

An incomplete history: representation of American Indians in state social studies standards

By: [Wayne Journell](#)

Journell, W. (2009). An incomplete history: Representation of American Indians in state social studies standards. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48(2), 18-32.

*****© Arizona State University. Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Arizona State University-Center for Indian Education. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. *****

Made available courtesy of University of Minnesota Press: <https://jaie.asu.edu/>

Abstract:

Using an interpretive analysis, American history standards from nine states that incorporate high-stakes assessments in social studies are analyzed for their representation of American Indians. Research on high-stakes assessments shows that teachers are more likely to align their instruction with state standards due to mounting pressure to achieve high scores. Therefore, an understanding of the way that American Indians are represented in state standards may provide a better understanding of how they are then portrayed in the classroom. The findings show that all nine states largely depict American Indians as victimized rather than providing examples of societal contributions made by tribes. Moreover, nearly all of the states cease their coverage of American Indians after the forced relocation in the 1830s, creating an incomplete narrative. The findings have implications for the historical consciousness of all students and specifically for American Indian students in mainstream public education who may feel disengaged and alienated by the current curriculum

Keywords: American Indians | American public education | social studies education | textbooks

Article:

***Note: Full text of article below

An Incomplete History: Representation of American Indians in State Social Studies Standards

Wayne Journell

Using an interpretive analysis, American history standards from nine states that incorporate high-stakes assessments in social studies are analyzed for their representation of American Indians. Research on high-stakes assessments shows that teachers are more likely to align their instruction with state standards due to mounting pressure to achieve high scores. Therefore, an understanding of the way that American Indians are represented in state standards may provide a better understanding of how they are then portrayed in the classroom. The findings show that all nine states largely depict American Indians as victimized rather than providing examples of societal contributions made by tribes. Moreover, nearly all of the states cease their coverage of American Indians after the forced relocation in the 1830s, creating an incomplete narrative. The findings have implications for the historical consciousness of all students and specifically for American Indian students in mainstream public education who may feel disengaged and alienated by the current curriculum.

In his account of the California textbook adoption process, LaSpina (2003) describes a photograph found in the selected textbook that depicts two figures standing in front of the Grand Canyon. One of the figures is a bearded European-American explorer, John Wesley Powell, who the textbook notes as the first American to explore the Grand Canyon. The caption fails to identify Powell's companion, although the dress and physical features suggest that the man is an American Indian. Oblivious to the potential political ramifications of such an omission, the publishers did not include identifying information about the American Indian in the photograph until members of the adoption process voiced criticism. In a revised edition of the textbook, the publishers note that the mystery figure is actually Tau-Gu, a chief of a Paiute Tribe located along the Colorado River.

This oversight serves as a microcosmic view of the way American Indians and Alaska Natives continue to be portrayed in American public education. Besides the omission of Tau-Gu, the caption identifies Powell as the first American to explore the Grand Canyon although American Indian tribes lived throughout the Western United States long before European settlers began expanding and settling past the Mississippi River. Too often, the version of American history taught in public schools caters to a Eurocentric male point of view, starting with the voyage of Columbus and continuing with English colonization over a century later (Banks, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 2003).

In this era of increased standardization of public education, state content standards have replaced textbooks as the primary culprit responsible for the narrowing of curricula throughout the United States. Even within social studies, which falls outside the realm of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), states are standardizing curricula under the guise of increased teacher accountability (Ross, 2006). In this study, I conduct a content analysis on American history standards in nine states where students and teachers are subject to high-stakes testing in order to determine the nature of American Indian representation in the standards. If teachers align their instruction with state standards in order to prepare their students to succeed on state assessments, then an analysis of the standards may provide a better understanding of the way American Indians and Alaska Natives are portrayed in public education classrooms. Specifically, the questions I seek to answer are: a) How are American Indians represented in state standards? b) To what extent does the representation of American Indians in state standards differ from stereotypical views found throughout popular culture? and c) To what extent does the inclusion of American Indians in state standards portray American Indians as victims of European settlement versus contributors to modern American society?

Review of Related Literature

A liberal conception of education places as its primary goal the preparation of future citizens for life in a multicultural, democratic society. Therefore, ideas of diversity and tolerance are valued and should be emphasized in all areas of the curriculum, but particularly in the social studies, which deal with historical narratives and responsibilities of citizenship (Gutmann, 1987, 2004). Within social studies education many scholars advocate a thematic approach where curriculum is student centered, deliberative, and focuses on issues of social justice and equality (Benitez, 2001; Ross, 2000; Vinson, 2006). Lintner (2004, 2007) goes so far as to advocate the teaching of American history using critical race theory in order to challenge dominate discourses on race often found in public school curricula. However, increased efforts to ensure that students throughout the nation are exposed to similar instructional content has narrowed the social studies curriculum, forcing teachers to prescribe to the traditional Eurocentric canon that seeks to maintain the status quo (Evans, 2001).

Nowhere do definitions of the traditional curriculum resonate louder than with the depiction of American Indians and Alaska Natives in public school classrooms. Studies have shown that students enter public education conceptualizing American Indians as warlike, half-naked savages, a depiction stemming from cartoons and Hollywood productions. Although the educational process begins to sophisticate students' understanding of American Indians rather quickly, research shows that students' knowledge of American Indian culture plateaus around fifth grade when discussions of American history turn to the American Revolution and the subsequent rise of the American nation (Brophy, 1999). From that point forward, researchers found that American Indians "disappeared or were mentioned only as faceless impediments to western expansion" (p. 42).

When American Indians are included within the curriculum, they are too often treated as a collective entity and only receive attention near the Thanksgiving holiday when teachers tell exaggerated and historically inaccurate stories about the relationship between American Indian tribes and European settlers. Such instruction is often coupled with arts and crafts depicting tribal headdresses or dramatic plays involving romance between John Smith and Pocahontas (Raines & Swisher, 1999; Weatherford, 1991). As the curriculum progresses, American Indians increasingly take the position of victims, initially decimated by disease and then forced to relocate as part of the Westward expansion of European settlers.

This representation in public education perpetuates racial stereotypes by ending the American Indian narrative in the early 1800s and failing to explain how American Indian culture has evolved since then. In her undergraduate educational diversity course, Writer (2001) asked her students what words came to mind when they thought of American Indians. A sampling of the answers she received was: *dark eyes, long dark hair, braids, and jewelry*. When asked about images of American Indians, her students answered with *feathers, moccasins, arrows, alcohol, and scalped white people* among others. These responses reinforce Wills' (1996) belief that students of European descent may benefit from a multicultural education as much, if not more, than students of minority groups.

Sadly, such ignorance appears to be reinforced by school culture as well as the formal curriculum. In a study of a suburban school with an enrollment of children of predominantly European descent, de Waal-Lucas (2007) found that the social studies teachers had little knowledge or resources on how to teach a multicultural curriculum. Many of the teachers also admitted that they did not believe multiculturalism was a salient instructional outcome for their classes since the majority of their students were of European descent. These findings support Writer's (2002) assertion that teacher training institutes should place a higher premium on educating prospective teachers about the merits of a multicultural education, with specialized focus on specific groups, such as American Indians/Alaska Natives.

Ogbu (1987, 1992) contends that members of minority groups need to feel as if they are positively represented in curricula in order to become engaged in their education. He argues that this is particularly important for what he terms “involuntary minorities,” groups that were either forcibly brought to the United States or systematically oppressed by Europeans, such as African Americans and American Indians. In order for members of those groups to embrace public schooling, they must see examples of people like themselves within the curriculum, which often does not occur with traditional forms of social studies education. Moreover, when members of minority groups are mentioned within the curriculum it is often to remind students of periods in history when a particular group was discriminated against and then to celebrate their subsequent struggle for equality. This practice raises an important question regarding the representation of marginalized groups in American history; should members of minority groups be included within the curriculum as exemplars of people who fought for liberation against their oppressors, or as productive members of society that have contributed to the social, political, and economic fabric of our nation? (Epstein, 1998).

Increasingly, states are answering that question for educators as they continue to standardize instructional content. Even though social studies fall outside the realm of NCLB, many states are moving to a standards-based curriculum backed by high-stakes assessments in all content areas (Ross, 2006). State social studies standards have been accused of being assimilatory based on their propensity to align with traditional Eurocentric views of history and reducing their coverage of members of minority groups to instances of oppression (Forbes, 2000). Title VII of NCLB allows for American Indian/Alaska Native tribal schools to develop culturally diverse curricula provided their students are learning the same content as other students in their respective states. However, the notion of conformity pervades into reservations, and American Indian/Alaska Native students are still subjected to emphasis of basic knowledge articulated by the state, even if such information conflicts with tribal beliefs or opinions (Beaulieu, 2006).

Grant (2001) describes standardized testing as an “uncertain lever” that influences teachers’ perceptions, yet does not dramatically alter their instructional practices, a claim supported by subsequent research (Segall, 2003; van Hover, 2006; Vogler, 2005; Yeager & van Hover, 2006). However, teachers do make curricular decisions based, at least partly, on content mandated by states, particularly in states that annually assess student knowledge (Vogler & Virtue, 2007). When faced with time constraints teachers may choose to dismiss or marginalize information not included within the formal curriculum, reverting instead to recitation of state-mandated content in order to adequately prepare students for end-of-course tests (Journell, 2007; Vogler & Virtue, 2007). Since standards force teachers to frame their instruction to varying degrees (Sleeter & Stillman, 2005), an examination of state social studies standards backed by high-stakes testing may provide a better understanding of the way American Indians and Alaska Natives are represented within public classrooms.

Method

I performed a content analysis of American history standards from nine states identified by the Department of Education as having end-of-course state assessments (Education Commission of the States, 2002). The states, California, Georgia, Indiana, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, represent diverse geographical and political regions of the United States. The standards were accessed from each state's respective department of education website. Therefore, the analysis only takes into consideration specific content listed in the standards and not any supplemental information on American Indians given to teachers by the state.

In addition, the study only focuses on American history courses taught in middle or high school. Five of the states (GA, IN, NC, SC, VA) teach American history as one course, usually during students' junior year of high school. Three of the states (CA, OK, TX) split American history into two courses with Reconstruction as the historical dividing point. The first half of the course is taught in eighth grade with the corresponding portion taught in eleventh; both sections are used for analysis. Finally, the New York standards do not delineate American history into grade levels. Instead, the state chooses to separate their American history curriculum into sections labeled "intermediate" and "commencement" with no historical dividing point.

The analysis is interpretive in that I sought to understand the motives behind the inclusion or exclusion of content relating to American Indians in the standards (Schwandt, 1994). I read each standard and noted any references to American Indians. Based on my findings, I developed categories relating to the representation of American Indians and coded all references to correspond to those categories. I also took note of any references to American Indian individuals within the standards.

Results

The representation of American Indians within the standards relies heavily on depictions from the 18th and 19th centuries and often portrays American Indians collectively as victims of European colonization. Rarely do the standards discuss societal contributions made by members of American Indian tribes or explore current issues pertaining to American Indians and their way of life. Table 1 shows all topics pertaining to American Indians found in the standards and the corresponding states that include each topic within their respective curriculum.

Of course, simply charting the inclusion of topics does not necessarily explain the detail each state requires for an individual topic. In states that use what Sleeter and Stillman (2005) refer to as "strong" framing, such as Virginia and North Carolina, the curriculum provides teachers with an exorbitant amount of detail in an attempt to control exactly what students are learning in the classroom. For example, Virginia standard VUS.6a describes the impact of territorial expansion on American Indians as

Table 1

	CA	GA	IN	NY	NC	OK	SC	TX	VA
Loss of land/Death by disease from settlers			X	X					X
As part of the French and Indian War/ American Revolution		X				X		X	X
Trail of Tears/Forced relocation	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Federal Indian Policies	X		X		X	X		X	
Indian Wars		X				X			
Tribal distinctions		X			X	X		X	X
Societal/Military contributions									X
Modern American Indian issues					X				

During this period of westward migration, the American Indians were repeatedly defeated in violent conflicts with settlers and forcibly removed from their ancestral homelands. They were either forced to march far away from their homes (the “Trail of Tears,” when several tribes were relocated from Atlantic Coast states to Oklahoma) or confined to reservations. The forcible removal of the American Indians from their lands would continue throughout the remainder of the 19th century as settlers continued to move west following the Civil War.

In contrast, a state that employs “weakly” framed standards (Sleeter & Stillman, 2005) would simply include a brief description of the topic and rely on the classroom teacher to provide relevant details during instruction. For example, the Texas standards approach the same topic by stating that “The student is expected to analyze federal and state Indian policies and the removal and resettlement of Cherokee Indians in the Jacksonian Era.” Further examples of the way the different state standards frame their discussion of American Indians, using the categories in Table 1, can be found in Appendix A.

Historical Representation

As Table 1 shows, the states place the greatest emphasis on the forced relocation of American Indians during the early 1830s. The majority of states portray the relocation as the “Trail of Tears” spearheaded by Andrew Jackson and note the loss of American Indian lives on the trek. New York separates themselves from the other states in that they call the acts of the Jackson administration a violation of human rights.

The only other aspect of American Indian history that is portrayed by more than half of the states is federal policies directly related to American Indians, most notably the Indian Removal Act of 1830. The other federal policy that is mentioned in the standards from Indiana, Oklahoma, and North Carolina is the Dawes Act, which sought to divide tribal lands for individual American Indian families. The North Carolina standards also mention the Native American Suffrage Act of 1924.

Beyond relocation and acts of the federal government, the states vary considerably on their representation of American Indians. Only three states discuss

the impact colonization had on American Indian tribes, both in the loss of land and the mass death from unfamiliar European diseases. Even fewer mention confrontations between Americans migrating Westward after the Civil War and American Indian tribes. The Oklahoma standards make a sweeping reference to the “Indian Wars” while only the Georgia standards deem representation of the “battle” at Wounded Knee as sufficiently important for inclusion.

Even less attention is paid to both examples of societal contributions made by American Indians and modern American Indian issues. In the only example of societal contributions, the Virginia standards laud Navajo codetalkers for their military service in the Pacific theatre during World War II. Similarly, only the North Carolina standards describe the continued fight for equality and recognition of American Indians by including knowledge of the American Indian Movement within their standards.

Finally, the states often represent American Indians as a singular entity within their standards, rarely delineating content as tribe-specific. Only Oklahoma includes more than one tribal distinction within their standards, noting Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, Seminole, and Cherokee peoples. Besides the aforementioned Navajo codetalkers in the Virginia standards, the only other states that make tribal distinctions are Georgia (Powhatan), North Carolina (Nez Perce), and Texas (Cherokee).

Personification within State Standards

The inclusion of American Indian individuals in the standards is sparse and varies among states even more than the representation of American Indians as a whole. Only three states’ standards, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia, even reference individual American Indians at all. Moreover, there appears to be no single American Indian that all of the states deem salient for an understanding of American history. In fact, only one American Indian, Sitting Bull, is mentioned by more than one state standard (Georgia and North Carolina). Beyond that, the Virginia standards recognize the aid of Sacajawea to the Lewis and Clark expedition while the North Carolina standards include three additional individuals: Tecumseh, Sequoyah, and Chief Joseph.

Discussion

All of the standards studied portray American Indians in a demeaning fashion, focusing almost exclusively on 18th and 19th century oppression with relatively little emphasis on cultural contributions, modern issues, or personification of American Indian groups. Moreover, given research on the way social studies educators align their instruction to state standards when faced with high-stakes assessments, the depiction of American Indians in these state standards may provide a fairly accurate reflection of the manner in which teachers are portraying American Indian groups in their classrooms.

From a psychological standpoint, instruction suggested from these standards may have damaging effects for all students. For students of American

Indian/Alaska Native descent, the constant sentiment of oppression may cause students to question their heritage or self-worth. If all students see within their history curriculum are examples of people like themselves constantly being oppressed and having to struggle for equality, that may act as a form of oppression in itself (Vinson, 2006). A curriculum that glorifies the majority at the expense of a particular minority group without equal time given to positive attributes of that group may increase feelings of alienation and distrust. When sympathy is the only emotion assigned to a certain group, then the natural reaction of others is to subconsciously look down upon members of that group. The narratives of all groups should be filled with truthful elements that both glorify and balance out the negative history that must also be included within the curriculum. Students need to identify with people like themselves in order to engage with the curriculum, and for American Indians/Alaska Natives, as with most minority groups, state social studies standards appear to cast an oppressive and uncaring pall over that specific narrative (Ogbu, 1992).

For students of European descent, such a curriculum reinforces their notion of being part of the majority and predisposes them to acts of discrimination toward minority groups, particularly in relatively homogenous settings where many students have little knowledge of other ethnic and cultural groups (Marri, 2005). Moreover, a curriculum that focuses the majority of its American Indian instruction in the 18th and 19th centuries fails to deconstruct the image of a half-naked savage often depicted in Hollywood. The descriptions of American Indians provided by students in Writer's (2001) college course reinforces the need to properly educate *all* students at an early age with an accurate and complete narrative of American history.

The way the standards portray American Indians also creates pedagogical issues regarding historical understanding. For example, the fact that only three states explained the way colonists systematically took land from American Indian tribes weakened from smallpox and other European diseases implies that the colonists had no problems expanding their territory or that American Indian tribes welcomed them with open arms. Although Weatherford (1991) states that most elementary students are annually exposed to stories of relations between American Indians and the first European settlers, at such a young age they are more likely to hear romanticized stories of Pocahontas rather than accounts of settlers knowingly trading disease-laden blankets with tribal leaders. Therefore, in states where conflicts between settlers and American Indian tribes are not discussed, students may develop questions ranging from why Westward expansion took decades to why American Indians did not fight to keep the land that was rightfully theirs.

Having American Indians virtually vanish from the curriculum after the forced relocation in the 1830s also creates gaping holes in the historical narrative. Not only does the lack of a modern American Indian focus fail to explain to students what happened to tribes after the Trail of Tears, but it perpetually leaves American Indians in a victimized light. Only a handful of states noted changes

in exclusionary federal policies, and only North Carolina included current issues relating to American Indians, nearly two centuries after President Jackson brutally forced them from their homes. By having standards that never make a correlation between the 19th and 20th centuries, states are forcing their teachers to ignore the history of an entire people or develop instruction on a topic which they may have little knowledge. Moreover, the lack of a modern American Indian focus marginalizes current events relating to American Indian equality that students may come across in the news, ranging from reservation tax policies to the use of American Indian images for sports team mascots.

Finally, the way state standards fail to individualize American Indians and distinguish between tribes keeps American Indian students from identifying with their social studies curriculum. From Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Edison, there is no shortage of Euro-American males that are guaranteed to appear in an American history course. Yet, no American Indian appears overwhelmingly important enough to be included as part of a general survey of American history. Even American Indians of Hollywood lore are absent from state standards. Only the Virginia standards include the tale of Sacajawea, an omission that seems particularly misguided due to the recent attention received by the federal government for placing her likeness on reissued dollar coins several years ago. However, considering the fact that American Indians inhabited the land that comprises the United States well before European settlers arrived, the exclusion of American Indians in state standards is most likely caused by nationalist framing rather than a lack of influential American Indians.

The failure of state standards to make distinctions among American Indian tribes presents students with a skewed portrait of early American Indian life. By treating all tribes as one entity, standards force students to make the assumption that all tribes lived peacefully among each other and unanimously agreed on the best way to deal with European colonists. Historians know differently, however. Many American Indian tribes were constantly at war with each other. Some tribes chose to prosper economically by trading with settlers while others took up arms and defended their lands from future settlement. By treating all tribes collectively, standards are presenting a simplistic view of history that does not provide a complete story.

Not recognizing tribal differences may also create resentment for Native students, particularly those with strong ties to their heritage. As Writer (2001) notes, many American Indians prefer to identify with their tribe rather than the monikers often used by the federal government. While survey courses in American history can never be entirely inclusive, each state can make the attempt to focus on the American Indian tribes that once dominated their landscape. This should not only pertain to states with large populations of American Indians, such as Oklahoma. Nearly every state has a rich history of American Indian life that either existed prior to colonization or that still continues today. In order to provide a complete history, states should start their instruction at the true beginning and describe how life in that state existed prior to European settlement.

Potential for Change

The standards of the nine states selected for analysis paint a bleak portrait of the representation of American Indians in public school curricula. However, these findings do not mean that representation cannot improve in the future. The solution to this problem is twofold. First, the deficiencies in how standards are representing American Indians need to be addressed by their respective states in order to form a more coherent and realistic portrait of the American Indian/Alaska Native historical narrative. States should frame their standards and assessments in a way that moves beyond a simple determination of whether students acquire content; they should also be used to fuel efforts for social change by ensuring that students are receiving a balanced education that incorporates knowledge of multiple narratives.

One example of a state using education in a proactive way is Montana's "Indian Education For All" (IEFA) Act passed in 1999. The IEFA details the spirit behind Section 2 of Article X of the Montana State Constitution, drafted in 1972, which commits the state to recognizing the cultural heritage of American Indians within the state's educational system (Starnes, 2006). The IEFA states, in part, that

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; and every educational agency...will work cooperatively with Montana tribes...when providing instruction or when implementing an educational goal...related to the education of each Montana citizen, to include information specific to the cultural heritage and contemporary contributions of American Indians...It is also the intent...that educational personnel provide means by which school personnel will gain an understanding of and appreciation for the American Indian people (State of Montana, 2007).

While only applicable to Montana, the IEFA "underscores a national challenge to our education system and to the educators within it" (Starnes, 2006, p. 186). The act reinforces the idea of a liberal education by stating that elements of diversity, in this case knowledge and respect for American Indians, is "no less important for students who live hundreds of miles from reservations than it is for students living on or near them" (Starnes, p. 186).

Of course, leaders from American Indian communities must play a key role in the process of curriculum development in order for true change to occur. No American Indians were part of the 100 delegates that drafted the 1972 Montana constitution; therefore, it is not surprising that it took over two decades for the state to fully commit itself and provide funding for the idea of American Indian education for all (Starnes, 2006). Public education is an ideological battleground often won by those in power (Apple, 1979). American Indian tribes need to exert their influence by lobbying elected officials and by volunteering their time to help educate non-Indians on ways to approach American history in a way that respectfully includes American Indian culture.

Secondly, at the classroom level, teachers must learn to stray from state standards when formulating their instruction. While social studies teachers may have a professional obligation to prepare students for success on end-of-course tests, they have a moral obligation to provide students with a complete history that showcases multiple historical narratives. This can most effectively be done by aligning multicultural lessons with state-mandated content whenever possible. Lintner (2007) describes an activity in which the Indian Removal Act of 1830 is juxtaposed alongside selected passages from *The Journal of Jesse Smoke*, a memoir of a young Cherokee boy who regularly jotted down his thoughts and feelings during his family's forced relocation from Georgia to Arkansas. Such activities allow students to see multiple versions of history, not just the dates and facts found in standards and textbooks. This particular activity could easily lead into debates about the merits of Jackson's policies, which force students to question the nationalistic principles often found in state standards.

Finally, teachers should tie current events to American Indian history whenever possible, such as the ongoing debate over mascots like Chief Illiniwek at the University of Illinois. These issues provide a logical segue into discussions of representation by tying a subject that students may have passionate opinions about into a historical question of fairness and diversity. Such discussions move beyond simply educating our students about history; they aid in developing critically aware and tolerant citizens as well.

Conclusion

While an analysis of state standards can never predict how teachers will portray certain elements of the curriculum in their classrooms, the fact that many social studies teachers feel pressured by high-stakes assessments suggests that instructional time will most likely be devoted to reinforcing standards-based content, limiting the amount of additional information added at the classroom level. Additional research on the teaching practices in these nine states is needed before any conclusions on the implications of state standards on the teaching of American Indians can be made. However, an analysis of the nine standards included in this study leave little doubt that each state prescribes to a traditional version of history that identifies American Indians as victims and marginalizes them by failing to identify key individuals or examples of societal contributions. While this version of American history may fulfill nationalistic views of state administrators, such a depiction presents an incomplete and skewed version of the American narrative. Therefore, teachers in each of the states studied must take it upon themselves to diversify their curriculum, particularly with respect to American Indians, in order to provide their students with a version of history that acknowledges multiple voices and allows for a truthful representation of all groups within society. Such pedagogy is relevant for all students, but particularly those of American Indian heritage as it is important for all students to be able to positively identify with the curriculum in order to increase their engagement and feelings of self-worth.

Wayne Journell is an assistant professor of Secondary Social Studies Education at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro. His research interests include citizenship education and the infusion of technology within social studies education. Prior to earning his doctorate at University of Illinois-Champaign this year, he taught high school American history and government in Virginia.

References

- Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(5), 4-14.
- Beaulieu, D. (2006). A survey and assessment of culturally based education programs for Native American students in the United States. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(2), 50-61.
- Benitez, H. (2001). Does it really matter how we teach? The socializing effects of a globalized U.S. history curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(2), 290-307.
- Brophy, J. (1999). Elementary students learn about Native Americans: The development of knowledge and empathy. *Social Education*, 63(1), 39-45.
- *California Department of Education (1998). *United States history and geography: Continuity and change in the twentieth century*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstgrade11.asp>
- *California Department of Education (1998). *United States history and geography: Growth and conflict*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/hstgrade8.asp>
- de Waal-Lucas, A. (2007). Teaching in isolation: An examination of the treatment of multicultural content in a predominantly white and affluent suburban school. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-21.
- Education Commission of the States (2002). *State policy review of high school end of course assessment programs*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from http://www.ecs.org/html/offsite.asp?document=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Enashonline%2Eorg%2Fcontent%2FEOCR_eport%2Epdf
- Epstein, T. (1998). Deconstructing differences in African-American and European-American adolescents' perspectives on U.S. history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(4), 397-423.
- Evans, R. W. (2001). Thoughts on redirecting a runaway train: A critique of the standards movement. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(2), 330-339.
- Forbes, J. D. (2000). The new assimilation movement: Standards, tests, and Anglo-American supremacy. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 39(2), 7-28.
- *Georgia Department of Education (2004). *United States history*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/DMGetDocument.aspx?United%20States%20History.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F6B985B806C1C09177A3D24FF76068D24BC55F816AE7C44437&Type=D>
- Grant, S. G. (2001). An uncertain lever: Exploring the influence of state-level testing in New York State on teaching social studies. *Teachers College Record*, 103(3), 398-426.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (2004). Unity and diversity in democratic multicultural education: Creative and destructive tensions. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 71-96). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- *Indiana Department of Education (2006). *United States history*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.doe.state.in.us/standards/docs-SocialStudies/2006-SS-USHistory.doc>

- Journell, W. (2007). Dewey and standardization: A philosophical look at the implications for social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 2(3), 301-315.
- LaSpina, J. A. (2003). Designing diversity: Globalization, textbooks, and the story of nations. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(6), 667-696.
- Lintner, T. (2004). The savage and the slave: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and the teaching of American history. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 28(1), 27-32.
- Lintner, T. (2007). Critical race theory and the teaching of American history: Power, perspective, and practice. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 2(1), 103-116.
- Marri, A. R. (2005). Building a framework for classroom-based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 107(5), 1036-1059.
- *New York Department of Education (1996). *Learning standards for social studies*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/ciai/socst/pub/sslearn.pdf>
- *North Carolina Department of Education (2004). *United States history*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.gcsnc.com/depts/curriculum/TIA/Social%20Studies%20and%20History/U.S.%20History.pdf>
- Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 312-334.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Educational Researcher*, 21(8), 5-14, 24.
- *Oklahoma Department of Education (2002). *Priority academic student skills*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.sde.state.ok.us/home/defaultie.html>
- Raines, F. V., & Swisher, K. G. (1999). Authentic voices: Advice for incorporating American Indians and Alaska Natives in the elementary school curriculum. *Social Education*, 63(1), 46-50.
- Ross, E. W. (2000). Diverting democracy: The curriculum standards movement and social studies education. In D. W. Hursch and E. W. Ross (Eds.), *Democratic social education: Social studies for social change* (pp. 203-228). New York: Falmer.
- Ross, E. W. (2006). The struggle for the social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed., pp. 17-36). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Segall, A. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of state-mandated standardized testing: The Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) as a case study of consequences. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31(3), 287-325.
- Sleeter, C., & Stillman, J. (2005). Standardizing knowledge in a multicultural society. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 35(1), 27-46.
- *South Carolina Department of Education (2005). *United States history and the Constitution*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/cso/standards/ss/documents/8INEZSocialStudiesStandards-UnitedStates.doc>
- Starnes, B. A. (2006). Montana's Indian Education For All: Toward an education worthy of American ideals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(3), 184-192.
- State of Montana Legislative Code 20-1-501 (2007). Recognition of American Indian cultural heritage—legislative intent. Available: <http://data.opi.state.mt.us/bills/mca/20/1/21-1-501.htm>
- *Texas Department of Education (1997). *Texas essential knowledge and skills for social studies*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter113/index.html>
- van Hover, S. D. (2006). Teaching history in the Old Dominion: The impact of Virginia's accountability reform on seven secondary beginning history teachers. In S. G. Grant (Ed.),

- Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp. 195-219). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Vinson, K. D. (2006). Oppression, anti-oppression, and citizenship education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed., pp. 51-75). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- *Virginia Department of Education (2001). *Virginia and United States history*. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/History/hist_11.pdf
- Vogler, K. E. (2005). Impact of a high school graduation examination on social studies teachers' instructional practices. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 29(2), 19-33.
- Vogler, K. E., & Virtue, D. (2007). "Just the facts ma'am": Teaching social studies in the era of standards and high-stakes testing. *The Social Studies*, 98(2), 54-58.
- Weatherford, J. (1991). Indian season in American schools. *The Social Studies*, 82, 172-175.
- Wills, J. S. (1996). Who needs a multicultural education? White students, U.S. history, and the construction of a usable past. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 27(3), 365-389.
- Writer, J. H. (2001). Identifying the identified: The need for critical exploration of Native American identity within educational contexts. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(4), 40-47.
- Writer, J. H. (2002). "No matter how bitter, horrible, or controversial": Exploring the value of a Native American education course in a teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education*, 24(2), 9-21.
- Yeager, E. A., & van Hover, S. (2006). Virginia vs. Florida: Two beginning history teachers' perceptions of the influence of high-stakes tests on their instructional decision-making. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 1(3), 340-358.

Appendix A
**Examples of standards relating to American Indians found
within the nine states**

Category from Table 1	Example(s) of standards
Loss of land/Death by disease from settlers	(NY) Use a variety of sources to study important turning points from different perspectives and to identify varying points of view of the people involved (e.g., European settlement and the impact of diseases on Native American Indian populations)
As part of the French and Indian War/American Revolution	(OK) Compare and contrast different perspectives on the (Revolutionary) war (e.g., free and enslaved African Americans and Native Americans)
Trail of Tears/Forced Relocation	(SC) USHC-3: Explain the impact and challenges of western movement, including...the displacement of Native Americans, and its impact on the developing American character.
Federal Indian Policies	(CA) 8.12: Identify the reasons for development of federal Indian policy and the wars with American Indians and their relationship to agricultural development and industrialization
Indian Wars	(GA) SSUSH12: Describe the growth of the western population and its impact on Native Americans with reference to Sitting Bull and Wounded Knee
Tribal Distinctions	(OK) Compare and contrast the policies toward Native Americans...including the resistance and removal of the Five Tribes (i.e., Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, Seminole, and Cherokee)
Societal/Military contributions	(VA) VUS.10: The student will demonstrate knowledge of World War II by noting additional contributions by minorities (such as) Communication codes of the Navajo were used (oral, not written language; impossible for the Japanese to break)
Modern American Indian Issues	(NC) 11.03: Identify major social movements including the American Indian Movement; compare leaders of the feminist movement with leaders of the American Indian Movement.