the systemic, sociocultural, and pedagogical barriers to the inclusion of indigenous representations in history. When responding to focus group interview questions 1 and 2 and individual interview questions 1 through 4, participant responses emphasized the proliferation of curriculum standards and high-stakes testing as the primary systemic barriers to indigenous representations in history. John's focus group interview response supported the researcher's own perception of how course curriculum standards and state testing constricts the inclusion of indigenous and multicultural perspectives in United States history courses. In response to Research Question 2, John stated:

I mean, we just don't have the time to go into a lot of detail on stuff. At the end of the day, I mean, if I felt the assassination of JFK was really important to discuss in class, but there's never a test question on it...in the end I am still responsible for the test, not for that topic. So, I'm going to skip over that regardless of how I feel about the topic. I can't justify my test scores and can't justify teaching something that isn't going to be on the test. That's what the school is counting on you for.

The researcher's field notes reveal that all 14 of the study participants perceive curriculum standards and testing to be the greatest challenges to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in history. The researcher also noted that the six participants who did specifically include indigenous perspectives into their courses, Charles, Bill, Neil, Wendy, Donald, and Alice, viewed their instruction as in direct opposition to the state curriculum, and based their decision to do so upon their own personal beliefs and background knowledge in regard to Native Americans. During the interview transcription process, the researcher noted the following:

All of the study participants professed a belief that the inclusion of indigenous representations in United States history curriculum would be welcome. The few participants who already include indigenous perspectives do so because of their unique personal experiences. For Bill, Alice, and Wendy this was a result of their own academic experiences and coursework, which expanded their cultural perspectives and background knowledge. For Donald and Charles the inclusion of indigenous perspectives was predicated upon their personal connection to the Cherokee. They both feel a deep sense of, almost obligation, to include the historical significance of Native Americans into their classroom instruction. For Neil, the inclusion of indigenous peoples was a result of his own exposure to indigenous cultures in his home country and public education experience.

The researcher also notes that participants echoed many of the themes within the literature in relation to multicultural education, social justice education, and issues such as racism and privilege. In response to individual interview question 1, which asked participants to describe what they believed to be the most important outcome of teaching U.S. history, 13 of the 14 respondents perceived citizenship education as their most significant instructional objective. Only Neil, citing his own experience as an immigrant to the United States, did not view citizenship education as an important product of teaching history. Each of the educators interviewed also indicated that preparing students to address issues in their own lives beyond high school was an important outcome of learning U.S. history. The researcher noted the following during both the focus group interviews and individual interviews:

In response to questions about what they feel is important for students to learn, or what outcomes they desire for their students, the participants suggest that their highest goal is

to produce productive and informed citizens. Every participant believes the inclusion of multiple perspectives and discussions about stereotypes and systemic racism are important for students, but they openly confess that the curriculum standards, lack of time, and insufficient background knowledge prohibits their ability to effectively include multiple historical perspectives. Most participants feel that the standards undermine multicultural education and base their instructional approach to racial issues upon the perceived intellectual level of their class. They believe these issues are important, but not all participants are comfortable approaching these topics in the classroom.

Donald's concise response to focus group interview question 2 supports the researcher's understanding. Donald stated, "It's part of our history, but always approach it with kid gloves."

The researcher's notes also indicate that all 14 participants suggested that the current United States history curriculum standards in the state of Tennessee were especially constrictive of indigenous perspectives. When asked how their high school history students would describe indigenous peoples, the researcher noted that the most common responses from participants included a high frequency of the words teepees, feathers, savage, mascots, footnote, vanished, reservations, casinos, headdresses, novelty, token, and Thanksgiving. The researcher noted that only Neil could attest to remembering anything that he learned about indigenous peoples during his own high school experience. All of the other respondents indicated that their own perception and understanding of indigenous peoples was developed through their own personal research, experience, and collegiate historical study.

The qualitative data collected through focus group interviews, face-to-face interviews, and a review of qualitative artifacts allowed the researcher to examine how high school history teachers perceive indigenous representations in United States history courses. Each participant

provided responses that gave the researcher insight into their own experience of the phenomenon under study. Further analysis of the focus group and individual interviews is offered within the interview results section of the study.

Interview Results

The findings of this phenomenological study are organized and presented based upon the emergence of dominant themes derived from the data collected pertaining to the research questions of the study. Specifically relevant and direct quotes from the participants' interview transcripts are presented within the proceeding section of Chapter 4. Participant quotes are used to provide evidence and support for the emergent themes identified by the researcher for each of the research questions of the study. A summarization and analysis of the study findings, in addition to the conclusions and recommendations of the principal investigator, are presented in Chapter 5.

Research Question 1

What are high school teacher perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?

Differentiation Between Personal and Professional Perception. A prominent theme that emerged from interview questions related to RQ 1 was that although all of the participants personally attested to the importance of the inclusion of multiple historical perspectives in the classroom, including indigenous perspectives, they often differentiated between their personal perception of the value of teaching from the perspective of indigenous peoples and the perceived professional value of indigenous perspectives in United States history. When asked to describe what they believed was important for their students to understand about Native Americans or

indigenous peoples in the study of United States history, every teacher was able to provide a response. Karl's statement exemplifies the majority of participant responses:

I think the first thing that they should understand is that the Native American people are still around. That's probably the first thing that we should make them be aware of. They [Native Americans] didn't just like vanish.

Alice stated:

Well...for one they still exist. I mean, that's a pretty general belief [for students] that they just disappear, they're just gone...I guarantee almost all the kids, even the ones that have Cherokee [ancestry] and are from the area automatically think of, you know, the "Indian Chief" with the feathers riding on a horse to find buffalo...I think it's part of how, I don't want to say just the standards, but like part of the history of how we're sort of confined to teach it. It's always sort of like Native Americans 'were' and this was always in the past tense and there's like only one standard, in terms of like teaching, there's only one standard for Native American history that is post-World War II.

Oliver and Susan both echoed Alice's sentiment. Oliver said:

Well...I definitely believe, especially in Tennessee, that we've got a deep heritage and roots in connection and interaction with Native Americans. However, the standards, I think especially after middle school, the standards [about Native Americans] are almost completely cut out, so it really kind of cuts out how they contributed to conflicts and other things that helped shape America.

Susan agreed:

I think it's pretty important for students to understand that Native Americans didn't just vanish. You know, the standards make it seem like that is the case. It's like, ok,

westward expansion happens, Little Big Horn, Custer, Wounded Knee and then nothing. There are like 1 or 2 standards about Natives thrown in during the Civil Rights movement, but those standards are so big and convoluted that they [Native Americans] still just get glossed over.

Graham also commented on the importance of students understanding the contemporary existence of indigenous peoples and how their historical perspective can be relevant to modern issues. Graham stated:

I want students to understand that, you know, we're not just like these "white saviors" who come in and we take America over, or think that, you know, we did all of these great things for the Indians like bringing all this technology and then all of the sudden they [Native Americans] are just kind of out of the history. Native Americans didn't just disappear...I think our kids have to understand what has happened to Native Americans and what they are dealing with today. They [students] need to know that they [Native Americans] were here first and that we, you know, as a group of Europeans came to this continent and we are like bad immigrants. We were immigrants. You know, we were giving out blankets infested with disease, destroyed cultures and were killing people, taking their food, taking their environment. So, I think it's really important for kids to realize that we were those people. So when we look at Hispanics or someone from another country and, you know, paint them in broad strokes, we are doing an injustice to ourselves and our own history and Native American culture provides, unfortunately, a great vehicle for talking about race, immigration, or colonialism.

When the interviewer proceeded further and asked how the participants incorporated indigenous perspectives into their course instruction, only six of the 14 participants actually included

indigenous perspectives in their classroom beyond the minimal requirement of the state standards. All six of these participants had either adapted their own instructional methods to include indigenous perspectives throughout the semester, or specifically targeted the inclusion of indigenous perspectives after the conclusion of standardized testing. For example, Bill, Wendy, and Neil, who had all previously taught United States history at the middle school level and were familiar with curriculum standards that did provide greater inclusion of indigenous perspectives, structured their courses in thematic units rather than teaching according to the chronological nature of the state standards. Charles and Alice reported that their instructional inclusion of indigenous perspectives was a result of their academic experiences and higher comfort level in regard to subject knowledge. Donald, who personally identifies with indigenous peoples due to his family's connection to the Cherokee, felt his obligation to the state curriculum trumped his personal perception and only included specific indigenous perspectives after the conclusion of state assessments.

Donald stated:

I think they [Native Americans] are vastly underrepresented in our standards. That's a tragedy, a travesty. It's almost like we're just continuing, it's this perpetual thing, we just continue to push them [Native Americans] on the back burner...we kind of just push them out of the way and we will continue to do that in our state standards. It's colonialism within the standards and you hate seeing that. What I do, because there are so many standards, I think right now there are 2 on maybe the Dawes General Allotment Act and the Code Talkers. I mean, I think that is the only time they are mentioned in our new standards, which is a travesty. I try my best to discuss them, especially when we get to the closing of the western frontier...I try to talk about it as much as I can, but in my

class I use a side project where they [students] have to take a native culture group, a specific tribe, and create class presentations. But with the standards and the way state testing works now, I've actually had to put that on the back burner until after, you know, after the EOC is over.

When asked by the investigator, all 14 of the study participants commented that a greater inclusion and representation of indigenous perspectives in high school United States history courses would require educators to disregard the boundaries of the current state curriculum.

When asked further by the investigator if the inclusion of indigenous perspectives would be more plausible in non-tested high school social studies courses, all 14 participants again responded in the affirmative. Of the six participants who did attempt to introduce indigenous perspectives into their classrooms beyond the state standards, only Alice, Bill, Wendy, Neil, and Charles felt comfortable enough to do so prior to state testing. Charles summarizes these participants' perspective stating:

Man...it's tough. I think maybe it's easier to adapt your instruction and not worry about the test as much if you have been in the classroom for longer. Or for me, it's just that I have studied so much about indigenous peoples that it really doesn't take that much additional work on my part. I don't think a lot of other educators are in that same boat. Especially now that our test scores are connected to points that impact the renewal of our licenses. You know, our teacher licenses are connected to student scores now. That's a lot of pressure for new teachers, or for folks who maybe don't feel as confident with the history. So, it's hard to blame anyone for not including Native perspectives because they just aren't there in the standards. But, I feel like it's my job. That's the stuff that I love,

so I am going to teach it. It's important to me personally to do that. You just have to get creative. You know, you just have to make it happen on your own.

Inclusion versus Addition. As a means of further expounding upon the qualitative data for RQ1 each individual interview concluded with the researcher asking participants to describe how they might address the current United States history curriculum and the lack of representation of indigenous peoples. All 14 participants reported feeling that indigenous perspectives in United States history are grossly inadequate and communicate to students and teachers that Native Americans are insignificant in regard to modern United States history and contemporary American society. However, every teacher who participated in a face-to-face interview also perceived the potential addition of more curriculum standards in order to include Native American perspectives as an inappropriate response to the phenomenon under study. Bruce's response captured the dominant feelings of most participants:

I don't want to add anything...as a teacher I am afraid that's what would happen. If it was communicated to the people that are really responsible for making standards that we would like to see more inclusion of Native populations I honestly think all that they would do is then just tack it on, or add to what they already had. I feel like that still wouldn't address the issue with the system. We've got 90 days of class, but 112 standards, and really only 75 days of class time because of EOC testing. Adding two or three or more standards to teach in 75 days is not going to help. What they would need to do is really go through and cut out some of the ones [standards] that are repetitive or that maybe don't have as many links to other standards...we don't have time to go into any of what's happening with Native populations because of time constraints, so I feel like you can cut some of that.

Lauren also discussed a fear of the addition of more standards in order to include indigenous perspectives:

It may sound really bad of me, but as much as I would love to add in more historical perspectives for Natives, or blacks, or women, we just can't do that. It's already so difficult to even cover everything already. I mean, we are supposed to get all the way up to modern America and I think the last real topic that I actually feel like I have time to really dig into is Vietnam. I mean, you know, that leaves over 40 or so years of history that I am having to rush my kids through just in case they have questions on a test.

Adding standards just won't work. We really need to be able to, I don't know, change the whole structure of how we teach history to really include multicultural perspectives.

The responses of Karl, Alice, and Neil correspond with Lauren's belief that a paradigm shift for teaching history rather than the addition of standards would provide educators with the ability to include indigenous perspectives in their courses. Karl states:

My fear is that to suggest change would only result in "let's put in five more standards" and expecting that to solve the problem. And I don't think that's going to solve the problem. You know, I mean, I personally believe that U.S. history should probably be two classes rather than one and that you should be able to take more time and look more at the Native American people. As it stands right now, to try to go from the American Civil War up until roughly around 2008 is overwhelming. You know, a quick Band-Aid fix isn't gonna really accomplish anything. I think you're [policymakers] going to have to reassess. Ok. Either we need to shorten the amount of standards that are in U.S. history or we need to lengthen the amount of time to teach.

Alice said:

U.S history can't be taught from Reconstruction to the present. You can't teach all of it and, you know, to gloss over issues just gives kids the perception that it doesn't matter...if you want to get down to more specifics like Native American history you would really need to acknowledge it and maybe add its own course. Well, you know, I guess just like don't throw in stuff just to have it [indigenous perspectives] there because all you're teaching them [students] is that it doesn't matter and it's just something else to memorize and forget, especially when you connect it to a test...until you actually make it matter for students it's never going to amount to anything for them and they're just going to memorize or regurgitate it and forget it.

Neil addressed the need for more instructional time and teacher training in multiple historical perspectives by suggesting, "I think what you can do is, you just have to pick, it's almost like a standard needs to become some sort of automatic concept and then you could look at the same theme and concept from all of these different perspectives." The interviewer asked Neil to further explain what he believed needed to occur to help prepare teachers to adapt their instruction to thematic concepts rather than standards. Neil stated:

That's the big thing, yeah, there's a big jump there. I think that you've got the education classes, so you've got to change something there first. The training programs will have to change before things can change on the ground and in schools. I didn't go into college thinking I was going to be a teacher so, therefore, I took all of these history classes whereas you get a lot of people that are in here [schools] and they're going to be social studies teachers, so they take history classes here and there, and they haven't really be trained to look at it [history] the same way.

John confessed that even the addition of standards representing indigenous perspectives would not be beneficial to his students due to his own lack of background knowledge, corresponding with Neil's perspective. John said:

I would like to incorporate those [Native perspectives] into my teaching, but the way the standards are now I'm meant to, kind of, connect to prior knowledge and there's a bit of a black hole when it comes to Native Americans...if you couldn't be interested, I mean, and you can't teach the things that you were never really taught yourself unless it was something that you were just personally interested in or have personal experience with.

Matt succinctly addressed the theme of inclusion versus addition stating:

I don't think you would find a history teacher in the entire district who wouldn't love to be able to really teach history from different perspectives. I mean, especially from the perspective of Native Americans because we have such a connection to the Cherokee around here, but, you know, the value of doing that is overshadowed by how we have to teach things. I think it would be really beneficial for our kids, and I really think they would like the class a lot more, but as much as I feel like those perspectives [indigenous] would be great to include. I don't feel like I really know how to do it well, and, you know, I have to do what I can to get kids ready for the test. Adding more things to the standards list would be a nightmare. I don't know what I would do.

Research Question 2

What are high school teacher perceptions of challenges to teaching United States history from the perspectives of indigenous people?

A Culture of Curricular Constriction. A clear theme throughout the data collection process and the transcription and coding of the focus group interviews and individual interviews

was that participants perceive current United States history curriculum as a systemic challenge to teaching from the perspectives of indigenous people. Focus group interview questions (1, 1a, 2, and 4a) and individual interview questions (1a, 3, 4a, 4b, and 7) were used by the principal investigator to identify qualitative evidence for RQ2. When the researcher asked participants to describe how they believed the teaching of United States history had changed throughout their career or since they were a student, all 14 participants referenced the emphasis on state standards and high-stakes testing. Susan, who is the most experienced study participant, provided a response that also represented the perspectives of Graham, Oliver, Donald, Charles, and Wendy, who are the more experienced participants within the sample population. Susan reported:

Standards. It's the standards, no doubt about it. That's the biggest difference or change that I have seen in my time in education. You know, there is always so much talk about the standards and the test, you know. It's always a part of what we discuss in department meetings, or professional development, or in summer training. The test stuff is always what is in the newspaper or on TV. It's all part of how we are evaluated, and the teacher observations, and how we are judged. Don't get me wrong, I think there is a lot of good from the accountability piece of it all, but when I first started teaching we just taught history. It's weird, you know, I think the standards and testing have made me become a better, or more focused teacher, but there are definitely some drawbacks. It, you know, makes it hard sometimes, especially to really teach from a lot of different angles.

John, Bruce, Karl, Alice, Lauren, Matt, and Bill described their view of curriculum standards in light of their own high school experience. Karl stated:

I know there is a lot different emphasis on standards than when I was in school. I don't ever even remember the teacher putting anything up on the board, or saying "Ok, this is

what we are going to cover today”. I mean, they may have told us what they were going to talk about in class, but it wasn’t any type of specific standard.

Alice’s focus group response echoed Karl’s statement:

When I was in high school, you know, I wasn’t in Tennessee, but New Jersey didn’t have an EOC for history, so it was more like you had a curriculum to cover, but it was at the teacher’s discretion of what they wanted to focus on. The time and pacing, things like that, I barely even remember taking U.S. history to be honest. There might have been some sort of standard involved, but I had a coach [as a teacher], and he wasn’t worried about that stuff in our class.

Lauren responded:

I don’t remember anything about standards when I took U.S. history in high school. I mean, I know there were certain things that we were supposed to learn, but there was no end of course test. I mean, we had a final exam, but no state test. So, I kind of feel like we pretty much just covered whatever the teacher wanted to cover, or topics that we asked about. There were a lot more lectures and stories. That is for sure.

Matt commented, “We talk about standards all the time now. We have to. I am pretty sure my teachers just talked about whatever they thought we needed to know. That might not be great all the time, but it seemed like they got to decide. We don’t, you know, have much choice really.”

During the focus group sessions, the researcher asked participants to describe their thoughts on the biggest challenge for U.S. history teachers today. All of the participants cited curriculum standards and their feelings of not having enough class time to adequately cover the course content prior to state testing. Charles’ focus group response provided a summary that characterizes the experience of the participants:

For me personally, the most difficult, biggest challenge for teaching U.S. history today is just finding the time to actually, you know, teach history. Does that make sense? I feel like there is just so much stuff that we have to rush through to get from Reconstruction, and I mean, that's one thing right there. Why do we start with Reconstruction in high school U.S. history when the kids don't even know anything, or remember anything about the Civil War from their 8th grade classes? So, we have all of these standards and we all really want to teach our kids the story of our country, not just a bunch of random, disconnected facts or whatever. I want my kids to know the story, but because we have to get through so much material, I am constantly forced to make decisions about what parts of the curriculum I feel like I can spend more time on and try and make it interesting, and on the flip side, try and decide what standards are so random and meaningless that they are best on some type of review guide or worksheet. I know that probably sounds bad. I know it does. But, I mean, our subject has so many standards, and history keeps going you know, every year adds more to the story. There is just so much that I would really like to discuss with my kids, have them research, do projects, etc., but I feel like most everything gets shortchanged because of the test. I love history. I love the stories. I would love to really contribute multiple perspectives, really get into social justice type stuff. But I have obligations and bills [laughs]. I gotta keep my job and I need the kids to do well on the test. The school needs the kids to score high. It is what it is I guess.

John's comments also provide a good indication of the group consensus:

Ok..so there's one [points to the board in the front of the classroom with a curriculum standard] right there. Looking at that, it's so long. They [the standards] could fill up half

this room, and, yes, I'm going put them up there. But I've showed that [standard] just for comparison purposes and I give them [the students] a condensed version of what the actual standard says because it might have a huge thing with all of these clauses plus a bulleted list that they're [the state] wanting them [students] to analyze or explain. Really what it breaks down to is trying to memorize all of these things on a standard and then you're going to fill out [on a test] a, b, c, d. So, it's guided instruction, but at the same time it's spreading us so thin. I can't go into depth with all of these [historical] figures in detail. And then the next day they [the standards] want me to cover more [historical] figures and I am supposed to do biographies of all these people. How am I supposed to know which ones to do? Which ones I am supposed to focus on? It really pushes you towards skimming the topic without detail. I feel like we're getting no time, and we're teaching so thin and reducing everything.

Only Donald deviated from the group stating:

I think the biggest challenge for me personally is that students just don't seem to be as informed, I mean, they just don't really have much background knowledge. Reading comprehension and lack of motivation too. I mean, you know, it's just hard to really get the students engaged if they struggle to read and have no interest.

The researcher continued this line of question with Donald, asking if the curriculum standards could impact student interest. Donald stated:

Well...yeah. I mean, I can definitely see that I guess. I mean, there are so many standards and we [teachers] have to, kind of, fly through them and it gets difficult sometimes to help the students connect them to anything relevant. So, yeah, I think having some standards that didn't look so much like, you know, a check list of a bunch of

random facts and people might help get kids interested. It would definitely help us [teachers] tell more of a connected story.

When the researcher asked participants questions that focused upon factors that influenced teacher's instructional decisions such as focus group questions 2 and 4a and interview questions 3, 3a, 4b, and 4c all 14 participants again responded with descriptions of the impact of curriculum standards and test preparation on classroom instruction. When the participants were specifically asked if they felt like they had to completely step outside of the curriculum to include multiple historical perspectives, especially indigenous perspectives, all 14 participants commented that they believed that was accurate and described feeling that the current curriculum constricted multicultural perspectives in history. Matt's response to interview question 4c highlights the experience of the participants:

Definitely the biggest thing about that [influences upon the inclusion of indigenous perspectives] is that they [Native Americans] just aren't there [in the standards]. So, we are supposed to teach kids what is in the standards, and you know, we only have so much time to do it. It's not just Native Americans, I feel like a lot of other groups, or perspectives, kind of get the shaft as well, but there is only so much we can do. Unless you are willing to get really out there [teach beyond the standards] most teachers aren't going to have time and feel safe enough, comfortable enough, to cover it. It would be cool, but, you know, that's just how things are.

Stick to the Script. All of the study participants reported that they valued indigenous perspectives in history and believed that their students should have a greater understanding of Native Americans and issues such as institutionalized racism, but nine of the 14 educators described their classroom instruction as driven by the current curriculum standards and pacing.

The two most common reasons why, as reported by these participants, were feelings of limited instructional time or lack of depth of knowledge. Bill's interview response expresses the participants' perception in regard to the impact of testing and accountability on instructional decisions.

It's the test. I know that they [school leaders] want to see scores. I feel like social studies in particular is the one [subject area] where, like, you can do so much more with it, but that test...that's it. People get test anxiety and they're so worried about scores and I think that's, that really influences, your teaching style, especially when you have a semester with over a hundred something standards. Right? Right? That's a lot.

Bill's response also connected to teacher depth of knowledge. He continued:

I definitely think that we are definitely too constricted, and I think it also depends on the comfort level of a teacher because there's some teachers...you just don't want to go there because, call it organized chaos or whatever, like they're afraid of losing control. But I do think, I think, having that test, I do think that that plays a huge part.

Wendy echoed Bill's statement on the influence of teacher historical knowledge and reliance upon curriculum standards to guide classroom instruction by recounting input from her students who had come from other teachers' classes:

Sometimes I would discuss things in my class and I noticed that they [the students] really struggled with it. I think they were, startled, or that they were, I don't want to say upset, but maybe disappointed that their [other] teachers hadn't exposed them to those pieces of history. You know, I don't think it's intentional or anything, like, they aren't trying to intentionally not teach things, but you have to know what you are missing. You have to know different perspectives to really teach them to the students. It can be hard for new

teachers or, maybe, you know, someone who just doesn't know as much about some of the historical eras and all the perspectives that can be included.

John and Bruce's perspectives also align with Bill. John stated:

I'm like...I don't know. I don't really want to talk about the "Exodusters" right now in class. But, this is the stuff that they [curriculum standards] want students to know. I'm not sure how it really connects to our students' lives all that much right now, but with the test coming around, if something that I really want to talk about in class isn't, if it's not going to be a question, it's not a topic. So, how am I supposed to justify spending time on that?

Bruce's response not only corresponds to Bill and John, but he goes further in stating that test preparation in U.S. history even influences his instructional approach in non-tested classes:

Testing is definitely the focus. So, I sometimes try and focus on kind of the same things. Like in military history, we are really doing United States military history because if the high-stakes testing is going to be in U.S. history, you kind of want to expose the kids to the material as much as you can. So, you are basically teaching U.S. history standards. I would also, kind of, refocus world history to really be world history with an emphasis on the United States. It's got to be, actually be, kind of really boring [for students], but the test kind of makes you feel like this is what we have to do.

All of the study participants commented on the value of multicultural perspectives and classroom discussion of racism, privilege, or stereotyping in history, but only Alice, Charles, Wendy, Neil, and Graham reported feeling completely comfortable incorporating such topics in their classroom. Graham stated:

I think one of the most important things is if you are teaching kids how to talk about an issue, how to bring up high-charged issues. So, I felt comfortable with it over time because my goal was, what I think is missing in this day and age is the idea of being civil and being able to discuss an issue a couple of different ways and fill in some of yourself. So I tried to model for my kids...I know that there is a strong stance in my personal life against racism, and, you know, against bigotry. I think that's, you know, what's powerful about education.

Graham went on to discuss his perception of why discussion of race and the inclusion of multiple perspectives is difficult for some teachers:

I think that, you know, that idea that, that basically everyone's side of an argument comes with their own presuppositions. I think that when you go into teaching that everybody comes to that point with their vehicles of their own culture. And so I think when that gets carried out in the classroom there's, you know, if you grew up as white middle class male in East Tennessee then discussing issues of race and privilege are really difficult for you if you've never engaged in those [issues] personally.

Wendy and Charles also drew in their personal experiences with notions of racism and privilege in regard to their feelings of comfort in teaching about such topics. Wendy said:

I don't have a problem with teaching about it. I actually think that it's highly valuable...I never felt uncomfortable personally, and I don't know what that has to do with.

Although I did grow up here in this area, it has to be, I was exposed to a lot more. Like, I got to go back to where my family was from [Germany] a lot, and you have, well, my grandmother had suffered a lot herself when she came over to America and, so I don't know if that played a part in it, but I never, myself, felt uncomfortable.

Charles commented:

Man. That's a big one, that's a big topic. But, I don't really care at all. I mean, it doesn't bother me to bring that stuff up with my students. You know, they need to hear about it. I kind of feel like, if we [teachers] don't do it, no one will. I am honestly surprised I haven't gotten any phone calls or, you know, parents complaining about some of the stuff I have talked about, or things my kids have discussed. They [the students] just don't know. Like, you know, it's easy to say, ok, slavery was bad and stuff like that. But they [the students] don't get how it still causes issues today. The standards definitely don't show it. I mean, I know as a white guy, you know, I have less to worry about than most everybody else. Especially compared to women or minorities, but, you know, I really had to learn that over time, it didn't come from, I mean, I didn't learn it in history classes except for maybe my graduate classes on race and history. So, when I talk about that, it kind of, you know, it kind of catches the kids off guard a bit. But I think it helps to talk about my own personal experience. I just think we have to be honest, you know, that not everyone is actually on the same level playing field.

Both Alice and Neil commented that they sometimes diluted these topics due to the cultural lens of their students. Alice stated:

When I first moved here I was really reserved at first, yeah, because I just didn't know, you know, not living here, I was like an outsider, like [the students would think] "oh, your northern". So I was afraid anything I would say would be perceived of that perspective, I didn't know how it would come off...so but, what I've tried to do is sort of change the angle at how I teach it, like, so it's not so one sided.

Neil echoed this sentiment, reporting:

I approach them [topics on racism and privilege] differently trying to be more inclusive. But, at the same time, my first year [in teaching] I had a really hard time connecting with a lot of these students because I just didn't understand their culture, and I couldn't get them to see some of the things that I've seen. Because they don't, they've never left Tennessee. And you know that part of my life, I have been to, I don't know, about 17 different countries or something, and I couldn't, my worldview and their worldview was just so different. My guess is that their lack of worldview is probably, I probably taught more to that. Then I have tried to broaden it. I brought my view down rather than trying to bring them up...like their narrow frame of reference, it's really hard to do. So, you have to put things in terms that, you know, that they can understand, which makes sense, but then at the same time, you know, there's a cost to that right?

Nine of the 14 study participants commented that the perceived social and intellectual maturity of their students impacted their decision to discuss topics dealing with racism or introduce multicultural perspectives beyond those required in state curriculum. Matt's comments exemplify the feelings of Susan, Lauren, Karl, and Donald.

Matt stated:

I think that stuff is good to talk about. It's important to cover, but you have to be careful. You know, you have to kind of choose your battles wisely. Now, some of the standards, like the Civil Rights stuff, you have to get into racism issues and things like that. But depending on the class, the kids might not be able to really talk about it, or sometimes they don't really seem to want to talk about it. Like, I have tried to open up some discussions and, you know, they all just sit there and stare at me. So, sometimes I feel like I can talk about those things beyond the standards, more than just what is required,

but sometimes I can't, or even when I try it doesn't go over well. Like, even the kids who handle it fine, even those kids are, I think, afraid to say anything that might get called racist or something.

Bill and Bruce emphasized their perception of student maturity as a determining factor for the inclusion of discussions of race, privilege, or stereotyping. Bill succinctly responded to this line of questioning stating, "I think if you can go there with them [the students] then you definitely should. I like those issues just because I like to see, obviously, the students' perspectives and see where they're coming from." Bruce expounded further:

I don't necessarily shy away from it, but I will sometimes change my approach depending upon the group [of students]. Some groups are just not good at discussing those things in a thoughtful way, or all they want to do is, some groups you just know all you are going to get out of them is just jokes. They don't take it seriously. Whereas if I've got probably a higher-functioning group I can kind of open it up a little bit, and, you know, talk about some things. So, in short, sometimes I do shy away from it, sometimes I don't. Honestly, it depends on how good I feel like I'm corralling [the students].

John and Oliver also indicated that they were sometimes hesitant to discuss race, especially early in their careers, due to a fear of offending students or creating a tense classroom environment.

John stated:

Depending on what demographic you're in, it can be a hard thing to teach because the teacher doesn't want to feel like a racist when they talk about things like Jim Crow laws, when they talk about something, some things, and they want to gloss over, and they don't give it as much attention because it's uncomfortable. Like, you're not sure who you're

gonna offend...I'm more comfortable about it now because I have learned, I have learned how to talk about it.

Similarly, Oliver commented on his experience:

I feel like certain things were easier [to discuss] than others. I'll be honest, racism was a very difficult one because of teaching a class in high school you have the Civil Rights movement, and it kind of started, you [American society] still have some tensions even to this day...you kind of feel, it's like, that maybe some [the students] wouldn't take things the right way even though you're being very professional and, yeah, trying to be objective...I definitely felt like that was a little bit harder to do at times. You know, it always depended on the students and the class and how they might have been, or, how open they were in general.

When questioned further by the researcher, all 14 participants reported feeling that they could be more instructionally creative, implement multiple historical perspectives more frequently, and spend more time engaging students in discussions of the historical connections to current social justice issues such as institutional racism and privilege when teaching non-tested social studies courses such as World History, Modern History, or Military History. Karl, comparing his earlier experience teaching a private school, summarizes the experience of the participants:

So, to give you an example of how that would play out, in my previous school I didn't have standards right, so when, when I had a whole lot of time, where I could, you know, go from like 1972 to Obama, it wasn't stressful because I wasn't trying to check them [standards] off. I could, I could really pick and choose some of those things [multiple historical perspectives] to show trends about America...It's just like now I'm just shoving it all on them [students] and they can't possibly absorb it all that fast. So, without the

standards I think you can still cover the same themes that they [standards] want you to cover. The kids might not get all the same information, but I still think you can provide a narrative that will remain more memorable than the last two weeks [of the semester], which is just going to be scrambled in their memory and they're going to have, like, some snippets [of history] that they recall, but not much.

Research Question 3

What are high school teacher perceptions of the historical representation of indigenous people in United States history curriculum?

Perpetuation of Stereotypes. Research question 3 was supported by focus group questions 2 through 5 and individual interview questions 2 through 5. Both the focus group and individual interview questions provided rich, in-depth descriptions of the participants' perceptions of the representations of indigenous people in current United States history curriculum. Respondents described their experience in context of not only the curriculum standards and textbook portrayal of Native Americans, but also their own educational experiences and their perception of student understanding of indigenous peoples. When participants were asked to describe their feelings about the inclusion and portrayal of indigenous people in U.S. history curriculum 13 of the 14 teachers reported feeling that indigenous perspectives were not adequately included within the curriculum. Donald and Lauren's focus group responses exemplify the participant responses. Donald concisely responded, "The lack of attention as the state level is absurd". Lauren described her perception in more detail:

Right now there are only two standards I think, yeah, maybe only two standards that actually represent Native Americans in our curriculum. There's not much else in the textbooks either because, you know, they are supposed to match the standards. There

might be some pictures or something extra, but not much. I think there should be more about them in the curriculum, especially around here in East Tennessee. But there are only two, and both of those standards are just kind of thrown in with other big standards, so we don't really focus on it much, and, you know, the kids don't actually learn much on them.

Susan also believes that the curriculum is inadequate and undermines student learning of indigenous perspectives commenting:

There's just nothing there really. No individual Native Americans or tribes that are mentioned. I mean, the standards don't even mention the Cherokee, and we basically live right here by them [Eastern band of Cherokee]. Even though we cover those few standards in class like we are supposed to, I just, I would find it hard to believe that the students actually gain any knowledge or understanding from them. Because we aren't really able to teach much about it.

Alice's focus group response corresponds with Lauren and Susan. Alice pointed out:

It's just that, this is what we have to deal with. If you think about it, they [Native Americans] are never depicted in the present. Like when someone talked about the 8th grade [standards]. It's almost like we always talk about them [uses hand gestures and motions to represent distance] before, they're in the past, we're keeping them in the past. They're not really here [in the present] anymore. At least that is what the curriculum basically teaches.

Of the study participants, only John expressed some hesitation in the belief that a greater inclusion of indigenous perspectives in high school United States history curriculum was

necessary, qualifying his statement with his own personal historical perception of Native Americans in United States history.

John stated:

At first, I would say I don't think it really did. It's just one of those things. They [Native Americans] were seen as bad people, and were just a footnote in American history from what I learned in American history and even the standards that I teach in American history...so they get seen as kind of a footnote, a subculture, and, yeah, we [Europeans] treated them bad under Andrew Jackson and the Trail of Tears. We messed up, but now everything is ok. And is there anything really that we still maintain? You know, what valuable, long-lasting influence do the Native Americans leave on us? Or are they just a thing of the past? It's hard to say unless you do a deeper study of them. I guess, I don't, in that sense, think that the standards cover it well. I'm just not sure. I'm just not sure how they fit in modern standards as much. I just never really thought about it...it's uprooted an interest for me to start to make those connections for myself. To really, kind of, study in more detail than how they have been presented. I realize that, hey, there's got to be a more significant influence in there [the curriculum].

When the researcher followed this line of questioning further and asked participants to describe what they had learned about Native Americans in high school, or how they believed their students would describe their academic knowledge of indigenous peoples, the responses highlighted the continued perpetuation of indigenous stereotypes. Each of the 14 participants expressed their perception of their own experience in high school U.S. history or their students' understanding in stereotypical language. Transcription and coding revealed that the most common terms in each participant's response were as follows:

John said: First Americans, headband, feathers, savage.

Bill commented: Teepees, savage, mascots, headdress, Thanksgiving.

Bruce stated: Token, cartoon caricatures, savages, Westward expansion.

Graham reported: Trinkets, savages, casinos, reservations.

Karl replied: Columbus, Thanksgiving, bows and arrows, feathers.

Alice responded: Buffalo, feathers, reservations, casinos.

Oliver stated: Cherokee, reservations, mascots, headdresses.

Donald concluded: Headdresses, Cherokee, Disney, reservations.

Wendy explained: Cherokee, “Indian princesses”, savages, mascots.

Neil said: Squanto, teepees, savages, corn.

Susan described: Columbus, casinos, Pocahontas, nature.

Charles reported: Cherokee, teepees, buffalo, mascots.

Lauren believed: Feathers, uncivilized, teepees, buffalo.

Matt commented: Reservations, casinos, bows and arrows, headdresses.

Participant responses align with much of the available literature in regard to the sociocultural and pedagogical barriers to accurate historical representations of indigenous peoples. Each of the 14 participants expressed a belief that their own experience in high school U.S. history classes, and the experience of their students in regard to knowledge of indigenous peoples, would most readily be described in the stereotypical language often used to characterize indigenous peoples.

The Vanishing Indian. When the principal investigator asked participants to explain what they believe current U.S. history curriculum teaches students about Native Americans or indigenous peoples, responses most frequently cited the terms vanished, footnote, insignificant, and defeated.

Donald responded by stating, “It teaches kids that they [Native Americans] don’t matter. That they are, like I said earlier, just a footnote on our history.”

Oliver commented, “I keep using the word limited. But insignificant, that’s probably the, well, I don’t even know if that would be the most accurate [term] because it’s [curricular representation of Native Americans] almost non-existent when you’re talking about indigenous peoples.”

Susan’s response echoes Oliver:

It all [the curriculum] communicates that they [Native Americans] aren’t important to know about. You know, the kids, and probably some teachers too, would just think, if they even ever think about it at all, that they [indigenous peoples] aren’t significant. They’re not mentioned, so they must not be a big part of the story of America. Just insignificant. So, we don’t do a good job teaching about them, and kids don’t learn anything about them other than what they might see on TV or something.

Karl provided a more in-depth response

Just vanished. Vanished peoples. I mean the standards, like, don’t even mention that they [Native Americans] are still around. Yeah, uh, I can’t even, the standards lend themselves to amassing them [Native Americans] all into one people group, just a Native American people group. There is no differentiation in the different societies that still exist. They just kind of threw them together and, yeah, I think just vanished or just struggling people on the fringes of American society, you know, they are just out there.

Matt reported:

They [standards and textbooks] basically tell kids, you know, that they [Native Americans] are gone. They just disappear. It’s like they are there in early American history and they just, you know, keep getting moved farther and farther. Then kids learn

about the Trail of Tears and maybe about what a reservation is, and then, you know, the Natives are gone. It's like even the way we teach history, the way the standards and textbooks show it, they [Native Americans] just get defeated and that's driven home by not talking about them anymore.

Neil's response to the researcher's question about what he believed the lack of indigenous representations in high school U.S. history standards communicates to students is indicative of his perception that the curriculum underscores broader racial implications and attitudes. Neil first states, "That we [Europeans] won". When prompted further, Neil continues, saying:

I think if you ask white students in the school district that [question], I think a lot of them would probably say that it was inevitable, but it's, I think that, I think that narrative has been given to them over time. I mean we talked about Manifest Destiny as if it couldn't have turned out in any other way and I think we talked about the Trail of Tears. I mean, I think all of those things, I just think that I was probably the only one [teacher] that ever gave them, engaged in, counterfactual stuff...but I think for a lot of our kids they would probably say that because that's the narrative that they have been given. Like this idea that the white people were always going to win and white males were always going to win.

Like Neil, Graham also makes reference to Eurocentric outcomes:

It's important for kids to realize that, you know, they [Native Americans] struggle in part because of what we've done as a nation and, so, they need...Let's be honest there's political connotations when you teach diverse cultures and I think that there's a sense of like, like, history is not whitewashed, and the idea of us being the greatest nation ever is pretty bogus.

As the researcher questioned Graham further about his belief about the “white washing” of curriculum and what that could communicate to students about indigenous peoples, Graham responded:

I think that they're [Native Americans] less than nothing. That's the easiest answer...I think that's sad man. I think, like, what's sad about it is it doesn't give access for kids for understanding reality. That's what history does, it lets us be informed about what's really happening. So, you know, they're kind of, the Native Americans are kind of there and then all of a sudden, you know, they disappear. Especially on the high school level. I think that's the best way to describe the curricular depiction of Native peoples. That they're just kind of, you know, the Trail of Tears happens, Westward movement, then they're on the reservations and then “poof” they cease to exist.

Charles also feels that a Eurocentric historical narrative diminishes the representation of indigenous peoples in United States history and impacts student learning. Charles stated:

Sometimes I wonder if so much of it [lack of indigenous representation in the curriculum] is about some type of, I don't know, historical guilt or something. It's like, let's not teach about these people, because it's all going to be bad, and maybe that it, I don't know, makes America look bad. Or maybe people think that. It could also be worse though right? It could just be as simple as continuing to try and suppress Native Americans by totally making students think they aren't even there anymore. It's hard, even when I really try, to get them [students] to understand how biased the textbooks and everything can be. They [the students] definitely get that the European perspective is the dominant one in the books and standards, but getting them to realize that this happens at

the expense of other perspectives is difficult. It's just like, well, they [Native Americans] aren't really in the book or the standards, so they [students] think, what's the big deal?

Karl, Wendy, Alice, Donald, and John also specifically commented on the Eurocentric nature of current United States history curriculum in relation to RQ3.

The participant responses from focus group and individual interview questions supporting RQ3 clearly indicate that teachers perceive current U.S. history curriculum as harmful to the representation of indigenous peoples in history due to the inadequacy of indigenous perspectives and the resulting perpetuation of negative stereotypes. All 14 participants also expressed a perception that current curriculum is prohibitive to understanding contemporary indigenous peoples by presenting a narrative that communicates to students and teachers that Native Americans only belong in the distant past and are irrelevant to modern United States history.

Research Question 4

What are high school teacher perceptions of indigenous people?

Victimized and Marginalized. Interview results from individual interview questions 4 through 6 and focus group questions 3 and 4 allowed the researcher to identify emergent themes with regard to the study participants' perceptions of indigenous peoples. The transcription and coding of interview data, as well as the review of the qualitative documents provided by the six participants who specifically included lesson plans or class activities focused upon indigenous historical perspectives, revealed that teacher perception of indigenous peoples is strongly influenced by the victimization of Native Americans throughout U.S. history and their marginalized status in contemporary American society. When the researcher posed questions that asked the participants to describe how they address indigenous stereotypes in their classroom, their own perception of the representation of indigenous peoples in history, or

personal experiences that have influenced their own view of Native Americans, all 14 teachers provided responses that highlighted the victimization and oppression of indigenous peoples.

Table 2 provides a graphic for the most frequently used terms in participants' individual interview responses for the interview questions supporting RQ4:

Table 2

Frequently Used Terms in Participant Responses Corresponding to RQ4

Participant	Interview Q4	Interview Q5	Interview Q6
John	footnote Andrew Jackson	footstool, inequality Wounded Knee	mistreated
Bill	cooperation, conflict	mascots, assimilation, Trail of Tears	forgotten, marginalized
Bruce	western expansion, Wounded Knee Little Bighorn	token, unimportant	Manifest Destiny
Graham	colonialism, Trail of Tears, reservations	whitewashed, invisible, mistreated, defeated	colonialism, casinos, token
Karl	reservations, still exist	nonexistent, oppressed	vanished, marginalized
Alice	boarding schools, western expansion	footnote, victimization, reservations	Eurocentric, victimization
Oliver	Little Big Horn, still exist	uncivilized, mascots, victims	unimportant, imperialism
Donald	underrepresented, colonialism	footnote, reservations, stereotypes	sad, tragic, minimized, unfortunate
Wendy	conflict, intolerance, Trail of Tears, forced west	mascots, savages, Trail of Tears	vanished, casinos
Neil	conflict, Eurocentric	bias, villains, savages	Manifest Destiny, defeated
Susan	struggle, reservations	uncivilized, Manifest Destiny, oppressed	victims, marginalized, insignificant
Charles	colonialism, conflict	Trail of Tears, reservations, bystanders	oppressed, bystanders, Manifest Destiny

Participant	Interview Q4	Interview Q5	Interview Q6
Lauren	Trail of Tears, Wounded Knee, Andrew Jackson	disappear, unimportant, ancient	tragedy, forgotten
Matt	resistance, conflict, violated	footnote, reservations	colonialism, victimized, mistreated

The high frequency of participant focus upon the representation of indigenous peoples through historical themes such as western expansion, Manifest Destiny, Native and European conflict, or the Trail of Tears underscores teacher perception of indigenous peoples as victimized and marginalized. Matt provided an interview response that characterizes participant responses related to research question 4:

I think they're [Native Americans] historical representation, when they are actually represented, is too simple. I mean, we want our kids to learn from the past, but, you know, also how the past connects to today right? It's like they [standards and textbooks] just breeze by this stuff hoping nobody spends too much time talking about the skeletons in our [America] closet. At least, that's how I feel sometimes. But we need to talk more about it. It's important to know how they [Native Americans] were treated and what happened to them. They're just a footnote to the story. But we need to go back and, you know, reevaluate things, and take a critical look at what happened. More than just basically saying, they [Native Americans] were here and then they're on reservations. Students need to learn how indigenous peoples were victims of the growth of the nation too, not just trivial characters in the beginning of the story.

Each of the 14 study participants contributed similar responses that emphasized the perception that representation of indigenous peoples in history should provide students with a greater

understanding of what happened to Native cultures as a result of American colonialism. This view promotes the theme of indigenous peoples as victimized and marginalized.

The qualitative artifacts collected during the study strengthen this emergent theme for RQ4. Of the six participants who did include lesson plans or classroom activities that specifically emphasized indigenous historical perspectives, only Donald provided his students with an opportunity to learn about modern tribal nations and societal contributions of contemporary indigenous peoples and culture. The lesson plans used by Wendy, Bill, and Neil were based upon the historical themes of cooperation and conflict. These lessons did frequently present indigenous peoples in a more active historical role, but all of the lesson plans and activities led students to discussions of the oppression of Native Americans and their eventual defeat. Alice's classroom application of additional indigenous representations focused upon class discussions and readings related to "Indian Schools" or boarding schools and reservation life. Though Alice did attempt to draw connections to contemporary issues for indigenous communities, much of the negative emphasis of these lessons leads students to think only of indigenous peoples as oppressed and victimized. Similarly, Charles incorporated various lesson plans and activities in his classroom that included indigenous perspectives, however, the inclusion of these perspectives stopped following course discussions of Wounded Knee and the triumph of Manifest Destiny. On the final exam for the course, Charles' students were required to discuss how Native Americans played an active role in the development of the United States, but a review of these qualitative documents did not reveal to the principal investigator that the course provided meaningful connections to contemporary indigenous peoples beyond discussions of marginalized populations.

Summary of Data Analysis

The role of the researcher within qualitative data analysis is to, through the process of qualitative coding, accurately present an “essence of the experience” for the study participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014; Patton, 2015). The coding process for this study was initiated in October 2016 as the focus group interviews were conducted, and continued throughout the collection of data. The principal investigator personally performed the transcription for each interview. The transcriptions for each participant interview are stored in a secure location and any personally identifiable information reported by participants was omitted from transcription to ensure anonymity for participants. Both the focus group interviews and the individual interviews provided the rich, in-depth data that is essential to qualitative inquiry.

The coding process for this study was implemented in three phases. First, the initial coding process occurred as the researcher reviewed the transcribed participant responses and correspondingly created notes and memos highlighting key ideas and broad interpretations. The principal investigator was primarily focused on drawing connections across participant responses and the categorization of responses corresponding to each qualitative research question. Second, the researcher proceeded to highlight and annotate the textual data collected from participant interviews. The researcher made note of frequently used phrases and words. The transcribed data was then labeled and organized according to the emergence of significant themes in the coding process. Constant comparative analysis revealed categories and themes as the researcher analyzed the data. Finally, the third phase of coding included the reduction of data into significant sections of text categorized by the occurrence of themes. These codes were reviewed and categorized into qualitative interpretations of the phenomenon under study. The conclusion of the data analysis occurred as the researcher interpreted the results of the iterative process to

identify the significant themes within the study findings and articulated the relation between the emergent themes and the research questions for this study. The data for this study were continuously reviewed throughout analysis and member checks were used to strengthen credibility.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of teacher perception of indigenous representations in history through an examination of the experience of United States history teachers within a school district in East Tennessee. In chapters 1, 2, and 3 of this study, the researcher presented an introduction to the topic, the significance of the study, a description of the phenomenological approach to qualitative inquiry, the data collection measures, a review of pertinent literature, and the study's research methodology. An explanation of the emergent themes derived from the multiple data collection measures of the study, the correlation between emergent themes and the research questions, and the results and analysis of the focus group interviews, individual interviews, and qualitative document review were discussed in Chapter 4. The data collected for this study provided the researcher with rich, in-depth descriptions by the participants that supported the dominant themes within the literature in regard to the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in history. The emergent themes corresponding to each of the study's supporting research questions underscore the systemic, sociocultural, and pedagogical obstacles to the inclusion and accurate representation of indigenous historical perspectives cited in this study's literature review. A summarization of the study findings, conclusions, and the principal investigator's recommendations for future research are contained within this chapter.

Conclusions

This phenomenological inquiry was directed by four research questions, which guided the principal investigator throughout the inductive, qualitative process. The data derived from the

analysis of focus group and face-to-face interview transcriptions, qualitative artifacts such as lesson plans and class activities, and the researcher's own notes and memos provided the necessary means by which to capture an essence of the study participants' experience in regard to the phenomenon of teacher perception of indigenous representations in history. The findings and conclusions of this study may inform future research and are applicable to the curricular and instructional decision making processes of educators and educational policymakers.

Consideration of the implications of this study could help to improve not only the historical representation of indigenous peoples in United States history courses, but also further the role of history teachers in curricular decisions at the local and state level, which could provide educators with the instructional input and autonomy necessary to adequately meet the needs of diverse learners and better prepare students for life in an increasingly diverse society. The conclusions for each of study's research questions are provided in this section.

Research Question 1: What are high school teacher perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?

Each of the 14 participants of this study reported a positive perception of the inclusion of multicultural historical perspectives and indigenous perspectives in the teaching of United States history. Thirteen of the 14 teachers who participated in focus group and/or individual interviews held the perception that the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in high school United States history classes would be beneficial to the historical narrative and help provide students with a greater understanding of Native Americans in contemporary American society. Only John hesitated to state that a greater inclusion of indigenous perspectives was warranted within high school U.S. history standards, commenting on his own individual lack of knowledge in regard to indigenous historical perspectives and how Native Americans could be included more frequently

in the teaching of modern American history. Participants connected a belief in the value of multicultural historical perspectives to a perceived value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous peoples. Each of the 14 study participants also promoted the notion that the inclusion of multicultural historical perspectives within United States history would not only provide students with a greater depth of knowledge in regard to the story of America, but also improve student engagement and critical thinking.

Participant interview responses produced the emergence of the theme of differentiation between personal and professional perception. The study participants unanimously indicated that they personally believed indigenous perspectives are valuable to the teaching of United States history. However, all of the participants also commented on the implications of including greater representation of Native American historical perspectives in context of the professional expectations of teaching the state curriculum and producing high achieving student test scores on the United States history assessment. Only 6 of the 14 study participants chose to include indigenous historical perspectives beyond the representation of indigenous peoples present in the current curriculum. This data indicates that the personal perception of participants of the positive value of the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in United States history is diminished by their professional perception of the value of indigenous historical perspectives. Because teacher effectiveness and accountability is directly connected to teaching the prescribed state standards as part of the teacher evaluation process and student performance on state assessments, participants' professional obligations overshadowed their personal desire to include indigenous perspectives in their classroom instruction.

The data collected throughout focus group and individual interviews revealed that participant perceptions of the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of

indigenous peoples was strongly influenced by participants' personal experience. The teachers who had been exposed to indigenous historical perspectives during their own educational experiences, or as a result of strong feelings of personal connection to the Cherokee, were more adamant in their belief that the lack of indigenous historical perspectives is harmful to both an accurate telling of the historical narrative of the United States and student understanding of contemporary Native populations. When the researcher asked participants to discuss how they would address the lack of indigenous historical perspectives in high school U.S. history courses, all 14 participants expressed dismay at the thought of the addition of more course curriculum standards. This led the researcher to the identification of the theme of inclusion versus addition. Participants believed that indigenous peoples should be afforded a greater voice within the curriculum, but were quick to offer other alternatives for addressing this issue rather than simply including additional standards. Participants such as Neil, Wendy, and Bill discussed a pedagogical shift away from a chronological teaching of United States history to a thematic approach of the subject. Alice, John, Karl, Bruce, Charles, and Donald commented on the need for a division of high school United States history into multiple courses rather than a single semester class. The impassioned participant responses belying the addendum of curriculum standards that increase indigenous representation juxtaposes the teachers' negative overall perception of the current curriculum versus their positive perception towards the inclusion of multicultural and indigenous historical perspectives. This data indicates the powerful influence of the lack of a perceived professional benefit for teaching the historical perspectives of indigenous peoples in contrast with each individual teacher's expressed belief in the value of Native Americans to the story of the United States.

Research Question 2: What are high school teacher perceptions of challenges to teaching United States history from the perspectives of indigenous people?

The findings of this study strongly correlated to the most commonly cited challenges for social studies and history teachers discussed within the review of literature, the proliferation of curriculum standards and high-stakes testing (Loewen, 2010; Woodson, 2015). When the researcher asked participants to describe what they believed is the greatest challenge to teaching United States history, 13 out of the 14 teachers who took part in the study stated that the greatest challenge for their instruction was covering all of the curriculum standards in enough time to prepare students for end of course tests. Only Donald gave a different response, commenting on his own experience working with students who lacked intrinsic motivation, background knowledge, and reading skills. However, the interview questions focused upon the challenges of including indigenous perspectives within the classroom garnered a unanimous participant response in regard to curriculum standards being the most significant obstacle to greater representation of Native Americans within the historical narrative. Each of the participants reported a belief that the inclusion of multiple historical perspectives is significant to the study of United States history and valuable for student learning, but the inclusion of indigenous perspectives was especially limited due to an overall lack of Native American representation with the current curriculum. The six participants who did address indigenous historical perspectives within their classroom instruction beyond the current curriculum all reported either a greater personal or academic motivation for including lesson plans or class activities specifically focused upon Native Americans. Even for these participants, however, the challenges of teaching all of the required curriculum standards and preparing students for the end of course exam continued to impact their instructional decisions. Donald only included course

instruction emphasizing indigenous perspectives after his students had completed the required state tests. Charles, Wendy, Neil, Bill, and Alice reported that their inclusion of indigenous perspectives often resulted in the exclusion of other curriculum standards, or occurred only when class instruction centered upon topics most conducive to discussions of Native Americans. Thus, as the scholarly literature on this subject indicates, the inclusion of indigenous representations within United States history essentially remains confined to the distant past. Although this study included participants who held the perception that indigenous historical perspectives were critical to an accurate narrative of America, their instructional inclusion primarily relegated Native Americans to pre-1900, which is indicative of the perceived curricular obstacles reported by each teacher.

Focus group and individual interview responses aligned to Research Question 2 led the researcher to identify emergent themes that highlighted the participants' feelings of being instructionally constrained by the course curriculum and a perception that United States history teachers must stick to the script, adhering closely to state curriculum in order to prepare students for state assessments. The participants who choose not to introduce indigenous historical perspectives beyond what is currently required within the 112 curriculum standards for teaching high school United States history in Tennessee all commented on the difficulty of teaching each standard prior to state testing, as well as their feelings of frustration in regard to a perceived lack of instructional autonomy. Participants believe current curriculum constricts their ability to include diverse historical perspectives and that the time constraints resulting from test preparation produces an instructional portrayal of the historical narrative of the United States that is uncritical and uninteresting. All 14 participants commented on their perception that the requirement of teaching such a large number of standards in a single semester actually hinders

effective teaching and diminishes student learning in United States history courses. The data from this study reveals that these perceptions are especially critical to the inclusion of indigenous historical perspectives due to the extremely limited representation of Native Americans within the current curriculum.

Research Question 3: What are high school teacher perceptions of the historical representation of indigenous people in United States history curriculum?

The study participants' focus group and individual interview responses related to Research Question 3 strongly aligned to the literature focused upon the historical representation of indigenous peoples. Teachers of United States history in the district under study held the perception that current course curriculum communicates to students that Native Americans are insignificant to American history and hold no contemporary historical value. Indigenous peoples are confined to the distant past, portrayed only as victimized and oppressed peoples, and are depicted as unfortunate obstacles to the nation's progress and the fulfillment of Manifest Destiny (Haynes- Writer, 2008; Journell, 2009; Keene, 2015; Shear et al., 2015).

The transcription of interview responses and the subsequent coding of data resulted in the thematic emergence of the perpetuation of stereotypes. Participants perceived the current curricular representation of indigenous peoples as contributory to the perpetuation of negative stereotypes of Native Americans, frequently citing stereotypical language to describe their students' common depictions or understanding of indigenous peoples. When asked to describe their own understanding of Native Americans derived through their experience in high school United States history courses, or the perceived knowledge of their students in regard to indigenous peoples, each of the 14 study participants responded with terms such as savages, headdresses, teepees, and mascots. These responses underscore the powerful influence of

stereotypes on the contemporary understanding of Native peoples (Fryberg & Stephens, 2010; Landry, 2014; Morgan, 2009). Seven of the 14 study participants held the perception that the representation of indigenous peoples within current United States history curriculum was indicative of the dominance of Eurocentric, white historical perspectives and colonialism. This data supports the central argument of Tribal Critical Race Theory that colonialism and white privilege are systemic within American society, including an assimilative influence upon educational institutions, policy, and practice (Brayboy, 2005; Chandler, 2010; Haynes-Writer, 2008).

The data derived from this study clearly indicates that participants perceived United States history curriculum as contributing to the misconception that Native Americans are only part of America's past and do not exist in contemporary society (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Portillo, 2013). Each of the 14 participants reported the belief that the most significant piece of knowledge that their students must understand about indigenous peoples was that Native American communities and tribes still exist. The participant responses to interview questions associated with Research Question 3 provided for the researcher's identification of the emergent theme of the vanishing Indian. Again, the participant responses align to the scholarly literature focused upon the curricular representation of indigenous peoples. Participants most frequently described their own perception of the curricular portrayal of indigenous peoples through the use of terms such as vanished, insignificant, and footnote. This data highlights the participants' perception that current United State history curriculum is prohibitive to student understanding of the historical significance of indigenous peoples to the development of our nation as well as to a greater knowledge of contemporary indigenous peoples and culture.

Research Question 4: What are high school teacher perceptions of indigenous people?

The data corresponding to research question 4 produced the emergent theme of teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples as victimized and marginalized. Although each of the participants believed that teaching indigenous historical perspectives was valuable, and perceived current curricular representations of Native Americans as insufficient to a greater understanding of their historical significance, participant responses routinely reverted toward depictions of indigenous peoples as oppressed and victimized. This can be attributed to the current curricular inclusion of indigenous peoples being confined within standards that focus only upon civil rights and social justice movements. Another contributing factor to participant perception would be the fact that only Neil, Alice, Charles, Bill, Donald, and Oliver had developed greater subject knowledge of Native American cultures through their own academic experiences in college or through personal intellectual interest. All of the participants, with the exception of Neil who attended a public school in Canada, reported that their own experience learning about indigenous peoples in high school was either nonexistent or limited to discussions of topics such as conflict, removal, and reservations. For participants who did not take courses dealing with Native Americans at the collegiate level or pursue indigenous studies based upon personal motivation, research shows that most reported knowledge of Native Americans is influenced by stereotypical Hollywood portrayals and historically inaccurate depictions of indigenous peoples as bystanders to European colonization (Chandler, 2010).

The analysis of interview responses and qualitative documents provided by the teachers who did include lesson plans and activities representing indigenous historical perspectives revealed that participant perception of indigenous peoples was strongly influenced by notions of Native Americans as the oppressed and marginalized victims of colonialism. Of the six educators who expanded their instructional inclusion of Native Americans beyond the prescribed

state standards, only Donald required his students to examine current tribal communities and cultures. Although Bill, Wendy, Alice, Neil, and Charles also provided their students with a greater exposure to indigenous historical perspectives, the lesson plans and activities included in their classrooms remained focused upon the victimized and marginalized status of Native Americans. The researcher concludes that teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples, even for the participants who reported a greater knowledge of Native American history and culture, remains dominated by the Eurocentric, colonial narrative of United States history. This relegates teacher perception of indigenous representations in history, and, therefore, teacher perceptions of indigenous peoples, to a view of Native Americans as victimized and marginalized rather than as resistant and resilient cultures within contemporary American society.

Recommendations for Practice

The data collected for this phenomenological study provides evidence for the following recommendations for practice in regard to the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples in the study of United States history:

- Examination of the current curriculum standards and course structure for high school United States history and consideration of the division of United States history into multiple course offerings.
- Redesign of United States history curriculum standards based upon conceptual themes rather than a chronological narrative.
- Increased teacher professional development and training in multicultural historical perspectives and especially in regionally relevant indigenous cultures such as the Cherokee.

- The development of additional non-tested social studies courses at the high school level, which would provide students and teachers with the opportunity to examine diverse historical perspectives in more detail and emphasize critical analysis and historiographical skills.

Each of the recommendations for practice based upon the findings of this study can be achieved at the local level. While structural and curricular changes to high school United States history courses would certainly be warranted at the state level, the local education agency has the autonomy to allow for instructional changes such as those proposed by the researcher to be determined within the district. The school district's close proximity to a university with a highly regarded teacher training program and department of history could also provide for access to multicultural professional development opportunities and training for teachers. The educational resources available through the Cherokee Nation could also be implemented by high school educators and the school district at minimal cost.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of this study lead the researcher to propose the need for further research related to the instructional challenges for teachers in regard to the inclusion of not only indigenous historical perspectives in the teaching of United States history, but of diverse perspectives beyond those prescribed within state curriculum standards and textbooks. Following the scholarly research already available, future studies upon the instructional influence of curriculum standards upon multicultural or culturally responsive teaching and social justice education is warranted. Research in regard to the instructional autonomy and inclusion of diverse historical perspectives in non-tested high school social studies courses would also be beneficial in further examining this phenomenon. Additional studies based upon student

perception of indigenous populations as a result of present United States history curriculum could also provide significant evidence for future attention to the challenges and issues facing contemporary Native American communities.

The principal investigator would also recommend the need for further research focused upon the preparation of social studies teachers, especially the training programs for educators whose primary instructional obligations are teaching history. Research based upon the instructional decision making processes of educators who are trained in historiography rather than pedagogy could provide beneficial findings for both local school systems and colleges and universities responsible for preparing social studies teachers. Greater consideration in regard to the collegiate course requirements for teachers of United States history should also be emphasized. An analysis of the teacher effect data of educators who received at least a bachelor's degree in history compared to United States history teachers who did not study history at the collegiate level could also provide valuable findings for school leaders.

While there exists numerous studies emphasizing the positive outcomes for students who are exposed to diverse historical perspectives, further research on the personal satisfaction of teachers who have the autonomy to teach curriculum beyond state standards and textbooks is also recommended. As noted by the researcher, the participants of this study unanimously reported positive perceptions towards the inclusion of diverse historical perspectives and the ability to make instructional decisions without the hindrance of curriculum standards and state assessments. More in-depth research in this area could lead to curricular and policy decisions that might result in an improvement of both teacher job satisfaction and increased learning and engagement for students. Research in this area could also hold implications for recruitment initiatives for teacher preparation programs as well as school districts.

Concluding Summary

The aim of this inquiry was to examine teacher perceptions of the representation of indigenous peoples in the study of United States History within a school district in eastern Tennessee. The principal investigator was able to capture an accurate reflection of participant experience of the phenomenon through the use of the qualitative research methodology. The reported experiences of the voluntary participants of the study provided the researcher with rich, in-depth descriptions of teacher perception in regard to the inclusion and representation of the historical perspective and significance of indigenous peoples. Thus, this five chapter study achieves the qualitative aim of presenting an essence of the experienced phenomenon from the perspective of the participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). Chapter 1 defined the need for this research via an introduction to the study that included a presentation of the statement of the problem, the guiding research questions, definitions of significant terms, and a review of the limitations and delimitations of the research study. Chapter 2 presented a review of literature that included the prominent themes within the scholarly research that supported the principle objective of the study and highlighted the systemic, sociocultural, and pedagogical barriers to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives in history. The literature review also provided a description of the conceptual frameworks of multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, Critical Race Theory, and Tribal Critical Race Theory, which were foundational to this study. Chapter 3 contains a thorough description of the research methodology and design that includes an explanation of the role of the researcher, ethical considerations, setting, population and sampling strategy, data collection procedures, measures of rigor, and data analysis. Chapter 4 provided the reader with the researcher's interpretation of the qualitative data resulting from the study, including profiles of the study participants, an analysis of the researcher's personal notes and

memos, and the research findings, which identified the emergent themes derived from the transcription and coding of focus group interviews, individual interviews, and a review of qualitative artifacts such as lesson plans and classroom activities. The researcher provided evidential data to support the emergence of themes related to each of the study's four research questions and granted the reader with further insight into the data collection and data analysis measures employed for the study in order to strengthen the credibility of inquiry. The contents of this chapter drew the study to a close with a summarization of the research findings and conclusions related to each guiding research question, as well as the study's implications for practitioners and further research.

While the findings of this study are not intended to be generalized to all teachers of high school United States history courses, it is clear that the inclusion and representation of indigenous historical perspectives is impacted tremendously by the current impetus upon curriculum standards and high-stakes testing as a means of determining teacher effectiveness and student achievement. When instructional decisions are dominated by curricular expectations and test preparation, diverse historical perspectives in U.S. history courses will be limited to the classrooms of teachers who traverse beyond the prescribed boundaries of course curriculum and textbook narratives. In order to improve the inclusion and historical representation of indigenous peoples, the systemic, sociocultural, and pedagogical barriers to Native American historical perspectives must be addressed at all levels of educational policymaking. Until then, representations of indigenous peoples in the history classroom will be confined to the distant past and contemporary Natives will continue to be marginalized and stereotyped in the present.

REFERENCES

- Aldridge, D.P. (2006). The limits of master narratives in history textbooks: An analysis of representations of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), 662-686.
- Anderson, C.B. (2012). Misplaced multiculturalism: Representations of American Indians in U.S. history academic content standards. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(4), 497-509.
- Anderson, C. B., & Metzger, S. A. (2011). Slavery, the Civil War era, and African American representation in US history: An analysis of four states' academic standards. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 39(3), 393-415.
- Anfara, V., Brown, K., & Mangione, T. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28-38.
- Apple, M.W. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher*, 21(7), 4-19.
- Apple, M.W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.), New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.), New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apthorp, H. S. (2016). Where American Indian students go to school: Enrollment in seven central region states. REL 2016-113. *Regional Educational Laboratory Central*. Retrieved September 5, 2016, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED562652>
- Archambault II, D. (2015). State of the tribal-state relationship. Address to the 64th Legislative Assembly State of North Dakota. January, 8, 2015. Retrieved September 10, 2016, from www.legis.nd.gov/assembly/64-2015
- Armitage, A. (1995). *Comparing the policy of Aboriginal assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Arrows, F. (2013). *Teaching truly: A curriculum to indigenize mainstream education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Bain, R.B. (2006). Rounding up the unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 2080-2114.
- Balter, A., & Grossman, F. (2009). The effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on the language and culture education in Navajo public schools. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48(3), 19-46.
- Banks, J.A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural Education* (2nd ed., pp. 3-29). San Francisco: Jossey Banks.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational researcher*, 37(3), 129-139.
- Banks, J.A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W.D., Irvine, J.J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J.W., & Stephan, W.G. (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(3), 196-203.
- Barnes, C. J. (2006). Preparing preservice teachers to teach in a culturally responsive way. *The Negro Educational Review*, 57(1-2), 85-95.
- Beaulieu, D. (2006). A survey and assessment of culturally based education programs for Native American students in the United States. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(2), 50-61.
- Bell, L.A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L.A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 1-15). New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, C. I. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of educational research*, 71(2), 171-217.

- Bennett, C. I. (2007). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*. New York: Pearson Education
- Branch, A. (2003). A look at race in the national standards for the social studies: Another bad check. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 99-122). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Brandt, J. (2007). *Understanding and dismantling racism: The twenty-first century challenge To white America*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Brayboy, B.M.J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425-446.
- Brophy, J. (1999). Elementary students learn about Native Americans: The development of knowledge and empathy. *Social Education*, 63(1), 39-45. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ590452>
- Brown, A.L., & Brown, K.D. (2010). Silenced memories: An examination of the sociocultural knowledge on race and racial violence in official school curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43(2), 139-154.
- Brown, K.D. (2011). Breaking the cycle of Sisyphus: Social education and the acquisition of critical sociocultural knowledge about race and racism in the United States. *The Social Studies*, 102(6), 249-255.
- Brown, M. R. (2007). Educating all students: Creating culturally responsive teachers, classrooms, and schools. *Intervention in school and clinic*, 43(1), 57-62.
- Bureau of Indian Affairs. (2014). *2013 American Indian population and labor force report* (U.S. Department of the Interior, Indian Affairs). Retrieved June 8, 2016, from

<https://www.bia.gov/cs/groups/public/documents/text/idc1-024782.pdf>

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(4), 941-993.

Chandler, P. T. (2007). *White teachers, social studies, and race: A case study of the intersection of teachers' habitus and pedagogy*. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertations. Retrieved September 5, 2016, from <http://gradworks.umi.com/33/13/3313704.html>

Chandler, P.T. (2009). Blinded by the white: Social studies and raceless pedagogies. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 49*(3), 259-288.

Chandler, P.T. (2010). Critical race theory and social studies: Centering the Native American experience. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 34*(1), 29-58.

Chandler, P., & Branscombe, A. (2015). White social studies: Protecting the white racial code. In P. Chandler (Ed.), *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives* (pp. 61-87). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Chandler, P., & McKnight, D. (2009). The failure of social education in the United States: A critique of teaching the national story from “white” colourblind eyes. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 7*(2), 217-248.

Chandler, P., & McKnight, D. (2011). Race and social studies. In W. Russell (Ed.), *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 215-242). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Chu, S. (2011). Perspectives in understanding the schooling and achievement of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 38*(3), 201-209.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five*

- Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Curwen, M.S. (2011). "Martin Luther King stopped discrimination": Multi-generational Latino elementary students' perceptions of social issues. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 7, 62-71.
- Demmert, W., & Towner, J. (2003). *A review of the research literature on the influences of culturally based education on the academic performance of Native American students*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Lab. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED474128.pdf>
- de Waal-Lucas, A. (2007). Teaching in isolation: An examination of the treatment of multicultural content in a predominantly white and affluent suburban school. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-21.
- Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Epstein, T., Mayorga, E., & Nelson, J. (2011). Teaching about race in an urban history class: The effects of culturally responsive teaching. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), p. 2-21.
- Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18, 335-356.
- Evans, R.W. (2001). Thoughts on redirecting a runaway train: A critique of the standards movement. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(2), 330-339.
- Fenimore-Smith, J. K. (2009). The power of place: Creating an Indigenous charter

- school. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48(2), 1-17.
- Feuerstein, A. (2013). Knuckling under? School superintendents and accountability-based educational reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 23(5), 865-897.
- Fixico, D. L. (1998). Ethics and responsibilities in writing American Indian history. In D. A. Mihesuah (Ed.), *Natives and academics: Researching and writing about American Indians* (pp. 84-99). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fleming, W.C. (2006). Myths and stereotypes about Native Americans. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(3), 213-217. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <http://www.rvrhs.com/ourpages/auto/2011/9/13/33530341/Myths%20and%20Stereotypes%20About%20Native%20Americans.pdf>
- Forbes, J.D. (2000). The new assimilation movement: Standards, tests, and Anglo-American supremacy. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 39(2), 7-28. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ620433>
- Frankenburg, R. (1993). Growing up white: Feminism, racism and the social geography of childhood. *Feminist Review*, 45, 51-84.
- Fryberg, S.A. (2003). Really? You don't look like an American Indian: Social representations and social group identities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(1549), 3B. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.466.7464&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fryberg, S.A., Markus, H.R., Oyserman, D., & Stone, J.M. (2008). Of warrior chiefs and Indian Princesses: The psychological consequences of American Indian mascots. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 208-218. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from http://www.indianmascots.com/fryberg--web-psychological_.pdf

- Fryberg, S.A., & Oyserman, D. (2010). Feeling good about me: Reconsidering the social use of Native American images. Unpublished manuscript.
- Fryberg, S.A., & Stephens, N.M. (2010). When the world is colorblind, American Indians are invisible: A diversity science approach. *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*, 115-119.
- Fujiyoshi, K.F. (2015). Becoming a social justice educator: Emerging from the pits of whiteness into the light of love. *Democracy & Education*, *23(1)*, 1-6.
- Garrett, H.J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re)considerations of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64(4)*, 294-304.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53(2)*, 106-116.
- Gay, G. (2004). Social studies teacher education for urban classrooms. In S. Adler, *Critical Issues in Social Studies Teacher Education*, 75-95. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43(1)*, 48-70.
- Gesener, V.L. (2011). Native transgressions: A look at the portrayal of Karankawa natives in Texas history textbooks and trade books. *American Educational History Journal*, *38(1)*, 219-236.
- Gillborn, D. (2006). Citizenship education as placebo: “Standards” institutional racism and education policy. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *1(1)*, 83-104.
- Gillborn, D. (2013). The policy of inequity: Using CRT to unmask white supremacy in education policy. In M. Lynn & D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 129-139). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Giroux, H. (2011). Rejecting academic labor as a subaltern class: Learning from Paulo Freire and the politics of critical pedagogy. *Fast Capitalism*, 8(2). Retrieved September 5, 2016 from www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8_2/Giroux8_2.html.
- Good, A. (2009). Framing American Indians as the “First Americans”: Using critical multiculturalism to trouble the normative American story. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(2), 49-66.
- Gordy, L., & Pritchard, A. (1995). Redirecting our voyage through history: A content analysis of social studies textbooks. *Urban Education*, 30(2), 195-218.
- Gorski, P. C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 17(2), 163-177. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from http://www.edchange.net/publications/Complicity_with_Conservatism.pdf
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(2), 309-318. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://www.edchange.org/publications/MTE.pdf>
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (2006). *Turning on learning: Five approaches to multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hare, J., & Pidgeon, M. (2011). The way of the warrior: Indigenous youth navigating the challenges of schooling. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(2), 93-111.
- Hawkey, K. (2015). Whose history is this anyway? Social justice and a history curriculum. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 10(3), 187-198.

- Haynes-Writer, J. (2008). Unmasking, exposing, and confronting: Critical race theory, tribal critical race theory and multicultural education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 10(2), 1-15. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <http://ijme-journal.org/index.php/ijme/article/viewFile/137/226>
- Hickling-Hudson, A., & Ahlquist, R. (2003). Contesting the curriculum in the schooling of Indigenous children in Australia and the United States: From eurocentrism to culturally powerful pedagogies. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(1), 64-89. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/1800/1/1800.pdf>
- Holt, T.C. (1995). Reconstruction in United States history textbooks. *Journal of American History*, 81(4), 1641-1651.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195-202.
- Howard, T.C. (2004). Does race really matter? Secondary students' constructions of racial dialogue in the social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 32(4), 484-502.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who are we?: The challenges to American national identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hytten, K. (2015). Ethics in teaching for democracy and social justice. *Democracy and Education*, 23(2), 1-10.
- Journell, W. (2009). An incomplete history: Representation of American Indians in state social studies standards. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48(2), 18-32. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from https://jaie.asu.edu/sites/default/files/482_2009_2_journell.pdf
- Keene, A. (2015). Representations matter: Serving native students in higher education. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 101-111. Retrieved

April 10, 2016 from https://ncore.ou.edu/media/filer_public/c9/2c/c92cd21e-2180-4ab0-b302-ba6d992a4e7a/adrienne_keene_jcscscore_2015_.pdf

King, L.J. (2014). Learning other people's history: Pre-service teachers' developing African American historical knowledge. *Teacher Education*, 25(4), 427-456.

King, L.J., & Chandler, P.T. (2016). From non-racism to anti-racism in social studies teacher education: Social studies and racial pedagogical content knowledge. In A.R. Crowe & A. Cuenca (Eds.), *Rethinking social studies teacher education in the twenty first century* (pp. 3-21). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from

http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/41659049/King_Chandler_2016.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485989212&Signature=An7ARfmomsMb54r%2FjR4Q0l3sVBU%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DFrom_Non-racism_to_Anti-racism_in_Social.pdf

Kisker, E. E., Lipka, J., Adams, B. L., Rickard, A., Andrew-Ihrke, D., Yanez, E. E., & Millard, A. (2012). The potential of a culturally based supplemental mathematics curriculum to improve the mathematics performance of Alaska Native and other students. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 43(1), 75-113.

Kovach, M. (2013). Treaties, truths and transgressive pedagogies: Re-imagining indigenous presence in the classroom. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes*, 9(1), 109-127. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://socialiststudies.com/index.php/sss/article/viewFile/23527/17411>

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells: Developing a critical race perspective toward the social studies. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory: Perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 1-11). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 229-234.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Landry, A. (2014, November 17). "All Indians are dead?" At least that's what most schools teach children. Retrieved October 28, 2015, from <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2014/11/17>
- Lee, C.H. (2014). Public perceptions of minorities in America: Political correctness in U.S. History textbooks, before and after 1970. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4(3), 233-237.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137-152.
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levstik, L., & Tyson, C. (2008). *Handbook of research in social studies education*. New York: Routledge.

- Lewthwaite, B., & McMillan, B. (2010). She can bother me, and that's because she cares: What Inuit students say about teaching and their learning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(1), 140-175. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ883527.pdf>
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lipman, P. (1997). Restructuring in context: A case study of teacher participation and the dynamics of ideology, race, and power. *American Education Research Journal*, 34(1), 3-37.
- Loewen, J. (1996). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.
- Loewen, J. (2010). *Teaching what really happened: How to avoid the tyranny of textbooks and get students excited about doing history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2002). When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and the democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 279-305.
- Lomawaima, T., & McCarty, T. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Love, J.B. & Kallam, M.L. (2007). Issues and recommendations related to educating Native American students. In M.B. Spencer & R. Tudor (eds.) *Sixty-seven nations and counting: Proceedings of the seventh Native American symposium*. Durant, OK: Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://www.se.edu/nas/files/2013/03/NAS-2007-Proceedings-Love-and-Kallam.pdf>

- Luttrell, W. (2005). Crossing anxious borders: Teaching across the quantitative–qualitative ‘divide’. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 28(2), 183-195. Retrieved November 27, 2015, from ERIC.
- Mapp, T. (2008). Understanding phenomenology: The lived experience. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 16(5), 308-311.
- Mann, B. A. (2013). History. In F. Arrows (Ed.), *Teaching truly: A curriculum to indigenize mainstream education* (pp. 135-151). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Maranto, J. (2015). The effect of standardized testing on historical literacy and educational reform in the U.S. *Academic Leadership Journal in Student Research*, 3, 1-8. Retrieved October 25, 2015 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1062724.pdf>
- Marino, M.P. (2011). High school world history textbooks: An analysis of content focus and chronological approaches. *The History Teacher*, 44(3), 421-446.
- Marshall, M. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13(6), 522-526.
- Martell, C. (2013). Proceedings from AERA 2013: Whiteness in the social studies classroom: Students’ conceptions of race and ethnicity in United States history. San Francisco, CA. Retrieved October 25, 2015, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED542100.pdf>
- Martell, C. C., & Hashimoto-Martell, E. A. (2012). Throwing out the textbook: A teacher research study of changing texts in the history classroom. In H. Hickman & B. J. Porfilio (Eds.), *The new politics of the textbook: Critical analysis in the core content areas* (pp. 305-320). Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Mathison, S., & Freeman, M. (2004). Teachers working with standards and state testing. In S. Mathison & E.W. Ross (Eds.), *Defending public schools: The nature and limits of*

- standards-based reform and assessment* (Vol. 4, pp. 81-91). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCarty, T. L. (1997). American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian bilingual education. In J. Cummins & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual education* (pp. 45-56). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 101-124.
- McDonough, K. (2009). Pathways to critical consciousness: A first-year teacher's engagement with issues of race and equity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*, 528-537.
- McKnight, D., & Chandler, P. (2009). Social studies and the social order: Telling stories of resistance. *Teacher education quarterly*, *36*(1), 59-75. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ851028.pdf>
- McLaren, P.L. (1994). White terror and oppositional agency: Toward a critical Multiculturalism. In D.T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2014). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Meyer, N. (2011). Selecting diverse resources of Native American perspective for the curriculum center: Children's literature, leveled readers, and social studies curriculum.

- Education Libraries*, 34(1), 23-32. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ937211.pdf>
- Mihesuah, D.A. (1996). *American Indians: Stereotypes & realities*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity.
- Milner, H. R., & Ross, E. W. (2006). The colorblind myth and why racial identity matters in education. In E. W. Ross & V. O. Pang (Eds.), *Race, ethnicity, and education: Vol. 3, Racial identity in education* (pp. xvii-2). Westport: Praeger Books.
- Morgan, H. (2009). What every teacher needs to know to teach Native American students. *Multicultural Education*, 16(4), 10-12. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ858583.pdf>
- Nelson, J.L., & Pang, V.O. (2006). Racism, prejudice, and the social studies curriculum. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 143-162). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Noboa, J. (2011). From the battlefield of the Texas history wars: Contending with “American exceptionalism”. *Multicultural Education*, 19(1), 44-45. Retrieved October 25, 2015 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ986891.pdf>
- Parameswaran, G. (2007). Enhancing diversity education. *Multicultural Education*, 14(3), 51-55.
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Paxton, R. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(3), 315-339.
- Pease-Windy Boy, J. (1995). Cultural diversity in higher education: An American Indian perspective. In C.E. Sleeter & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference* (pp. 399-413). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Pewewardy, C. (1995). The Americanizing of “Pocahontas”: Misconceptions and assimilation of an American Indian heroine. Paper presented at the *National Indian Education Association Annual Convention, Tucson, Arizona*.
- Pewewardy, C. (2002). Learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students: A review of the literature and implications for practice. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 41(3), 22-56.
- Pewewardy, C., & Hammer, P. C. (2003). Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students. ERIC Digest. 1-9. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED482325.pdf>
- Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 197-215.
- Portillo, A. (2013). Indigenous-centered pedagogies: Strategies for teaching Native American literature and culture. *CEA Forum*, 42(1), 155-178. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <https://journals.tdl.org/ceaforum/index.php/ceaforum/article/download/7027/6111>
- Powers, K. (2006). An explanatory study of cultural identity and culture-based educational programs for urban American Indian students. *Urban Education*, 41(1), 20-49.
- Rabb, T. (2004). No child left behind historical literacy. *Education Digest*, 70(2), 18-21.

- Rabb, T. (2007). Those who do not learn history... *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(42).
- Rains, F. (2002). From the eyes of the colonized: Rethinking the legacy of colonization and its impact on American Indians. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, 52, 125-130.
- Rains, F. (2003). To greet the dawn with open eyes: American Indians, white privilege and the power of residual guilt in the social studies. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 199-227). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Rains, F. (2006). The color of the social studies: A post-social studies reality check. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 137-156). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Rector-Aranda, A. (2016). School norms and reforms, critical race theory, and the fairytale of equitable education. *Critical Questions in Education*, 7(1), 1-16. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from [http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/41814829/Rector-Aranda-CRT and Equitable Education.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485988683&Signature=b17QCi%2Fvr6cPtjwwLo3nm517R4o%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DSchool_Norms_and_Reforms_Critical_Race.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/41814829/Rector-Aranda-CRT_and_Equitable_Education.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485988683&Signature=b17QCi%2Fvr6cPtjwwLo3nm517R4o%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DSchool_Norms_and_Reforms_Critical_Race.pdf)
- Rosier, P., & Farella, M. (1976). Bilingual education at Rock Point: Some early results. *TESOL Quarterly*, 379-388.
- Ross, E.W. (2006). *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Santamaría, L. J. (2014). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(3), 1-45.
- Segall, A., & Garrett, J. (2013). White teachers talking race. *Teaching Education*, 24(3), 265-291. Retrieved June 10, 2016, from http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/34100583/White_teachers_talking_race.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485988459&Signature=YKq8THQO3dixPQ%2FN1VxACgDaU74%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DWhite_teachers_talking_race.pdf
- Sewall, G.T. (2004). *World history textbooks: A review*. New York: American Textbook Council.
- Shear, S.B., Knowles, R.T., Soden, G.J., & Castro, A.J. (2015). Manifesting destiny: Re/presentations of indigenous peoples in k-12 U.S. history standards. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43(1), 68-101. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from http://www.teachingforchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SHEAR_ManifestingDestiny.pdf
- Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63-75.
- Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Smith, B. (2014). Teaching a “social studies without guarantees”: Disrupting essentialism, ameliorating exclusions and planting seeds. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 8(1), 64-79. Retrieved September 5, 2016, from <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/36116916/critlit.pdf?AWSAccessKey>

[Id=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485988852&Signature=B2gC5t2lcVm2uR5u649Vs6tNHxo%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DTeaching_a_Social_Studies_without_Guaran.pdf](https://www.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ849019.pdf)

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

Spring, J. (2011). *The politics of American education*. New York: Routledge.

Subedi, B. (2008). Fostering critical dialogue across cultural differences: A study of immigrant Teachers' interventions in diverse schools. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 36, 413-440.

Szabo, S., & Anderson, G. (2009). Helping teacher candidates examine their multicultural attitudes. *Educational Horizons*, 190-197. Retrieved September 5, 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ849019.pdf>

Taylor, R. W. (2010). The role of teacher education programs in creating culturally competent teachers: A moral imperative for ensuring the academic success of diverse student populations. *Multicultural Education*, 17(3), 24-28.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2016). *Tennessee State Board of Education social studies standards*. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from <https://www.tn.gov/education/article/social-studies-standards>.

Terenzini, P.T., Cabrera, A.F., Colbeck, C.L., Bjorklund, S.A., & Parente, J.M. (2001). Racial and ethnic diversity in the classroom: Does it promote student learning? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 509-531.

Tharp, R. G. (2006). Four hundred years of evidence: Culture, pedagogy, and Native

- America. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(2), 6-25.
- Trafzer, C.E., & Lorimer, M. (2014). Silencing California Indian genocide in social studies texts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(1), 64-82.
- Tukachinsky, R., Mastro, D., & Yarchi, M. (2015). Documenting portrayals of race/ethnicity on primetime television over a 20-year span and their association with national-level racial/ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 71(1), 17-38.
- United States Census Bureau. (2012). *The American Indian and Alaska Native population: 2010 census briefs* (U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration Publication No. C2010BR-10). Retrieved June 8, 2016, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf>
- Vasquez Heilig, J., Brown, K., & Brown, A. (2012). The illusion of inclusion: A critical race theory textual analysis of race and standards. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(3), 403-424.
- Vaught, S.E., & Castagno, A.E. (2008), "I don't think I'm a racist": Critical race theory, teacher attitudes and structural racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(2), 95-113. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from https://hartfordschools.org/files/Equity%20Page/Vaught__Castagno_2008.pdf
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of teacher education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28.
- Vogler, K.E., & Virtue, D. (2007). "Just the facts ma'am": Teaching social studies in the era of Standards and high-stakes testing. *The Social Studies*, 98(2), 54-58.

- Williams, J., Price, R. F., DeLaney, M., Green, D. Y. H., Finley, P., Finley, T., & Yates III, L. (2016). Cultured pearls: A phenomenological investigation of the pedagogical practices of culturally responsive white teachers in urban schools. Proceedings of the American Education Research Association. Public Scholarship to Educate Diverse Democracies. Retrieved September 5, 2016 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Danielle_Hairston_Green/publication/303697597_Cultured_Pearls_A_Phenomenological_Investigation_of_the_Pedagogical_Practices_of_Culturally_Responsive_White_Teachers_In_Urban_Settings/links/5797c16508ae33e89faedaec.pdf
- Wills, J.S. (2001). Missing in interaction: Diversity, narrative, and critical multicultural social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(1), 43-64.
- Wilson, A.C. (1996). American Indian history or non-Indian perceptions of American Indian history? *American Indian Quarterly*, 20(1), 3-5.
- Wilson, A. C., & Yellow Bird, M. (Eds.). (2005). Beginning decolonization. *For indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook*. Santa Fe: School of American Research.
- Woodson, A. (2015). "What you supposed to know": Urban black students' perspectives on history textbooks. *Journal of Urban Learning Teaching and Research*, 11, 57-65. Retrieved October 25, 2015 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071418.pdf>
- Zinn, H. (2003). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-Present*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Zirkel, S. (2008). The influence of multicultural educational practices on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1147-1181. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from

http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30985765/zirkel_2008_tcr.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1485988961&Signature=r372QZEijBzW%2BLa33aHla3RHAKA%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DThe_influence_of_multicultural_education.pdf

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



EAST TENNESSEE STATE
UNIVERSITY

Office for the Protection of Human Research Subjects • Box 70565 • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-1707
Phone: (423) 439-6053 Fax: (423) 439-6060

IRB APPROVAL – Initial Expedited Review

October 14, 2016

Joshua Tipton

Re: Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations in History
IRB#: c0916.17s
ORSPA #:

The following items were reviewed and approved by an expedited process:

- New protocol submission xForm, external site permission letter - [REDACTED] schools, Pertinent literature, PI resume, Revised informed consent form 2 version 9/12/16, Initial contact script, Interview Protocol Questions and Alignment, Focus group guide

The following revisions were received and approved as part of the requested changes:

- Statement regarding storage of records

On **October 10, 2016**, a final approval was granted for a period not to exceed 12 months and will expire on **October 9, 2017**. The expedited approval of the study *and* requested changes will be reported to the convened board on the next agenda.

The following **enclosed stamped, approved Informed Consent Documents** have been stamped with the approval and expiration date and these documents must be copied and provided to each participant prior to participant enrollment:

- Informed Consent Document (Informed consent (version 9/12/16 stamped approved 10/10/16))

Federal regulations require that the original copy of the participant's consent be maintained in the principal investigator's files and that a copy is given to the subject at the time of consent.

Projects involving Mountain States Health Alliance must also be approved by MSHA following IRB approval prior to initiating the study.

Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks to Subjects or Others must be reported to the IRB (and VA R&D if applicable) within 10 working days.



Accredited Since December 2005

Proposed changes in approved research cannot be initiated without IRB review and approval. The only exception to this rule is that a change can be made prior to IRB approval when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the research subjects [21 CFR 56.108 (a)(4)]. In such a case, the IRB must be promptly informed of the change following its implementation (within 10 working days) on Form 109 (www.etsu.edu/irb). The IRB will review the change to determine that it is consistent with ensuring the subject's continued welfare.

Sincerely,
Stacey Williams, Chair
ETSU Campus IRB

cc: Pamela Scott

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent

Title of Research Study: **Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations In History**
Principal Investigator: **Joshua C. Tipton**

Principal Investigator's Contact Information: Phone: 865.300.2409 Email: tiptonjc2@etsu.edu
Organization of Principal Investigator: East Tennessee State University

INFORMED CONSENT

This Informed Consent will explain about being a participant in a research study. It is important that you read this material carefully and then decide if you wish to voluntarily participate.

- A. Purpose: The purpose of this research study is to examine the phenomenon (something that is observed or exists to happen) of high school teacher perceptions of indigenous representations in the study of United States History within the [REDACTED] school district. For the purpose of this study, high school teachers perceptions of indigenous representations in history will be defined as teacher beliefs towards the inclusion and representation of indigenous peoples, the peoples and cultures native to North America prior to European colonization, in the teaching of United States history. Your participation will include responding to face to face interview questions, focus group interview questions, and the collection of sample instructional plans and activities that include the representation of indigenous peoples.
- B. Duration: The expected duration of this study will be comprised of 1 to 4 contact hours over the course of three to four weeks. Each participant will be asked to meet with the researcher twice, once for participation in a focus group session and once more for a face to face interview. The collection of sample instructional plans will occur at the time of face to face interviews, is voluntary, and will not require any additional contact time.
- C. Procedures: The procedures, which as a participant in this research will involve you, include participation in semi-structured face to face interviews and focus group interviews with Mr. Joshua C. Tipton. Other procedures which could involve the research participants would include the voluntary submission of instructional plans and activities that include the representation of indigenous peoples. Note: This study will include no invasive techniques. There are no specimens to be collected by this study. This study is not a double-blind test or experiment. There are no anticipated circumstances which would result in a participant's participation being terminated by the investigator without regard to the participant's consent.
- D. Alternative Procedures/Treatments: There are no alternative procedures/treatments available to non-participants in this study. There are no known possible benefits for non-participants.
- E. Possible Risks/Discomforts: There are no known possible risks and/or discomforts that would occur as a result of your participation in this research study other than the minimal risk of loss of confidentiality due to the recording of participant interviews.
- F. Possible Benefits: There are no known possible benefits to you that would result from your participation in this research study. While this research does seek to contribute to

Title of Research Study: Teacher Perceptions of Indigenous Representations In History
Principal Investigator: Joshua C. Tipton

the body of educational research and knowledge, you will receive no direct benefit for participation in this study.

G. Financial Costs: There are no financial costs to you as a participant in this research study.

H. Compensation in the Form of Payments to Participant: There is no compensation for your participation in this research study.

I. Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this research experiment is voluntary. *You may choose not to participate.* If you decide to participate in this research study, you can change your mind and quit at any time. If you choose not to participate, or change your mind and quit, you will not be penalized in any way. You may quit by calling Mr. Tipton, whose phone number is 865.300.2409. You will be told immediately if any of the results of the study should reasonably be expected to make you change your mind about continuing to participate.

J. Contact for Questions: If you have any questions, problems, or research-related problems at any time, you may call Mr. Joshua C. Tipton at 865.300.2409 or alternatively at 865.457.2611. You may also call the Chairperson of the ETSU Institutional Review Board at 423.439.6054 for any questions you may have about your rights as a research participant. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team or you can't reach the study staff, you may call an IRB Coordinator at 423.439.6055 or 423.439.6002.

K. Confidentiality: Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. Prior to the conclusion of the study, you will be asked to perform a member check in order to review the researcher's textual description of your interview participation. As a participant you will have the right to request that any transcribed information be amended or removed based upon your review of the researcher's transcription. A copy of the records from this study will be stored in East Tennessee State University's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis department for at least 6 years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming you as a participant. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the ETSU IRB, and Mr. Joshua C. Tipton and Dr. Pamela Scott have access to the study records. Your records will be kept completely confidential according to current legal requirements. They will not be revealed unless required by law, or as described in this form.

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understand this Informed Consent Document and that I had the opportunity to have them explained to me verbally. I confirm that I have had the opportunity to ask questions and that all my questions have been answered. I acknowledge that my agreement to this consent grants the researcher the permission to conduct audio

Ver. 09/12/16

Page 2 of 3

Participant Initials _____

Approved by ETSU Campus IRB / Approval Date: October 10, 2016 / Expiration Date: ~~October 9, 2017~~

APPENDIX C

Focus Group Interview Protocol and Alignment

Focus Group Moderator's Guide

Focus Group Interview Questions:

Introduction:

Thank you all for taking the time to meet with me today. I will proceed by asking a series of questions to the group and allow you to discuss your thoughts and responses with one another. Feel free to share your thoughts and opinions. As the group discourse begins to draw to a close I will ask another question. Thank you again for your time.

1. How do you think the teaching of U.S. history has changed throughout your career, or since you were a student? (RQ1, RQ2)
 - a. What would you say is the biggest challenge for U.S. history teachers today?
2. How do you feel about teaching topics such as racism or stereotyping in your class? (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3)
 - a. How do your students typically respond to such topics?
3. How would you describe the representation of indigenous people in U.S. history? (RQ4)
 - a. Tell me about some personal experiences that have influenced your own view of Native Americans or indigenous peoples. (RQ4)
 - b. How and when did you learn about Native Americans in your own school experience? (RQ1, RQ3, RQ4)
4. What about Native Americans or indigenous peoples do you believe is important for your students to understand? (RQ1, RQ3, RQ4)
 - a. How do you incorporate these topics into your classes? (RQ2)
5. How do you feel about the inclusion and portrayal of indigenous people in current U.S. history curriculum? (RQ3)

Tell me about how you address indigenous stereotypes in your class. (RQ4)

APPENDIX D

Individual Interview Protocol and Alignment

Interview Questions and Alignment

Research Questions:

1. What are high school teachers perceptions regarding the value of teaching United States history from the perspective of indigenous people?
2. What are high school teachers perceptions of challenges to teaching United States history from the perspectives of indigenous people?
3. What are high school teachers perceptions of the historical representation of indigenous people in United States history curriculum?
4. What are high school teachers perceptions of indigenous people?

Face to Face Interview Protocol:

1. What would you describe as the most important outcomes of teaching U.S. history? (RQ1)
 - a. How do you think the teaching of U.S. history has changed throughout your career, or since you were a student? (RQ2)
2. What is your feeling toward the inclusion of multi-cultural or diverse historical perspectives in teaching U.S. history? (RQ1, RQ3)
 - a. How do you include different historical viewpoints or perspectives in your class? (RQ1, RQ3)
3. How do you feel about teaching topics such as racism or stereotyping in your class? (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3)
 - a. How do your students typically respond to such topics? (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3)
4. What about Native Americans or indigenous peoples do you believe is important for your students to understand? (RQ1, RQ3, RQ4)
 - a. How do you incorporate these topics into your classes? (RQ2)
 - b. What influences your decision to or ability to include indigenous perspectives? (RQ2, RQ3)
5. How do you feel about the inclusion and portrayal of indigenous people in current U.S. history curriculum? (RQ3)
 - a. What do you think current U.S. history curriculum teaches students about Native Americans or indigenous peoples? (RQ3, RQ4)
 - b. Tell me about how you address indigenous stereotypes in your class. (RQ4)
6. How would you describe your own perception of the representation of indigenous people in U.S. history? (RQ4)
 - a. Tell me about some personal experiences that have influenced your own view of Native Americans or indigenous peoples. (RQ4)
 - b. What impact do those experiences have on your teaching of indigenous perspectives? (RQ4)
7. What suggestions, if any, would you give to policy makers in regard to United States history curriculum and the representation of Native Americans and indigenous people? (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, RQ4)

VITA

JOSHUA CHARLES TIPTON

- Education: East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN
Ed.D. Educational Leadership, May 2017
- Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, TN
Ed.S. Educational Administration and Supervision, July 2011
- Norwich University, Northfield, VT
M.A. Military History, June 2008
- University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
B.A. History, May 2004
- Professional Experience: District Data and Evaluation Coordinator and Middle College
Supervisor: July 2016 to Present, Anderson County Schools, TN
- Assistant Principal: 2013 – 2016, Clinton High School, Anderson
County Schools, TN
- 9-12 Social Studies Teacher: 2010 – 2013, Clinton High School,
Anderson County Schools, TN
- Adjunct History Instructor: 2010 – Present, Roane State
Community College, Oak Ridge, TN
- 6-8 Social Studies Teacher: 2005 – 2010, Clinton Middle School,
Anderson County Schools, TN
- Honors and Awards: Mid-South Educational Research Association Research in Progress
Award Recipient, November 2016
Anderson County Schools Secondary Teacher of the Year, 2013
Clinton High School Teacher of the Year, 2013
- Professional Licensure: Professional Administrator School Leadership, TN
8-12 History, TN
8-12 Geography, TN
- Professional Organizations: Anderson County Education Association
Tennessee Education Association
Mid-South Educational Research Association