EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL:

A TRIBAL CRITICAL RACE THEORY ETHNOGRAPHY

by

Micki Abercrombie-Donahue

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

in

Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 2011

ii

APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

Micki Abercrombie-Donahue

This dissertation has been read by each member of the dissertation committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to The Graduate School.

Dr. Joyce Herbeck

Approved for the Department of Education

Dr. Jayne Downey

Approved for The Graduate School

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this dissertation should be referred to Pro Quest Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microform along with the nonexclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Micki Abercrombie-Donahue

August, 2011

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my mother and father, Jerry and Marlene Abercrombie, whom have sacrificed so much of themselves to make my academic preparation and research possible. They taught me the love of learning and the value of education through the sacrifices they made in their own lives to make my undergraduate and graduate studies possible. Their commitment to me throughout my academic career has helped me to keep going in spite of all the obstacles I have faced. I sincerely thank them both and I hope that my work has become a reflection of their strength, wisdom, and commitment to education as a form of liberation that can make the world a more just place. Their ceaseless effort and relentless work throughout the many, many years of my academic preparation have earned them a place of highest honor and respect in any circle. I owe them both a debt I can never repay, and I hope that my past, present, and future work brings them a small measure of the honor they clearly both deserve. May my work bring healing and restoration to our family by reconnecting the lines of historical continuity and relationship with our ancestors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express a special thank you to Dr. Joyce Herbeck, the chair of my doctoral dissertation committee. Dr. Herbeck, thank you for your unfailing commitment to me throughout my program and for your professionalism, faithfulness, and integrity in every area of your life. Thank you for encouraging me to produce scholarship that improves the educational experiences of teachers and students. I would also like to thank, Dr. Jioanna Carjuzaa for her commitment to my professional training, academic development, and mentorship into the professorship. Your life and your work have transformed my perspective of what is possible in our field. In addition, I extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Lynn Kelting-Gibson for encouraging me to find my own academic voice. I am indebted to Dr. Mary Murphy, whose early mentorship during my M.A. in History program and throughout my Ed. D. program played a pivotal role in the evolution of my ability to engage in critical academic scholarship. I extend a heartfelt thanks to Dr. Wayne Stein for your input and insight throughout this project, especially for your understanding of Indian Education and Indigenous peoples. To the administrators, faculty, and staff at my research site, thank you for teaching me through your lives, your stories, and teaching. I would especially like to thank my family and friends, Jerry and Marlene Abercrombie, Cheryl Jorgensen, Lynn Sieck, Michele Ramirez, and Dr. Jessica Krim, for their generosity, love, and support throughout this process. Finally, I would like to extend my love and thanks to my husband, Benjamin Donahue. Thank you for your patience and for being one of my greatest teachers by walking with me through each turn and twist throughout this difficult process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS-CONTINUED

TABLE OF CONTENTS-CONTINUED

TABLE OF CONTENTS-CONTINUED

x

LIST OF TABLES

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Anti-racist education- A strategy in schools to eliminate tracking, inequitable funding, and school desegregation.

Assimilation- A process by which groups are forced to adopt or change to reflect the mores of the dominant culture. Assimilation happens when to be successful in school, students are expected to communicate and behave according to the dominant school cultural norms.

Bicultural- An individual whom has the knowledge, skills, and understandings to operate effectively within more than one cultural community.

Civil rights- The rights of personal liberty guaranteed by the 13th and the 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and by acts of Congress.

Class-A group sharing the same economic and social status based on wealth, income, and socio-economic status.

Colonization-A process whereby sovereignty over a particular land area, its natural resources, economic, political, and social resources is taken at the expense of Indigenous peoples. Colonization of the Indigenous peoples of the United States has continued through the ongoing systemic legal, political, social, and economic oppression of European American thought, knowledge, and power structures that continue to dominate present day institutions in the United States.

Color blindness- The claim that one does not see a person's race and treats everyone equally regardless of race.

Critical thinking- An effort to see an issue clearly and truly to judge it fairly without a pre-set bias.

Critical pedagogy- A focus on the culture of everyday life and the interaction of class, race, and gender with contemporary power struggles.

Critical race theory (CRT)- A theoretical framework for academic research and teaching that focuses on racism as central to all other forms of oppression. CRT challenges racial oppression, racial inequities, and white privilege (Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Culture- Socially transmitted ways of thinking, believing, feeling, and acting within a group. These patterns are transmitted from one generation to the next.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS-CONTINUED

Cultural capital- Endowments such as academic competence, language competence, and wealth that provide an advantage to an individual, family, or group.

Cultural competency-The ability to successfully teach students who come from cultures other than one's own. Only by gaining the requisite awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to become culturally competent can teachers hope to actualize their professional commitment to the academic success of all students.

Cultural identity- Includes the traits and values learned as part of our ethnicity, race, religion, gender, age, socio-economic status, primary language, geographic region, place of residence, abilities or exceptional conditions, etc.

Cultural pluralism- The maintenance of cultures as parallel and equal to the dominant culture in a society.

Cultural relativism- An attempt to view the world from multiple cultural perspectives.

Culturally responsive pedagogy-Affirms the cultures of students, views the cultures and experiences of students as strengths, and reflects the students' cultures in the teaching process. It is defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching students more effectively. It is based on the assumption that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly.

De facto segregation-The separation of groups that occurs when people have chosen to live in different neighborhoods or participate in different clubs or social groups.

De jure segregation-The separation of groups that occurs as people have been mandated by city, state, or federal governmental policies.

Discrimination-The arbitrary denial of privileges and rewards to members of oppressed groups. Discrimination occurs at both an individual and an institutional level. Institutionalized discrimination refers to the effects of inequalities that have been integrated into the system-wide operation of society that secure benefits for some and deny benefits to others.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS-CONTINUED

Dominant Culture- The cultural group whose values and behaviors have been adopted by most institutions in society, including schools. In the United States, it is the middle class, white, English speaking, heterosexual Christian culture with its historical roots in Europe.

Egalitarianism- A belief in the social, political, and economic rights and privileges for all people.

Enculturation- This is the process of acquiring the characteristics of a given culture and becoming competent in its language and ways of behaving and knowing.

Equality-State of being equal in that one cultural group is not inferior or superior to another and that all groups have equal access to the same benefits of society regardless of group membership.

Ethnocentrism- The belief that one's cultural group is superior to all others.

Feminists- People who actively support the rights of women, gay, gender, transsexual, transgender persons, and gender equality within society.

Indigenous/Indian- A population of people that is native to a country or region. In the United States, American Indians, Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives are considered to be indigenous populations. Indigenous peoples are those who have inhabited lands before colonization or annexation; have maintained distinct, nuanced cultural and social organizing principles; and claim a nationhood status.

Indian Education Act- A 1972 Congressional law that encouraged the development of educational opportunities and federal funding for the creation of tribal culture and language programs throughout the United States.

Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act-A 1975 Congressional law that facilitated the development of tribally controlled schools and educational programs throughout the United States.

Indian Education for All Act- A 1999 Montana state law that required all educational institutions in Montana to establish curriculum and instructional reforms that worked to preserve and promote Montana Tribal Nations' cultures and histories in K-16 schools and universities.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS-CONTINUED

Individualism-The belief that every individual is his or her master, is in control of their destiny, and will advance and regress in society according to their own efforts.

Informal Curriculum-Rules that guide the expected behaviors and attitudes of students in schools.

Inequality- Marked systemic distinctions in economic success, educational achievement, education credentials and power among groups of people.

Marginalization-Relegation to a position that is not part of the mainstream nor accepted by most people.

Meritocracy- Suggests that everyone has equal opportunity to be successful if they work hard enough.

Multicultural curriculum-Coursework in schools that incorporates the histories, experiences, traditions, and cultures of students in classrooms and supports diversity.

Multicultural education- An educational strategy in which students' cultural backgrounds are used to develop effective classroom instruction and school environments. Multicultural education supports and extends the concepts of culture, diversity, equality, social justice, and democracy in the school setting**.**

Nationalism-A national identity shaped by a common language, common culture, and loyalty and devotion to a nation.

Pedagogy-The art or science of teaching, which includes both instructional strategies and methods.

Prejudice- An aversion to members of a cultural group that is different from your own. Prejudice can result when people lack an understanding of the history, experiences, values, and perceptions of other groups.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS-CONTINUED

Race- A social construction used as a means of classification, often made by skin color. Race is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies. Race is simultaneously socially constructed and socially significant. Race is a categorical system of privilege and discrimination invented and sustained by individuals and institutions rather than a natural part of the world.

Racism-Belief that one race has inherent superiority over all others and thereby its members possess the natural right to be dominant.

Sexism-The conscious or unconscious belief that men are superior to women that results in behavior and action to maintain the superior, powerful position of males in society and families.

Social justice-Expects that citizens will provide for those persons in society who are not as advantaged as others.

Social stratification- Ranking of persons and families based on specific characteristics such as income, education, occupation, wealth, and power.

Socialization- The general process of learning the social norms and expectations of a culture.

Socioeconomic status-A composite of the economic status of families or persons on the basis of occupation, educational attainment, income, and wealth.

Stereotype- Application of generalizations about a group of people without the consideration of intra-group diversity.

Subcultures-Sub-societies connected to cultural group memberships such as gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, religion, exceptionalities, language, and age.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS-CONTINUED

Tribal critical race theory (TribCrit)- A theoretical framework for academic research and teaching that focuses on racism and colonialism as central to all other forms of oppression especially with research and teaching involving Indigenous peoples. TribCrit challenges the lasting legacies of colonialism, ongoing systemic racism, the impact of ideological/cultural hegemony on students in schools, the subordination of Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies, and the continued violations of tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and the rights of tribally controlled education.

White Privilege-Individuals or groups whose socioeconomic status, race, native language, gender or other group membership grants them advantages and power over others in society.

xvii

ABSTRACT

This tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study explored educators' perceptions of Indian Education for All (IEFA), the latest in a series of educational reforms designed to preserve the heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations and transform Montana school curricula and teaching. This study found a lack of consensus and understanding among the educators about the purposes and the design of IEFA. The educators believed the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA would be recursive, ongoing and consistent partnerships and collaborations with Indigenous specialists who could equip the educators with the Indigenous knowledge, pedagogies, and skills they needed to build and sustain relationships with Indian students and families. The educators indicated that the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA curricula were: the lasting legacies of colonialism, Native American subjectivity, misrepresentations of Indigenous identities, lack of understanding about Indigenous epistemologies pedagogies and life ways, systemic racism, poor communication, broken relationships, mistrust and lack of rapport, whiteness and white privilege, and a lack of support or professional development opportunities with Indigenous specialists from particular tribal communities in Montana.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Evolution of the Study

In 1999 the Montana Legislature passed a landmark piece of legislation titled
Indian Education for All (IEFA). IEFA was the latest in a series of legal reforms that
mandated systemic educational changes designed to establish equality of educational
opportunity for Indian students. The legislation was designed to address the academic
achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students through the implementation of
curricula that more accurately represented the heritages, histories, and life ways of
Montana Indians. Although the constitutional guarantee of the equality of educational
opportunity for Indian students had been enumerated within the language of the 1972
Montana Constitution, IEFA represented the first successful attempt to integrate the 1972
constitutional mandate into the Montana Codes Annotated. IEFA mandated the
implementation of educational curricula and pedagogy that recognized and preserved the
unique cultural heritage of all Montana Tribal Nations. Indian Education for All was
designed to help Montana to fulfill the constitutional commitment of Article X, Section 1
(2) which stated,

> the state is committed to establish a system of education which will
> develop the full educational potential of each person. Equality of
> educational opportunity is guaranteed to each person of this state. The
> state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American
> Indians and is committed in its educational goals to the preservation of
> their cultural integrity (p.1).

Indian Education for All (IEFA) was designed to address the ongoing academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students in Montana schools. In the Indian Student Data Report (2010), the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) reported a significant academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students on the state criterion referenced test (CRT). The 2006-2010 CRT trend data indicated that Indian students in all grade levels had scored a 71% in reading, a 40% in mathematics, and a 29% in science, while white students had scored an 87% in reading, a 71% in mathematics, and a 61%/ in science. IEFA was designed to help educators to close the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students in Montana schools.

Although the vision for the best methods of implementing the IEFA reforms evolved over time, the primary intentions behind the educational mandate have remained relatively constant. Throughout the course of this thirty- year journey towards transformative change in Montana schools, those involved in the reforms have possessed a relatively unaltered intersection of key foci: addressing the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students, the integration of more accurate portrayals of American Indians into educational curricula and teaching, the preservation of tribal sovereignty and self-determination, the integration of culturally responsive pedagogy for Indian students, and the development of relationships and collaborations between Indians and non-Indians in Montana (Carjuzaa, Jetty, & Veltkamp, 2010).

IEFA was designed to address the devastating consequences of colonialism and systemic racism on the educational experiences of Indian students. Battiste (2000) has researched the connection between inaccurate representations or stereotypical portrayals

of Indigenous peoples in school curricula and the academic achievement of Indigenous students. Her work demonstrated that, "Indigenous students have been subjected to multiple forms of cognitive imperialism within colonial educational systems that have destroyed and distorted their Indigenous ways of life, histories, identities, cultures, and languages" (p. 193). School curricula has deliberately privileged "one language, one culture, and one frame of reference" and asked Indigenous students to disconnect themselves from their intimate and life giving relationships with their ancestors, their ancestral homelands, and Indigenous ways of knowing and understanding the world (p. 198). Indigenous students have experienced intense "frustration, alienation, and conflict" within schools that have asked them to abandon the ancestral connections that have given their people wisdom and life for many generations (Cajete, 1994, p. 19). IEFA was designed to disrupt the legacies of colonialism and systemic racism that have continued to impact the educational experiences and academic achievement of Indian students.

<div align="center">The Origin of the Project</div>

My interest in IEFA was first sparked by the portrayals of Montana Indians that seemed to permeate the K-12 school curriculum and teaching materials that I was asked to use as a secondary social studies educator in public and private schools in Montana. As a social studies educator, I was asked to utilize curricula that seemed to either omit or misrepresent the histories, stories, and life experiences of Montana Indians. The curricula used in an array of social studies courses in Montana schools appeared to misalign with my life experiences and the personal and professional relationships I had

built with several Indian friends and colleagues. The representations of Montana Indians in school curricula were inconsistent with the understandings I had constructed within the context of relationships with Indian colleagues, friends, and mentors. In addition, I was troubled by the fact that the school curricula bore little resemblance to the oral histories and historical narratives written by Montana Indians that I had researched as a part of my graduate work in history. These apparent inconsistencies and contradictions eventually drove me to begin to question the foundations of curricula design and implementation.

At first I had dismissed this conflict as evidence of my lack of education and lack of advanced training in understanding the complex processes involved in the removal of knowledge from the site of its production to its eventual translation in school curricula and teaching. I ignored the internal conflict I experienced when I utilized social studies curricula that were inconsistent with my life experiences and the oral traditions and narratives that had been well documented by an array of well-respected elders, storytellers, and historians throughout the years. At the time, I can honestly say that I had no idea that this area of professional and personal conflict would eventually evolve into the single most enduring line of inquiry that would run throughout my teaching, research, and academic service over the course of the next several years.

At this point in my career, I enjoyed teaching and working each day to help my students grow to love social studies. I had chosen social studies teaching as my vocation because it represented a natural extension of my love of political studies, history, philosophy, law, learning, and teaching. In my youth, I had enjoyed listening to the stories about the westward migration, homesteading, gold mining, fur trapping, and

Montana's growth from a small territory into the rather large, albeit sparsely populated state that it is today. I loved listening to the stories that had been passed down by my grandfathers and grandmothers to my parents, and then eventually to me. These oral traditions had served as powerful instruments in the hands of a multitude of storytellers who had used them to craft and shape my identity and sense of self. They had provided me with a sense of continuity and connection with my ancestors, my community, my culture, and a particular place that had grounded my life and given it deeper meaning. Because I understood the role these oral traditions and histories had played in shaping my own identity, I started to wonder how my students felt when I presented a narrative description of history that excluded the voices of their families, communities, and life ways.

As the grandchild of Montana homesteaders and oil and natural gas developers, I was an unlikely candidate to defend Montana Indian rights to sovereignty and self-determination. As a direct beneficiary of the colonization of Indian land, economics, education, cultures, languages, knowledge, and natural resources, I knew that I could not claim to understand what it was like to be an Indian in Montana. I had considered the consequences of colonization for Montana Indians when I started my research, but I had failed to consider how colonization had impacted the hearts, minds, bodies, and lives of both Indians and non-Indians in Montana. As this project progressed, I realized that I had to position myself, my family, and my life within this historical context in order to analyze and explain my research data with any degree of clarity or depth.

The Research Problem and Purpose

I first heard about IEFA while I was completing my graduate work in history. I was fascinated by IEFA because it appeared to address several of the key issues in education that were already of interest to me as an educator and a scholar. Although I possessed little understanding of the generation of Montana Indians who had worked tirelessly over the last thirty years to make the IEFA reforms a reality, I believed that the impetus behind the reforms aligned with my vocational calling, scholarship, and vision as a teacher educator. When I designed this study, I failed to predict how this research would transform me both professionally and personally.

Despite my limited knowledge of IEFA at the outset of the study, I understood that all Montanans would benefit from a school system that provided equality of educational opportunity to every person and recognized the rich and distinct cultural heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations. Although Montana had made a constitutional commitment to recognize and preserve the cultural heritages of Montana Indians in 1972, a comprehensive implementation of the landmark reforms mandated in Article X, Section 1 (2) had remained elusive for over thirty years. When IEFA was passed in 1999, the Montana legislature had made its first significant fiscal commitment to the implementation of these systemic transformative changes in schools.

After making the decision to study the implementation of IEFA, my early research efforts revealed that by 2006 the state of Montana had allocated approximately $13 million in funding to the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and approximately $2 million in funding to the Montana tribal colleges across the state to assist them in the

publication of written versions of every Montana Tribal Nation history designed for distribution in state K-12 schools (Schweitzer, 2006). This unprecedented fiscal support for IEFA enabled an unparalleled outpouring of time, energy, and effort towards the development and the implementation of the IEFA curricula by the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI).

As part of my effort to gain a greater understanding of IEFA, I spent the first year of this project exploring historical and archival documents that recorded the evolution of the IEFA curricula. This research revealed a long and hard fought campaign waged by several Indian and non-Indian activists over the past thirty years. While conducting this historical research, I participated in professional development opportunities designed to support the current implementation. The time I invested at the IEFA professional development events helped me to understand the significance of this particular moment in time for many, many Montanans. The excitement among the Indian and non-Indian leaders, educators, and students attending the IEFA professional development events was palpable; everyone seemed to recognize that they were not just witnesses but participants in a historical moment that had the power to transform the lives of all Montanans.   After reading and familiarizing myself with the IEFA curricula, I started to understand the significance and scope of the state efforts to integrate the heritages and histories of the Montana Tribal Nations into school curricula.

After researching the evolution of IEFA, I discovered that despite a series of legal mandates that worked towards the integration of Montana Tribal Nations' heritages into school curricula throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, a comprehensive implementation of

the 1972 Montana Constitutional reforms had still remained elusive. IEFA was the latest

in a series of reforms designed to transform schools through the implementation of

curricula generated by the Montana Tribal Nations. Since the Montana legislature passed

IEFA in 1999, OPI has invested a great deal of time, energy, and effort in the

development and the implementation of the curricula. The Office of Public Instruction

had gathered an extensive amount of data documenting its district level IEFA curricula

implementation efforts, but the implementation needed to be strengthened by additional

school level data from the perspectives of classroom teachers, paraprofessionals,

students, and parents. In addition to the need for more qualitative data, the

implementation of IEFA could also be strengthened by an analysis of the sources of

resistance to past implementation efforts. The purpose of this study was to enrich the

current body of research literature informing the implementation of IEFA through the

integration of more localized, school and classroom level ethnographic data. This study

was also designed to inform the literature regarding the sources of resistance to past

implementation efforts.

<div align="center">The Research Questions</div>

After determining the problem and the purpose for this study, I considered the

specific questions that I wanted to explore. After discussing a variety of research

questions with Indian and non-Indian educators involved in the implementation of IEFA,

I narrowed down the scope of my study to four major research questions:

1) What were educators' perceptions of the purposes of Indian Education for

All?

2) What were educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the

implementation of Indian Education for All?

3) What were educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for

future implementations of IEFA? And,

4) What were educators' perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural

identity in shaping the implementation of Indian Education for All?

The Conceptual Framework

After narrowing the scope of my research questions and surveying the educational

literature to determine which conceptual framework best informed my research, I decided

to utilize tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) as the conceptual framework for this study.

TribCrit researchers adapted critical theory and critical race theory to design a research

framework that recognized the unique historical, legal, political, social, and racial status

of Indigenous peoples. TribCrit educational researchers centralized the analysis of

racism and colonialism in their explorations of the educational experiences and learning

outcomes of Indigenous students. TribCrit educational researchers have contextualized

their research within an analysis of the ongoing legacies of colonialism and racism in the

lives of Indigenous students and families, including: the endemic nature of colonial

representations of Indigenous peoples, the endemic nature and ongoing consequences of

systemic racism for Indigenous peoples, the perpetuation of cognitive imperialism in

school curricula and teaching, the exclusion of Indigenous epistemologies as legitimate

forms of knowledge in schools and universities, the continued violation of tribal

sovereignty and self-determination, and the exclusion of Indigenous pedagogies and life ways from schools and universities.

TribCrit was a valuable explanatory tool that helped me to interpret educators' perceptions of IEFA, their perceptions of the greatest obstacles to and most beneficial future sources of support for the implementation of IEFA, and their perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural identity in shaping the implementation of IEFA. TribCrit made it possible for me to contextualize the educators' perceptions of IEFA within the context of my participants' lives and the historical legacies of colonialism and racism.

<u>The Research Context</u>

I chose to conduct this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study in a middle school within a mid-sized Montana community. The U.S. Census Bureau (2010) indicated that Montana has a population of approximately 989,415 people dispersed over a geographic area of approximately 2,000 square miles. When asked to identify their racial or ethnic backgrounds, Montanans identified themselves as White 89.4%, American Indian or Alaska Native 6.3%, Hispanic or Latino 2.9%, and Two or More Races 2.5%, Asian .6%, and Black .4%,. The 2010 U.S. Census also indicated that Montanans had a median income of $42,222 and an estimated per capita income of $22,881. This middle school and the community that surrounded it were the ideal context for this study because their demographics would likely characterize most of the other communities where IEFA would be implemented throughout the state.

The U.S. Census Bureau (2010) identified the largest minority group in Montana as American Indian and Alaskan Native. Despite its low population density, Montana has a large representation of American Indians and Alaskan Natives living on and off the seven reservations throughout the state. The Montana Indian Student Achievement Report (2010) indicated that there were 16,274 American Indian and Alaskan Native students enrolled in Montana K-12 public schools. The most widely represented tribal nations within Montana schools were "Salish-Pend d'Oreille, Kootenai, Blackfeet, Chippewa, Cree, Little Shell Band of Chippewa, Gros Ventre, Assiniboine, Sioux, Northern Cheyenne, and Crow" (p. 2). This data report indicated that 11.8% of the students within Montana schools were American Indians.

This TribCrit ethnographic study was conducted within a middle school in a mid-sized Montana community. The U.S. Census Bureau (2010) indicated that the community had a population of approximately 89,513 people. Members of the community identified themselves as White 95.1%, Hispanic or Latino 2.8%, Two or More Races 1.9%, Asian 1.1%, American Indian or Alaska Native .9%, Black .3%, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander .1%. There were large variations in the income levels reported within this community, the median income was $47,065 and the per capita income was $25,921. The community surrounding the middle school was described as predominately white with wide disparities of both income and wealth.

This particular middle school was an ideal context to explore the research questions in this TribCrit ethnographic study because the school had a reputation for innovation and leadership in curricula and instructional reform and maintained a fairly

steady enrollment of approximately six hundred students in grades six, seven, and eight. The students within the school community were identified as White 91.9%, Latino 2.2%, Native American 1.5%, Black .5%, and Asian .5%. The school employed approximately thirty-eight full time certified educators and fifteen additional part time educators and paraprofessionals. Although the majority of the educators identified themselves as white, the school did employ educators that indicated they were racial minorities. Some of the educators within the school had served in leadership roles in the design and implementation of IEFA in the past. In addition to their past efforts to implement the IEFA curricula, the educators in the middle school had implemented accelerated academic programs, and a Response to Intervention (RTI) program for struggling students.

This middle school was located within a district that the Indian Student Data Report (2010) indicated had an academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students on the Montana criterion referenced test (CRT). The report indicated that Indian students in the district had scored a 61% in reading, a 55% in mathematics, and a 49% in science, while White students had reportedly scored an 87% in reading, a 71% in mathematics, and a 63% in science. Middle school Indian and non-Indian students across all of Montana had a similar achievement gap on the CRT. Sixth grade Indian students in Montana scored a 64% in reading and a 41% in mathematics, while sixth grade White students in Montana scored an 84% in reading and a 71% in mathematics. Seventh grade Indian students in Montana scored a 62% in reading and a 39% in mathematics, while White students scored an 87% in reading and a 71% in mathematics.

Eighth grade Indian students in Montana scored a 60% in reading, a 37% in mathematics, and a 31% in science, while White students scored an 87% in reading, a 70% in mathematics, and a 60% in science.

According to the 2010 CRT results, a significant achievement gap has continued to exist between Indian and non-Indian middle school students across Montana. This middle school was an ideal place to explore the efforts to close the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students through the implementation of IEFA. This middle school community had a reputation for innovation and excellence, and had educators that had served as leaders in the early design and implementation of IEFA. The school community expressed openness to the implementation of IEFA, yet the educators continued to struggle to build relationships and connections with their Indian students. The school had several accelerated academic programs, yet the educators continued to struggle to raise the achievement gap of their Indian students. The complexity of these issues made this particular middle school an ideal research site for this study.

<center>Summary</center>

In chapter one I explained the problem, purpose, and the questions that I explored in this TribCrit ethnographic study. After briefly explaining the conceptual framework for this TribCrit ethnographic study, I explained why I chose this particular school community as the context for this research. Since the state of Montana has invested a considerable amount of time, energy, money, and effort in the development and the implementation of the IEFA curricula, I designed this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit)

ethnographic study to augment the current research literature informing the current

implementation efforts. This TribCrit ethnographic study engaged in a highly localized,

school and classroom level analysis of the implementation of IEFA that explored the

perceptions of IEFA from the perspective of educators, students, and the families they

serve. The purpose of this study was to enrich the current body of research literature

informing the implementation of IEFA through the integration of school level and

classroom level ethnographic data contextualized within an analysis of the historical

evolution of IEFA.

In chapter two I introduce the current educational research and literature in tribal

critical race theory (TribCrit), charting its evolution from critical theory, critical race

theory, and then eventually into tribal critical race theory. I outline the evolution of

TribCrit as a valuable, critical, analytical lens for exploring the role of race, colonialism,

and other intersecting forms of systemic oppression in shaping the educational

experiences of Indigenous students.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In chapter one I outlined the evolution of this project through a brief description of the problem and the purpose of this TribCrit ethnographic study. This study was designed to address the lack of school and classroom level data and the lack of socio-historical context informing the current implementation of IEFA. This TribCrit ethnographic study was designed to explore educators' perceptions of IEFA, their perceptions of the greatest obstacles to and the best sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA, and their perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural identity in shaping the implementation of IEFA. In chapter one, I explained why tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) was a valuable conceptual framework that helped me to contextualize this study within a systemic analysis of the role of racism and colonialism in shaping Indian students' educational experiences. I concluded the previous chapter with a description of the context of this study and why this middle school community was an ideal place to conduct this TribCrit ethnographic study exploring educators' perceptions of IEFA.

In the first section of chapter two, I explore the evolution of tribal critical race theory (TribCrit). I begin this section with a description of the evolution of critical theory as the theoretical foundation for TribCrit scholarship. The critical theoretical tradition first emerges within the Frankfurt School in Germany throughout the 1920s and the

1930s as a theory of social critique designed to explore the inequitable consequences of

Enlightenment rationality and positivism. In this chapter, I explore the evolution of

critical theory and the analysis of the role of cultural and ideological hegemony in

perpetuating systemic inequality and prejudice.   I conclude the first section of this

chapter with a description of how critical theorists analyze the perpetuation of prejudice

and racial inequality in the United States.

In the second section of chapter two, I describe how critical race theory (CRT)

developed through the integration of critical and racial theories in the United States.

Critical race theory evolved as an area of academic specialization in response to the

under-theorization of race within academic research. Bell (1980) suggested that race and

racism were so deeply rooted within American society and its educational institutions that

racial analysis had to be centralized in educational research. This section of chapter two

includes an explanation of the CRT analysis of the endemic nature of racism,

convergence theory, colorblindness, the educational meritocracy, and the neutrality of

knowledge production. This section concludes with an explanation of the role of oral

traditions and story-telling in the production of CRT counter-hegemonic scholarship

within the academy.

In the third section of chapter two, I focus on the most recent adaptation of critical

race theory, called tribal critical race theory (TribCrit). In this section, I explain how

TribCrit researchers have adapted critical race theory to their analysis of the unique legal,

political and racial issues confronted by Indigenous peoples (Brayboy, 2005). TribCrit

researchers have worked to disrupt models of education that perpetuate the colonization

of Indigenous peoples. This section includes an explanation of the TribCrit integrated

analyses of colonialism, systemic racism, Indigenous epistemologies, Indigenous

pedagogies, and tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and tribally controlled forms of

education. The third section includes an explanation of the importance of integrating

Indigenous oral traditions, histories, stories, and forms of knowledge into schools,

universities, and academic research. I conclude with an explanation of the value of the

systemic decolonization of education for both Indian and non-Indian peoples.

   The fourth section of chapter two includes an analysis of the historical evolution

of IEFA in Montana. Exploring the constitutional and statutory evolution of the IEFA

legislation, I identify the major obstacles and sources of resistance to previous curricula

reform efforts. After analyzing the obstacles to previous implementation efforts, I utilize

this analysis to place my research within a larger socio-historical context.

<u>Critical Theory</u>

   Tribal critical race theory evolved from scholarship generated within the critical

theoretical tradition. Critical theory emerged in scholarship produced by the Frankfurt

School of Sociology throughout the late 1920s in Germany (Giroux, 2009). Critical

theory scholars engaged in an intellectual critique of the positivist philosophies that

characterized most of the academic research produced by the European academy at the

time. Rejecting the positivist claim that academic researchers constructed knowledge

from positions of ideological neutrality and objectivity, critical theorists insisted that

knowledge was constructed from within particular socio-cultural and historical contexts

that influenced and shaped its formation (p. 33).   According to critical theorists,

positivist academic researchers had failed to contextualize their work within particular

historical and cultural periods and had neglected to exercise the spirit of self- critique at

the heart of true scholarship.

Enlightenment Rationality

Under the leadership of Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse and

Theodor Adorno, the Frankfurt School-Institute of Social Research, produced scholarship

that challenged an unquestioned faith in human reason that characterized much of the

positivist scholarship produced within the Enlightenment tradition (Giroux, 2009). Many

scholars had suggested that the perfection of human reason and rationality would

eventually lead to the liberation and emancipation of humanity. Adorno and Horkheimer

(1974) suggested that the intellectual achievements of the Enlightenment could just as

easily be used as a new form of oppression as a tool of emancipation. They expressed the

paradox of Enlightenment thought when they stated, "In the most general sense of

progressive thought, the Enlightenment has always aimed at liberating men from fear and

establishing their sovereignty. Yet the fully enlightened earth radiates disaster

triumphant" (p. 29).   Rejecting the positivist assumption that humanity could place its

blind faith in human rationality, critical theorists warned that an unbridled trust in human

reason could have perilous and devastating consequences.

One of the most influential intellectual theories derived from the Enlightenment

rationality was positivism. August Comte (1865) introduced a positivist epistemology

that suggested knowledge could only be inferred from an accumulation of observable or

documentable facts, from documented sensory experiences, and from a system of standardized methods of verification.   Critical theorist, Horkheimer (1972) rejected positivist epistemology, suggesting that true reason or rationality could only flourish in an environment of free and critical thinking. Critical theoretical scholars questioned the positivist researchers' claims to have achieved objectivity and ideological neutrality in their academic inquiry.   Critical theorists believed that positivist epistemologies had stripped both knowledge and science of their critical possibilities (Horkheimer, 1972). Positivist epistemology rewarded scholarship that emphasized the accumulation and collection of facts rather than scholarship that questioned: "the genesis, development, and normative nature of ideas" (Giroux, 2009, p. 32). By emphasizing the accumulation of factual information at the cost of the consideration of qualitative and normative questions, positivist researchers had neglected to explore the more sophisticated "interactions of power, knowledge, and values, reflected in the genesis and the nature of ideological presuppositions" (p. 33).

Critical theorists suggested that scholars using positivism and Enlightenment rationality led many people to conclude that human civilization had a clear hierarchy of epistemologies. Positivist scholars claimed to possess the only legitimate epistemologies, "[Since there] was only one true reality that could be broken down into overriding laws. [Positivist scholars were required to] experiment, to dissect, and to manipulate the smallest controllable bits of nature to establish a cause and effect relationship in an attempt to discover truth, [always with] the ultimate goal of predicting and controlling reality (Wilson, 2008, p. 36). Thus, claiming to have arrived at the pinnacle of the

progressive evolution of human rationality, scholars established their own "regimes of truth and the general politics of truth to support it" (McLaren, 2009, p. 72).

Cultural/Ideological Hegemony

Critical theorists utilized the work of Antonio Gramsci to describe the mechanisms of cultural domination used to manipulate and control the flow of knowledge and ideas within society. Gramsci (1971) defined hegemony as a system of values, beliefs, attitudes, ideas, or morals that so permeate society that they become common sense. Establishing the central organizing principles or general meanings that govern daily life, these hegemonic ideologies regulate daily social interactions and social structures without the use of physical force. Once accepted, these ideologies act as an "organized assemblage of meanings and practices that serve as the central, effective, and dominant system of meanings, values, and actions in the lives of people" (Apple, 2004, p. 4).

Educational researchers applied critical theory to their exploration of the role of schools in perpetuating ideological hegemony. McLaren (2009) suggested that schools act as "agencies of transmission of an effective dominant culture that has become the accepted or assumed tradition for everyone" (p. 5). School curricula and pedagogies perpetuate hegemonic ideologies without the use of physical force because they maintain dominance "primarily through consensual social practices, social forms, and social structures produced in specific sites such as the church, the state, the school, the mass media, the political system, and the family" (p. 67). The success of these common sense discourses has led generations of teachers and students to embrace values, beliefs, and

ideas that inadvertently disadvantage large numbers of students in schools. These common sense educational discourses have actually "disguised the relations of power and privilege" at work in schools (p. 68).

Critical Race Theory

Critical theorists generated scholarship that equipped a new generation of leftist scholars throughout the 1920s and the 1930s for their fight against anti-Semitism (Outlaw, 1990). Although the early focus of critical theoretical scholarship was the elimination of prejudice and systemic oppression through Marxist analysis, this focus changed after the rise of German fascism. "With the rise of Hitler and Nazi Germany, the Frankfurt Institute was moved to New York City in 1935 and California in 1941" (Outlaw, 1990, p. 70). After the Frankfurt Institute moved to the United States, critical theoretical scholars centralized the analysis of race not class in their academic research. Although critical theorists utilized Marxist theory in their analysis of prejudice and oppression, they centralized the analysis of race in their studies of the matrices of systemic oppression. Critical theorists produced scholarship throughout the 1930s and 1940s that provided the intellectual foundation for subsequent critical race theory (CRT) scholarship.

Race and Racism are Endemic

Critical race theory (CRT) research developed throughout the 1980s and 1990s within the critical legal studies community in the United States. CRT scholars adapted the critical theoretical tradition to fit their analyses of the mixed legacies of the Civil

Rights Era reforms in the United States. CRT emerged as an area of specialization within academic research in response to the under-theorization of race throughout the academy. One of the original CRT theorists, Bell (1980) suggested that race and racism were so deeply rooted within society and its institutions that racial analysis had to be centralized within any academic research. CRT researchers asserted that race existed as an endemic aspect of society and life (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

CRT scholars centralized race within an interdisciplinary analysis of other forms of subordination including class and gender (Crenshaw, 1993). Integrating research generated from within ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, the humanities, and law, critical race theory researchers worked to eliminate racism, sexism, and poverty (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Working to undermine the multiple layers of oppression and discrimination operating within society, CRT researchers committed themselves to the development of "liberatory and transformative solutions to racial, gender, and class subordination" (p. 23). CRT scholarship was designed to "disrupt, expose, challenge, and change racist policies that have worked to subordinate and disenfranchise certain groups of people" (Milner, 2008, p. 333).

CRT was first adapted to fit the needs of educational researchers in the mid-1990s. Gloria Ladson-Billings (1998) adapted critical legal scholarship to fit the unique demands of her educational research studies exploring the experiences of African-American students in schools. Ladson-Billings and Grant (2006) conducted multiple educational research studies and discovered that most of the schools failed to provide equality of educational opportunity for all students despite the transformative intentions

of desegregation law and educational reforms. In subsequent CRT studies, Dixson and

Rousseau (2006) challenged the validity of claims that educational meritocracy and

equality of educational opportunity have ever existed in schools.

Jewett (2006) concluded that despite claims to the contrary, race has continued to

impact administrators, teachers, students, and families in schools. Despite the popularity

of educational discourses that claim that equality of educational opportunity exists within

schools, "Race has been and continues to be a significant factor in explaining educational

inequity" (Ladson-Billings &Tate, 2006, p. 15). CRT researchers have worked from

within all the major legal and educational institutions to expose the mechanisms for

perpetuating systemic inequality in schools.

Colorblindness, Meritocracy, and Ideological Neutrality

CRT researchers reject the claim that educational institutions and educational

researchers operate from positions of ideological neutrality or objectivity. According to

Solórzano and Yosso (2002), the myths of the ideological neutrality of education and the

educational meritocracy have "camouflaged the self-interest, power, and privilege of the

dominant groups in American society [and in schools]" (p. 25). Despite the claims of

neutrality and equality of educational opportunity, race has continued to play a central

role in shaping students' learning outcomes and life experiences, "Despite legal

guarantees of formal equality and access, race has continued to be a fundamental

organizing principle of individual identity and collective action. I would argue that, far

from declining in significance, the racial dimensions of politics and culture have

proliferated. The central principles of these ideas have worked to evade notions of race, racial justice, and democracy altogether" (Giroux, 2008, p. 192).

Omi and Winant (2005) suggested that race has continued to shape the educational experiences and learning outcomes of students, stating "Colorblindness theory has failed to recognize that at the level of experience, of everyday life, race [has continued to be] a relatively impermeable part of our identities" (p. 4). According to the theories of colorblindness, individual merit and hard work have led to achievement regardless of students' race or ethnicity. Colorblindness theories have distanced educators from any personal or corporate responsibility for social injustice, systemic inequality, and the inequality of educational opportunity in schools. According to Giroux (2008), colorblindness theory has distanced educators from consequences of systemic racism operating within schools, "Racism [has been] reduced to an utterly privatized discourse in an effort to erase any trace of racial injustice by making it possible to deny the very notion of the social operations of power through which racial politics are organized and legitimated" (p. 192).

Whiteness

CRT researchers define whiteness and white privilege as distinct categories of racial designation that have worked to sustain the inequitable distribution of political, social, and economic resources within society. CRT researchers suggest that the assimilation of multiple ethnic groups into a socially constructed homogenous, singular, and white identity in the late 19th century made it possible for the inequitable nature of whiteness to operate while simultaneously creating the appearance of equality. Once

normalized and naturalized throughout society, whiteness went unquestioned, "The

process of the construction of the white race has naturalized itself almost immediately

[within the context of each human interaction and relationship]" (Butler, 1990, p. 273).

CRT researchers have documented the economic advantages of whiteness and

how these advantages have translated into greater educational opportunities. Historically,

white and upper middle-class men and women have had the greatest opportunities to

purchase and sustain land holdings. Because home ownership, landholdings, property

taxes, and school funding have been so intimately connected throughout United States

history, "Those with better property have been entitled to and had access to better

schools" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006, p. 17). American students have attended

schools that reflect the relative affluence of their representative communities,

> The quality and quantity of the curriculum varies in accordance with the
> property values of the school. The availability of 'rich' or enriched
> intellectual property delimits what is now called the 'opportunity to learn'
> — the presumption that along with providing educational standards which
> detail what students should know and be able to do, they must have the
> material resources that support their learning. Thus, intellectual property
> must be under girded by real property: science labs, computers, and other
> state of the art technologies, and appropriately certified and prepared
> teachers (p. 18).

Educational researchers have documented a direct correlation between race,

economic advantages, and academic achievement. Kozol (1991) found that, "Schools

that served poor students of color were unlikely to have access to resources and

consequently their students would have a much reduced opportunity to learn despite the

attempt to mandate educational standards" (p. 29). Despite educational discourses that

have claimed schools provide equality of educational opportunity to all students

regardless of their race, "Students of color are more segregated than ever before" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006, p. 19). A bitter irony of the history of legal school reforms has been that, "Instead of providing more and better educational opportunities, school desegregation [and the language of liberal legal reform] has meant increased white flight, along with a loss of African American teaching and administrative positions" (p. 19).

Oral Traditions, Storytelling, and Alternative Epistemologies

CRT researchers have integrated the oral traditions, stories, and diverse epistemologies from communities of color into their academic research. Integrating the stories, histories, biographies, and narratives drawn from the lived experiences of people of color into their academic research, CRT researchers have engaged in a form of counter-storytelling designed to integrate the experiences of previously marginalized people into academic circles at all levels (Brayboy, 2005). CRT researchers have embraced storytelling as a form of resistance and the key to the cultural preservation of the rich and lasting traditions of many minority communities, including African Americans, Chicanas, Chicanos, and American Indians. Delgado (1989) claimed that storytelling has served as an important method of resistance to the hegemonic epistemologies perpetuated in mainstream educational institutions, "Oppressed groups have known instinctively that stories were an essential tool to their own survival and liberation" (p. 243). CRT researchers have integrated these alternative epistemologies into the academy in an attempt to disrupt and resist ideological hegemony.

Interest Convergence

Critical race theory research integrates the analysis of liberal legal reforms with an exploration of the life experiences of minority populations. Rejecting the assumption that the Civil Rights Act eliminated systemic racism and its consequences in the United States, CRT researchers argued that interest convergence, not the quest for social or racial equality, was the primary catalyst for the social reforms achieved throughout the Civil Rights Era. Lopez (2003) maintained that interest convergence meant that, "Whites had tolerated and advanced the interests of people of color only when they had converged with the promotion of the self- interest of whites" (p. 84). Bell (1980) agreed that, "The interests of blacks [and other people of color] in achieving racial equality had been accommodated only when these interests had converged with the self-interests of whites" (p. 523).

CRT researchers documented a correlation between the self-interest of majority populations and the implementation of new liberal legal reforms for the benefit of racial minorities. In their CRT research, Castagno and Lee (2007) exposed the fatal weaknesses in federal policies that were sustained only as long as they benefited the racial majority, "Interest convergence has exposed the selfishness behind many policies and practices that may [have been used to] advance greater equity" (p. 10). When interest convergence ceased to exist, many of the major liberal legal reforms were reversed almost immediately.

Tribal Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory has been adapted to address the unique legal, political, and racial issues confronted by Indigenous populations (Brayboy, 2005). Tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) researchers have contextualized their educational studies within an exploration of the role of colonialism and imperial ideology in shaping each aspect of Indigenous peoples' lives, including: Indigenous families, Indigenous lands, Indigenous epistemologies, Indigenous education, Indigenous languages, Indigenous identities, and Tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Colonialism is Endemic

TribCrit researchers have centralized the analysis of colonialism in their study of the educational experiences of Indigenous students. TribCrit researchers analyze the role of colonialism in shaping the identities and educational experiences of Indigenous students. TribCrit scholars have documented the ongoing legacies of colonialism through the violation of Indigenous treaty rights, the seizure of Indigenous lands, the assimilation of Indigenous children, and the cultural genocide of Indigenous peoples through the destruction of their knowledge systems, religious beliefs and practices, and Indigenous language systems (Williams, 1989).

Tribal critical race theorists contextualize their research within a study of ongoing legacies of colonialism and imperialism. Colonialism was originally defined as a series of historical events connected to European "exploration, discovery, conquest, exploitation, distribution and appropriation" of land and goods to secure and control global markets,

investments, and trade (Smith, 1999, p. 21). Said (1978) suggested, "Imperialism meant the practice, the theory, and the attitude of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory, [while] colonialism, which [was] always a consequence of imperialism, [was] the implanting of settlements on a distant territory" (p. 8). Colonialism was originally grounded in the Enlightenment ideals of nationalism, rationalism, capitalism, modernity, and civilization science, and economic expansion (Smith, 1999). Although colonialism was initially narrowly conceptualized as solely a European economic enterprise, colonialism eventually evolved into a complex system of cultural, economic, and intellectual justifications for the global colonization of Indigenous peoples.

Although the methods of building and managing colonial landholdings changed over time, certain characteristics of the colonial and imperial administrations remained relatively consistent. Bush (2006) defined colonialism as: "An empire, imperium, reich, or commonwealth, that has expanded nation states outside of their territory through a widening of geographic space, either by land or by sea, that has been designed to extend power and influence"(p. 1). Said (1993) suggested that colonialism has impacted the daily experiences of diverse groups of peoples throughout the world, "Everyone who is alive today has been touched by the empires of the past" (p. 7). Since colonialism has shaped the life experiences of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples for several generations, TribCrit researchers have centralized the analysis of colonialism in their exploration of the educational experiences of Indigenous students.

The theories of social evolution and human development used to justify colonialism have had a devastating impact on the lives of Indigenous peoples. Max

Weber, the father of social science, constructed a theory of social evolution that offered

an explanation for the evolution of superior rationalities and social hierarchies within

human populations. Weber (1946) suggested that human civilizations had progressed

through successive stages of evolution towards higher levels and forms of rationality

since late antiquity. At each progressive stage of this intellectual evolution, more

advanced civilizations had "invented new and superior forms of government, law,

economics, society, culture, and civilization" (Blaut, 1993, p. 103). Civilizations

possessing more advanced forms of human rationality had developed superior economic,

political, social, cultural, and technological forms: capitalism, advanced technologies,

democracy, and globalization (Blaut, 1993). Since Indigenous civilizations were less

advanced and less capable of rationality, the colonization of their lands, communities,

and cultures was considered a natural step towards their social evolution. TribCrit

researchers analyze the lasting legacies of these theories of social evolution in the lives

and educational experiences of Indigenous students.

Race and Racism are Endemic

In an effort to disrupt the lasting legacies of colonialism, TribCrit researchers

have centralized the analysis of race and systemic racism in their academic research.

Throughout the history of colonialism, race has served as a powerful ideological

justification for the colonization of Indigenous peoples and their lands. According to

Bush (2006), colonial nations and imperial ideologies defined race as "an irreconcilable

difference or otherness of subordinated peoples that evolved into a continuous feature of

empires and essential to the maintenance of their superior identities and power" (p. 27).

Once global Indigenous populations were defined and racialized as a sub-human other, the combination of racial ideology and imperial power justified the global expansion of colonial power and privilege. According to Memmi (1965), "Racism was not an incidental detail of colonialism and the practical workings of imperialism it was a consubstantial part—the highest expression of the colonial system and the basis of the fundamental discrimination between the colonizer and the colonized" (p. 140).

Within the colonial context, racial categories were used to position human beings as members of particular inferior or superior racial groups. Indigenous peoples were classified as sub-humans, incapable of higher order rational thought. This sub-human racial status made colonization appear like an economic inevitability for Indigenous peoples, "Indigenous peoples were considered not fully human or not human at all, enabling the justification of various policies of either [cultural] extermination or domestication of Indigenous peoples" (Smith, 1999, p. 26). Categorizing Indigenous peoples as sub-humans based upon their racial membership, "Imperial practices produced the colonized subjects as symbolically, philosophically, and materially inferior human beings—other and lesser—relative to Western Europeans" (Dei, 2010, p. 15). Once Indigenous peoples were considered inferior human beings, the colonization and exploitation of Indigenous lands and resources appeared rational, logical, and inevitable.

Since the fifteenth century, European travelers had included descriptions of their exotic adventures and encounters with primitive and savage Indigenous peoples in their travelogues (Bernasconi, 2001). Said (1978) suggested that the earliest travelogues included vivid narrative descriptions of European adventures and journeys into dark,

dangerous Indigenous lands that portrayed the imperial mission as a powerful redemptive force for humanity. According to Banton and Harwood (1975), "The first recorded use of the word race was in a poem by William Dunbar in 1508. In the next three centuries the word was used with growing frequency in a literary sense as denoting a class of persons [throughout the travel writings]" (p. 13). These early travelogues constructed racialized images and representations of Indigenous peoples that were used to justify the colonization of Indigenous lands, "Indigenous inhabitants were increasingly racialized as an inferior 'other'. Imperialism had created the racialized 'others' of Africa, Asia, Australia, and America" (Bush, 2008, p. 28).

By the seventeenth century, scholars had constructed an organized typology of racial groups. Bernasconi (2001) described sections of essays written by Francois Bernier in 1684 that included four or five different types of human bodies, "He did not give them all names, but they corresponded roughly to Europeans, Africans, Orientals, and Laplanders, while allowing for the possibility of two additional types, the Native American and the Hottentots" (p. 12). Bernier constructed a typology of different human bodies and used the word race to distinguish between them. Bernier appeared to be among the first to attempt to construct a typology of the human beings through the use of race.

In the eighteenth century, natural history had become so popular in European universities that scholars applied their theories of plant and animal organization to the study of human species (Bernasconi, 2001). German Philosopher, Immanuel Kant, used European travelogues and natural history methodologies to construct his racial

classification system. Using skin color and hair texture as his primary indicators of difference, "Kant distinguished four fundamental races: Whites, Blacks, Hindustanic, and Kalmuck" (p. 23). Applying metaphors from the natural sciences to the study of humans, Kant suggested that nature had granted each human being seeds of difference that when exposed to different air and sun developed into distinct human races. Kant developed one of the first classification systems for racial difference in Western scholarship.

Racial theories placed Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples into racial groups and constructed corresponding social hierarchies that justified colonialism. Linnaeus constructed a theory of racial difference that placed human beings in four geographical racial groups. Utilizing travel literature, "Linnaeus categorized human beings into four distinct subspecies: *Americanus*, *Asiaticus*, *Africanus*, and *Europaeus*" (Darder & Torres, 2009, p. 154). Linnaeus placed Europeans at the top of the racial hierarchy and placed the Indigenous peoples of the Americas at the bottom or base of human racial groups. Linnaeus believed that each human subspecies demonstrated a specific set of physical and behavioral characteristics consistent with their stage of development; "[These] physical features and behavioral characteristics [were] hierarchically arranged in accordance with the prevailing social values and the political and economic interests of the times" (p. 154). Racial theories represented Indigenous peoples as an 'uncivilized' and 'animal like' other, incapable of self-determination and intellectual thought. These representations of Indigenous peoples were then used to justify the global expansion of colonialism.

When Charles Darwin published the *Origin of the Species* in 1859, researchers worked to construct scientific theories about race. Darwin suggested that *Homo sapiens* progressed through several stages of evolution from primitive to more advanced life forms. Darwin's theory of heredity and natural selection suggested that only the fittest within the human species survived, thus human beings in the advanced stages of evolution naturally possessed superior genetics, intelligence, and physicality. Social Darwinian Theory emerged when the Darwinian theory of natural selection was integrated with Mendel's theories of genetic racial grouping (Outlaw, 1990). Social Darwinian Theory provided scientific criterion for demonstrating that racial hierarchies were the natural and the logical consequence of human evolution (Omi & Winant, 1994). Indigenous peoples were categorized as a less evolved, less civilized, and less advanced racial group. The colonization of Indigenous peoples was logical, rational, and inevitable, because non-Indigenous racial groups were naturally smarter, stronger, and more powerful.

Given the widespread and lasting impact of these racial theories, tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) researchers have centralized colonialism, race, and racism in their analysis of the educational experiences of Indigenous students. Smith (1999) suggested that once Indigenous peoples were categorized as members of a sub-human and savage race, schools designed curricula and instructional strategies based on the assumption that Indigenous students were less intelligent, rational, and capable than their non-Indigenous counterparts. Nsabimana (2000) suggested that, "The colonial educational systems colonized Indigenous peoples' imaginations. The educational system set up by the

colonists was violent and psychologically destructive on multiple levels. First, it denigrated Indigenous knowledge and culture and turned the gaze of the natives toward Europeans as bearers of humanity, beauty, civilization, and intelligence" (p. 49). Influenced by colonialism and popular racial theories, schools designed curricula and instructional strategies that alienated Indian children from their native families, communities, languages, customs, religions, dress, knowledge systems, and life ways.

TribCrit researchers have centralized the analysis of colonialism, race, and racism in their academic research in an effort to disrupt the devastating consequences of colonialism and racism for Indigenous students. Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) documented the historical role of educational policies and practices in the aggressive and unapologetic colonization of the minds and hearts of Indigenous peoples in schools. Their research revealed that by working towards the elimination and deconstruction of Indigenous tribal languages, economic, political, social, legal, and aesthetic institutions, educational systems have threated Indigenous cultural identities and existence. Within the colonial context, educational curricula and instructional strategies have either completely excluded Indigenous knowledge or included only racialized and stereotypical portrayals of Indigenous peoples. TribCrit researchers have worked to explore how these racialized misrepresentations of Indigenous peoples have impacted the educational experiences of Indigenous students.

Although it may seem that colonialism and racialized representations of Indigenous peoples has become a part of the distant past, educational researchers have documented a very different story. Chavers (2009) conducted a survey of educational

studies throughout the United States and he identified four major ways that Indigenous

students have continued to experience racism and racial discrimination within schools:

"1) placement in bonehead or lower track classes, 2) failure of the school to connect to

the home or home culture, 3) the lecture method of teaching, and 4) low teacher

expectations" (p. 125). Dei (1997) documented the disproportionate numbers of

Indigenous students that have been placed in lower academic streams or special education

courses in his academic studies. Since educators had lower expectations for Indigenous

student academic preparation and aptitude, they consistently placed Indigenous students

in less demanding academic courses regardless of their previous grades or test scores.

Educators expected less from Indigenous students, so the students started to lose

confidence in their own academic aptitude and ability, "The outcomes of this process of

streaming or tracking has been a loss of self-esteem, diminished hopes and a

disengagement from school entirely" (p. 119).

Indigenous Epistemologies

TribCrit researchers have integrated Indian epistemologies into their scholarship

in an effort to disrupt ideological hegemony in schools and universities. Within the

colonial context, Indigenous epistemologies and Indigenous relationships with the earth

and all living things were dismissed as pre-modern forms of human organization.

Indigenous ways of knowing and understanding were devalued and removed from

schools and universities. Indigenous epistemologies were dismissed as unscientific myths

and legends and removed from school and university curricula and teaching. Indigenous

students were encouraged to leave their ancestral homelands, disregard their oral

traditions and tribal histories, separate from their tribal ancestors, and individuate themselves from their tribal communities in order to be successful in mainstream society (Smith, 1999).

Battiste (1998) suggested that schools and universities engaged in forms of cognitive imperialism by "discrediting [and devaluing] other knowledge bases and values and validating only one source of knowledge through public education" (p. 95). Within the colonial context, schools and universities implemented curricula that either misrepresented or omitted Indigenous epistemologies. Battiste (2000) indicated that these misrepresentations "perpetuated damaging myths about Indian knowledge and heritage, languages, beliefs, and ways of life" (p. 86). Within the colonial context, the only valid and acceptable epistemologies were those grounded in positivism, objectivism, and Enlightenment rationality (Dei, 2000). Schools and universities perpetuated a particularly virulent form of ideological hegemony by devaluing Indigenous forms of knowledge.

Indigenous epistemologies were omitted from school curricula and teaching as a part of the colonial project. Schools designed curricula and instructional strategies that represented Euro-centric knowledge as the only legitimate and valid epistemology. Indigenous epistemologies were considered unscientific and highly localized forms of knowledge that could never be applied "across cultures, histories, geographical spaces, or time" (Dei, 2000, p. 4). Schools and universities established hierarchies of knowledge that declared Indigenous epistemologies invalid. Schools taught students that, "Knowledge, truth, and education only stemmed from the White teachers and from Europe, so [Indigenous] students were taught to dismiss and devalue anything from their

own cultures since their parents and their systems of knowledge could not teach them anything" (Nsabimana, 2000, p. 51).

TribCrit scholars have integrated Indigenous ways of knowing into their research and teaching in an effort to indigenize their educational systems. According to Deloria and Wildcat (2001), "[Indigenous peoples] have worked towards the deliberate Indigenization of our educational philosophy, pedagogy, and systems of knowledge because they have been actively repressed for five centuries" (p. vii). TribCrit researchers have integrated Indigenous epistemologies into their academic work to integrate "an entire realm of the human experience in the world that has been marginalized, declared unknowable and consequently, left out of serious consideration" (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001, p. 12). This Indigenization of academic research has been designed to contextualize academic research within Indian metaphysics.

TribCrit researchers have integrated Indigenous epistemologies into their academic research in an effort to decolonize school and university curricula and teaching (Smith, 1999). TribCrit researchers have embraced Indigenous forms of knowledge and the power that comes from the acquisition, preservation, and utilization of that knowledge as the key to the survival of diverse Indigenous communities (Brayboy, 2005). TribCrit scholars have worked to implement more authentic representations of Indigenous peoples into schools and universities through the integration of Indigenous oral traditions, oral histories, storytelling into their academic research and teaching (Medicine, 2001). Since Indigenous peoples have preserved their cultural knowledge across multiple generations through oral tradition, oral history, and storytelling, TribCrit researchers have used these

sources of knowledge to enrich their understanding of Indigenous peoples. Brayboy

(2005) stated, "Stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are,

therefore, real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being" (p. 1).

Indigenous Pedagogies

Indigenous epistemologies have traditionally been taught in the context of

relationships with particular tribal peoples and places. Indigenous knowledge has usually

been shared within the context of daily informal interactions, shared life experiences, and

long term relationships with tribal members and tribal communities. Castellano (2000)

suggested that Indigenous epistemologies have usually been taught through oral traditions

and they have encouraged students to build relationships with particular tribal lands,

peoples, and places. Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies have been grounded in

the idea that all things in the world "operate according to a dynamic, circular flux in

which human beings participate directly in an interactive relationship with all things"

(Battiste & Henderson, 2000, p. 27).

Historically, Indigenous pedagogies have helped students learn to connect to and

sustain relationships with specific tribal peoples, places, and communities. Lambe (2003)

suggested, "Indigenous education has been intrinsically connected with specific cultures,

languages, lands, and knowledgeable elders and teachers" (p. 308). Grounded in the

relationships students develop with their cultures, languages, lands, families, elders, and

tribal communities, Indigenous instructional strategies have been mostly informal and

have been adapted to fit the students' relationships with specific tribal communities.

Indigenous pedagogies have usually utilized story-telling, oral traditions, ceremonies, life

experiences, dreams, visions, and symbols. Indigenous pedagogies have encouraged the holistic integration of the mind, the heart, the soul, and the body of all students.

Indigenous pedagogies have usually been implemented in informal contexts and informal settings where mentors "spend time with [students as] individuals so as to come to know [them]. Lambe (2003) suggested that Indigenous pedagogies have usually included a mentor who makes suggestions, usually in valid terms of the nature of the context of the situation, depending upon where the [student] is in his or her life and the nature of the relationship between the mentor and the [student]" (p. 309). Traditionally, mentors have shared stories, symbols, ceremonies, and life experiences with their students and encouraged them to reflect on and grow in their understandings of their "spiritual, personal, and interpersonal relationships" with all forms of life (p. 310). Within this context, "learning has been nurtured and encouraged but never forced or dictated by the mentor to the student" (p. 309).

TribCrit scholars have worked to integrate Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies into educational curricula and teaching. According to (Deyhle, 1992), educational researchers have documented that Indigenous students that have "maintained a strong sense of their Indigenous identity as distinctive and as a source of pride" and that this connection to their home cultures has led to greater academic achievement and success in schools (p. 28). Dei (1997) suggested that when Indigenous students have failed to see any connection between their home cultures and school, they have lost interest, engagement, and opportunities to learn. According to Dei (1997), "Students that were unable to find relevance to their own lives in the school curriculum found it difficult

to connect with their educational experiences [and they found it more difficult to stay in school]" (p. 136).

TribCrit research has encouraged the integration of Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies into curricula and teaching for the benefit of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. Gross (2005) has suggested that when educators "teach about American Indians, although [they may achieve] some successes in getting non-Indians to appreciate Indian cultures as a topic of study, Indians [still] remain the exotic other without any particular relevance to the lives of non-Indians" (p. 122). For educators to truly understand the Indigenous epistemologies and life ways, they must be introduced to them through "American Indian ways of knowing and understanding the world" (p. 123). Gross (2005) has suggested that content about Indians can be integrated into school curricula and still not transform peoples' perspectives. He has suggested that "students should be given actual instruction in American Indian ways of knowing. That is, not only [should] they [be] presented a knowledge set but they [should] also [be] given training in the intellectual skills that arise out of American Indian cultures" (p. 123).

Tribal Sovereignty and Self-Determination

TribCrit researchers have generated scholarship designed to explore and preserve the unique legal standing of Indigenous peoples and tribal nation members, including tribal sovereignty and self-determination. Tribal critical race theory scholarship has explored the unique legal status of Indigenous peoples and how that status has impacted the educational experiences of Indigenous students. Since education was secured as a right by treaties between the U.S. government and tribal nations, tribal critical race theory

researchers have explored the role of educational institutions in either undermining or preserving tribal sovereignty or self-determination.

TribCrit researchers have worked to protect tribal sovereignty for Indigenous peoples by generating scholarship that can be used support the unique legal status of tribal nations and members under international law. Tribal sovereignty has been defined as the right and ability of Indigenous peoples and tribal nations to control their lands, natural resources and the management of all their affairs within their tribal national boundaries (Brayboy, 2005). The unique legal status of Indigenous peoples as dual citizens of tribal nations and their national governments was guaranteed in the Commerce Clause in the U.S. Constitution. Only the U.S. Congress was granted the right "to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes" (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002, p.283). TribCrit researchers have recognized the unique legal status of Indigenous peoples and tribal nations and worked to preserve and promote the constitutional guarantees of tribal sovereignty and self-determination. Doxtater (2004) stated that, "Indigenous control of Indigenous education documented at all levels has provided a platform for self-determination through schools (p. 624).

Deloria and Lytle (1984) argued that since the Indigenous peoples with ancestral homelands residing in the United States were recognized as members of distinct and separate tribal nations prior to the existence of the U.S. Constitution, the legal guarantees of tribal sovereignty, tribal self-determination, and tribally controlled education were secured as part of nation-to-nation treaties. These treaties placed Indigenous peoples and

tribal nation members within the United States in a unique legal position that is the key to understanding the current issues impacting Indigenous peoples.

The History of Indian Education for All

The legislation that has become known as Indian Education for All (IEFA) originated in a Montana state constitutional provision created after the federal Indian Education Act was passed. In response to the landmark federal legislative mandates created by the Indian Education Act, the Montana constitutional delegates met in 1972 and designed a legal provision that recognized the distinct cultural heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations within the 1972 Montana Constitution. Senator Dorothy Eck, a member of the 1972 Constitutional Delegation, believed the provision was necessary to undermine the consequences of racism and colonialism for Indigenous students in Montana schools. Dorothy Eck led the group of activists that lobbied the 1972 delegation for a provision that mandated the integration of the unique Montana Tribal Nations' histories, cultures, and heritages into all Montana educational institutions. These provisions mandated the integration of curricula and pedagogy that recognized the distinct and unique heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations and guaranteed the equality of educational opportunity for all students throughout the Montana educational system.

The 1972 Constitutional Convention

In response to the testimony delivered by two young students from the Fort Peck reservation, the 1972 Montana Constitutional Convention passed Article X, Section 1 (1) and Subsection 1 (2). The newly revised Montana Constitution (1972) stated that, "It is

the goal of the people to establish a system of education which will develop the full

educational potential of each person and to provide equality of educational opportunity to

each person of this state" (p.1). To fulfill the requirements of Article X and to provide

equality of educational opportunity to all students, the Montana Constitution (1972)

added Section 1(2) which stated, "The state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural

heritage of the American Indians and is committed in its educational goals to the

preservation of their cultural integrity" (p.1). The state legislature suggested that that the

Montana educational system was constitutionally responsible for retraining and

equipping all Montana educators with the requisite Indigenous knowledge and

pedagogical strategies they needed to guarantee equality of educational opportunity for

all Indian and non-Indian students in Montana.

The 1973 Indian Studies Law

The federal Indian Education Act passed the U.S. Congress in 1972 and

established the implementation of tribal history, language, and culture into public schools

as a national priority. In an effort to raise Indian student achievement throughout the

United States, the Indian Education Act and the companion funding bills opened up

federal tax revenues to fund the evolution of bicultural and bilingual teaching materials

and teacher training. The Indian Education Act was designed to close the academic

achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students through the transformation of

curricula and pedagogy in schools.

Since the integration of Indian educational materials into public schools was

mandated by the Indian Education Act and the 1972 Montana Constitution, the 1973

Montana Legislative Session passed legislation outlining the implementation of the mandated curricula and pedagogical reforms. In 1973, the state legislature passed The Indian Studies Law to guide the Montana educational system in the implementation of the constitutional provisions of Article X, Section 1 (2) and ensure that "every Montana teacher had an understanding of and an appreciation for American Indian people." The Indian Studies Law (1973) required that "all teachers and administrators who secure contracts to work on Indian reservations in Montana to take at least (6) hours or (6) college credits in Indian culture" (p. 1).   H.B. 343 planned to utilize teacher training as the primary mechanism of integrating "American Indian history, traditions, customs, values, beliefs, ethics, and the contemporary affairs of American Indians into Montana classrooms" (p. 1). A companion bill, H.B. 501 (1973) was also passed that expanded the influence of the constitutional language and legislative intent, making it mandatory for all school personal, not just those on or near state reservations, across the state.

The 1974 Indian Studies Master Plan

The initial efforts to implement the demands of the H.B. 343 immediately revealed that the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) needed a more detailed implementation plan before embarking upon such a large project. The 1973-1974 bi-annual session of the Forty-third Montana legislature responded by working with Indian and non-Indian educators across the state to design an implementation plan titled, the Indian Education Master Plan. The first piece of the plan was included in, S.J.R. 17 (1973) and it stated that the legislature:

1) encourages Montana teacher training institutions to provide programs specifically designed to prepare teachers to teach Indian culture; 2) encourages the Montana Superintendent of Public Instruction to coordinate activities to assist the public schools and training institutions in developing curricula and educational programs designed to preserve the cultural integrity of the American Indians; and, 3) and transmits these intentions to the schools and training institutions of the state (p. 1).

The second section of the plan was passed in H.J.R 60 (1974) and established the following implementation outline; 1) the state will, provide teacher-training institutions in Montana with the adequate resources to prepare teachers to understand the history, culture, sociology, and values of American Indians as seen by Indians, 2) the state will, provide in-service training, planned in consultation with the Indian people, for those teachers who cannot return to an institution of higher education for formal courses in Indian studies, 3) the state will, provide means by which all public school teachers in Montana, may within ten (10) years of the adoption of this resolution, receive training in Indian studies as directed in this resolution, 4) the state will, provide all public schools in Montana, within ten (years), with a program of study that includes American Indian history, culture, sociology, values, as seen by Indians, 5) the state will, provide a means by which qualifications for teacher certification may include, within ten (10) years, adequate training in Indian studies to prepare the certified teacher to understand the unique background of his or her Indian students, and 6) provide a means by which Indian people may be utilized in the preparation and presentation of the courses planned under the guidelines of this resolution.

The Path to the 1979 Repeal of the Indian Studies Law

The original efforts to implement Montana Tribal Nation heritages into school

curricula and instructional methods met with considerable resistance. In fact, for the first

three years after the Indian Studies Law was passed, most of the school districts

throughout the state simply ignored the legislation because their failure to comply had no

consequences (Erickson, 1996). Many educators across the state felt that it was just

another one of those civil rights mandates that would be here today and gone tomorrow,

so it would be a waste of time to invest any energy in the implementation. Many people

throughout the state resented being forced to participate in the Indian education

professional development opportunities and simply refused to comply with the provisions

of the law (Erickson, 1996). Although the state university campuses established Native

American Studies courses and educational courses for new teachers, within three years

there had already been a significant shift in public opinion that made it possible for the

state education departments, the Montana Board of Regents, and the Montana Education

Association to reject the requirements for all Montana teacher education candidates by

1978 (Erickson, 1996).

Loss of Local Control: One opponent of the reforms, Representative Carl Seifart

(1979) testified in a legislative repeal meeting that he felt that the IEMP had overstepped

its constitutional authority and violated the sacred principle of local control of schools, "It

is my feeling that the present law was carried far beyond the intent of the original

legislation that was enacted by the legislature of the State of Montana" (p. 1). Seifert and

other local level education and state officials believed that the legislation had violated the

principle of locally controlled schools when it chose to mandate state-wide curriculum studies in Montana Tribal Nation heritages. Many administrators across Montana resented having to implement a set of Indian educational reforms without additional money or support. After the first three years of the implementation the mandate had generated significant resistance among the educational leaders throughout the state.

Indian Student Achievement Gap/Colonialism: Another obstacle to the initial implementation efforts was a lack of understanding about the significance of colonialism and racism in shaping the educational experiences and learning outcomes of Indian students in Montana schools. After years of assimilationist educational training, many of the educators across Montana did not understand either the purpose or the benefit of the curricula or the pedagogical reforms for their students. Many educators lacked a clear understanding of the significance of colonialism and racism in shaping the educational curricula and pedagogy and the devastating consequences of these choices for Indian students. Testimony recorded at the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of both the House and Senate held in February 2, 1979 demonstrated this lack of understanding. Journalist Deidre McNamer (1978) over heard some educators waiting in line to pay their twenty dollars for a teacher training workshop state, "Who do I make this damn thing out to anyway?' An irate voice piped up. 'Try Sitting Bull,' another teacher replied. 'Everyone laughed'" (p. 11). Several of the educators at this professional development opportunity expressed feelings of resentment and anger. One Missoula grade school teacher, attending Indian Education training in 1978 reflected this shift in public opinion,

"It's still an emotional subject. They did a fine job of legislating prejudice. When you say a teacher MUST, it slaps, it hurts, it causes a lot of hardships" (p. 11).

Race and Racism: Despite the fact that the civil rights movement had helped many minority groups gain legal access to state institutions of all kinds, including schools, by the late 1970s, there continued to be a lack of understanding about the significance of race and racism in shaping student educational experiences. Without a clear understanding of the role of race and racism in shaping school curricula and teaching, many educators misunderstood the purpose of the curricular reforms. Rather than valuing the curricula and pedagogies as a mechanism for ensuring the equality of educational opportunity for Indian and non-Indian students, many educators believed that the reforms were racist and discriminatory, "The people speaking had to put in their quota of guilt trips for non- Indians. We are NOT personally responsible for anything that has happened to the Indians" (McNamer, 1978, p. 11). Many educators expressed resentment and anger when they were asked to analyze the role of systemic racism in shaping the educational experiences of Indian students. Responding to a discussion on systemic racism led by Henrietta Whiteman, Director of University of Montana's Native American Studies Program, a teacher commented, "I felt treated like a second grader, and I felt defensive. She implied that we were all racists, so I stopped listening" (McNamer, 1978, p. 11). Many of the educators perceived the professional development opportunities as events designed to force them to take responsibility for all that had happened between Indians and non-Indians, "One thing that hasn't helped is Indians coming to the in-service and laying a real guilt trip on the whites. I want to get some

other information from the trainings other than that Custer died for my sins" (McNamer, 1978, p. 11).

Linda Shadow, an educator who has worked with American Indian students in Montana and Minnesota since 1968 shared her experiences with white teachers at the Indian education professional development event in 1979. She stated, "It is an observable fact that the majority of teachers are Caucasian. They reflect a particular culture—patterns of attitudes, expectations, traditions, and values—that allow them the confidence of being able to predict similar patterns and reactions in others" (Shadow, 1979, p.1). When educators are confronted with students with different cultural patterns and rules of behavior and they lack knowledge and proper understanding, they will almost certainly experience:

> confusion, irritation, and annoyance; and, even more importantly in teaching, teachers without training, will attribute motivations and attitudes to their students that are derived from the mainstream culture not from the student's culture. This misalignment leads to comments like the following, Indians are lazy; increase the rewards for winning, and they will come around (Shadow, 1979, p.1).

Several Indian students testified before the Montana legislature that the curriculum choices, instructional approaches, and lack of understanding among both their teachers and their peers had led them to struggle in school. When teachers lack the necessary materials, training, and understanding of Indian students, Indian students are ultimately the ones who pay the ultimate price. A teacher-education candidate at Montana State University-Bozeman, Barbara Kates (1979) a Chippewa Cree, shared her experiences as an American Indian attempting to deal with the consequences of failed

educational reforms on her reservation. She stated that as an American Indian in Montana

schools, students felt:

> inadequate and therefore lose confidence in themselves. It has been my experience that when I was a child [I was taught] to be ashamed that I was an Indian, I don't think this is right for any child; and the reason for this is that what little we were taught about Indians was the wrong thing. For example, Indians were savages, drunks, and a worthless bunch. If that was the case you would rather belong to some other group of people not the one to which you were born. This happened when I was in and out of school. (p. 1)

The 1995 Revitalization of Indian Education for All

Despite the compelling testimony supporting the continued implementation of

Montana Tribal Nation heritages into school curricula, the provision went unfunded until

the early 1990s. In 1995 the Montana Legislature met under the leadership of

Representative Carol Juneau and sponsored Senate Joint Resolution No. 11 that asked the

state director of Indian affairs to research ways to reinvigorate the Article X, Section 1

(2) provisions within the Montana educational system. When legislative researchers

traveled throughout the state, they discovered that most schools had yet to integrate

curricula or pedagogy that recognized the unique heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations

and most teachers still lacked knowledge and understanding of Native American Studies.

The researchers discovered that although Montana students recognized several of the

other key figures in Montana history, "There was a prominent gap in their knowledge,

and the missing content that created this gap was both significant and telling" (Starnes,

2006, p. 184)

By 1999, supporters of Indian education had generated enough legislative support to convince state legislators to pass the Indian Education for All Act, "A law that incorporates mandates that are intended to give effect to the constitutional provisions of Article X, Section 1 (2)." IEFA (1999) mandated that:

> a) every Montanan, whether Indian or non-Indian, be encouraged to learn about the distinct and unique heritage of American Indians in a culturally responsive manner; b) every educational agency and all educational personnel will work cooperatively with Montana tribes or those tribes who are in close proximity, when providing instruction or when implementing the educational goal or adopting a rule related to the education of each Montana citizen, to include information specific to the cultural heritage and contemporary contributions of American Indians with particular emphasis on Montana Indian tribal groups and governments; and, c) All school personnel should have an understanding and an awareness of Indian tribes to help them relate effectively with Indian students and parents, that educational personnel provide the means by which school personnel will gain an understanding of and appreciation for Indian people (p. 1).

Since IEFA was passed in 1999, "The state of Montana has allocated $13 million in funding to the Office of Public Instruction and $1 million in funding to the tribal colleges to assist them in the publication and implementation of written versions of each state tribal history and curriculum" (Schweitzer, 2006, p. 196). A flood of inventive scholarship has been produced throughout the state as a result of this financial provision, and tribal scholars have worked to record innovative versions of Montana history that include new oral histories and materials from each Montana Tribal Nation. The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) has held professional development workshops across the state of Montana, and the Indian Education Division has created an abundance of curricula for distribution in schools. OPI has invested a great deal of time and energy in the development and the implementation of the IEFA curricula.

53

<u>Summary</u>

In this chapter, I charted the evolution of tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) from its origins within critical theory and critical race theory through its eventual integration with research conducted from the unique political, historical, legal, social, and racial perspectives of Indigenous peoples. I outlined the evolution of TribCrit as a critical analytical lens for the exploration of the role of race, colonialism, and other intersecting forms of systemic oppression in shaping the educational experiences of Indigenous students. I defined TribCrit research as a theoretical framework that centralized the analysis of race and colonialism in shaping the learning outcomes of Indigenous students. After explaining the basic tenets of CRT and TribCrit, I concluded chapter two with a historical analysis of the past efforts to implement IEFA into Montana schools and an explanation of why TribCrit was a valuable analytical tool for this particular study.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

This tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study utilized an ethnographic

research design and methodology to explore four major research questions:

1) What were the educators' perceptions of the purposes of Indian Education for

All?

2) What were the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the

implementation of Indian Education for All?

3) What were the educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support

for the future implementations of Indian Education for All? And,

4) What were the educators' perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural

identity in shaping the implementation of Indian Education for All?

In this chapter I begin with a discussion of my role as a participant observer in the

research site. I begin my discussion of the research methodology with a description of

how I selected and gained entry into this particular research site. I continue with an

explanation of the methods I used to establish relationality, relational accountability, and

reciprocity with my research participants. After describing the selection of my research

site and the methods I used to establish rapport and trust with my research participants, I

outline my participant selection techniques and my methods of data collection and

analysis. I continue the chapter with an explanation of how I established the

trustworthiness and reliability of my data collection, data analysis, and research findings. I conclude the chapter with a description of the limitations of this TribCrit ethnographic study.

<div align="center">Research Site</div>

I conducted an archival document analysis of the historical evolution of the IEFA from June of 2008 to March of 2009. This early research revealed that an area school district was in the process of implementing a three year IEFA professional development series. In the meetings that I attended as part of this early research, I heard several of the teachers within the district mention one particular school in the district that had a reputation for academic excellence and leadership in educational reform. Some of the educators at this particular middle school had been leaders in the original design and implementation of IEFA. This school also interested me because some of the teachers had not only been early leaders in IEFA but they had also begun to design an implementation plan for their specific grade levels and content areas. The school appeared to be an ideal site to explore the questions I wanted to answer in my study.

The middle school had an enrollment of approximately six hundred students in grades six, seven, and eight. Five percent of the student population self-identified as a racial minority and ninety-five percent of the students identified themselves as Caucasian. Among the five percent of students that were identified as a racial minority, a majority indicated that they were bi-racial or mixed racial. The students that self-identified as American Indians indicated that they had a mixed tribal background and had parents or

grandparents with more than one tribal affiliation. Twenty-five tribal nations were represented within the student population.

The middle school employed approximately sixty part-time and full-time educators, administrators, school counselors, paraprofessionals, and support staff. All but three of the educators within the school self-identified as Caucasian. The school employed one American Indian educator. The educators taught a variety of academic subjects including: mathematics, communication arts, social studies, science, modern languages, physical education, art, technology, special education, counseling, and administration. The educators worked together in six multidisciplinary teaching teams across the three grade levels. Each grade level had two teaching teams with representatives from each academic subject, from each school elective, and from the school counseling staff.

The middle school had a principal in the second year as lead administrator with thirty- six years of experience in teaching, educational administration, and educational leadership. The middle school vice principal was also a veteran teacher and administrator. The vice principal had served at the school since its inception, first as a science teacher for twelve years and now as a vice principal for three years. Utilizing a teaming and collaboration model, response to intervention programs (RTI), standards based and outcome based educational models, and a collaborative learning community model, the administrators encouraged collaboration and team building among the educators within this school community.

In March of 2009 I contacted the administrator at the middle school and discussed the possibility of researching the implementation of IEFA at the school. We discussed the benefits of conducting an ethnographic study that explored the educators' perceptions of IEFA within the middle school. The administrator indicated that he was open to the idea of learning more about the implementation of IEFA and he was committed to the integration of the IEFA materials within the school community. We agreed that the IEFA implementation would have to be adapted to fit the unique needs and cultural climate of this particular school population to be successful. The administrator felt that the findings of this TribCrit ethnographic study could be used to inform the future implementations of IEFA within this school.

In April of 2009 I presented a research proposal to the administrator and he granted me permission to conduct the study. The administrator at the middle school suggested that I begin the study by administering a survey designed by the Montana Office of Public Instruction-Indian Education Division (Appendix D). I met with the educators at a school faculty meeting and administered the survey. After administering the survey, I recorded, analyzed, and shared the data results and findings with the administrators and educators at a school faculty meeting.

From June of 2009 to August of 2009 I attended a series of IEFA professional development events with school educators and administrators. I researched the district IEFA implementation efforts and discussed the perceptions of the implementation of IEFA within this school with district lead teacher mentors. After providing the administrator with my initial research findings, I suggested that I work in cooperation

with the area school district as an IEFA consultant within this particular middle school

for the upcoming school year. Acting as an IEFA consultant, I worked on-site

distributing IEFA curriculum materials across the content areas to particular educators as

they expressed interest. As an IEFA consultant, I also planned a series of professional

development events with speakers for the educators that addressed: 1) Indigenous oral

traditions, 2) Indigenous oral histories, 3) tribal sovereignty, and, 4) Indigenous

education.   I worked with the educators to help them locate and implement lesson plans

related to these Indigenous issues.

<div align="center">The Researcher</div>

Working as an IEFA consultant, I built rapport and trust with the educators from

September of 2009 to December of 2009. I focused on building relationships with the

educators and I documented these efforts in my research journal, participant observations,

and field notes. This approach was consistent with the scholarship produced by

Indigenous researcher, Shawn Wilson (2008), who stated; "Indigenous knowledge and

research have always been deeply embedded in the principles of relationality and

relational accountability" (p. 6). Indigenous research, at its heart, has always been about

"ideas developing through the formation of relationships" (p. 6).

Relationality

The relationships that I built with the educators were the foundation of this

research. Over time, I realized that I had become deeply embedded within the research

context and that I could not "remove myself from this world in order to examine it"

(Wilson, 2008, p. 12). Thus, I chose to integrate myself into the study within the context of these relationships to make the research more authentic by grounding it within my experiences with the educators. According to Wilson (2008), "In Indigenous research, the researcher must be situated in the research process by giving a detailed description of self in relationship to the research context and the research itself" (p. 6). Thus, I situated myself and my research within the context of the relationships that I had built with the educators. Although I had become an insider to a certain degree, I understood as the study progressed that the educators would always consider me, as a researcher, an outsider.

The complexity of the relationships that this study explored became the most intriguing aspect of this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study. According to Wilson (2008), "Indigenous epistemology is all about ideas developing through the formation of relationships. An idea cannot be taken out of its relational context and still maintain its shape" (p. 6). Thus, I situated my research within this relational context and I selected slices or small pieces from my daily conversations with the educators to construct a narrative description of these relationships.

Relational Accountability

After building rapport and trust with the educators, I made it clear that I would use my research to help them to build and maintain reciprocal and respectful relationships within the school community (Wilson, 2008). Relational accountability was a very important aspect of this TribCrit ethnographic study, because the legacies of colonialism and imperial ideologies had impacted the relationships at the research site. Over the

course of this study, my understanding of the role of colonialism and racism in shaping

the implementation of IEFA grew. At the beginning of the study, my understanding of

how colonialism had shaped research, teaching, and learning was very superficial. By the

end of the study, I had gained a greater understanding of how academic research and

teaching had provided the primary ideological justifications for the colonization of

Indigenous peoples and the denial of Indigenous tribal sovereignty and self-determination

(Wilson, 2008).

My commitment to relational accountability meant that as a researcher, I would

commit to the careful consideration how my research would impact Indigenous peoples'

struggle to secure their tribal sovereignty and self-determination. I evaluated whether

this research would help Indian families and students in Montana schools. As I began to

analyze the data within the context of relational accountability, I was compelled to report

what I discovered in a way that helped to raise the awareness of Indigenous

epistemologies, research methodologies, and pedagogies. I committed to creating a piece

of academic scholarship that worked to build better relationships between Indians and

non-Indians in Montana.

Reciprocity

I conducted this research with a commitment relational accountability and

reciprocity. The principle of relational accountability required me, as the researcher, to

commit to the formation of reciprocal relationships with the Indian and non-Indians

within this middle school. I worked to establish reciprocity throughout this study by

asking the Indian and the non-Indian educators to make suggestions about what research

they wanted conducted and what methods they believed were most suitable for this study.

Participant Selection

After building rapport and trust with the educators as an IEFA consultant from

August of 2009 to December of 2009, I started to select specific research participants. As

an IEFA consultant, I attended teaching team meetings for each grade level throughout

this time period. Through my work as an IEFA consultant, I identified at least two

educators in each teaching team that were willing to discuss their perceptions of IEFA in

more depth. My participants were selected because they demonstrated an interest in

IEFA and a commitment to working with their fellow teachers, students, and the other

staff members. After identifying two lead teachers within each teaching team that

expressed an interest in the implementation of IEFA, I used snow ball or convenience

sampling to locate additional participants. Throughout this time period, I worked to

identify participants from within each teaching team, across all the grade levels, and from

within each academic content area. I selected participants that supported and opposed the

implementation of IEFA within the school community. I worked to contact every

educator, administrator, and counselor within the school that was willing to speak with

me about the implementation of IEFA. My participant selection was limited by the

number of educators that were willing to speak with me about IEFA.

Research Participants

Although I collected data within my research journal, participant observations, document analysis, and field notes from a much larger cross section of the school population, my key research participants in this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study included twenty-two middle school educators. These educators included members of all six teaching teams, taught a wide array of academic and elective courses, worked as administrative faculty or school counseling staff, and served as support staff from multiple departments. Teaching teams at every grade level included a group of six to eight educators who taught a combination of mathematics, language arts, science, modern languages, social studies, communication arts, arts and technology, physical education, special education, music, and counseling. The participants were chosen from each of the content areas to gain as diverse a representation of educators as possible.

Mathematics Education

Some of the mathematics educators who participated in this study were veteran educators while others were early or mid-career professionals. The most experienced among the math teachers had taught for fifteen years in multiple school settings throughout the United States. Some of the mathematics educators in this study had worked with several groups of students from culturally and linguistically diverse populations, while others had just taught within this particular school community. The newest mathematics educator among the participants had taught for only three years and

had been mentored by other lead teachers in the school throughout this time period. The mathematics educators in this study shared their perspectives generated from a diversity of experiences and perspectives that were particularly valuable for this research.

Communication Arts/Social Studies Education

The communication arts and social studies educators in this study were all mid-career to late career professionals that had taught for several years Many of the veteran teachers in this content area had moved back and forth between different communication arts and social studies courses throughout their tenure here. An educator that had taught many different subjects stated, "I taught communication arts and history this year, and I've taught many other classes in my content areas in the past, maybe two or three other years – so I've been here 12 years total at this school and I have taught many different things throughout that time."

Science Education

For the most part, the science educators in this school had fewer years of teaching experience than the participants in the other academic content areas. Some of the science educators were second career professionals who had chosen to go into teaching after working in other professional fields for some time. One such educator stated, "And then I got lucky after I moved here and I got a job here six years ago. I got a Master's and a Montana Teaching Certificate; it was a coup for me because I had started my life doing something so different from this."

<u>Modern Languages</u>

The modern languages educators have had multiple opportunities to teach languages, culture, and communication arts in diverse countries, states, and cities both within and outside of the United States. Certain educators had taught culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in urban schools within other nations. One educator stated, "I teach French here and I'm qualified to teach French and Spanish, and I've only been here this year – but I've been teaching for 14 years. I have taught in the UK. Mostly inner-city schools, at-risk schools, where languages are actually a core subject." The modern language educators all had intercultural teaching experiences that had transformed their lives. The educators indicated that culture, language, and intercultural communication were at the heart of their instructional philosophies and they felt that modern languages were a valuable part of the curricula at this area middle school.

<u>Physical Education</u>

The physical education educators at the research site had taught for many years in the area school district. The participant who had taught the longest started teaching over thirty years ago, "I started teaching in Bozeman in the late 1970s. I student-taught the year before that – graduated in health education, which at that time was called physical education – and got a job at Wilson School, teaching 5th and 6th grade P.E." The physical education teachers had worked at this area middle school since it opened over 14 years before. They had taught other academic subjects throughout the years, but the focus of their teaching had always been physical education.

Art and Technology

The art and technology educators had a diverse array of professional backgrounds and had worked outside of the educational field for extended periods of time prior to beginning their teaching careers. These experiences had clearly enriched the opportunities for the students at the research site. Prior to teaching at the middle school, some of the educators had worked in design, advertising, film, artistic production, drama, theatre, and an array of other industries. The educators indicated that they had worked within this school community for approximately five to ten years.

Special Education

The special education, reading and math intervention, and resource educators at the research site drew from a wealth of experiences in teaching and special education. They had all taught or worked as a paraprofessional or educator in schools for at least ten years. One participant stated, "I have worked here for 11 years, and for the past 2 years, I have been working with Resource in 6th and 7th grade. And before that I was in a self-contained special education classroom." Some of the educators had worked to re-design, implement and assess a new reading and math intervention program within the school. One educator had taught reading and math intervention, "I have taught mostly reading intervention and math intervention, and I've been at this school for 10 years, although I've been in this position for 3."

Counseling

The counseling educators at this area middle school had many years of experience in classroom teaching, peer mediation and support, and school counseling. One of the educators stated that they had worked in the district for over twenty years, "I have worked in this district for over 25 years and for 6 years prior to that in another city in Montana." The counseling and peer mediation educators described their role as primarily a student advocate or a liaison between the students and the school. The participants had worked as counseling staff, educators, and as paraprofessional support staff at the school level for many years. They had served their educational communities in a variety of capacities in the past. Another educator stated, "I've been a counselor here for the last seven years. I've been a teacher here for seven years before that. So I've been here 14 years."

Administration

The research participants included two administrators with extensive experience in teaching, teaching supervision, and educational leadership. One administrator had twenty- six years of experience as a classroom educator, a resource teacher, a vice principal, and a principal. Another administrator had an equally impressive resume with over fourteen years of experience as both an educator and a vice principal. Both administrators had advanced degrees in educational leadership and were familiar with educational theory, educational research, educational leadership, and teaching. The administrators had worked together over the last two years at the research site to lead a series of progressive and ambitious educational programs and reforms.

Critical Ethnographic Methodology

I selected critical ethnography as my research methodology for this study because I believed that it would help me to explore the deep, multi-layered context of the implementation of the IEFA curricula in this middle school community. Ethnography has been defined as "an approach to learning about the social and cultural life of communities and institutions" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 1). This study explored the way the research participants constructed knowledge and theories about teaching and learning from within the localized context of this particular area middle school. Working to make sense of the ways the participants constructed their understanding of the world around them and their ideas about teaching and learning, I worked as a participant observer to try to identify, observe, and document the observable "patterns of behavior, customs, and ways of life" shared by the members of this school community (Fetterman, 1989, p. 27). I documented the observable patterns of behavior, beliefs, ideas, and rituals within this school community. Utilizing a critical ethnographic research design, I explored beneath the surface of the daily discourses within this learning community to try to identify the unwritten and unstated cultural rules, values, and beliefs operating in this school culture.

Critical ethnographic methodologies were particularly useful for this study because they are designed to explore the daily lives of the research participants to identify their distinctive cultural values, belief, rituals, and behaviors within learning communities. This study explored the middle school community's "beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, emotions, verbal and nonverbal communication, social networks, and patterns of behavior" related to the recent IEFA reform efforts (LeCompte & Schensul,

1999, p.6). The critical ethnographic design of the study helped me to "generate or builds theories of cultures—or explanations of how people think, believe, and behave—that are situated in local time and space" (p. 8).

Through my daily interactions and the relationships I built with my research participants throughout the school year, I was able to establish both an emic and an etic perspective in this study (Fetterman, 1989). My long-term observations and daily interactions with the research participants made it possible for me to build rapport and trust with members of this community and to "penetrate the depth and portray the cultural landscape in detail rich enough for others to comprehend and appreciate" the complexities within this particular school community (Fetterman, 1989, p. 47).

Data Collection Techniques

I collected five sources of data for this critical race ethnographic study: participant interviews, participant observations, archival documents, research journal and field notes, and a survey. I collected data from these five sources from June of 2008 to March of 2010. I conducted the document analysis of the history of IEFA from June of 2008 through March of 2009. I collected the survey data in April 2009 and then used the results to assist me in the ethnographic research design of the larger project. I recorded field notes and participant observations in my research journal from August of 2009 through March of 2010. I conducted the participant interviews from January of 2010 through March of 2010. I transcribed the data from April of 2010 to May of 2010. I utilized a variety of ethnographic data sources to create "lush, thick, and detailed

descriptions" of the lived experiences of the participants within this area middle school

(Creswell, 2007, p. 194). With the diversity of data sources and the time I invested at the

research site, I created an engaging narrative that "presents detail, context, the voices,

feelings, actions, and dialogical interactions of the participants" (Creswell, 2007, p. 194).

Interviews

From January of 2010 through March of 2010 I conducted research interviews

with individual participants for one 90 minute audio-taped time period with open-ended

interview questions and then another 30 minute follow up interview at a later time. I

conducted the interviews at the school site in a private office. I audio-taped the interviews

and took notes throughout the interview process. I followed up with the participants to

confirm the accuracy of the previously recorded data, and asked them to authorize the

release of the data and confirm my data analysis. The interviews were taped, transcribed,

and analyzed (Appendix C).

Participant Observations

From August of 2009 through March of 2010 I recorded participant observations

by observing educators, students, and families in their daily interactions with one another

within the research site. I also observed educators while they taught a lesson in their

classrooms related to the IEFA curricula. Ten of the participants agreed to allow me to

observe lessons in grades six, seven and eight in the fall of 2009. As a participant

observer, I served as an IEFA consultant and provided lesson plan materials to the

educators that expressed interest. Over the course of the study, I recorded and observed

student and educator responses to the IEFA materials. My field notes and research

journal helped me collect and organize the data from these participant observations.

When I completed my data collection, I recorded, transcribed, and analyzed these

observations in my data analysis.

Document Analysis

I conducted an extensive document analysis from June of 2008 through March of

2009. This document analysis included materials from the Montana Historical Society

archives and an analysis of the historical evolution of the IEFA implementation efforts in

Montana. After gathering these historical materials, I analyzed the evolution of IEFA

through pieces of Montana constitutional law, Montana statutory law, and Montana

educational policy documents throughout the next year. I collected letters, legal statutes,

constitutional convention minutes, district educational policy documents, state legislature

minutes, Indian Education for All work committee documents, audiotapes from IEFA

meetings, and public testimony related to IEFA. Collecting my data from these

documents, I collected and recorded the information in a research journal and within my

field notes throughout 2008 and 2009. Through this historical research, I was able to

situate and position this study within the historical context of the evolution of the IEFA

curricula.

Research Journal/Field Notes

From August of 2009 through March of 2010 I collected data in a research journal

and field notes. Maintaining a record of the daily interactions with faculty, students, and

district staff in a research journal with field notes, I maintained an ongoing record of my

interactions with the participants and their perceptions of IEFA throughout the course of

this study. My research journal included descriptions of my formal and informal

observations and interactions with the educators throughout the academic year. Although

I did not include all of this data in my research findings, I did use it to keep track of the

events, the people, and my observations throughout the study. This research journal

included my observations as both a participant and an observer in different IEFA events

and professional development workshops at the middle school.

IEFA Survey

In April of 2009 I collected introductory quantitative and qualitative data in the

IEFA teacher professional development survey created by the Montana Office of Public

Instruction to measure educator responses to past IEFA implementation efforts. I

collected, analyzed, and reported the data to the educators at the middle school in an

effort to gain entry to the research site and identify potential research participants

(Appendix D).

Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis methods I utilized for this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit)

ethnographic study was the procedures advocated by Wolcott (1994): description,

analysis, and interpretation of the culture sharing groups. I started my data analysis by

trying to identify the common cultural patterns, beliefs, and ideals shared by the members

of this particular school community. According to Wolcott (1990), ethnographic

descriptions are the foundation of narrative research, "Description is the foundation upon which qualitative research is built. Here you become the storyteller, inviting the reader to see through your eyes what you have seen" (p. 28).

After recording the research data, I transcribed, coded, and analyzed the data to look for major thematic patterns and regularities within the data from June of 2010 through August of 2010. I utilized the data analysis procedures outlined by Wolcott (1994), first analyzing and comparing what members of particular cultural groups within the school had in common with one another and then looking to compare the groups to one another. After identifying the common data themes within and across groups, I re-analyzed the data to look for variations, what stuck out or differed, both within and across these groups. I worked to triangulate the data and identify the shared patterns within these groups, while simultaneously trying to recognize the intra-group diversity beneath the common patterns among the research participants.

I utilized critical ethnographic methodology to try to document the poly-vocal and multi-voiced nature of the perspectives generated within these particular cultural groups. Utilizing ethnographic methods, I explored the diversity of "attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that varied depending on their perceptions of ethnicity, racial identity, gender, social class and status, and other factors considered relevant in the social and the political rhetoric and composition of contemporary life" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 24).

From August of 2010 to December of 2010 I worked each day within the research context to build conclusions drawn from the perspectives of the research participants. Because the research process of this dissertation was recursive, my data collection and

data analysis were "cyclical in nature, moving back and forth between inductive analysis—which used specific items to build more general explanatory statements—and deductive analysis—which applied general explanatory analysis to more specific items" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 15).

From January of 2011 through May of 2011 I worked to place the data within the larger historical, political, and economic contexts surrounding the implementation of IEFA. I compared the new ethnographic data collected in the TribCrit ethnographic study with the research literature published by scholars working in educational, Indigenous, critical race theory and tribal critical race theory research. As a TribCrit ethnographic researcher, I acted as both an advocate and an activist, supporting research participants in their efforts "to bring about change in inequitable distributions of power, cultural assets, and other resources" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 45). This process began by choosing to listen carefully to the voices of the educators at this area middle school and how they perceived the implementation of IEFA. After listening to the perspectives of my research participants, I contextualized the results of this study within the larger systemic issues addressed by IEFA.

Establishing Trustworthiness, Validity, and Reliability

Eisner (1991) suggested that ethnographic researchers should establish the trustworthiness of their data collection and analysis by collecting a weight of evidence that can demonstrate the trustworthiness of their conclusions. Thus, I collected data from multiple data sources, multiple forms of data collection, and by both inductive and

deductive data analysis methods to try to establish the trustworthiness, validity, and reliability of the inferences drawn from my study. I worked to identify "critical elements" that repeatedly appeared within multiple sources of data and drew "reasonable, plausible interpretations" from them (Wolcott, 1990, p. 146). I asked the following questions to measure the validity of the inferences drawn from the data: "1) Are the results an accurate interpretation of the participants' meaning? 2) Are different voices heard in this interpretation of the data? 3) Is there a critical appraisal of all aspects of the research? And, 4) Are these investigations self-critical?" (Creswell, 2007, p. 206).

I spent an extensive amount of time within the research site over an academic year, building trust and rapport with the participants, learning the cultural values within this school community, and checking with the participants to make sure that the conclusions I had drawn had not distorted their perspectives (Creswell, 2007). Collecting multiple sources of data across a longer period of time, I drew conclusions about the data only after careful review to try to confirm my interpretations. I worked to establish the reliability of the data by working to document "the stability of responses to multiple coders and data sets" by submitting them to external reviewers. These external reviewers examined a sub-set of the data, the codes, and the companion inferences drawn from them and looked to see if these matched with those drawn in this ethnographic study (Creswell, 2007, p. 210). This feedback was extremely valuable and helped to ensure the quality of the ethnographic project.

<u>Limitations</u>

This tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study produced a localized description of educators' perceptions of IEFA within a particular middle school. The focus of this TribCrit ethnographic study made it possible for me to spend additional time with a smaller number of research participants. This study did not engage in a broader analysis of the implementation of IEFA throughout this district, across the state, or within the national context of Indian education. This study was not intended to collect data or draw inferences from any other implementation context other than the one under study.

<u>Summary</u>

This tribal critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study utilized an ethnographic research methodology to explore four major research questions:

1) What were the educators' perceptions of the purposes of Indian Education for All?

2) What were the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of Indian Education for All?

3) What were the educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of Indian Education for All? And,

4) What were the educators' perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural identity in shaping the implementation of Indian Education for All?

Chapter three included a detailed description of the methodology used to conduct this TribCrit ethnographic study. This chapter began with a description of my

positionality and role as the researcher in the research site, including a description of how I worked to establish relationality, relational accountability, and reciprocity with my research participants. After I explained my role, I described how I selected my research site, my research participants, and my sources of data. This chapter included a detailed description of the data I collected from interviews, document analyses, participant observations, a research journal and field notes, and a survey. After outlining my sources of data, I explained how I collected, recorded, and analyzed the data for this TribCrit ethnographic study. Chapter three concluded with an explanation of the limitations of this study and the methods I used to establish the trustworthiness and reliability of the inferences I drew from the data collected in this TribCrit ethnographic study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

In chapter four I include the research findings for my four major research questions:

1) What were the educators' perceptions of the purpose of Indian Education for All?

2) What were the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of Indian Education for All?

3) What were the educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of Indian Education for All? And,

4) What were the educators' perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural identity in shaping the implementation of Indian Education for All?

In this chapter I include descriptions of my research findings for each of the four research questions that guided this TribCrit ethnographic study. Chapter four includes four sections that are structured around the participants' answers to each of the four research questions. In the first section of chapter four, I describe the educators' perceptions of the purposes of IEFA. In the next section, I include a description of the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. In the third section, I include a description of the educators' perceptions of the best sources of support for future IEFA implementations. In the final section, I describe the educators'

perceptions of the role of school culture and cultural identity in shaping the implementation of IEFA.

<div align="center">
Question One: What were Educators'
<u>Perceptions of the Purposes of IEFA?</u>
</div>

My interactions with the research participants over the course of this study convinced me that they possessed a diversity of opinions about the purposes of IEFA. Although most of the educators believed that IEFA was designed to help close the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students, the educators' perceptions of the purposes of IEFA were quite varied.   After analyzing the data, I found that the educators' perceptions of IEFA could be broken down into three major themes or groups. The first group of educators believed that IEFA was intended to act as a catalyst for the integration of Indigenous epistemologies and heritages into Montana school curricula. According to the second group of educators, IEFA was designed to help educators incorporate Indigenous pedagogies and instructional strategies that promoted healing, the restoration of relationship, and mutual respect between Indian and non-Indian members of the school community. The final group of educators believed that IEFA was designed to restore relationships, a sense of reciprocity, and trust and communication between Indian students, their families, and the schools. In the following table, I have included an illustration of the codes I used to identify the educators' perceptions of IEFA (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Illustration of Codes for Educators' Perceptions of the Purposes of IEFA

Educators' Perceptions of Purposes	Category/ Code Descriptor
Curricula Reforms	
	Decolonize Curricula
	Integrate Indigenous Epistemologies
Pedagogical Reform	
	Address Academic Achievement Gap
	Culturally Responsive Pedagogy
Build Relationships	
	Promote Intercultural Communication
	Build Relationships

Curricula Reforms

Decolonize Curricula: Several of the educators indicated that colonialism had led to broken relationships between Indians and non-Indians in Montana for several generations. They believed that the purpose of IEFA was to address the devastating consequences of colonialism for Indian and non-Indians in Montana. In one of my participant observations, I observed an educator while he taught a lesson on the history of Indigenous oral traditions and their connection to different interpretations of past historical events. Throughout the lesson, he discussed the different methods of recording and re-telling the past with his students. Several students expressed confusion when he explained how colonialism had established the types of histories that were either included or excluded from their history books. He suggested that colonialism had led to

stereotypical misrepresentations or the complete omission of Indigenous perspectives from school curricula. He used this lesson to introduce his students to the idea that Indigenous peoples had recorded their own versions of historical events within their oral histories that frequently contradicted the versions included in their history books. In a discussion following this participant observation, the educator indicated that he believed that IEFA was designed to de-colonize schools and integrate these Indigenous oral histories into school curricula for the benefit of all Montanans.

In my document analysis of the notes from the 1972 Montana Constitutional Convention, I read an excerpt from testimony provided by Dorothy Eck that confirmed that IEFA was intended to be a systemic curricula reform. Eck indicated that these landmark educational reforms were designed to integrate the unique Montana Tribal Nations' histories, cultures, and heritages into school curricula. Schools were mandated to implement curricula and pedagogies that recognized the distinct and unique heritages of the Montana Tribal Nations.

In the next section, I include a selection from a conversation with one of my key participants, Carol. Carol was not the only participant to indicate that she believed IEFA was designed to decolonize school curricula but I chose her descriptions because they had the greatest degree of clarity. Carol was a member of the committee that designed the IEFA essential understandings curricula and she possessed clarity about her perceptions of the purposes of IEFA. She indicated that IEFA was designed to decolonize Montana schools through the implementation of more authentic representations of Indigenous

epistemologies, heritages, and peoples throughout school curricula. In the following

discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Carol with a (C).

> **M**: Describe your perceptions of the purposes of IEFA.

> **C**: I was a part of the group that developed the essential understandings, as a Native and as an educator; it was my understanding that IEFA meant that we were going to finally have a voice in how we were represented in Montana school curricula

> **M**: From your perspective, how was IEFA designed to accomplish this?

> **C**: We wanted to see some authenticity in the way that the Natives of Montana were represented in the school curricula. We wanted IEFA to explain that we are – and not that we just *were*. We wanted the curricula to reflect the vitality and diversity of our cultures and communities. We hoped we would no longer be just a paragraph in the beginning of the book that said that we had been the previous inhabitants of this region.

> **M**: Do you think this is the original purpose of IEFA?

> **C**: The issue of being recognized and acknowledged, the issues of cultural identity, Native American identity, the issues of the representations the dominant society has assigned to me for my identity as a Native– these issues are the really challenging and difficult issues at the heart of the implementation of IEFA. These issues are the results of colonialism. We want to integrate Indian representation and voice into Montana schools and the consequences of colonialism are a huge obstacle. IEFA was designed to decolonize school curricula.

Carol indicated that the purpose of IEFA was to integrate the voices and

perspectives of the Montana Tribal Nations into school curricula. Since the Indian

peoples of Montana have a right to represent themselves in school curricula, IEFA was

designed to decolonize schools through the integration of Indigenous epistemologies,

pedagogies, and heritages throughout school curricula.

Integrate Indigenous Epistemologies: Many of the participants believed that the purpose of IEFA was the integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula. The integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula was designed to help educators present more balanced and accurate representations of Indigenous knowledge, perspectives, and life ways. In the data I collected from the IEFA survey, one educator indicated that IEFA was designed to integrate Indigenous knowledge into school curricula, "I feel that Montana's Indian children should see themselves in our schools. Montana's Indian nations are a part of our history and should be a part of our curriculum." The participants' perceptions of the purposes of IEFA as a curricula reform were confirmed by the data I collected within my document analysis. My document analysis revealed that the Montana legislature had mandated the integration of "American Indian history, traditions, customs, values, beliefs, ethics, and the contemporary affairs of American Indians into all Montana classrooms" in H.B. 343 in 1973 (p. 1).

In the following discussion, I have included a section of a conversation with my research participant, Dave. Several of the educators indicated that they believed IEFA was designed to integrate Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula, but Dave had taught for fifteen years and had worked to address the misrepresentations of Indigenous epistemologies and perspectives in school curricula throughout his career.   In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Dave with a (D).

> **D**: I believe that IEFA is a re-visiting of our curriculum to ensure that it is balanced and complete, as far as how we are presenting American history, and the involvement of the Native cultures. I guess my perception is that IEFA curriculum was designed to help us to set the record a little straighter, and to perhaps to help us to develop more balanced opinions about of what really happened here without necessarily a negative

judgment on our predecessors or our ancestors, but certainly to help us present a more honest account of how things have really occurred.

Pedagogical Reforms

Address Academic Achievement Gap: Several of the educators indicated that the purpose of IEFA was to address the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students in Montana schools. IEFA was created to equip educators with the knowledge and skills they needed to adapt their pedagogical strategies to meet the needs of their Indian students. The educators believed that the implementation of IEFA should be designed to help educators to adapt their pedagogies to the cultural backgrounds, interests, and learning styles of their Indian students. Once they understood how to adapt their instructional strategies to meet the needs and interests of their Indian students, they believed that the academic achievement of their Indian students would definitely improve.

During my time at the research site, I had the privilege of working with an educator that allowed me to model an IEFA lesson about Blackfeet oral histories in her classroom. After I taught the lesson, I had a conversation with this educator that helped me to understand her frustrations and concerns about connecting with and raising the academic achievement of her Indian students. Throughout our conversation, she asked me if I had noticed that an Indian student in her class had appeared disengaged and even hostile while I taught the IEFA lesson. She indicated that she believed it was difficult to work with her Indian students when they were so withdrawn and disengaged. She felt

that IEFA should help her to identify the specific pedagogical strategies to overcome

these cultural barriers and raise the academic achievements of her Indian students.

In my document analysis, I also discovered that Linda Shadow had testified in a

1979 Montana legislative repeal hearing that she agreed that IEFA should help educators

to adapt their pedagogical strategies to meet the needs of their Indian students. She

believed that when educators lacked a clear understanding of the cultural backgrounds

and learning styles of their Indian students, the Indian students were placed at a

disadvantage in classrooms. She stated, "When educators are confronted with students

with different cultural patterns and rules of behavior and they lack knowledge and proper

understanding, they will almost certainly experience: confusion, irritation, and

annoyance; and, even more importantly attribute motivations and attitudes to their

students that are derived from the mainstream culture not from the student's culture"

(Shadow, 1979, p.1). The document analysis confirmed that educators wanted IEFA to

help them to adapt their instructional strategies to meet the needs of their Indian students.

In the next paragraph, I have included a section of a discussion that I had with an

educator that worked with the majority of the students that were struggling academically

at this middle school. Since she worked every day with several Indian students who had

academic difficulties, she possessed a great deal of clarity about how IEFA should

address the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students. In the

following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Erin with an (E).

> **E**: I think the purpose of IEFA was to create awareness in educators, and I
> mean that across the board – administration, everyone involved – that
> Native American children are coming from a culture where our modality
> doesn't match theirs, so to speak; nor does our history, nor does our

cultural perspective, so they have historically struggled academically in the schools.

M: How was IEFA designed to address these issues?

E: My expectation or understanding is that it's a program to help everyone in this state to have a better understanding of past, present, and future Indian-related issues, which span our entire curriculum and to raise Indian student academic achievement. IEFA should help me to understand Indian students, their pace of learning, their chronology of learning, so that I can connect with them and help them learn to the best of their ability.

Erin expressed feelings of frustration throughout our discussion because she believed that the current implementation of IEFA had failed to provide her with additional pedagogical strategies for working with her Indian students. She believed that the purpose of IEFA was to help educators to align their pedagogy and instructional strategies with the cultural backgrounds and learning styles of their Indian students. Erin believed that IEFA should provide educators with specific guidance about pedagogical strategies that would improve the academic achievement of their Indian students.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: In my discussions with the participants, I found that many of the educators wanted to learn more about the cultural backgrounds and learning styles of their Indian students. They believed the purpose of IEFA was to prepare educators with a greater understanding of the cultural backgrounds of their Indian students. Several educators lacked confidence in their understanding of Indian culture and the best instructional strategies for teaching Indian students. IEFA should equip educators with the knowledge and skills they needed to provide culturally responsive pedagogy for their Indian students. Elizabeth, my next participant, believed that IEFA had failed to provide educators with the knowledge they needed to contextualize Indian

student learning within Indigenous cultural contexts. In the following discussion, I am

identified with an (M) and Elizabeth with an (E).

> **E**: IEFA should help me to get the knowledge I need of Indian cultures to help my students to learn. I need to get that knowledge - the same knowledge I have of the subject I teach, I need that same knowledge of Indian culture so I can carry that over into my teaching.

> **M**: Why do you think that learning Indian culture is the purpose of IEFA?

> **E**: IEFA should help us to understand the cultural backgrounds of Indian students so we can help them be more successful in school. As teachers, we need to understand why students might act certain ways because of their cultural backgrounds so we can build the types of relationships that are the key to student learning.

Build Relationships

Promote Intercultural Communication: Many of the participants believed that the

purpose of IEFA was to build relationships between Indians and non-Indians in Montana.

According to several of the educators, the first step in building these relationships was

promoting better intercultural communication between Indians and non-Indians.

Throughout the course of this study, most of the participants expressed a sense of

desperation and discouragement because they believed that the intercultural

communication between the school community and the Indian students and their families

had been so strained in the past. In conversation after conversation, the educators shared

their experiences with cultural miscommunications and misunderstandings that had led to

a culture of distrust, anger, and fear within the community that they desperately wanted to

overcome.

In my document analysis, I discovered that building relationships and improving the communication between Indians and non-Indians was a key feature within the original design of IEFA. The 1999 Montana legislature indicated that improving the communication and relationships between Indian and non-Indians was one of the most significant purposes of IEFA. IEFA (1999) mandated that, "every educational agency and all educational personnel work cooperatively with Montana tribes or those tribes who are in close proximity and all school personnel should have an understanding and an awareness of Indian tribes to help them relate more effectively with Indian students and parents" (p. 1). The document analysis indicated that IEFA recognized that the relationships and communication between Indians and non-Indians within Montana schools needed improvement.

In the following excerpt you will read a small section of a conversation that I had with Janelle, another key participant in this study. Janelle had worked a great deal in her job with helping the educators to build better relationships and communication with Indian students and their families. She believed that the primary purpose of IEFA was equipping educators with intercultural knowledge and communication skills they needed for their work with Indian students and families. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Janelle with (JA).

M: What do you think is the purpose of IEFA?

JA: IEFA should equip the faculty and staff in this school with specific skills to improve the intercultural communication with Indian families and students. Our lack of communication with Indian families has been a problem in the past. I think the purpose of IEFA should be to prepare educators and help us to understand, what the Native American kids are dealing with in order to improve our communication and our teaching.

Build Relationships: Several of the participants believed that IEFA was designed

to build relationships between the Indian and non-Indian members of this school

community. Many of the educators felt that their school was a welcoming community

that cared about kids, but they agreed that Indian students and their families experienced

culture shock when they tried to integrate into the school. The educators believed that

IEFA should help them to communicate more effectively and build better relationships

with Indian students and their families. Tim, the next participant, suggested that the

primary purpose of IEFA was to help educators to build better relationships with their

Indian students and families. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and

Tim with a (T).

> **T**: Even though I like to think we're very friendly here at this school, I know it is a cultural shock for Indian kids and families. Our expectations are different. We expect better attendance. IEFA needs to help us learn how to build better relationships with Indian kids and their families.

> **M**: How do you think IEFA can fulfill this purpose?

> **T**: I think the temptation of IEFA is to just focus on the academics because that seems easier, and the academic focus of IEFA is important. But really, the primary purpose of IEFA should be building or re-building relationships. IEFA needs to help us learn how to do both of these things in order for it to work. IEFA should make our school feel even more open for Indian students and families. We need to learn how to build good relationships with Indian families with open dialogue that is crucial and help us to have better interactions with the Indian communities as a whole. One of the things we need to do is make sure that we build a better cultural bridge of understanding between the communities through relationships.

While I was working at the research site, I had the opportunity to observe a series

of interactions between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and parents that

confirmed that the implementation of IEFA needed to equip this school community with

specific intercultural communication and relationship building strategies. One of the interactions I observed occurred simply by coincidence while I was working as an IEFA consultant. One day I was waiting to meet with an educator in the main office, and I was asked by a school staff member to walk an Indian parent down to a meeting with a group of educators. As I walked down the hallway with the parent, she asked me what I did in the school and told her that I was currently working as an IEFA consultant. The parent appeared visibly agitated and she asked me why I thought that I had a right to represent her tribe or teach her child about her tribal community. She indicated that she was very unhappy with how her child had been treated here and she was not impressed with the relationships she currently had with members of the school community. She indicated that she believed that rather than trying to teach her child about her tribal community or culture that I should help the school community learn how to build better relationships with Indian students and parents.

<div align="center">

Question Two: What were the Educators'
Perceptions of the Greatest Obstacles to IEFA?

</div>

The participants in this study had a lot to say about their perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. This study revealed that the educators believed there were far more obstacles than there were sources of support for the IEFA implementation. The participants identified several obstacles to the implementation of IEFA, so I chose to organize the obstacles around three major themes. The first theme included the participants' perceptions of the greatest systemic obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. The educators identified colonialism and systemic racism as the

most significant systemic obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. Since school

curricula and pedagogy had played a key role in perpetuating systemic racism and the

assimilation of Indian students into mainstream society, the participants believed that

these were obvious obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. Arguing that the school

had well established social hierarchies, some of the educators indicated that they believed

whiteness and white privilege were obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. Since they

had a lack of clarity about the purposes of the current implementation efforts, several

participants suggested that the current IEFA implementation had devolved into a form of

tokenism.

The second theme within the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to

the implementation of IEFA included school level obstacles. The educators indicated

that the demands of outside meetings and committees in addition to their normal teaching

loads and duties made implementing IEFA difficult due to a lack of time. In contrast to

the majority of the educators, one participant argued that the greatest obstacle to the

implementation was the resistance to change and accountability. The final group of

participants argued that the greatest obstacle to the implementation of IEFA was a lack of

valuing among the educators. Other participants indicated that the greatest obstacle to the

implementation of IEFA was the Indian student absences and drop-out rates.

The participants identified interpersonal and intercultural conflict as a significant

obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. Many of the educators believed that there was a

history of poor intercultural communication between the Indian students, their families,

and the school community. They felt that poor intercultural communication had led to a

series of strained relationships between Indian students, their families, and the school community. In this context, several educators were afraid of saying or doing the wrong thing, so they had chosen not to implement the IEFA curricula. Many of the participants described experiences with Indian students and families that they believed demonstrated the interpersonal mistrust and defensiveness that had made implementing the IEFA curricula more difficult. Many of the educators expressed frustration and a sense of hopelessness about their relationships with their Indian students and families. In the following table, I have included an illustration of the codes I used to identify the educators' perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Illustration of Codes for Educators' Perceptions of Obstacles to IEFA

Educators' Perceptions of Obstacles	Category/ Code Descriptor
Systemic Level	
	Colonialism
	Race and Racism
	Whiteness/White Privilege/White Guilt
	Lack of Clarity
	Tokenism
School Level	
	Time
	Resistance to Change/Accountability
	Lack of Valuing and Buy In
	High Rates of School Absences/Dropout
Interpersonal Level	
	Disconnection/Relationships
	Intercultural Miscommunications
	Mistrust and Defensiveness
	Invisibility
	Drop-outs/Push-outs

<u>Systemic Obstacles to IEFA</u>

<u>Colonialism</u>: The more time I spent reviewing this data and analyzing the

participant perceptions of IEFA, the more I understood the significance of colonialism

and imperial ideology in shaping the daily experiences and interactions between the

Indian and non-Indian educators and students in this middle school. The consequences of

colonialism and imperial ideologies were so deeply embedded within the hearts and

minds of the Indian and non-Indian participants in this study that my analysis of their

perceptions of IEFA would have to be contextualized within the legacies of these

troubled histories.

Throughout my study, my conversations with Carol had evolved to become

increasingly candid and open. As a late career educator, Carol had watched several

different educational reforms launched with varying degrees of success throughout her

tenure at the school.   In the following interview, Carol revealed that she believed

colonialism was the major significant obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. In the

following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Carol with a (C).

> **M**: What do you think are the most significant obstacles to IEFA?
>
> **C**: Colonialism. The dominant society's expectations of Indian peoples
> and the consequences of colonialism are huge obstacles to the
> implementation of IEFA. The biggest obstacle created by colonialism is
> the whole idea that it created the Native as subject. Natives under
> colonialism have not been treated as active, equal participants, but as
> subjects under study for the colonial institutions. The biggest problem is
> that Natives have been treated as subjects to be dissected when we are
> people.
>
> **M**: How do you believe colonialism impacts the implementation of IEFA?

C: I think the colonialism has had a lasting impact on Native American identity and how Native Americans are expected to act by members of the mainstream society. Colonialism has established expectations for who I am supposed to be, the federal government has established expectations for who I am supposed to be, and they have claimed the right to represent me in the past. IEFA has attempted to disrupt and decolonize these representations and give us the right to represent ourselves.

Race and Racism: Throughout the course of this study, the participants revealed that even though they did not believe that individual acts of racism were an issue in the school, they did believe that the consequences of systemic racism were a significant obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. The participants agreed that the colonial representations of Indigenous people had portrayed them as an inferior, uncivilized, and primitive racial group in order to justify the illegal seizure of and removal from Indigenous homelands and the colonization of every aspect of Indigenous life. Within the colonial context, Indigenous people had been racialized and the relationships between Indians and non-Indians were changed forever.

My document analysis revealed that Indian students felt that they had been stereotyped and denied equality of opportunity in Montana schools. At the 1979 Montana legislative repeal hearing, teacher-education candidate at Montana State University-Bozeman, Barbara Kates (1979) a Chippewa Cree, indicated that she had been taught racialized and stereotypical representations of Indian peoples that made her ashamed to be an Indian. She stated that these stereotypes had made her feel "inadequate and ashamed that I was an Indian. We were taught that Indians were savages, drunks, and a worthless bunch" (p. 1). Several Indian students and educators indicated that they felt these racial stereotypes had made a direct impact on their educational experiences.

While working as an IEFA consultant within the school community, I had the opportunity to interact with Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and parents. I observed an interaction between a group of educators and an Indian parent. In these discussions the Indian parent indicated that she believed both she and her daughter had been racially stereotyped as dumb Indians. She indicated that she believed her daughter had been placed in lower academic tracks because she was an Indian not because she had academic deficits. In a subsequent discussion with the educators and the parent involved in these interactions, both the educators and the parent indicated that they believed they had been racially stereotyped. Although I had observed several positive interactions between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and parents within the middle school, this particular participant observation indicated that race was an obstacle to the implementation of IEFA in this situation.

In the following interview with my participant, Rob, he shared an example of how he believed systemic racism impacted the implementation of IEFA in this school community. In this interview, Rob described one of his discussions with an Indian parent. In this discussion he believed that despite his efforts to communicate and teach an Indian student from a colorblind and neutral perspective his interactions became racialized, emotionally charged, and very complicated. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Rob with an (R).

> **R**: I think that preconceived ideas about race are a huge obstacle to IEFA. When Indian students struggle, the families seem to believe that the problem is racism without looking at other possible issues as well. As teachers, we don't have time to see race; we see scores and low grades. What gets our attention as teachers is a child's grades, not a child's culture, race, religion, or anything like that. As teachers we are being held

to an expectation that when we teach, we are doing so in a race-less, religion-less, and gender-less way.

M: Could you explain why you believe race is the most significant obstacle to IEFA?

R: Sure. We had an Indian parent that came in bristling – and again, she came in with the perception that we had identified her child as a struggling student that needed extra help only because she was an Indian. The parent believed we were stereotyping the child with a lack of ability because the child was an Indian. The parent seemed very hostile, and we were just trying to help the child. The parent felt like we were stereotyping and believed we were treating her like a dumb Indian.

M: How do you think these interactions impact the implementation of IEFA?

R: When the parent used that kind of blunt racialized language it was very startling for all of us. And again, in this particular school, I don't want to be naïve but I don't see a lot of immediate prejudice here. With the Indian students I've had experiences with, I think they've been really, really welcomed here. These interactions based on racial assumptions create a climate of fear that was difficult to overcome.

Whiteness/White Privilege: Throughout my time at the school, several of the participants mentioned that they were afraid of either saying or doing something that was offensive to the Indian students and their families, so they had chosen to avoid the implementation of the IEFA curricula entirely. During my time working as an IEFA consultant within the school, I had several discussions with educators that indicated that they felt uncomfortable implementing the curricula. In a discussion with one particular educator, she indicated that she did not feel comfortable implementing the IEFA curricula because she had not received adequate professional development. She also suggested that her other curricula goals and objectives were more important within this particular district and school community.

My next participant, Jen, believed that this fear within the community was based on preconceptions or assumptions about race especially perceptions of whiteness, white guilt, and white privilege. She identified these racial assumptions as a significant obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Jen with a (J).

> **M**: What do you think are the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA?
>
> **J**: I think the major obstacles to the implementation of IEFA here are whiteness, white guilt, and white privilege. Some people here truly think that we cannot talk to the kids about white privilege and its connection to IEFA. This is difficult for me to say, but I think just the fact that the teachers assume the right to say that they don't want to implement IEFA, or that they are afraid to implement IEFA, or that they either don't have time to implement IEFA or that they simply won't implement it, all of those responses mean that they are speaking from positions of incredible privilege. They have assumed the right to decide whose voices will or will not be heard in their classrooms.

Lack of Clarity: Throughout most of my conversations with the participants, one of the recurring themes within their perceptions of IEFA was that the current implementation had a lack of Indian presence, a lack of consensus about its benefits to Indian students, and a lack of clarity about the purpose of IEFA. These frustrations fed into the educators' fears about race, racism, and the issues surrounding authentic Indian representations, leading many of the participants to demand more clarity about the purpose and design of IEFA before they agreed to implement the curricula. In the following conversation, Erin indicated that the current implementation of IEFA was so nebulous and unclear that most educators had simply chosen not to implement the curricula. In the following discussion, Erin is identified with an (E).

E: The greatest obstacle is that most people don't even know what IEFA does. I don't know what it really is or what I am supposed to be doing with it, because I haven't really seen it in action. Or maybe I don't know what I'm supposed to be looking for. I don't have a clear understanding of what I should be doing, and I haven't seen a clear implementation of the IEFA curricula. I want to know how it is going to help my students and help me be a better teacher. It is too nebulous and unclear right now so most teachers don't take it seriously.

Tokenism: Several of the participants suggested that the current implementation of IEFA had become a form of tokenism. The educators indicated that the IEFA curricula and implementation should be re-designed to fit more organically and naturally into the existing school standards, school curricula, and instructional goals. If the IEFA curricula and implementation fit more holistically and organically into the other educational goals established at the state, district, and school levels, the participants suggested that the IEFA implementation would be far more authentic and meaningful. In the IEFA survey, an educator stated that the current IEFA implementation lacked authenticity and had become a form of tokenism, "I feel it is disrespectful to Native people to approach IEFA with great intent but little knowledge. I would rather have teachers do nothing than do misleading work."

In the following excerpt, I include a section of a discussion that I had with my participant Michael. Michael suggested that the IEFA curricula and implementation needed to be re-designed to make it more effective in schools. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Michael with an (MC).

M: What do you think are the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA?

MC: IEFA should be integrated organically into our curriculum and standards so that it does not look like just another add-on or another token program. IEFA needs to come up in natural ways with the other major objectives we are working on as a school community. IEFA should be integrated into current curriculum and utilize curriculum that's already there. There's too much to do already to have something added on for arbitrary or token reasons. When teachers know it's not being done in a meaningful way or valuable way it is offensive, this kind of token-ism doesn't do anything but build resentment and resistance among the faculty and staff. It needs to have a meaningful and natural connection. It can't be forced.

School Level Obstacles

Time: When I tried to think about how to describe the intensity of the climate in this research site, I struggled to come up with the words to explain the relentless pace of the school day for these participants. While working as an IEFA consultant, I interacted with all of the teaching teams within the middle school. I recorded my participant observations in a research journal and reviewed that data throughout the course of this study. When I reviewed my research journal, I discovered that I had recorded a discussion with a teaching team that had indicated that their team did not have adequate time to implement the IEFA materials. This particular team expressed frustration with the IEFA materials and indicated that that they did not have adequate time to figure out how to align the IEFA curricula with all of their other instructional goals. This team indicated that they did not have time to speak with me about IEFA or to implement the IEFA curricula. Over the course of this study, several educators expressed that they felt significant pressure to meet the increasing demands within the school district. Many

educators felt that they could not give up valuable class time to implement the IEFA

materials.

When I sat down to interview my participants, I was not surprised to hear that

many of them felt like lack of time was a major obstacle to the implementation of IEFA.

Many of the participants felt like they had so many different things that demanded their

attention every day that it was difficult for them to find the time to implement the IEFA

curricula. Abigail, my next participant, indicated that time was the greatest obstacle to

the implementation of IEFA. In the following excerpt, Abigail is identified with an (A).

> **A**: I think time is the greatest obstacle to the implementation of IEFA.
> I think people are very hard hard-working here, but I think people are
> strapped for time, I do think there are a lot of meetings, and I think this is
> a job you don't get done between your hours of being here, so you have to
> dedicate more time outside your regular work day. I would just say this,
> this is the first district that has maxed me out to the point where I don't
> want to volunteer for committees anymore or make any changes to my
> teaching. I just don't have time.

Resistance to Change/Accountability: My document analysis revealed that one of

the major obstacles to previous implementation efforts was educator resistance to change.

During the repeal hearing held by the Montana legislature in 1979, educators testified that

they did not support the curricula because they believed it was discriminatory and

unnecessary. As a journalist, Deidre McNamer (1978) recorded statements that

demonstrated educator resistance to the educational reforms at a teacher training

workshop. One educator stated, "It's still an emotional subject. They did a fine job of

legislating prejudice. When you say a teacher MUST, it slaps, it hurts, it causes a lot of

hardships" (p. 11). Educators resisted the educational reforms and indicated that they

resented the legislative mandates and they did not feel like they should be forced to participate in professional development events.

During my interview with my research participant, Edward, he was very candid about his perceptions of the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA. He believed that the educators were deeply resistant to change and accountability. Edward indicated that the implementation of IEFA would have to devise strategies to overcome educator resistance to be effective.

> **E**: Asking teachers to change is the biggest hurdle or obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. It isn't easy to get teachers to change anything – regardless of the content, topic, law – ask a teacher to do more of anything, and see how far you get. And there will always be teachers that aren't open to change in any school. For some of the teachers, as long as IEFA is not enforced and they are uncomfortable with change, they are not going to implement IEFA. If IEFA is not enforced, then the teachers that are resistant to change will never do it.

Lack of Valuing and Buy-In: While some of the educators believed that resistance to change was the most significant obstacle to IEFA, others indicated that the lack of buy-in or valuing among educators was the greatest obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. If educators had a clearer understanding of the purposes and the benefits of the IEFA curricula for their students and their teaching, they would readily accept and implement the curricula. The participants believed that the current implementation was ineffective because it had been presented to teachers as a legal mandate rather than a way to modify their teaching to improve Indian students' academic achievement in schools.

In the IEFA survey, educators indicated that they believed there was a lack of valuing because the implementation of IEFA had been too broad, superficial, and inadequate to actually equip educators with the knowledge and skills they needed to implement the curricula. One educator suggested that, "IEFA funds and training have not been used effectively." The educator indicated that the IEFA curricula and implementation needed to be re-designed in a way that helped educators to understand the purpose and the benefit of the curricula for their students. Once educators had the knowledge and skills they needed, they would embrace and implement the IEFA curricula.

In the following excerpt, you will read a section of an interview with my research participant Michael. Michael suggested that educators had failed to find value in the current implementation of IEFA because the purpose and design of the curricula were still unclear. Michael is identified with an (MC) and I am identified with an (M).

> **MC**: I would say that there's a lack of understanding and lack of clarity about the purposes of IEFA. There's a lack of buy-in because of this lack of understanding, people don't see the value of or the connection with IEFA clearly right now.

> **M**: Could you describe what you mean when you say that there is a lack of understanding and a lack of buy-in to IEFA?

> **MC**: Sure. There is a lack of understanding of why IEFA is important or necessary for many teachers. There is a general lack of knowledge or interest – simply because I think we've been going on for so long without really having to embrace it. I think that there is a lack of valuing. Many people view IEFA as one more thing they have to do, I'd say. I would say that people would need more education on it, on why they should value it.

Interpersonal Level Obstacles

Disconnection/Relationships: The next obstacle to the implementation of IEFA identified by the research participants was relationships. As I listened to the educators describe their struggle to build and maintain relationships with their Indian students and families, I began to realize how colonialism had impacted the relationships between my participants. Every participant expressed frustration and discouragement when they discussed the strain that characterized many of their relationships with their Indian students and their families. The participants hoped that the implementation of IEFA would help them learn how to restore these relationships and build bridges of understandings across cultural communities within the school.

In the following excerpt from an interview, Jim described the essence of many of my participants' experiences with their Indian students and families. Jim described how deeply discouraged he was with his inability to build connections and relationships with his Indian students and their families. Of all my participants, his descriptions of this interpersonal separation and alienation possessed the most poignancy and clarity. He was honest and forthright in his experiences and how he had responded to them. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Jim is identified with a (J).

> **M**: What do you think are the major obstacles to the implementation of IEFA?
>
> **J**: Building relationships. I have a hard time connecting with Native American students at times. I don't know if it's because of the culture of our school; that they don't feel welcome, or – I don't know what it is. This conflict makes it seem like it's more of a fight to get to know the Indian students and their families. The body language of Indian students seems defensive and it is difficult to know how to respond to it as a teacher.

M: How do you think these relationships are an obstacle?

J: I can only speak for myself, but it seems like so many of my Indian students just sit back in their chairs, slouching, their heads seem to be always looking down, and they seem to lack engagement. There is a defensiveness there that I don't know how to handle right now. I don't know what to do with that. The Indian students seem to be so defensive and they seem to separate themselves, they seem to be very antagonistic and defensive.

M: When you have those interactions as a teacher, how do you respond?

J: So I don't know. I don't teach them. I see that some are late to every class, try to get out of things, late to school every day. Just that interaction, it bothers me and I think about it a lot. I want to know what to do with those walls. It's true that those walls are really there, and I don't know how to get through them. I am just desperately trying to figure out how to make a connection.

Intercultural Miscommunications/Misunderstandings: As a participant observer, I observed several intercultural misunderstandings and miscommunications throughout this study. When I reviewed my research journal, I was reminded of a particular participant observation that demonstrated the power of intercultural miscommunications and misunderstandings to disrupt relationships and perpetuate conflict. When I attended a professional development event with a group of educators and administrators from the school district, I observed an Indian educator while he shared his personal collection of Indigenous archeological artifacts with district educators. At first, the district educators seemed to respond with curiosity and interest while he shared his impressive collection of artifacts, but when the educator started to share his experiences at the annual tribal buffalo hunt the conversation seemed to change. The Indian educator shared that each year members of his tribal community participated in a sanctioned hunt of the buffalo

herds that had strayed outside of the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park. He

indicated that this hunt provided the tribe with enough food to supply the needs of most

of the members of the tribal community throughout the winter months. Since the

Yellowstone National Park bison hunt has been a very controversial subject in Montana

for many years, I was not surprised when several of the non-Indian educators appeared to

become visibly agitated and indicated that they neither appreciated nor supported the

bison hunt. When the Indian educator described his perspective of the yearly buffalo

hunt, he seemed to disrupt some of the district educators' expectations of how he should

behave and think as an Indian. As the conversation evolved, the interactions seemed to

regress into an openly hostile intercultural conflict.

In the next interview excerpt, Carol suggested that colonialism and imperial

ideologies had established such a narrow worldview for most people that is was difficult

for them to imagine a world outside of their own. Although Carol had helped several of

her fellow teachers to grow in their understanding of Indigenous perspectives, she had

also come to understand how difficult it was for people to make those types of paradigm

shifts. In the following discussion, Carol explained how colonialism had made

intercultural communication and understanding very difficult for Indians and non-

Indians. In the following excerpt, I am identified with an (M) and Carol is identified with

a (C).

> **C**: I think a major obstacle to IEFA is that people cannot completely
> understand a culture unless they have lived it themselves. I went on an
> IEFA professional development event, and one of the things that became
> glaringly obvious to me was that – we went to reservations, we were on
> Native land, but our interactions with Natives were extremely minimal.

We were not engaging in real discussions with Indian people. And the teachers that went were looking for a lot more.

M: How did you interpret that gap? What do you think you observed and how to you think it is an obstacle to IEFA?

C: Yes, I think I started to think about what it was that we were really doing there if we weren't building relationships with Natives. And so then it opens up all these other questions: What was really going on? We couldn't wrap our head around it, why did they use those words, or when we asked these questions why did we get that answer…and it was almost hostile. The Indian and non-Indian participants did not seem to be talking with each other or listening to one another, they were talking at each other. Hostile. They were hostile to each other. There was no reconciliation of those relationships there that day.

M: How did this particular experience impact you? How did you interpret it?

C: It was the protection of Indigenous identity, and I understand that. So it's not as simple as some people would like to make it, because that holistic nature of a culture cannot be dissected and torn apart into strands. I don't believe most Indian people are going to resist the implementation of IEFA, but they will if the implementation of the curriculum looks like it is just another attempt to simplify, dissect, and colonize their culture so it can be neatly appropriated to fit into the mainstream society.

Carol had observed a series of intercultural miscommunications and misunderstandings between Indian and non-Indian educators that she had identified as a major obstacle to IEFA. Carol had observed both Indian and non-Indian participants in a IEFA professional development event safe guarding their cultural identities rather than strengthening their relationships and growing in their understanding of each other. Since this implementation of IEFA had been removed from a relational context, Carol believed that the IEFA event had actually caused more harm than good. Without addressing the colonial context and the need for building relationships, the event had generated more

hostility and misunderstandings between the Indian and non-Indians in attendance that day.

Mistrust/Defensiveness: Several of the participants in this study had witnessed interpersonal conflicts between Indian and non-Indian members of their school community. Many of the educators wanted to learn how to build trust and rapport with their Indian students in order to overcome this defensiveness and mistrust. As a participant observer, I observed interactions between Indian students and non-Indian teachers that could easily be attributed to mistrust or defensiveness. As an IEFA consultant, I observed one particular educator interacting with his Indian students in his classroom and in the hallways. When this educator attempted to engage in a discussion with his Indian students, the students usually looked at the ground, defended themselves verbally, tilted back in their chairs, or walked in the other direction. The Indian students appeared to refuse to participate in classroom activities, seemed to prefer to disengage from classroom discussions, and seemed to react with hostility when the educator tried to start up conversations with them. The educator appeared visibly frustrated and discouraged.

In my next interview, Mike described this mistrust and defensiveness among the Indian students he worked with at the school. He included a description of how he has tried to build trust and rapport with each Indian student. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Mike is identified with an (MK).

M: What do you think is the greatest obstacle to the implementation of IEFA?

MK: Well, I think the greatest obstacle to IEFA is mistrust. So there's a deep mistrust, and we especially see the mistrust with our students that have just moved here right off of the reservation. They're highly suspicious of me and of everyone else here.

M: What do you mean when you say mistrust and how is this connected to IEFA in your mind?

MK: And I don't feel a lot of negativity, but I sense uneasiness or mistrust when I try to talk to the Indian students. They have a lot of caution. And again, it's different with all different kids but they all seem to be very cautious at first when they come here. They seem to have a defensive barrier that is designed to preserve not to be aggressive or to hurt people. The barrier does not seem to be negative, it just seems that the students want to preserve what they have already and they seem to feel threatened and vulnerable here at first. I do a lot and I wait a long time to re-build these relationships and restore that trust that has been broken for a long time. IEFA should help all of us learn how to restore these relationships and restore that trust in our schools.

Invisibility: Historically, Indian peoples have learned several mechanisms of resistance in order to survive and resist cultural assimilation within mainstream educational institutions. While a certain degree of defensiveness and mistrust can certainly be understood within the historical context of the educational experiences of Indian students, the educators in this study identified the invisibility of Indian students and their families as a significant obstacle to IEFA within this school. In the following segment of an interview, Scott identified the invisibility of Indian students and families within the school community as the most significant obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. In the following discussion, I am identified with an (M) and Scott is identified with an (S).

M: What do you think are the major obstacles to IEFA?

S: Building relationships with the Indian parents and the students has been difficult because they are kind of invisible. I mean, we might hear from an Indian students' family – somebody's dad came in and talked to a staff member, but I didn't see him myself. Or you might hear about the grandma that said, I don't think we'll get dad to come in, or grandma calls and says, don't think you're going to get him to come in. It is just difficult to build relationships that way. The Indian families and parents rarely come in to speak with us to build a relationship with the faculty and staff. They just never come in, you never see them, there's not that connection. I want them to know that my door is always open but it is difficult when I never see them.

Drop-Outs/Push-Outs: Several of the educators indicated that Indian student invisibility and school absences were major obstacles to the implementation of IEFA within this school community. Every educator that participated in this study indicated that the high rates of school absenteeism and school transfers among Indian students were the most significant obstacle to their academic achievement. Several of the educators asked me for specific strategies for building relationships with Indian students and their families. The participants expressed feelings of concern and frustration with their failed attempts to reach out and build relationships with Indian students and their families. In the following interview excerpt, Jane shared her perspective on school absences, school drop outs, and the implementation of IEFA.   In the following excerpt, Jane is identified with a (J) and I am identified with an (M).

J: It has been a struggle for all of the teachers throughout my career, it is more work for a teacher and it's really hard on the Indian kids, because they're always behind and trying to catch up with their classmates. I think eventually it has meant that a lot of my Indian students have just become so discouraged that they have dropped out when they were very intelligent and capable. I really think that the issue is that they have not felt comfortable here so they are gone a lot and they are always trying to play catch-up. So it's hard. It's hard for them.

M: What do you think are the major obstacles to IEFA and the academic achievement of your Indian students?

J: And yet, they can do good work from what I've seen, but they are always behind because of school absences and feeling isolated here at school. As a teacher, you try to give them what they need to get caught back up, but they are still missing stuff that happened when they were gone. Many of our Indian students miss a lot of class discussions, so they don't make the connections between how this connects to the next thing we're going to learn. Their learning is fragmented, so they are falling more and more behind every year because these gaps are cumulative. Every gap has a consequence in the lives of the students.

<div align="center">

Question Three: What were Educators' Perceptions of the Most
<u>Beneficial Sources of Support for Future Implementations of IEFA?</u>

</div>

The educators had a diversity of opinions about the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA. I had several conversations with the educators and I identified three major themes within their perceptions of the best sources of support for future implementations of IEFA: 1) content knowledge and curricula, 2) pedagogical reform, and 3) intercultural communication and relationships. Content knowledge and curricula was the first major theme within the participant perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support. The educators wanted an ongoing, systemic, and recursive professional development series in cooperation with Indigenous experts with connections to specific Montana Tribal Nations. Through partnerships with Indigenous mentors within specific tribal communities, the educators hoped to gain the knowledge of Indigenous epistemologies, perspectives, and life ways that they felt they needed to implement the IEFA curricula.

The second major theme in the educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA was pedagogical support and mentorship. The educators indicated that they wanted mentorship and support from an onsite Indigenous expert that could model effective pedagogical strategies for teaching Indian students. Several of the participants indicated that they wanted onsite mentoring and modeling with educators that had a proven record of teaching experience and success with Indian students. With this mentorship and knowledge, the educators felt that they could be more confident and successful with their Indian students.

Intercultural relationships and communication was the third major thematic strand within the educators' perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA. The educators indicated that they needed additional support to improve their intercultural communication and relationships with Indian families, parents, and students. Several participants indicated that they wanted to find a common ground and build closer relationships between the Indian and non-Indian members of the school community. They felt that improving the relationships with Indian students and their families through the guidance of and Indigenous or tribal mentor would be the key to their success with IEFA. In the following table, I have included an illustration of the codes I used to identify the educators' perceptions of the best sources of support for the future implementations of IEFA (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Illustration of Codes for Educators' Perceptions of Best Sources of Future Support

Educators' Perceptions of Support	Category/ Code Descriptor
Curricula Design/Implementation	
	Systemic/Clear Curricula Design
	Recursive/Ongoing Implementation
	Indian Educators/Partners
Pedagogical Change/Support	
	Onsite Indian Ed. Specialist
	Culturally Responsive Pedagogy
Build Relationships	
	Build Relationships
	Common Ground/Paradigm Shift

Curricula Design/ Implementation

Clear Curricula Design: The participants expressed concern that the IEFA curricula had never been integrated in an organic way into state content standards, state performance standards, and district curricula goals. Several of the educators indicated that the best source of support for the implementation of IEFA would be a much clearer curricula design and implementation strategy that fit organically into pre-existing standards and educational objectives. In the IEFA survey, the educators indicated that they believed that greater clarity about the purposes and the design of the IEFA curricula would be a very beneficial source of support. Once they had more clarity about the purpose and the design of the IEFA curricula, they felt that they could implement the curricula with more authenticity and appropriateness.

In the following excerpt from an interview, Michael indicated that he also believed that IEFA needed a clearer design and implementation strategy. He believed that

a clearer curricula design and implementation strategy would be one of the most significant sources of support for future IEFA implementation efforts. In the following excerpt, Michael has been identified with an (MC).

> **MC**: The IEFA implementation has all been too forced, and I believe that if we taught it the way it was intended the kids would know that it was forced. That was my first reaction; I'll be honest with you. And it felt like it had been designed as such a stretch, like an add-on rather than a well thought out design. I responded with the usual sense of well, we have to do it, because the state legislature told us we have to. And my first reaction was, quite frankly, this is silly. I knew that IEFA was going to be seen as a stretch unless it was re-designed and integrated more holistically and thoughtfully with the standards and our other educational goals in mind.

Recursive and Ongoing Implementation: Many of the participants expressed frustration and anger with the current implementation of IEFA. Several of the educators were angered by the fact that they were expected to teach the IEFA curricula without receiving adequate professional development. In the following interview excerpt, Erin indicated that she was very frustrated and disappointed with the current IEFA implementation. Erin felt that the current implementation efforts had been superficial and counter-productive and she wanted to see a recursive and ongoing and implementation of IEFA. In the following excerpt, my participant, Erin, is identified with an (E).

> **E**: I think that the implementation of IEFA has to be more clearly defined, ongoing, and recursive. I think everyone here at the school would be open to IEFA, if the school and the district would actually define it and actually do it. The IEFA implementation has to be a recursive process where we keep coming back to it, so it becomes a part of our teaching culture. It can't just be a one-time thing, but instead it has to be an ongoing, continuous process with several sources of support for the implementation of IEFA to work.

Indian Educators/Partners: Many of the participants believed that the best source

of support for future implementations of IEFA were ongoing partnerships with Indian

educators from specific tribal communities. Since the school community already valued

collaborations and professional partnerships, several of the educators expressed the desire

to partner with Indian educators with connections to specific tribal communities in

Montana. In the IEFA survey, the educators indicated that collaborations with Indian

learning partners and educators would be a very beneficial source of support for the

future implementations of IEFA. Since they were concerned about their lack of

background knowledge about Indian cultures and histories, they believed collaborations

with Indian partners and educators would help them to implement the IEFA curricula

materials in a more authentic and culturally appropriate way.

In the following interview excerpt, Beth indicated that collaborations with Indian

educators and Indian partners were the most beneficial sources of support for IEFA.

According to Beth, collaborating with an Indian educator and building curricula that

connected organically across the content areas would be the most beneficial source of

support for the implementation of IEFA in this middle school. In the following excerpt,

my participant, Beth, is identified with a (B).

> **B**: The best source of support for IEFA is mentorship and time we spent
> this year collaborating with Indian educators, who are expert teachers, and
> they helped us to make the connections with the kids. Being able to
> collaborate with a Native American teacher and the other teachers on my
> team with the IEFA curriculum development has been the most valuable
> source of support for IEFA. Together, we designed, developed, and
> implemented an IEFA curricula titled, "People, Place, and Nature." We
> aligned it with our content areas throughout the entire academic year and
> implemented it in a way that it was meaningful and it didn't look like just
> another add- on.

<u>Pedagogical Support</u>

Onsite Indian Education Specialist: Several of the educators indicated that the most beneficial source of support for future implementations of IEFA was an onsite Indian education specialist. In the IEFA survey, several of the participants indicated that they preferred to work with an onsite IEFA expert that had connections within a specific tribal community. The educators preferred working with an on-site Indian education specialist that had a proven record of success teaching Indian students. They indicated that they preferred working with an onsite Indian education coach or trainer to district level professional development opportunities.

In the following interview excerpt, Scott described the reasons why he believed that an onsite specialist was so vital to the future implementations of IEFA. Scott is identified with an (S) in the following excerpt.

> **S**: I like having a low-key onsite IEFA specialist who can ask the teachers what they are thinking, ask the teachers how they believe they can be supported, and then can work to meet those needs on a daily basis. This onsite specialist can help the teachers to think about ways that they can implement IEFA themselves. They get to choose how to implement it and the IEFA specialist just helps them find the materials and models how they can be used in the classroom. The onsite specialist really just plants the seed for other people and grows the internal capacity of the school from within in a quiet way. We need more in-house training like this. We need to be shown where the materials are and how we can teach them.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Several of the participants indicated that professional development opportunities that equipped educators with culturally responsive pedagogies for Indian students would be a very beneficial source of support for the future implementations of IEFA. Several educators indicated that they lacked a

clear understanding of Indigenous epistemologies, perspectives, and life ways and this gap in their knowledge had made it difficult to adapt their teaching to meet the needs of their Indian students.

My document analysis revealed that several educators felt that IEFA should equip them with the knowledge they needed to integrate culturally responsive pedagogies for Indian students. In my document analysis, I analyzed the testimony of Professor Whiteman at a Montana legislative repeal hearing. Whitman (1979) stated that the implementation of the curriculum reform efforts must integrate culturally responsive pedagogies for Indian students, "If schools are a microcosm of the real world, then the school and its curriculum must reflect the reality of that world, in this case the existence of and contributions of Montana's Indians" (p. 1). Educators indicated that the implementation of IEFA needed to equip educators with pedagogical content, knowledge, and methods that reflected both Indian and non-Indian cultures.

In the following interview, Rob indicated that he wanted to learn culturally responsive strategies for teaching his Indian students. He felt that the most beneficial source of support for IEFA would be professional development that equipped him with specific culturally responsive pedagogies that helped him to work more effectively with his Indian students. Rob has been identified with an (R) in the following excerpt.

> **R**: I know a lot of our Indian students have a lot of trouble academically, so IEFA should help us close the achievement gap between Indian and non-Indian students here at this school. So, I think they have had difficulty, because they have gaps in their understanding, so we have these ongoing academic achievement gaps. Many of the Native American kids we have right now are really struggling with reading, writing, and math skills, so IEFA needs to help us figure out how to meet those needs here.

<u>Build Relationships</u>

     <u>Relationships</u>: Many of the educators indicated that the most beneficial source of support for the implementation of IEFA would be training in specific strategies for connecting and building relationships with Indian students and their families. Although the participants struggled to identify the exact origins or causes of these broken relationships, they all agreed that they felt like the Indian students and their families were disconnected from the school community. They hoped that IEFA would provide them with the tools they needed to build relationships with their Indian students.

     As a participant observer within the research site, I had the privilege of working with a team of educators that were working to implement the IEFA curricula materials. I observed this team of educators while they implemented sections of their curricula at an outdoor school. The Indian and non-Indian educators on this teaching team indicated that the relationships they had built made it possible for them to design and implement the IEFA curricula in a meaningful and transformative way. The educators had collaborated across their academic content areas to design a curricula implementation that fit organically and naturally into their other educational objectives. When we discussed their perceptions of the most beneficial sources of support for future implementations of IEFA, they indicated that specific strategies for building relationships between Indian and non-Indians within the school community were very valuable sources of support.

     In the following interview excerpt, Scott indicated that he believed that the most beneficial source of support for the future implementations of IEFA would be strategies

for building relationships with Indian students and their families. Scott has been

identified with an (S) and I have been identified with an (M) in the following excerpt.

>**S**: I've seen a lot of teachers reach out to the Native American parents and not always have positive experiences. If OPI has people that do tribal, inter-cultural stuff, that's the kind of person that needs to come in and help us to learn how to communicate with one another, because this is a relationship and a communication thing, not a curriculum thing. I'm speaking personally, but I could use more training on how to communicate, connect, and build relationships with Native American people.

>**M**: What do you think is the source of this disconnection and how do you think IEFA should address it?

>**S**: We are dealing with intense and ongoing cultural misunderstandings and cultural differences. We need to work on rebuilding those connections with the Indian people in our school so they feel comfortable here. We need specific strategies for rebuilding those relationships and creating that sense of community for everyone here.

>**M**: How do you think IEFA can help you to restore the relationships here?

>**S**: I really think we could use some type of formal liaison that works with all of our families to help us build good relationships with the Indian families, students, and communities. I think we need someone specifically from within the Native American cultures that could be an assistant in that transition process.

Common Ground/Paradigm Shift: Throughout this study, the participants

indicated that they wanted to find a common ground where the Indian and non-Indian

members of this community could meet to discuss the difficult issues surrounding the

implementation of IEFA. My participant Carol had worked for several years to try to

provide her colleagues with the materials, guidance, and time they needed to implement

the IEFA materials. When we started to discuss the best sources of support for IEFA,

Carol indicated that the most beneficial source of support for IEFA were relationships

between Indian and non-Indian students, educators, and families. Carol is identified with

a (C) and I am identified with an (M) in the following excerpt.

> **C**: I don't think you can force the implementation of IEFA on people. I don't think you can force the type of personal transformation and the paradigm shifts that IEFA is trying to encourage people to make. So, we need to start by building a common meeting ground within the context of quality relationships. I think, and again coming back to that idealistic notion that we're all in this for the same purpose, that there has to be a huge paradigm shift within people to implement IEFA. I believe that educators need to make this shift from the 'noble savage' to, we're all people. That is our common ground.

> **M**: How do you think we can work to establish a common meeting ground between people?

> **C**: I think it is one of those things that people have to become comfortable with over time through relationships with Indian people. Because, like you observed, teachers will just shut down if they don't understand a particular aspect of Indian culture because particular aspects of Indian people and culture are just so contrary to their expectations in some situations.

<p style="text-align:center">Question Four: What were Educators'
<u>Perceptions of School Culture and Cultural Identity?</u></p>

The educator perceptions of school culture and cultural identity emerged within

conversations throughout the course of this study. I broke the educators' perceptions of

school culture and cultural identity into three themes: 1) community context, 2) school

context, and 3) classroom context. Theme one, community context, described the

educators' perceptions of the school culture within the context of the school and its

surrounding community. The second theme, school context, included the participants'

perceptions of the school culture as it had developed through the daily interactions within

the school. The final theme, classroom context, described the school culture within the

classroom context. In the following table, I have included an illustration of the codes I used to identify the educators' perceptions of school culture and cultural identity (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Illustration of Codes for Educators' Perceptions of School Culture and Cultural Identity

Educators' Perceptions of School Culture	Code/Category
Community Context	
	White Privilege
	Whiteness
	High Status/High Expectations
	Academically Accelerated/High Pressure
School Context	
	Collaborative Learning Community
	Holistic and Interdisciplinary
Classroom Context	
	Student Centered/Relationship Driven
	Autonomy
	Open to Change
	Resistant to Change

Community Context

White Privilege: Several of the educators indicated that they felt the community context of this school was overwhelmingly characterized by white privilege. The educators indicated that they believed that the cultural context of the community surrounding the school was an important aspect of the school culture. In the following excerpt from an interview, my participant Scott described his perceptions of the role of entitlement in shaping the school culture. He is identified with an (S) in the following excerpt and I am identified with an (M).

S: I think that it is clear when you look at the makeup of the majority of the students that our school serves come from a middle- to upper- or high-class socio-economic community. This is our majority population, and we have a very low Native American population. There's an obstacle there, especially as it relates to IEFA and building relationships with the Native American community.

M: Could you describe how you think the culture of the school could be considered an obstacle?

S: Sure. There is such a spectrum of students here. Some kids are going to Ivy League schools – We also have a lower socio-economic group – we have poverty and some tough kids, I know that. We do too, but we also have what is very different to deal with, and that's the sense of entitlement. Those are the parents that you call and you don't get the support. They say, 'Not my kid. My kid can do no wrong, that type of thing.'

Although I had anticipated that some of my participants would probably consider race as an important aspect of this community and this school culture, I was unprepared for the way the participants described whiteness and its role in shaping the formation of this school community. Several of the educators indicated that they believed that the school culture was characterized by whiteness and white privilege. They enjoyed working in the school, but they also believed that this particular aspect of the school culture probably impacted the implementation of IEFA more than any other. Jen, one of my participants, indicated in the following interview that she believed that white privilege had a tremendous impact on the school culture and the cultural identities of several members of the school community. In the following excerpt from one of our discussions, I am represented by an (M) and Jen is represented by a (J).

M: How would you describe the culture of this school?

J: This school is very white and characterized by white privilege. Most of our students here don't really know what it's like to need things. They

don't know what it's like to feel like everyone around you is failing and dropping out. They have no sense of that.

M: Would you mind describing what you mean by white and white privilege?

J: Oh, boy. I have to think about that one. I think whiteness means different things in different places. But here I think it means everyone accepts Christianity, it means having money, it means feeling entitlement, and it can mean being close-minded to new ideas – Or even it can mean having the right to say and the ability to say, I don't want to do that IEFA stuff so I won't, or I'm afraid of doing that so I won't. I look around and these kids have 10 iPods. They're leaving their North Face jackets on the floor in the hallways. And I don't know if whiteness is the same in other places, but here, that is what I think whiteness looks like in this community.

High Status/High Expectations: Throughout the time I spent at this middle school, I listened to several participants describe the gap in the socio-economic status and affluence of different families served by this particular school. The participants frequently expressed that they felt pressure to make sure that the needs and the expectations of the more affluent families in the community were met. They indicated that this was a high status school in a high status district filled with families from a community that had very high expectations for schools.

Tim, one of my key participants, indicated in the following interview that both the teachers and the students felt the pressure of living in this high status community every day.   In the following excerpt from one of our discussions, Tim described his perceptions of how this high status community impacted the school culture. In this excerpt, I am identified with an (M) and Tim is identified with a (T).

M: How would you describe the school culture here?

T: This school has a huge separation between the haves and the have-notes. The difference between the life experiences of some of the students is just huge. On one hand, we have a kid culture where a lot of the kids are given a lot; this group is a pampered group of young people. Don't get me wrong, they are a wonderful, solid, hardworking group…but they really don't know how good they have it. The school has a much smaller percentage of students that have very little.

M: How do you think this aspect of the school culture impacts the students and teachers here?

T: You know, we have single parents here trying to get through college and pulling 2 or 3 kids along, leaving home to come to a different community and trying to do their best and looking at those kids, the rest of the crowd here and the beautiful clothes and incredible cars that pull up in the driveway, it's difficult. It's hard at this school for the have-nots. I think it's hard on those kids that don't have as much financially. There are pressures on them to want all the bells and whistles that the other kids have. They feel inferior or inadequate because they don't have as much money.

Academically Accelerated/High Pressure: As I worked with and observed the educators on a daily basis, several of the educators indicated that they believed the school was academically accelerated. Maintaining the academic achievement of the highest achieving kids within the school was a top priority for many of the educators, because of the expectations of the community surrounding the school. In the following interview, Beth indicated that the school was very academically accelerated and filled with high achieving kids. She felt pressure to accelerate her courses to meet the expectations of the community. In the following excerpt, Beth is identified with a (B).

B: We have relatively high-achieving kids, because we draw from a pretty affluent socio-economic background of people. I think education is highly valued for the most part with the kids that go to school here. This is a high-pressure job in a high pressure district. I find myself spending a lot more time with parent interactions this year. Dealing with the pressure from the parents and the community can be very difficult at times.

<u>School Context</u>

<u>Collaborative/Team Building</u>: Many of the educators indicated that they felt like the school culture was characterized by collaborations within teaching teams that helped one another to do their jobs more effectively. As a participant observer, I observed several of the teaching teams collaborating and working cooperatively throughout the work week. I observed as the educators created lessons, built curricula, devised new teaching strategies, and mentored their students within their teaching teams.

In the following interview, Michael described the collaborative nature of the school culture from his perspective. In this excerpt, Michael is represented by an (MC) in the following excerpt.

> **MC**: The make-up of our school culture is based on team building and collaboration among the faculty and staff, at least of the core subjects -- the teachers and the students are all divided into teams. There is an incredible emphasis on giving them the time they need to work together to plan and to solve issues all on their own – and that is an incredibly important part of helping the teachers to create learning communities within each of their respective grade levels. The collaborations and the teams are all different and the identities of the teams are determined by their own teaching styles, their own beliefs, their own values, and we kind of worked that out with all the different teams.

<u>Holistic/Interdisciplinary</u>: Many of the educators felt that the school's holistic and integrated approach to teaching and learning helped them to teach their students more effectively. By engaging in collaborative lesson planning, teaching, and assessment, the educators felt like they could all help the students grow in every area of their development. Remaining connected to their students through relationships, utilizing a holistic approach to learning, and collaborating in their teaching, the participants

indicated that they believed they had developed a culture of learning in the school.

Several participants indicated that they believed the middle school utilized a holistic

model that integrated all the academic subjects with an understanding of the holistic

development of the child.

In the following interview excerpt, Michael described the holistic and

interdisciplinary nature of the teaching and learning at the school. In this excerpt, I am

represented by an (M) and Michael is represented by an (MC).

> **MC**: We use a holistic model of learning and teaching. It's not just the core subjects. It's not just those areas that are being tested. There's recognition and an appreciation of the other elements of learning for kids. And that includes music, the arts, languages, nature-based learning.
>
> **M**: How do you encourage the integration of each aspect of student learning?
>
> **MC**: Our school has a holistic approach to learning that includes identity, team-building, social growth, and social education. This school does an amazing job of that. Our school culture operates under a collaborative and interdisciplinary team model, where every content area covered within that team on a regular basis…and to look at their program together – a lot of it focuses on kids, which is good.

Classroom Context

Student Centered/Relationship Driven: The participants indicated that they

believed the instructional approach at the school was predominately student-centered and

relationship driven. Many of the participants suggested that the personal connections

and the relationships they built with their students were a key aspect of their teaching. As

a participant observer in the research site, I recorded a particular observation that

demonstrated the degree of care and concern that many of the educators had for the

Indian students within the school community. While I was working in my office at the middle school one morning, an educator and an administrator entered my office and asked me if I could look after one of the students for a few hours. I agreed and I was very curious about the nature of this situation since they had never asked me to work with particular students in the past.

As I sat at my desk, a beautiful young Indian girl walked into my office and quietly sat down next to me. I asked her if she would like to read some Indian stories with me and act out the voices and the parts together. She agreed and we spent several hours reading, coloring, and listening to music in my office. Throughout the day, all of her teachers checked in with me and the student and told the young lady that they cared about her and missed having her in class today. At the end of the day, I followed up with the educators and administrators and I discovered that they were very concerned about this student and the very difficult issues that she was facing at home and at school. Over the course of this study, the educators kept asking me about different approaches to building trust, rapport, and good relationships with this student and with other Indian students and their families in the school. These interactions led me to conclude that many of the educators were relationship driven and used a student centered approach to teaching and student learning.

In the following interview, Tim indicated that the student centered nature of this school community was its greatest strength. He indicated that relationship building was at the very center of the cultural identity of this school community. In the following excerpt, Tim is represented by a (T).

> **T**: A key part of our school culture is that we all work really hard each day to make connections with every kid in order to help them learn. What we do here is very deliberate and we work on it together every day. We talk about who we think we are doing a good job with and who we need to try to do better with in our team meetings. We constantly discuss how we can do it better. Our teaching and everything we do with the kids is driven by relationships. This school is student centered and relationship driven.

Autonomy: The language of collaboration and relationship building was balanced by an equally prevalent theme in the data that emerged about authority and autonomy. As a researcher, I found it interesting that these themes emerged right next to each other within the data. Some of the educators indicated that the school culture was characterized by a high degree of autonomy and professional freedom to create curriculum and design interventions to meet the needs of different students. For some of the participants, the school climate was an ideal balance between accountability and the freedom to bounce ideas off of colleagues while still retaining control over daily decision making in the classroom. In the following interview, Erin described the autonomy and independence that she felt like she enjoyed as an educator in the school. In the following excerpt, Erin is represented by an (E).

> **E**: Our school culture gives us significant autonomy and independence as teachers in our classrooms, so the teams look really different. I'm very comfortable with that and I really enjoy that aspect of teaching here. They give me the greatest degree of freedom; they'll let me do whatever I want as long as I stay accountable to their vision for the school, which is great.

Competition/Politics: As I interacted with different educators within the research site, I observed that some of the participants appeared to work well within their teaching teams and others seemed to prefer to work independently. The longer I worked side by

side with the educators at the school, the more open they seemed to become about the

conflicts and disagreements they had among themselves. I found that although the school

emphasized team building and collaborations, several of the participants felt like the

school had a clear ranking system and encouraged competition among the educators. In

the following interview, Erin described her perceptions of the school culture and how

they impacted her work as an educator. In the following excerpt, I am represented by an

(M) and Erin is represented by an (E).

> **A**: The culture of this school has been characterized by competition and the ranking among the teachers as long as I have been here. Yeah, that's so weird to me. Teachers have been ranked based on who has pushed their own agenda and been the most vocal. Everybody here has had their own agenda, and I have never have seen that anywhere else that I have taught.
>
> **M**: How do you think this has impacted you and your teaching?
>
> **A**: Both this school and this school district have a culture of politics that has impacted all of my relationships. The culture of politics in this district has produced weirdness in the interactions between the teachers and caused many people to withdraw from the community. In order to make it here, I have found that I have been much happier when I have just stayed in my room and isolated myself.
>
> **M**: From your perspective, how would you describe the culture as you experience it each day?
>
> **A**: I have seen more competition in this school and this school district than I have ever seen in the other schools where I have taught. The competition has meant that I have felt like I don't ever really know people, so I have learned to be cautious. Even though people have been friendly on the surface here, I have not thought that it was really real here.

> Open to Change/Accountability: While working as an IEFA consultant, I

observed several discussions and debates between the educators about their perceptions

of the positive and negative aspects of the school culture. Many of the participants

indicated that they were open to change but wanted to retain the ability to interpret what

that meant for particular students.   In the IEFA survey, one educator indicated that the

school was very open to change and would readily embrace the implementation of IEFA.

She stated, "It is important to have this education for our students and teachers because of

where we live. The implementation of IEFA will be readily brought in by the staff."   In

the following interview excerpt, Michael indicated that he also believed that the school

was open to change and to IEFA. Michael is represented by an (MC) and I am

represented by an (M) in the following excerpt.

> **M**: How would you describe the culture of this school?
>
> **MC**: I think our school is really open to new ideas, and ready to take on programs – as good as anywhere. One of the strengths of this place is, I think, that the school is progressive and open to change. That's a good word to use.
>
> **M**: Would you explain that to me a bit more? What do you mean by openness?
>
> **MC**: I think this school has a culture of openness and a desire, from everyone, to do everything possible to do it better. We are always trying to make improvements, to be aware, and to be willing to make changes that make learning easier for the students. I think we have a great school as far as receptiveness or openness. There are people chomping at the bit here to have an open door to all the students and their families, the teachers have an open mind to work with you or anyone else who comes in, to do it right or better each day.

Closed to Change/Accountability: Many of the participants indicated that they

felt like the school community was resistant to change and accountability. Throughout

the time I spent at the research site, I had several conversations with educators in which

they indicated that they believed that most of the teachers at the school were resistant to

and afraid of change. The longer I spent time with the educators, the more I started to

hear conflicting perceptions about the school culture.

In the following interview, Edward indicated that he felt like the educators within

this school were very closed to change and accountability. In the following excerpt, I am

represented by an (M) and Edward is represented by an (E).

> **E**: Implementing any educational reform, especially IEFA, into the
> schools is going to be difficult because there is no accountability. That is
> the biggest issue, since there is zero account for any action in schools, no
> action is fine. The schools are insulated and resistant to change.
>
> **M**: Would you describe particular aspects of the school culture that you
> believe demonstrate a resistance to change and accountability?
>
> **E**: Sure. A good example is that even if you want to make changes for
> IEFA, the layers of the educational bureaucracy make that extremely
> difficult to actually accomplish. The layers of bureaucracy insulate
> teachers from having to do anything, and they also block people and
> teachers that want to make change happen from getting anything done.
> Either lack of accountability or bureaucracies are the two key words I
> would use to describe school culture. These two aspects of school culture
> make organizational changes largely inefficient and counterproductive.
> You put these two aspects of school culture together, and it has tragic
> consequences for schools.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

In this chapter, I described the research data results and findings of this tribal

critical race theory (TribCrit) ethnographic study. The educators indicated that they

believed the purposes of IEFA were, 1) the decolonization of school curricula through the

integration of Indigenous epistemologies and perspectives into Montana schools, 2) the

implementation of culturally responsive pedagogies to close the academic achievement

gap between Indian and non-Indian students in Montana schools, and 3) the

implementation of specific strategies for building relationships and better intercultural communication between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, parents, and communities.

The educators indicated that the greatest obstacles to the implementation of IEFA were, 1) the consequences of colonialism and systemic racism for Indian students in schools, 2) a lack of clarity about the purposes and design of the IEFA curricula and its implementation, 3) a lack of time, a resistance to change, and lack of buy-in among educators, and 4) a lack of relationship and poor intercultural communication between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities.

The educators suggested that they believed the most beneficial sources of support for future implementations of IEFA included, 1) a clear IEFA curricula and implementation design that aligns with state standards and district instructional targets, 2) a recursive and ongoing implementation that encourages partnerships between schools and expert Indian educators, 3) an onsite Indian education specialist with ties to a specific tribal community, and 4) ongoing partnerships and collaborations with Indian partners and communities that help educators to learn specific culturally responsive pedagogies for Indian students.

The educators indicated that they believed that the school culture and cultural identity was characterized by, 1) a surrounding community that had a high socio-economic status, white privilege, high expectations, and placed a lot of pressure on teachers and students to achieve; 2) a school culture that was characterized by collaborations, both an openness to change and a resistance to change, competition, and a

holistic approach to teaching and learning; and 3) a classroom culture that valued

collaborative learning, a holistic and interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning,

and a student centered approach to teaching.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, I begin with a summary of my research findings and the answers

to the four major research questions that guided this tribal critical race theory (TribCrit)

ethnographic study. After including a summary description of my research findings, I

outline the conclusions that I have drawn from these findings and contextualize these

conclusions within the tribal critical race theory research literature. I conclude this

chapter with a list of recommendations for the future implementations of IEFA, potential

questions for future research, and my final thoughts about IEFA.

This study revealed that the educators believed that the purposes of IEFA were, 1)

the decolonization of school curricula and teaching through the integration of Indigenous

epistemologies and life ways in Montana schools, 2) the integration of culturally

responsive pedagogies to close the academic achievement gap between Indian and non-

Indian students, and 3) the implementation of specific strategies for building relationships

between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities.

The study indicated that the educators felt that the greatest obstacles to the

implementation of IEFA were, 1) the long term systemic consequences of colonialism

and racism for Indian students, parents, and communities, 2) lack of clarity about the

design and purposes of the IEFA curricula and implementation, 3) a lack of alignment

between the IEFA curricula and the state standards and the district instructional

objectives, and 4) a lack of relationship and trust between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities.

This study revealed that the educators believed the most beneficial sources of support for future implementations of IEFA were, 1) a clear IEFA curricula and implementation design that aligns with state standards and district instructional targets, 2) a recursive and ongoing IEFA implementation that includes partnerships with Indian education specialists that equip educators with culturally responsive pedagogies for working with Indian students, and 3) a focus on building ongoing relationships and partnerships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities.

The educators indicated that they believed that the school culture and the cultural identity were characterized by, 1) a high socio-economic status, high pressure, and high expectations community; 2) a collaborative, holistic and interdisciplinary school culture, that was both open and closed to change; and 3) a collaborative, holistic, interdisciplinary, relationship driven, and student centered classroom and teaching culture.

Research Conclusions

Colonialism was Endemic within the School Community

This study revealed that colonialism and the racialized misrepresentations of Indian peoples within school curricula had shaped the life experiences, perspectives, and relationships among the Indian and non-Indian members of this school community.

These research findings were consistent with the research literature that has documented the devastating consequences of colonialism for Indian students and their families. Historically, Euro-American school curricula and teaching have perpetuated damaging misrepresentations of Indian cultures and communities.

This study indicated that the current IEFA implementation lacked authenticity because it had tried to force educators to implement the curricula without helping them to understand the purpose and design of the IEFA curricula. This study revealed that future implementations of IEFA curricula had to be contextualized within an analysis of how colonialism and the racialized misrepresentations of Indian peoples have impacted the academic achievement of Indian students. This study indicated that the educators wanted to understand why IEFA had been created and how it benefitted their Indian students. This study revealed that IEFA needed to equip educators with specific culturally responsive strategies for teaching their Indian students and working with Indian families. In order to help educators to understand how to implement the IEFA curricula in a culturally responsive and appropriate way, the IEFA implementation must be contextualized within discussions about colonialism and its devastating impact on Indian students.

Once these colonial and racialized representations have been addressed in school communities, this study indicated that the implementation of IEFA could work towards building relationships with Indian students and their families. A central theme that emerged throughout this research was the idea that authentic relationships could never develop between Indians and non-Indians unless Indian students and their families were

allowed to represent themselves and their cultures. Relationships could develop between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and families when Indian peoples were permitted to represent themselves and disrupt the colonial and racialized misrepresentations of their cultures and communities in school curricula, pedagogies, media, and popular culture.

Race was Endemic within the School Community

This study indicated that the school had utilized educational curricula and pedagogies with colonial and racialized misrepresentations of Indian peoples in the past. The educators suggested that they had tried to adapt the school curricula and instructional strategies to address these misrepresentations, but they felt that race continued to be a significant obstacle to the implementation of IEFA. Previous interactions with Indian students and their families had left several of the educators so frightened and intimidated that they had avoided implementing the IEFA curricula because they feared either saying or doing something that was considered racist or culturally inappropriate.

The school climate was racialized despite the educators' efforts to maintain colorblindness and treat all of their students the same way regardless of their race, class, gender, etc. Since the majority of the educators and the students self-identified as Caucasian and a minority self-identified as American Indians, the participants indicated that they were extremely uncomfortable with implementing the IEFA curricula. Several Indian students and families also expressed feelings of frustration with the colonial and racialized misrepresentations of Indian cultures and communities within school curricula. Some of the Indian students and parents felt that they had been racially stereotyped as

less intelligent and capable, and some of the non-Indian educators felt that they had been stereotyped as racist and prejudice.

This study revealed that colonial and racialized misrepresentations of Indian peoples had impacted the relationships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities in this school. When I began to contextualize my research findings within the research literature, I discovered that historically colonial and racialized misrepresentations of Indian peoples have had a significant impact on relationships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and families. The implementation of IEFA needed to be contextualized within an understanding of the role of colonialism and systemic racism in shaping the educational experiences of Indian and non-Indian students and their families. The IEFA curricula could be used to disrupt the lasting legacies of colonialism and systemic racism for Indian students and build relationships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and families.

Indigenous Epistemologies were
Omitted from School Curricula

This study indicated that Indigenous epistemologies, perspectives, and understandings had been omitted from most of the middle school curricula and teaching. The educators agreed that IEFA had been designed to disrupt cognitive imperialism through the integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula and teaching. They indicated that the integration of Indigenous epistemologies, perspectives, and understandings into school curricula could work to disrupt the consequences of colonialism and systemic racism for their Indian students.

Several of the educators felt that the integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula was important because it helped Indian students to build connections between the school culture and their home cultures. Educators agreed that the integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula could help to raise the academic achievement of Indian students. Although most of the educators agreed that the integration of Indigenous epistemologies into school curricula and teaching was the original purpose of IEFA, they also indicated that the implementation of the IEFA curricula had been much more difficult that they had originally anticipated.

This study revealed that several of the educators within this middle school felt anxious about raising student standardized test scores, so they had focused most of their instructional time on improving student achievement in the academic subjects assessed by standardized tests. The educators indicated that the school was academically accelerated so developing student competence in the core academic subjects was more important than the implementation of the IEFA curricula. This study revealed that the middle school had a clear hierarchy of knowledge that had made it difficult for educators to find the best time, the appropriate place, and the most effective methods for integrating Indigenous epistemologies into their classroom curricula and teaching. These hierarchies of knowledge had devalued Indigenous knowledge and disadvantaged Indian students within the school.

This study revealed that the implementation of IEFA had to be contextualized within an understanding of how colonialism constructed hierarchies of knowledge in school curricula and teaching. Educators must understand how the construction of school

curricula and pedagogies has impacted Indian student academic achievement. This study indicated that the implementation of IEFA had to be contextualized within an understanding of the impact of standards-based educational reforms and standardized testing on the curricula and instructional choices of districts, schools, administrators, and educators. The educators in this study needed to have a clearer idea of the exact purpose and benefit of the IEFA curricula for their Indian and non-Indian students. The implementation of IEFA within this school must be contextualized within the larger debates going on within education about the privileged epistemologies and the hegemonic ideologies that have shaped the production and implementation of school curricula and pedagogies.

Indigenous Pedagogies were
Necessary for the Implementation of IEFA

This study revealed that the educators wanted the implementation of IEFA to equip them with specific pedagogical strategies for improving the academic achievement of their Indian students. Several of the educators indicated that they felt like the current implementation of IEFA had failed to equip them with the specific instructional methods and strategies they needed to help their Indian students to learn. The results of this study indicated that the educators wanted the implementation of IEFA to include an onsite Indian educator, mentor, and liaison that could help the school community to learn about teaching through Indigenous oral traditions, storytelling, life experiences, symbols, place, family, community, and ceremonies. Several of the participants indicated that they wanted to learn more authentic and meaningful ways of integrating the IEFA curricula

within their classrooms. They believed that if they could learn about Indigenous ways of

knowing, understanding, and living within the context of relationships and life

experiences, they could implement the IEFA materials with confidence and competence.

The educators in this study indicated that they wanted to understand Indigenous

pedagogies so they could implement the IEFA curricula in a meaningful and

transformative way.

Educators Needed Instruction in
Tribal Sovereignty and Self-Determination

This study revealed that the IEFA curricula was designed to secure tribal

sovereignty and self-determination through the integration of more accurate

representations of Indigenous epistemologies, pedagogies, and life ways into Montana

schools. Although these principles were central to the original design of the IEFA

curricula, several participants indicated that the current implementation needed to make

the connection between tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and the IEFA curricula

clearer to educators.   If educators had a clearer understanding of the importance of tribal

sovereignty and self-determination, they would have a clearer idea of the purpose of the

IEFA curricula. Once educators had clarity about the purposes of the IEFA curricula and

its role in addressing the historical legacies of colonialism and systemic racism for Indian

students, families, and communities, they would have a better understanding of its

importance and value. The implementation of IEFA curricula must be understood within

the context of the importance of maintaining tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and

tribally controlled education. Educators must understand these important political, legal,

social and educational issues and their connection to the IEFA curricula and the equality of educational opportunity for Indian students.

Recommendations

Clarify the Purpose of IEFA

Since the vast majority of the educators indicated that they lacked clarity about the exact purpose of the IEFA curricula, the first step in making the implementation of IEFA more successful is to clarify the purpose of IEFA within this school community. I recommend that the school approach their district and the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and discuss the implications of these research findings. This study indicated that several of the educators in the school lacked a clear understanding of the connection between colonialism, systemic racism, cognitive imperialism and the purposes of the IEFA curricula. Since the educators lacked a clear understanding of the socio-historic context and the purpose of IEFA curricula, I recommend that the school administrators and lead educators approach district and state officials and ask for professional development opportunities that help to clarify the original purposes of the IEFA curricula.

Clarify the Design of IEFA

Lack of clarity about the IEFA curricula and implementation design within this school has created confusion, resistance, and resentment among the educators. Since educators lack clarity about the curricula and implementation design, they have been reluctant to implement IEFA materials. The lack of clarity about the purpose and the

design of the IEFA curricula has led to an uneven and hit and miss implementation. I recommend that the school work in collaboration with the OPI-Indian Education Division and the school district to discuss the confusion about the current IEFA curricula and implementation design. School administrators and educators should ask state and district officials to identify how the IEFA materials can be aligned with the state content standards, the state performance standards, and the district standards and scope and sequence documents in an organic and meaningful way. It is reasonable for administrators and educators to expect clarification about the design of the IEFA curricula and how the curricula has been aligned with the other educational objectives, expectations, and goals established by school district and the state.

In order to make the implementation of the IEFA curricula more organic, ongoing, and meaningful, the school administrators and educators must express their concerns about the current misalignment with district and state educational officials. The IEFA curricula implementation efforts have looked like an add-on because the epistemological foundations of the current standards, instructional objectives, school curricula, and instructional strategies have not been adequately analyzed and deconstructed. In order to make room for Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies, school administrators and educators must engage in discussions with state and district officials that analyze how school standards, school curricula, school instructional targets and classroom instructional strategies have not been constructed from positions of ideological neutrality, objectivity, or colorblindness. The school administrators and educators must be included in these discussions and debates so that they can help

construct an IEFA curriculum and implementation design that is more realistic and more successful within this school community.

Focus on Building Relationships

The implementation of IEFA at this school is very difficult because of the strained relationships and lack of connection between Indians and non-Indians within the school community. The implementation of IEFA will lack authenticity unless it is developed within the context of relationships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities. If the IEFA is framed as solely a curricula reform, IEFA will generate resistance and resentment among educators. The transformation of Indian and non-Indian educators' and students' perceptions will occur as they develop authentic, ongoing, and meaningful relationships within this school.

I recommend that school administrators and educators meet with state and district officials and discuss the apparent disconnection between the current IEFA curricula implementation and Indian educators, students, families, and communities. I suggest that the implementation of IEFA be focused on building relationships between Indian and non-Indian educators, students, families, and communities. I suggest that state, district, and school officials collaborate to design and build partnerships with particular tribal communities through tribal liaisons. This tribal liaison should help the educators to learn specific tribal protocols, communication methods, principles of tribal leadership, the role of elders and educators, and the best methods of building and sustaining relationships within tribal communities. This liaison could easily be a parent, an educator, a university faculty, or someone who already has ties to the school community and has expressed an

interest in helping the school to build better relationships with Indian students, families, and communities.

I recommend that the school administrators and educators approach district and state officials to discuss the importance of building ongoing relationships with Indian educators that have successfully taught Indian students. The school should work to build transformative relationships with specific tribal elders, tribal leaders, and tribal educators that are leaders within their communities. Indian educators and elders can help the educators in this school to learn Indigenous epistemologies, pedagogies, and life ways in a meaningful and non-threatening way. These tribal contacts can help model the most effective, natural, and transformative methods for implementing Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies within this school community. The educators within this school need Indian educators that can mentor them onsite, within this school community, and within the context of their own classrooms.

In order for the implementation of the IEFA curricula to be effective the educators in this school need the opportunity to learn through the relationships they have built with Indian peoples. This can be difficult because Indian students and families frequently do not wish to be singled out within schools. I suggest the school administrators and educators approach district and state officials about helping them to build connections and relationships with the Indian students and families they currently serve. I suggest that the school district and the school implement a specific program that works to build school and family partnerships. The school district and the school should work to identify Indian educators, parents, families, and elders within the community that can help them to

initiate and build these relationships and partnerships. As the Indian and non-Indians build trust and rapport within the school community, they can share knowledge, understandings, and life ways with one another without fear of judgment. This is an important beginning and promising start for the implementation of IEFA.

<u>Build School and Tribal Community Partnerships</u>

I do not recommend that the IEFA curricula be implemented in a way that makes people feel ashamed or guilty for their family, lands, communities, traditions, histories, and cultures. Rather, I recommend that the curricula be implemented in a way that helps people to understand that Indians and non-Indians have lived in relationship to the same places, the same lands, the same people, and many of the same traditions in Montana for several generations. We already live in relationship to one other and to this land, so now we need to focus on building stronger, more reciprocal, and more just relationships.

I recommend that school administrators and educators approach district and state officials and work towards developing mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships between this school community and one of the tribal communities represented within this school population.   I am not suggesting that the school district create a complicated and expensive implementation program; instead I am suggesting that the school district and the school reach out to the Indian educators, students, families, and elders that are already connected to their community and work to build relationships and partnerships with them. The IEFA implementation must be connected to specific tribal communities through ongoing partnerships and mutually beneficial and reciprocal relationships.

Embrace Ambiguity, Uncertainty, and Not Knowing

As a person trained in Euro-centric epistemologies and pedagogies, I am expected to observe the world, to document and verify my observations, to analyze these observations and compare them to the observations of others, and report my observations, analyses, and conclusions to others. In the beginning this study, I had confidence in my ability to observe, document, analyze, and report the implementation of IEFA within this middle school. By the end of the study, I had come to realize that there was much about the implementation of IEFA within this school that I would never be able to adequately describe for others. This study helped me to gain a greater appreciation for ambiguity, uncertainty, and the many aspects of Indigenous epistemology and culture that I will probably never be able to understand or explain. The study was humbling and encouraging for me as a scholar, an educator, and a person. The greatest challenge in this study was trying to describe the centrality of relationship to the construction and translation of knowledge within Indigenous communities. Over the course of the study, I realized that I had failed to understand Indigenous epistemologies until I had seen them lived out within the context of the relationships I had built with Indian people.

The implementation of IEFA must occur within the context of relationships between Indian and non-Indian peoples. The stronger the relationships are between Indians and non-Indians within this school community, the stronger the implementation will be. If the relationships between Indians and non-Indians remain weak within the school community, the implementation of IEFA will continue to regress into tokenism. The implementation of the IEFA curricula must be introduced as a mechanism for

building relationships through the exploration of different ways of knowing and understanding the world and one another. In order to do this, Indians and non-Indians must journey into the blind spots in our ways of looking at our world and one another. The implementation of IEFA must be designed in a way that encourages educators to work towards understanding Indian and non-Indian ways of knowing so that Indians and non-Indians can re-interpret and re-imagine our world together.

Suggestions for Further Research

The first area that I recommend further research is the exploration of the best methods of building and maintaining school, family, and tribal community partnerships. In addition to identifying the best methods of building school community and tribal community partnerships and collaborations, I suggest that educational researchers explore how relationships shape the way Indian and non-Indian educators, students, and families construct knowledge. My final suggestion for further research is an exploration of the role of relationships in shaping the attitudes of educators, students, parents, and communities towards the IEFA materials and Indigenous epistemologies.

Final Thoughts

The implementation of the IEFA curricula has the potential to transform the lives of Indians and non-Indians for many generations. Colonialism has had devastating consequences for all Montanans, and the IEFA curricula has provided Indians and non-Indians with the opportunity to re-think our relationship to one another, to our

environment, and to all living things. The cost of colonialism for the people, the lands, and the communities of Montana has been very high. The IEFA curriculum was designed not only to raise the academic achievement of Indian students but also to help Indian and non-Indian students to re-imagine their relationships with their world and with one another.

The integration of Indigenous ways of knowing into Montana schools does not just benefit Indian students; the IEFA curriculum has the potential to benefit the Indians and non-Indians of Montana for many generations. Although the IEFA curriculum cannot go back in time and prevent the colonization of Indian peoples and their lands, IEFA can work to disrupt the cycles of genocide and oppression that continue to impact humanity today. The IEFA curriculum was designed to help Montanans to create a better future for both Indians and non-Indians in the state. Friere and Faundez (1989) stated, "A decolonized school system will be a win for all. Decolonization itself does not call for the reversal of the social order in favor of formerly oppressed peoples but to the decimation of the oppressor. The goal of decolonization is the creation of a new humanism" (p. 44).

A decolonized educational system would benefit all Montanans by helping us to re-imagine our relationships to one another and to our world. Gross (2005) states that the goal of educating Indians and non-Indians about colonialism and Indigenous knowledge is not to lay a guilt trip on anyone but instead to help us to create the opportunity for a better future for everyone; he states, "We acknowledge the past in order to imagine a better future and to work towards that future in the present" (p. 127). An IEFA

curriculum implementation designed around these principles benefits Indian and non-

Indian students and all Montanans for many generations.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W. & M. Horkheimer. (1974). Dialectic of Enlightenment. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Apple, M.W. (2004). Ideology and Curriculum, New York: Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.) (1996). Multicultural education: Transformative knowledge and action, historical and contemporary perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity, implications for teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education, 52* (1): 5-16.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In *Diversity and citizenship education,* J.A. Banks (Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 3-15.

Banton, M.P. & J. Harwood. (1975). *The race concept*. New Abbot, England: David and Charles.

Barnes, R. (1990). Race consciousness: The thematic content of racial distinctiveness in critical race scholarship. *Harvard Law Review*, 103: 1864-1871.

Battiste M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in first nations education: A literature review with recommendations Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Ottawa.

Battiste, M. & J.Y. Henderson. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: A global challenge.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Purich.

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education, *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22 (1): 16-27.

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. Harvard Law Review, 93(3): 518-533.

Bernasconi, R. (2001). Who invented the concept of race? In R. Bernasconi (Ed), *Race,* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 11-36.

Bernasconi, R. (2001). The invisibility of racial Minorities in the public realm of appearances. In R. Bernasconi (Ed.), *Race*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 284-299.

Blaut, J. M. (1993). *The colonizer's model of the world-Geographical diffusionism and Eurocentric history*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Bobo, L., & J.R. Klugel. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: Self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes? American Sociological Review, 58(4): 443-464.

Brayboy, B. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education, *The Urban Review, 37*(5): 425–446.

Bush, B. (2006). *Imperialism and post colonialism*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the Mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education*. Durango, Colorado: Kivaki Press.

Calmore, J. (1992). Critical race theory, Archie Shepp, and fire music: Securing an authentic intellectual life in a multicultural world. *Southern California Law Review*, 65: 2129-2231.

Carjuzaa, J., M. Jetty, & T. Veltkamp. (2010). Montana's Indian Education for All: Applying multicultural educational theory. *Multicultural Perspectives,* 12 (4): 192-198.

Castagno, A. E., & S. J. Lee. (2007). Native mascots and ethnic fraud in higher education: Using tribal critical race theory and the interest convergence principle as an analytic tool. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 40: 3-13.

Castellano, M. B. (2000). Updating aboriginal traditions of knowledge. In G.J. S. Dei, B.L. Hall & D.G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts; Multiple readings of our wor*ld, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto, 21-36**.**

Champoux, D. (1951). Montana Constitutional Convention Proceedings,Verbatim Transcript for 3.10.1972. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, p. 1951.

Chapman,T. (2007). The power of contexts: Teaching and learning in recently desegregated schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly,* 38 (3): 297–315.

Chavers, D. (2009). Racism in Indian Country. New York: Peter Lang.

Christiansen, L. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, p. 1.

Coldiron, S. (1973). Testimony before the House Education Committee 2.6.1973. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, p. 1.

Collum, D. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, Helena: The Montana Historical Society, p. 1.

Comte, A. (1865). A general view of positivism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43: 1241-1299.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design, Choosing among five approaches.* London: Sage Publications.

Darder, A. & R.D. Torres (2009). Shattering the race lens toward a critical theory of racism. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres & M. Baltadano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader,* New York: Routledge, 245-262.

Decker, D. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, p. 1.

Dei, S.G.J (2010). *Fanon and the counterinsurgency of education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Dei, G. J. S. & Asgharzadeh, A. (2001). The power of social theory: The anti-colonial discursive framework. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35 (3), 297-323.

Dei, S. G.J., B.L. Hall & D.G. Rosenberg. (2000). Introduction. In G.J. S. Dei, B.L. Hall & D.G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts; Multiple readings of our worl*d, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 3-17.

Dei, G. J. S., J. Mazzuca, E. McIsaac & J. Zine. (1997). *Reconstructing drop-out: A critical ethnography of Black students' disengagement from school.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Deyhle, D. (1992). Constructing failure and maintaining cultural identity: Navajo and Ute school leavers. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 31: 24-47.

Delacampagne, C. (1990) Racism and the west: From praxis to logos. In D.T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Anatomy of racism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 83-88.

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, 87: 2411-2441.

Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68: 555-582.

Deloria,V. & D.R. Wildcat. (2001). Power and place, Indian education in America. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum.

Deloria, V. & C.M. Lytle. (1984). The nations within: The past and future of American Indian sovereignty. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Deloria, V. (1970). *We talk, you listen: New tribes, new Turf.* New York: Macmillan.

Díaz Rico, L. T. (1998) Towards a just society: recalibrating multicultural teachers, in: R. Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds) *Speaking the unpleasant: the politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (Albany, NY, State University of New York Press), 69–86.

Diller, J.V. & J. Moule. (2005). *Cultural Competence: A Primer for Educators.* Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Dixson, A. D., & C.K. Rousseau. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8(1): 45 -67.

Dixson, A., & Rousseau, C. K. (Eds.). (2006). *Critical race theory and education: All God's children got a song.* New York: Routledge.

Doxtater, M.G. (2004). Indigenous knowledge in the decolonial era. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 28 (3-4): 618-633.

Eck, D. (2008) Transcribed Interview 6.25.08. Bozeman, Montana.

Eisner, E.W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* New York: Macmillan.

Erickson, C. (1996) The Indian Studies Law: An exercise in futility? *A report to the Committee on Indian Affairs.* Helena: Legislative Research Division, 1-17.
Fetterman, D.M. (1989) *Ethnography, step by step.* London: Sage Publications.

Frederickson, G. M. (1997). Reflections on the comparative history and sociology of racism. In E. Nathaniel Gates (Ed.), *Critical race theory-Essays on the social construction and reproduction of race*, New York: Garland Publishing, 51-98.

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Friere, P. & A. Faundez. (1989). *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. New York: Continuum.

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

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M.P. Baltadano, & R.D. Torres (Eds), *The critical pedagogy reader*, New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H.A. (2008). Spectacles of race and pedagogies of denial: Anti-black racist pedagogy under the reign of neo-liberalism. *Communication Education,* 52 (3), 191-211.

Gordon, B. M. (1990). The necessity of African-American epistemology for educational theory and practice. *Journal of Education*, 172(3): 88-106.

Gorski, P.C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural Education. *Intercultural Education,* 17 (2): 163-177.

Grande, S. (2004). Red pedagogy-Native American social and political thought. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Grant, C. & C. Sleeter. (1998). *Turning on learning: five approaches to multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.

Gross, L.W. (2010). Some elements of American Indian pedagogy from an Anishinaabe perspective. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal,* 34 (2): 11-26.

Gross, L.W. (2005). Teaching American Indian studies to reflect American Indian ways of knowing and to interrupt cycles of genocide, *Wicazo Sa Review* 20 (2): 121-145.

Guillaumin, C. (1997). Race and nature: The system of marks, the idea of a natural group and social relationships. In E. N. Gates (Ed.), *Critical race theory-cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of race,* New York: Garland Publishing, 117-135.

Harbaugh, D. (1972). Montana Constitutional Convention Proceedings, Verbatim Transcript for 3.10.1972. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1949.

Harper, D. (1972). Montana Constitutional Convention Proceedings, Verbatim Transcript for 3.10.1972. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1951.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). Eclipse of Reason, Seabury Press.

House Bill No. 219. (1979) Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

House Bill No. 343. (1973). Proceedings of the Forty-Third Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

House Bill No. 501. (1973). Proceedings of the Forty-Third Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

House Bill No. 528. (1999.) The Indian Education for All Act, Proceedings of the Montana Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

House Joint Resolution No. 60. (1974). Proceedings of the Forty-Third Legislature, Special Session. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Jennings. M. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Juneau, S.J. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Jewett, S. (2006). If you don't identify your ancestry, You're like a race without a land: Constructing race at a small urban middle school, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly,* (37) 2: 144-161.

Kates, B. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Klug, B. & P. Whitfield. (2003). *Widening the circle, culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children*. New York: Routledge Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New York: Crown Publishing.

Ladson- Billings, G. & W.F. Tate. (2006). Toward a critical race theory of education. In A.D. Dixson & C.K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education- All God's children got a song*, New York: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: Complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 50–68.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincolns (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research,* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 257–278.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11* (1).

Lambe, J. (2003). Indigenous education, mainstream education, and native studies, *The American Indian Quarterly,* 27 (1-2): 308-324.

LeCompte, M. D. & J. J. Schensul, (1999) *Designing and Conducting Ethnographic Research, Ethnographer's Tool Kit Volume 1*, New York: Alta Mira Press.

Linwood T. B. (2006). Preserving our histories for those yet to be born. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 88 (3): 192.

Lomawaima, K. T. & T. L. McCarty. (2002). When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2): 279–305

Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1): 68-94.

Masters, B.N. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Matsuda, C. (1991). Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal*, 100: 1329-1407.

McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltadano, & R. D.Torres, (Eds) *The Critical pedagogy reader*. New York: Routledge.

McNamer, D. (1978) Indian Studies-volatile issue in the state's education community. *The Missoulian* 6.23.78, Missoula: The Missoulian Press, 11.

Medicine, B. (2001). *My elders tell me. Learning to be an anthropologist and remaining Native.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Milner, R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education* 59: 332 (15).

Montana Office of Public Instruction (2010). *Montana Indian Student Achievement Data Report*. Helena: Montana Office of Public Instruction.

Montana State Constitution (1972). Article X, Section (1) and (2). Helena: Montana Historical Society.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: the sociopolitical context of multicultural education,* New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (1995). From brown heroes and holidays to assimilationist agendas. In C. Sleeter & P. L. McLaren (Eds), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference,* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 191–220.

Nsabimana, N. (2000). Decolonizing imaginations-Pedagogical, social, and psychological possibilities. In G.J. S. Dei, B.L. Hall & D.G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts; Multiple readings of our wor*ld, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 49-62.

Omi, M. & H. Winant. (2005). The theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis & N. Dolby Race (Eds.) *Race, identity, and representation in education*. New York: Routledge, 3-12.

Omi, M. & H. Winant. (1997). By the rivers of Babylon: Race in the United States. In E.N. Gates (Ed.) *Critical race theory-Cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of race.* New York: Garland Publishing, 61-91.

Omi, M. & H. Winant. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Outlaw, L. (1990). Toward a critical theory of race. In D.T.Goldberg (Ed.) *Anatomy of racism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 58-82.

Peregoy, R. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Vintage Books.

Schiltz, D. (1972). Montana Constitutional Convention Proceedings.Verbatim Transcript for 3.10.1972, 1951.

Schweitzer, B. (2006). A new day in Montana, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88 (3): 196.

Seifart, C. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Senate Joint Resolution No.11. (1995). Proceedings of the Montana Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 17. (1973). Proceedings of the Forty-Third Legislature. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Shadow, L.(1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Sleeter, C. (2005). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis, & N. Dolby (Eds.) *Race, identity, and representation in education* New York: Routledge, 243-256.

Sleeter, C. (2003). Teaching globalization, *Multicultural Education,* 5(2): 3–9.

Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

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

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *24*: 5-19.

Solórzano, D. G. (1995). The baccalaureate origins of Chicana and Chicano doctorates in the social sciences, *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences,* 17*:* 3-32.

Solorzano, D. G., & T. J. Yosso. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research, *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*(1): 23–44.

Starnes, B.A. (2006). Montana's Indian Education for All: Toward an education worthy of American ideals*, Phi Delta Kappan,* 88 (3): 184-192.

Swartz, D.J. (1973). Testimony before the House Education Committee 2.6.1973. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

The Indian Culture Master Plan. (1975). Indian culture master plan. Helena: Legislative Services Division, Committee on Indian Affairs files, 3.

Tate, W. F., G. Ladson-Billings & C.A. Grant. (1993). The Brown decision: Revisited: Mathematizing social problems, *Educational Policy*, 7: 255-275.

Trinder, C. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Trueba, E. T. (1999). Critical ethnography and a Vygotskian pedagogy of hope: The empowerment of Mexican immigrant children. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 12(6): 591–614.

United States Census Bureau (2010). *United States Census Bureau Data*. Washington, D.C.: United States Census Bureau.

Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (1989). Documents of barbarism: The contemporary legacy of European racism and colonialism in the narrative traditions of federal Indian Law, *Arizona Law Review,* 95: 237-278.

Wilson, D. (2008). Montana Constitutional Convention Proceedings,Verbatim Transcript for 3.10.1972. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1953.

Wilson, S. (2008). Research is ceremony. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Fernwood Publishing, Limited.

Whiteman, H. (1979). Testimony before the Joint Hearing of the Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 2.2.1979. Helena: The Montana Historical Society, 1.

Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wolcott, H.F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION
OF INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL

1972- Gerry Finn and the Catalysts for IEFA

❖ In 1972, Gerry Finn the director of the Montana Association for Children and Youth, an organization designed to get youth involved in political activities throughout the state, heard that Montana would be holding a convention to re-write the state constitution, (Eck, 2008).

❖ Through her involvement in this organization, Gerry Finn had begun working with two young Indian women from the Fort Peck Reservation that chose to share several stories about the harsh realities of growing up as an Indian in Montana public schools, (Eck, 2008).

❖ After listening to the personal testimonies of these two students, Finn encouraged them to attend the Constitutional Convention and ask the delegates to work against the currents of institutionalized racism in Montana schools by establishing a constitutional guarantee, preserving Montana tribal cultures, (Eck, 2008).

1972 -Montana State Constitutional Convention

❖ Senator Dorothy Eck, a member of the 1972 Constitutional Delegation, believed that undermining racism in Montana schools and providing equal educational opportunity to Indian children should be a top priority within the new state constitution.

❖ In response to the testimony received at the 1972 Constitutional Convention, the Convention passed Article X, Section 1 (1) and Section 1 (2).

❖ Article X, Section 1 (1) guaranteed Montana citizens that, "It is the goal of the people to establish a system of education which will develop the full educational potential of each person. Equality of educational opportunity is guaranteed to each person of this state."

❖ To fulfill the requirements of Article X and provide equality of educational opportunity to all students, the 1972 Convention added Section 1(2) which reads; "The state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American Indians and is committed in its educational goals to the preservation of their cultural integrity."

❖ The Montana University System was constitutionally responsible for retraining and equipping all Montana's teachers to teach Native American culture and history to Montana's students

1973- The Indian Studies Law, H.B. 343

❖ In 1973, the state legislature passed, *The Indian Studies Law,* designed to assist the Montana educational system in the implementation of the constitutional provisions of

Article X, section 1 (2) and help ensure that "every Montana teacher had an understanding of and an appreciation for American Indian people."

❖ The *Indian Studies Law* (1973) required "…all teachers and administrators who secure contracts to work on Indian reservations in Montana to take at least (6) hours or (6) college credits in Indian culture," (*Section 1,* p. 1).

❖ H.B. 343 planned to utilize teacher training as the primary mechanism of integrating: "American Indian history, traditions, customs, values, beliefs, ethics, and contemporary affairs of American Indians [into Montana classrooms]," (*Section 2,* p. 1).

❖ Every institution of higher education through the university system was required to develop a Native American Studies program and companion courses to support the implementation of the Indian Studies Law (Erickson, 1996).

1973- Companion Bill to Indian Studies Law, H.B. 501, expands training to all schools.

❖ H.B. 501 (1973) expanded the influence of the constitutional language and legislative intent, making it mandatory for "all" school personal, not just those on or near state reservations, across the state to "…recognize the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American Indians and to be committed in its educational goals to the preservation of their cultural heritage," (*Section 1,* p. 1).

❖ This legislation made it mandatory for all Montana educators to receive formal courses of study at the institutions of higher education or through in-service trainings across the state by 1979, (*Section 2*, p. 1).

❖ Some educators agreed that this type of training had been desperately needed in Montana schools for many years.

1974-The Indian Studies Master Plan Produced in S.J.R. 17

❖ In the 1973-1974 bi-annual session of the Forty-third Montana legislature, an *Indian Education Master Plan* for the implementation of *Article X, Section 1 (1 and2)* was created.

❖ *The Indian Education Master Plan (IEMP)*, an official legislative document passed in two separate pieces of state legislation, established a series of strategies designed to assist the state in the long term implementation of Indian education in the state of Montana.

❖ The first piece of the *(IEMP)* was included in, S.J.R. 17 (1973) and it stated that the legislature:

1) encourages Montana teacher training institutions to provide programs specifically designed to prepare teachers to teach Indian culture;

 2) encourages the Montana Superintendent of Public Instruction to coordinate activities to assist the public schools and training institutions in developing curricula and educational programs designed to preserve the cultural integrity of the American Indians;

 3) and transmits these intentions to the schools and training institutions of the state," (p. 1).

1974-The Indian Studies Master Plan, Section Two, Produced in H.J.R. 60

❖ The second section of *(IEMP)* was passed in H.J.R 60 (1974) and established the following outline of plans for implementing these reforms;

1) the state will, provide teacher-training institutions in Montana with the adequate resources to prepare teachers to understand the history, culture, sociology, and values of American Indians as seen by Indians;

2) the state will, provide in-service training, planned in consultation with the Indian people, for those teachers who cannot return to an institution of higher education for formal courses in Indian studies;

3) the state will, provide means by which all public school teachers in Montana, may within ten (10) years of the adoption of this resolution, receive training in Indian studies as directed in this resolution;

4) the state will, provide all public schools in Montana, within ten (years), with a program of study that includes American Indian history, culture, sociology, values, as seen by Indians;

5) the state will, provide a means by which qualifications for teacher certification may include, within ten (10) years, adequate training in Indian studies to prepare the certified teacher to understand the unique background of this or her Indian students;

6) provide a means by which Indian people may be utilized in the preparation and presentation of the courses planned under the guidelines of this resolution," (p. 1).

1974-1979-Efforts at Implementation and Educator Responses

❖ The first three years after the implementation of the Indian Studies Law, most of the school districts throughout the state of Montana ignored the legislation, (Erickson, 1996).

❖ Once the law finally came into effect, many educators throughout the state resented being forced into the training and simply refused to comply with the provisions of the law, (Erickson, 1996).

❖ Although the state university campuses established Native American Studies courses, state education departments, the Montana Board of Regents, and the Montana Education Association rejected the Native American Studies requirements for all Montana teacher education candidates by 1978, (Erickson, 1996).

1979 -The Repeal of the Indian Studies Law, H.B. 219

By 1979, the Montana legislature repealed the mandatory provisions of the Indian Studies Law and made all of the requirements permissive rather than mandatory. The constitutional provisions of Article X, Section 1 (2) and the Indian Studies Law were un-enforced but remained within the Montana Codes Annotated as Montana Law, (Erickson, 1996).

1984-1994- Position Papers Draw Attention to Indian Achievement Gap and *Article X, Section* 1

❖ The Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction also wrote a position paper on Indian Education.

❖ In 1989, the accreditation standards were developed and includes language that directs schools to "nurture an understanding of the value and contributions of Montana's Native Americans and the unique needs and abilities of Native American students and other minority groups."

❖ In 1990 – A State Plan for Indian Education was completed.

❖ In 1990 the Board of Public Education passed a resolution reaffirming support of Article X, 1(2) – they were even going to explore the potential of requiring one PIR day for Indian/Multicultural education

.
❖ In 1991, the Board of Education, Governor, Board of Regents, OPI and OCHE re-affirmed
their constitutional commitment to the equality of educational opportunity for each person of the state and to preserving through the educational goals the cultural integrity of American Indians. They express commitment to work closely with tribal colleges, to increase graduation rates, etc.

❖ In 1994, the top 5 entities again re-affirmed their constitutional commitment to the equality

of education of each person in the state and pledged to support the infusion of gender and multicultural equity awareness through Montana's teacher education programs.

❖ By 1979, it seemed as if the implementation of the Indian Studies Law had failed.

❖ But in 1995, the Montana Legislature responded to activism throughout the state in support of Montana's tribes and adopted *Senate Joint Resolution No. 11*, directing the state director of Indian Affairs to research ways to reinvigorate the *Article X, Section 1 (2)* provisions within the Montana education system.

❖ Legislative researchers discovered that many schools throughout the state still did not teach either American Indian tribal histories or American Indian cultures in K-12 school curriculum and most of Montana's teachers had very little training in Native American Studies.

❖ .J. R. 11, directing the state Director of Indian Affairs to research ways to reinvigorate the *Article X, Section 1 (2).* Bobby Starnes (2006), in a recent publication of the educational journal *Phi Delta Kappan,* reported that the legislative researchers charged with researching the status of Montana tribal histories, cultures, and knowledge in state public schools discovered that most schools throughout the state still did not teach either Montana Indian histories or cultures in K-12 school curriculum and most of Montana's teachers had very little training in Native American Studies, (p. 184).

❖ The researchers discovered that although Montana students recognized several of the other key figures in Montana history, "…there was a prominent gap in their knowledge, and the missing content that created this gap was both significant and telling," (Starnes, 2006, p. 184)

1999-*Indian Education for All Legislation* Passed in Montana Legislature

❖ By 1999, supporters of Indian education had generated enough legislative support to convince state legislators to pass the *Indian Education for All Act* (IEFA), "A law that incorporates mandates that are intended to give effect to the constitutional provisions of Article X, Section 1 (2)."

a) every Montanan, whether Indian or non-Indian, be encouraged to learn about the distinct and unique heritage of American Indians in a culturally responsive manner;
b) every educational agency and all educational personnel will work cooperatively with Montana tribes or those tribes who are in close proximity, when providing instruction or when implementing the educational goal or adopting a rule related to the education of each Montana citizen, to include information specific to the cultural heritage and contemporary contributions of American Indians with particular emphasis on Montana Indian tribal groups and governments; and

c) All school personnel should have an understanding and an awareness of Indian tribes to help them relate effectively with Indian students and parents, that educational personnel provide the means by which school personnel will gain an understanding of and appreciation for Indian people, (p. 1).

❖ "Since *IEFA* was passed in 1999, the state of Montana has allocated $13 million in funding to the Office of Public Instruction and $1 million in funding to the tribal colleges to assist them in the publication and implementation of written versions of each state tribal history and curriculum," (Schweitzer, 2006, p. 196).

❖ A flood of inventive indigenous scholarship has been produced throughout the state as a result of this financial provision for Indian Education for All.

❖ Tribal historians and scholars throughout the state have worked to record innovative versions of Montana history that include new oral histories and materials from each Montana tribe

2005-2006 -Implementation of Indian Education for All

❖ In 2005, a quality educational funding lawsuit was filed, and the Montana State Supreme Court determined that the state legislature had to fund IEFA in order to maintain compliance with the 1972 Montana Constitution.

❖ Ellen Swaney stated, "A much harder task will be defining how teachers and faculty members effectively teach about the cultures of Montana's twelve tribes," (Swaney, 2006, p. 190).

❖ It is important that educators are trained in how to implement the Indian Education for All materials to prevent them from, "…trivializing highly complex cultural issues…and perpetuat[ing] injustice by ignoring the issues of power that *IEFA* will clearly bring to the forefront of our future discussions," (Swaney, 2006, p. 190).

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC RESEARCH
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Project Title: A Critical Race Ethnography Examining Educator Perceptions of Efforts
 to Implement *Indian Education for All*

You are being asked to participate in a study exploring your perceptions of what you
 believ is the most beneficial to you in the efforts to implement Indian Education for All as a
classroom teacher and schoolstaff member. You will also be asked to identify what makes
the implementation of Indian Education for All either easier or more difficult for you. You
will be asked to explain how you think this relates to the culture of your school and your
 background as a teacher and a person. You will only be asked to share your perceptions
 of what you believe can help make you successful as a teacher working to implement
Indian Education for All in your school.

These data will be used to identify what you believe as a teacher is the most helpful to
 you in working to implement Indian Education for All. Your identity will be kept completely
confidential and the data from this research will be reviewed by you and checked to see
if Ihas interpreted what you said correctly. This research can help people at
 the Office of Public Instruction and others involved in working with Indian Education for All
 to know what you believe you need to be successful.

You have been identified as a possible subject because you expressed an interest in
Indian Education for All and you have agreed to be interviewed. If you agree to further
 work as a participant, Iwill observe you teach a single 40 minute IEFA lesson.
 If you do not wish to be observed, you may decline.

 If you agree to participate, you will be asked for an interview that will be tape recorded
and transcribed.   The interview should take approximately 45 to 60 minutes and your
identity will be kept completely confidential. After the interview is recorded and transcribed,
the data will be secured in a confidential space and the tapes will be destroyed.

Because your identity will be kept completely confidential and you will able to check the
data after it is transcribed, there is very little risk to you as a participant. If at any point,
you no longer wish to participate in this study, you may decline to participate without any
penalty or repercussions. As a participant, you will be able to let those working to
implement Indian Education for All at the Office of Public Instruction know what you
believe has been the most beneficial to you as an educator.

If you decline to participate there will be no penalty.
_____

If you have any questions about this research project or the rights as a human subject you may contact: Mark Quinn, IRB Chair at Montana State University, 994-4707,
and you may also contact the researcher, Micki Abercrombie, Doctoral Candidate in the MSU-Department of Education, at, 451-9169, mabercrombie@montana.edu.

"AUTHORIZATION: I have read the above and understand the discomforts, inconvenience and

risk of this study. I, _____ *(name of subject),* agree to participate

in this research. I understand that I may later refuse to participate, and that I may

withdraw from the study at any time.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

Signed: _____

Witness: _____ (optional)

Investigator: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1) What do you teach and how long have you been working at this school?

2) What do you know about Indian Education for All?

3) What are you perceptions of Indian Education for All as an educator?

4) What are your perceptions of the most beneficial or helpful things in your efforts to implement IEFA at this school?

5) What are the greatest obstacles that you face in your efforts to implement IEFA at this school?

6) If someone were to ask you to describe the culture at this middle school, how would you describe the unique cultural aspects of this school?

7) Do you think the culture of this school has helped you or been an obstacle to your efforts to implement IEFA?

8) How do you believe your cultural background and the unique culture of this learning community have impacted your perceptions of IEFA?

APPENDIX D

INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL SURVEY

This survey is designed to assist schools and school districts in identifying professional development needs for the implementation of Indian Education for All (IEFA).

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion, or N/A if the question does not apply to you.

(4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree)
Background Knowledge and Attitudes

1. I feel that I clearly understand the intent of the Indian Education for All state mandate. 1 2 3 4 N/A

2. I have read the document "Essential Understandings about Montana Indians." Yes No

3. I am most comfortable integrating these Understandings into my curriculum:

Diversity of Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A
History of Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A
Sovereignty of Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A
Culture of Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A

4. I am the most knowledgeable about these Montana tribes:

Blackfeet 1 2 3 4 N/A
Pend d'Oreille 1 2 3 4 N/A
Salish 1 2 3 4 N/A
Kootenai 1 2 3 4 N/A
Northern Cheyenne 1 2 3 4 N/A
Crow 1 2 3 4 N/A
Assiniboine 1 2 3 4 N/A
Sioux 1 2 3 4 N/A
Gros Ventre 1 2 3 4 N/A
Little Shell 1 2 3 4 N/A
Chippewa 1 2 3 4 N/A
Cree 1 2 3 4 N/A

5. I currently integrate Montana Indian Studies into these content areas:
Social studies 1 2 3 4 N/A
Health/Physical Education 1 2 3 4 N/A
Art 1 2 3 4 N/A
Language Arts 1 2 3 4 N/A
Mathematics 1 2 3 4 N/A
Music 1 2 3 4 N/A
Science 1 2 3 4 N/A

Library-Media 1 2 3 4 N/A
Other_____

  Learning more about Montana Indians is a priority for me as an educator. 1 2 3 4 N/A
Resources

7. The resources I most often access for teaching Native American content are:

Collection of Native American literature in your building's library 1 2 3 4 N/A
Literature from personal collection or public library 1 2 3 4 N/A
Professional literature 1 2 3 4 N/A
Publications from Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) 1 2 3 4 N/A
Guest speakers from the local Native community 1 2 3 4 N/A
Colleagues, other educators 1 2 3 4 N/A
OPI Indian Education Web site 1 2 3 4 N/A
Tribal Web sites and other internet resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Local historic sites or museums 1 2 3 4 N/A
Other (describe) _____

8. The most valuable supports to integrating Native content into my curriculum are:

Familiarity with/access to resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Knowledge of authenticity/appropriateness of content 1 2 3 4 N/A
Availability of resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Administrative/collegial support 1 2 3 4 N/A
Personal background knowledge 1 2 3 4 N/A
Professional development opportunities 1 2 3 4 N/A
Personal interest 1 2 3 4 N/A
Other (specify) _____

9. The greatest challenges to integrating Native content into my curriculum are:

Unfamiliar with/can't access resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Concern for authenticity/appropriateness of content 1 2 3 4 N/A
Lack of resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Lack of administrative support 1 2 3 4 N/A
Lack of background knowledge 1 2 3 4 N/A
Lack of professional development opportunities 1 2 3 4 N/A
Lack of interest 1 2 3 4 N/A
Unsure how to integrate with my content area 1 2 3 4 N/A
Other (specify) _____ Office of Public
Instruction January 2009 Page 3

10. The following resources would help me improve my teaching on this subject:
Improved collection of young adult/children's literature about Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A
Interacting with Native American people 1 2 3 4 N/A
Greater familiarity with/easier access to district resources 1 2 3 4 N/A
Working with a Native American learning partner 1 2 3 4 N/A
Access to a collection of professional literature about Montana Indians 1 2 3 4 N/A
Access to pre-created lesson plans integrating Indian Education for All 1 2 3 4 N/A
Time for resource review, planning and collaboration with other educators 1 2 3 4 N/A
Other (specify)

_____

Professional Development

11. I have taken Native American Studies courses at the college level. Yes No

12. I have attended conferences and/or workshops which provided knowledge about Montana Indians Yes No

13. I have attended professional development opportunities to develop background knowledge about Montana Indians. Yes No

14. I feel professional development in these areas would most benefit my teaching:
Training in Indian Education for All /Seven Essential Understandings 1 2 3 4 N/A
University courses (including online courses) 1 2 3 4 N/A
Introduction to current children's/young adult literature 1 2 3 4 N/A
Background on local tribal history and culture 1 2 3 4 N/A
Background on Montana tribal history and culture 1 2 3 4 N/A
Introduction to guest speakers from the Native American community 1 2 3 4 N/A
Introduction to local cultural events, historic sites and museums 1 2 3 4 N/A
Ideas for integrating Native American content in other content areas 1 2 3 4 N/A

15. I would prefer these Indian Education for All professional development opportunities:

School level (on-site) professional development 1 2 3 4 N/A
District level professional development 1 2 3 4 N/A
Conferences during the academic year 1 2 3 4 N/A
Conferences during the summer 1 2 3 4 N/A
Working with an on-site IEFA coach or trainer 1 2 3 4 N/A
Study groups and/or peer mentoring 1 2 3 4 N/A
On-line or self-guided learning 1 2 3 4 N/A
Graduate level courses 1 2 3 4 N/A

16. I would be willing to share my learning about Indian Education for All with other educators. Yes No Office of Public Instruction January 2009 Page 4

17. Including on-site PIR, conferences and workshops, briefly describe up to three professional development experiences you have found most effective.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

18. Briefly explain your own *personal* attitudes toward Indian Education for All.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

Additional comments or suggestions are welcome!
    Modified with permission from the original survey created by Erin Lipkind in 2006.