

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education 1964-1970

Thomas (Tom) R. Hopkins

This chapter describes the experiences of the author working for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Education Program from 1964 to 1970. He describes it as a time of excitement and ready money for the Bureau's Education Program. The excitement was professional with new linguistic knowledge emerging, which was accompanied by new methods of teaching English as a second language (ESL). The ESL innovations, including the creation of the professional organization Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), was accompanied by teacher training which had an impact at the classroom level. Bilingual education was again implemented in the BIA's Education program in schools where there were large numbers of ESL children. There was also a great deal of evaluation, mostly standardized testing, of students attending BIA schools.

I came to the national level of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Education in 1964 after eight years in Alaska starting at Arctic day schools and then five years at the Mt. Edgecumbe High School, a BIA boarding school. At Mt. Edgecumbe I was head of the Academic Department. I left Mt. Edgecumbe in 1964 to take the position of "Education Specialist, Secondary," at the Field Technical Unit located in Brigham City, Utah, on the campus of Intermountain Indian School which then enrolled mostly Navajo students. At that time I was the only Secondary Education Specialist in the BIA.

Soon after arrival at the BIA Education Branch's Field Technical Unit on January 1, 1964, I was sent to Washington, DC, to get acquainted with Hildegarde Thompson, then Director of BIA Education. One of Mrs. Thompson's policies was to look for direction within the BIA Education Program and seldom look outside of it. I later learned that this was a main problem she had with Interior Department officials. She was brilliant in her understanding of teaching English as a second language, which was based on her experience in the Philippines and with the Navajos. She was not inclined to consult academics for advice. She was not especially anti-intellectual but she did somewhat demand that Education employees pay attention to her knowledge and experience, which she wrote about prolifically. Considering that starting with her appointment in 1952 with the inauguration of the Area Director system, she was only a "Technical Advisor" to school operations. As such, she was amazingly effective in having her policies and directives followed. She was a brilliant person, which is not to say that I necessarily agreed with all her policies and direction of the BIA Education Program.

Cite as from J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard & W.S. Gilbert. (Eds.). (2017). *Honoring Our Teachers* (pp. 135--174). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Honoring Our Teachers

From 1934 to 1965 there were three Education leaders of the BIA Education Program. After Thompson left and until I retired in 1979, there were a succession of acting and formal appointments numbering about a dozen with only one having had experience educating Indians/Natives. For all practical purposes, starting in 1966, the BIA Education Program as a viable Education system and was unique in U.S. education. In my view, federal government's approach to Indian Self-Determination in 2016 is analogous to Termination back in the 1950's. Indians now have control of their Education and, even with NCLB making Education a Trust Responsibility, besides funding, the federal government no longer has Indian/Native education responsibility.

Unbeknownst to me, when I first met Thompson, she was under political pressure from Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall who obviously thought she was behind the times educationally and professionally. While there I was taken aside and handed a stack of BIA literature, which included curriculum guides and a book, *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*, by Robert Lado (1964). I was assigned to do analysis comparing the BIA's approach to language teaching to Lado's 17 Principles reflecting a scientific approach. Coming from a boarding high school in Alaska, I was unawares of the politics of Indian education. This unawareness did not last long.

This was an interesting assignment as I was officially an "Education Specialist, Secondary." In fact, I was the only specific high school specialist in the whole BIA Education system. Yet, I was asked to do this analysis, which largely concerned primary and elementary education. As soon as I finished a draft of the analysis I was invited to have a conversation with Mrs. Thompson. I had rated the BIA curriculum literature and guides as a one on the seven point scale (0-6) on Principle 15, "Impart an attitude of sympathy or identification with the target culture." As I pointed out in the Overview, BIA curriculum guides had over the decades been written by almost exclusively non-Indian teachers and administrators. I didn't find much concern for the Indian/Native cultures and languages in the guides. Thompson rightly saw this as a rather serious weakness in her many efforts at second language teaching of Indian children. She had a discussion with me and then zeroed in on principle 15 and said I was wrong in my analysis. I thought it over and raised it to 2, which satisfied her. Since the six point scale and related assessment was "Professional" but unscientific, raising the score to 2 seemed the best thing to do at that time. Even so, raising the Principle 15 score to a 2 was not anything to brag about, but it did satisfy Thompson.

In my overview I used the BIA literature of which there was a bountiful supply to discern how language teaching evolved over time. Actually it did not move far in approach from the emphasis on the immediate environment as the beginning of second language instruction. Even though made available in the 1930's and 1940's it did not include linguistic knowledge and modern second language pedagogy for use in BIA schools. This analysis coincidentally took place just as modern language pedagogy was beginning to influence the BIA Education program. Interestingly enough, this assessment was the first and only one of Bureau curricula guides against a set of external criteria.

Rock Point and Dennehotso

Soon after I finished the Lado analysis, I was assigned as a member of a team to evaluate the English as a Second Language (ESL) programs at Navajo schools at Rock Point and Dennehotso. Both were elementary Beginners to eighth grade boarding schools. A team of evaluators was assembled which was comprised of one person from the Area Office, myself and my supervisor, Ms Dorothy Hanlon. We were told that Rock Point was using the “new” ESL scientific method, which included linguistic knowledge, and Dennehotso was using the BIA method.

We were further told that the Assistant Area Director for Navajo Area Education was dissatisfied with the Dennehotso principal’s performance and thought that competition between the two schools would shape her up. Having just finished with the Lado assignment, I was acutely aware of the new thinking on ESL. We visited Rock Point first and got acquainted with the principal, Wayne Holm, his Navajo wife, Agnes, and Dr. Willink, a language specialist. Wayne and Agnes became life-long professional acquaintances and friends as did Dr. Willink. The leadership at Rock Point was informed of the latest developments in ESL and linguistics. They were also suspicious of anyone from Washington looking over their program. They were afraid that something called the “BIA Method” would be imposed on them. I had learned from the Lado experience that there really was not an organized “BIA ESL Method.” Rather, there were disparate writings which taken together could become a BIA ESL Method, but this had not occurred. The BIA curriculum guide, *Minimum Essential Goals*, did have several good instructions on ESL, but in the end fell short of a comprehensive ESL Method. I had included many quotes from the *Minimum Essential Goals* in my Lado-BIA paper. Further, the Lado scientific method was backed by experience and linguistic knowledge. Rock Point, generally, reflected Lado’s method. It was encouraging and stimulating, even exciting, to visit Rock Point and to learn that a BIA school was reflecting the latest knowledge and method regarding English language instruction.

We next visited Dennehotso. We entered the school by walking up the steps to the school which were completely sand filled, making a sandy inclined plane on the order of modern day street approaches for the handicapped. The doors of the building were wide open and sand was blowing down the central hallway. A head teacher welcomed us and said the principal was busy meeting with parents. There were several parents sitting outside the principal’s office waiting to see her. We then discussed our purpose of the visit with the head teacher and visited the classrooms. The teachers were going about their usual instructional program. Some reflected the *Minimum Essential Goals* and some did not. No one was aware of a BIA ESL Method. Eventually, we met with the principal who was an expert in Navajo community relations and was fluent enough in Navajo so that no interpreter was needed when she met with parents and other community members. She said she was not aware specifically of a BIA ESL method other than that contained in the *Minimum Essential Goals*. We informed her that the Area Office wanted to do a comparative evaluation study between Rock Point and Dennehotso. She said that was fine with her, but she had a parent waiting and

Honoring Our Teachers

needed to get on with it. The Dennehotso teachers were carrying the instructional program albeit without any knowledge of a comparative evaluation between it and Rock Point. They did not seem to think it important since they had received no instructions on a specific BIA ESL method.

After the visits at Rock Point and Dennehotso I told my supervisor that there was no point in the evaluation. If the Navajo Area Education Director wanted the Dennehotso principal to improve as an education leader, she should call the principal in and lay it on the line. There was no educational benefit to be gained from a competition between Rock Point and Dennehotso, especially without a structured quasi-research design. Also, the Dennehotso principal had unique strengths in community relations which should not be inhibited through misdirected administrative action. The same for Rock Point and their innovative ESL program. The evaluation was abandoned.

Teacher Orientation Workshops for Navajo Schools

Soon after returning to the Field Technical Unit I was assigned to evaluate the Navajo New Teacher Orientation Workshop to be held at the new boarding school at Crownpoint, New Mexico. The workshop was to be held August 3 – 14, 1964. Subsequently, I was assigned to evaluate the 1965 Workshop held at Leupp Boarding school and in 1966 at the new Fort Wingate High School. I received very limited instruction regarding how to conduct a workshop evaluation. I remembered how it was done at two Intermountain Indian School workshops I had attended in recent years. The evaluation procedure was simple: assemble a committee of attendees and have them make a presentation to the participants at the end of the workshop. Invariably, the committee reports were laudatory, but in my view they were not evaluations.

BIA education workshops initiated by Willard Beatty in 1935 would often have academics, especially anthropologists, linguists and sociologists address the participants. On the other hand, Hildegard Thompson after 1951 continued the workshop practice but invited no academics, linguists or sociologists. She depended entirely on experienced BIA education employees to provide leadership at workshops.

I need to digress for a bit to explain how new teachers in the 1960's were recruited for the BIA operated school system. The BIA had created a "Teacher Recruitment Section" staffed with former experienced BIA teachers who spent the entire year visiting colleges and universities and other institutions to recruit new teachers.

Most BIA schools would be classified as "Rural," which historically, have experienced shortages of teachers. Teachers like to live in towns and cities where they generally received higher pay and more community services. Table 1 below provides the number of participants for each workshop. Though I did not have the ethnicity of the teachers provided to me, on observation, they were all non-Indian. Ethnically, they were mostly White with some Black teachers. The term "New" meant they were new to the BIA and Indian Education and "Experienced" meant they had taught the previous year in Navajo BIA schools.

A 1966 report from the Teacher Recruiting unit showed a total of 562 new BIA teachers appointed and 78 resigning, with the Navajo Area Office having 367 teachers appointed and 61 resigning.

Table 1: Teacher Workshop Participants

<u>Year and Location</u>	<u>New Teachers</u>	<u>Experienced Teachers</u>	<u>Total</u>
1964 Crownpoint	137	63	200
1965 Leupp	117	48	165
1966 Ft. Wingate	100	0	100
Totals	354	111	316

I went to Crownpoint without having clear in my mind just how I was going to evaluate the workshop. But, I knew for sure I was not going to take the “Committee Approach.” I arrived at Crownpoint a week before the workshop was to start. During this week I reviewed carefully the workshop goals and curriculum. Then, I was reading from the *Sociology of Education* journal and noticed an article “Teaching and Students, the Views of Negro and White Teachers” (Gottlieb, 1964). In this article stereotype perceptions of the two groups of teachers were determined using an adjective check list. Upon further reflection, I decided on a two part evaluation. One part consisted of visiting each class and approach it as I was taught when supervising teachers at the Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Alaska. I would take notes during the observations and for the report, summarize my observations in narrative form. The second part would be a questionnaire which contained the adjectives from the Gotlieb research article.

The quasi-research approach that I developed for the workshop evaluations was new to the BIA Education program, which had been sponsoring workshops for 30 years but never used an evaluation even remotely approaching something close to research. The Navajo Area education specialists who had responsibility for developing the workshops liked the reports and used them to assist in developing the 1965 and 1966 workshops.

I administered the questionnaires at the end of each workshop and took them back to the Field Technical Unit for analysis and reporting. It should be kept in mind that in those days there were no personal computers or mainframe computer available to me. Hence, the frequency counts were obtained by the old method, using a hand operated calculator. The workshop responders were a captive audience as they were employees of the BIA, and it was an official duty to complete the questionnaires. In those days and continuing to the present if something like the questionnaire was for “Administrative Purposes” there was not a privacy issue. A follow-up questionnaire was mailed out in January so that after teaching for a few months it could be determined if there were any changes in the perceptions of Navajos by the teachers.

Follow-up responses for 1964 were 77 (56%) for new teachers and 32 (50%) for experienced teachers and for the 1965 workshop 72 (55%) for new teachers and 15 (47%) for experienced teachers. For practical statistical purposes the over 50% response rate was strong enough to make qualified, logical, non-statistical

Honoring Our Teachers

observations. In February of 1966 I submitted a report to the Navajo Area Education Office that included an analysis of the check lists for 1964 and 1965. In summary, the 1965-66 new teachers indicated significant changes in their concept of the Navajo child between the August workshop and February of the school year. Most of them modified their ideas about the behavioral characteristics of the Navajo child. As a group, they indicated in February that they thought the Navajo child to be more talkative, lazy and moody than in August. They also thought in February the Navajo children were less calm, cautious, cooperative, humble, proud, quiet and reserved than in August. Nonetheless, they generally considered the children to be athletic, calm, cautious, easy going, happy, fun loving, quiet, reserved, and shy.

The teachers apparently started the year with a romantic, unrealistic concept of the Navajo child and after being in the classroom for a while learned that Navajo children were as human and individualistic as any other. It was indeed interesting to see a consistent pattern from year to year. Knowing the romantic pre-workshop conceptions, it might be possible to help teachers be more realistic before going into the classroom. Being more realistic is tantamount to sound understanding of the child, hence an improvement in effective teaching becomes a possibility from the start.

It should be noted that such characteristics as lazy and moody gained an inordinate amount from August to February. It hardly seems possible that the Navajo child could be considered lazy. In August, only 7% said they were lazy but in February 32% checked lazy. This possibly could be treated in the workshops and in inservice education sessions at schools. If the 32% is projected as a characteristic of the teachers throughout the reservation, then over 300, possibly more teachers would consider the Navajo child to be lazy. Lazy would certainly be considered a poor characteristic by the teachers and would influence their general attitude toward the children. So far, the figures have been those that rated a high percentage or changed considerably from August to February. It is interesting to look at those characteristics the teachers think to be unrepresentative of the Navaho student: ambitious (11%), arrogant (11%), dominant (4%), forceful (3%), hard driving (3%), high strung (4%), idealistic (5%), impetuous (4%), intellectual (13%), outgoing (5%), and sophisticated (1%).

Some of these characteristics could be considered important to success in middle-class America, especially in middle-class American schools. Successful students could be considered sophisticated, intellectual hard driving, ambitious and sometimes dominant. If the teachers could not see these characteristics in their students, then what does this mean for the Navajo education program?

Gardner's Research on Teachers Perceptions of Indian Students

In December of 1966 the BIA contracted with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) "to carry out a study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians in the care of the Bureau" (CAL, 1967), which became known as the Gardner study. An activity of the study was a survey of the attitudes of teachers of Indian students. It provided an important and probably benchmark

on attitudes, perceptions and stereotypes research on teachers of American Indian children. Though unrelated, it followed the workshops and referenced the adjective checklist findings. The study was based on 300 “Educators” of Indian children who completed and returned a nine-page survey instrument.

The Gardner (1967) study followed comprehensive research methodology including several statistical procedures. It provided clear definitions of what was being tested. An important measure included what was titled an “Orientation Index,” which was described thusly:

Each S[ubject] was asked to rank in order of importance three reasons for Indians learning English. These reasons were selected to describe an integrative orientation (to be truly part of both cultures), an instrumental orientation (to gain good employment) and an assimilative orientation (to become more like non-Indian Americans). Ss were classified in terms of one of these orientations on the basis of a reason he ranked most important. (1967, p. 4)

The workshop data was defined as “integrative” meaning that workshop attendees thought the purpose of Navajo education was to help the students live in both cultures. Providing this interpretative observation of the workshop data added a dimension of importance to it – and clarification. The summary of the stereotype data was:

The educators sampled in this study tend to have a generally favorable stereotype concerning Indian students. The degree of consensus among those tested is high, and it seems probable that such a reaction is common to most educators of Indian students. Moreover, the stereotype is well circumscribed. Individuals accepting one aspect of it tend to accept it all. This is true, even though the educators tested work with different Indian tribes. There is good evidence to suggest that the educators have an organized image of the Indian student. Their expectation is that he is intelligent and friendly. Despite the favorable image described, the Indian student is nonetheless perceived as being marginal. He is seen as having lost, to some extent, many traits identified with his adult community, but as not having yet acquired many traits presumed to characterize non-Indian students. The implications for teaching seem clear. The educators generally have a healthy respect for their charges. One would imagine that they experience reward with their task. Moreover, they appear to believe that their students are becoming more like non-Indian Americans, even though they see considerable differences still evident. (Gardner, 1967, p. 2)

The summary of the study included:

Honoring Our Teachers

The Indian student might be characterized as a marginal individual, a person in a period of transition, from the traditional Indian culture to the modern American one. But from the point of view of the educators, he hasn't yet made it.

Educators' attitudes seem to form three broad clusters. One, attitudes concerning characteristics of the students which influence language acquisition, seems to emphasize mostly motivational factors. Educators who perceive Indian students as highly motivated tend to deemphasize the negative effects of the peer group or the culture. They tend to feel that the students have the requisite abilities to learn English, but this component does not seem to be that important. A second cluster, aims of English language instruction, suggests that educators who support one aim tend to support them all. Nonetheless, there is a clear indication that the educators feel that the greatest benefit in teaching Indian students English is that it will allow them to deal effectively in both cultures.... The third cluster deals with educators' attitudes concerning their training and materials. Teachers satisfied with their training tend to be satisfied with the educational materials they have to use....

The problems involved with teaching Indian children would seem to be multiple caused. Educators working with different tribes stress different problems, teachers of the older students experience difficulties not apparent for teachers of the younger students, and even the type of school that the educator works in influences his perception of the problems involved. Assuming that the educators views are valid, one would argue against, for example, initiating one language programme. Different problems demand different solutions. Many of the educators emphasize motivational difficulties. The students themselves weren't investigated, but the results of this survey suggest that they should be.... This study demonstrated that more experienced teachers were less critical than beginning teachers. (Gardner, 1967, pp. 29-31)

Research on Navajo and Non-Navajo Teacher Characteristics

In the spring of 1970 I started research on Navajo and non-Navajo teachers, which was my dissertation research at The George Washington University. Having already used the adjective check list at the Navajo Orientation Workshops I thought to refine its use within a research design. As referenced in the Gardner (1967) research, the workshop data was already being used. Part of my dissertation abstract follows:

The recommendation has often been made that Indian teachers should be developed and employed in American Indian education. Yet there has been no systematic research to probe what is meant by such a recommendation. The basic purpose of this study was to describe the characteristics of Navajo and non-Navajo teachers and to determine their similarities and differences....

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education

Sixty-five Navajo teachers of Navajo children and a sample of 100 non-Navajo teachers from the Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel including Negro, White, Oriental, and other American Indian tribes were mailed a questionnaire in the spring of 1970. 42 Navajo and 83 non-Navajo teachers responded....

The background data of the two groups were significantly different except in areas pertaining to formal education and preparation for teaching. The study indicated that Navajo teachers started life as typical Navajos and were transformed, through education, to atypical individuals. There were no significant differences between the two groups regarding their major perceptions of the Navajo child as measured by the adjective check-list, nor in their selected educational objectives for the child. There were significant differences regarding the Navajo child, concerning likeability, scholastic potential, and teacher sensitivity to the child. Navajo teachers found the child to be more likable, to have more scholastic potential, and were more sensitive to the child. Neither group found the child to be especially unlikable....

The study concluded that while there were significant differences between the two groups of teachers, there were enough similarities to form a basis for teamwork on behalf of Navajo children. Navajo teachers have some decided advantages regarding understanding the child, but may also have some disadvantages, for the same reasons. Non-Navajo teachers may not understand the child as readily as the Navajo, but they possess strengths in understanding the importance and operation of formal education. Recommendations concerning operational procedures in Navajo schools and future research were made with the intent of achieving a blending of the two strengths.

Concluding Observations on Attitudes and Stereotypes

It has been frequently reported in research that short term workshops are relatively ineffective. The Navajo Teacher Orientation workshops were of longer duration and lasted two weeks. The content was innovative for the 1960's in that cross-cultural as well as Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) content were offered. The 1964 and 1965 workshops had one very effective class that was taught by a Navajo entirely in Navajo. The teachers (students) did not know any Navajo and were asked to learn something. It was interesting to observe the class because one could see teachers behaving individually much the same as Navajo children behaved when they were taught entirely in English without benefit of ESL instruction. Though I cannot prove it, I think this class had an influence on their selection of adjectives to reflect attitude and perceptions of Navajo children.

The 1966 workshop was very different from the two previous years because the Navajo Area had contracted with the new professional organization, TESOL. This workshop had experienced, professional ESL professors as instructors, a dramatic change in BIA sponsored workshops that had for several years depended

Honoring Our Teachers

on experienced teachers and administrators as workshop instructors. Dr. Buck Benham, then Assistant Area Director for Education, was willing to break with BIA workshop tradition in contracting to the TESOL organization. At the time, I was in contact with Dr. Jim Alatas of Georgetown University who was the first Executive Director of TESOL. Jim told me that the workshop was key to funding the struggling new organization and placed it on a good financial footing while awaiting dues from the new membership.

The previously mentioned Gardner (1967) study dealt specifically, among other things, with teacher stereotypical perceptions. My research dealt with teacher perceptions especially regarding intellectual capabilities of Navajo children. It was clear that Navajo educators perceived more learning characteristics than did non-Navajo educators. The Gardner research indicated experienced teachers were more positive in perceptions of Indian students than were new and inexperienced teachers, which brings us back to the 1964 and 1965 Orientation Workshops comprised mostly of new, inexperienced teachers. Those with experience had been teaching Navajo children for a year or less so for the most part, all teachers could be classified as “new and inexperienced.” I tried in my reports and analyses to urge the Navajo Area to work on the positive side of Navajo children and their basic humanness.

As mentioned above, BIA Education presented workshops for employees for various purposes. The Navajo Orientation workshops and the one conducted by TESOL were probably the most important for the 1964–1970 era. Teacher perceptions were not measured in the 1966 TESOL workshop as they were working with CAL and were aware of the Gardner project. On the other hand, were teacher perceptions of Indian students mentioned in historical BIA education literature? The brief articles printed biweekly in the *Indian Education* newsletter and collected in three volumes by Beatty (1944, 1953) and Thompson (1964) are the source for these perceptions. These three volumes cover the period from 1936 to part of 1964, just under 30 years. The direction of the content differed primarily according to the formal education and experiences of the Education Director. Beatty employed anthropologists and linguistics and asked academics to write for *Indian Education*. Thompson wrote most of the articles in the later issues until she retired in 1965, and they reflected her brilliance but also her limited academic background. She simply shunned academics and depended on her own mid-western background tempered with a genteel flavor. She could write pages and describe basic cultural differences, i.e. time and work, but seldom if ever present it from the perspective of the Indians. Thompson never did specifically or by implication, perceive teacher attitudes and stereotypes as appropriate knowledge related teacher training purposes. I believe that she perceived them as such, but did not believe that directly writing about them appropriate for BIA Education personnel.

On the other hand, Beatty had anthropologists, academics and medical doctors write articles for inclusion in *Indian Education*. For example, Gordon Macgregor, an anthropologist and BIA education employee wrote in a 1941 *Indian Education* article titled, “Stage Indians”:

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education

Anyone acquainted with Indians and reservations must have been fully enraged or have left the theatre in a fit of laughter at a recent “Western” that took place on a reservation. The Indian trader appeared to be a college graduate decked out in Western regalia, the assistant superintendent was in league with rustlers, and both he and the superintendent always traveled with rifles and six-shooters. The reservation Indians paraded through an ethnological nightmare in which, dressed in full war regalia they galloped across the western plains into a canyon filled with obvious California oaks where they jumped miraculously into birchbark canoes, which have never been known to any but Woodland Indians, to paddle downstream. They were fired upon by the rustlers, among whom were more Indians—whom one might term cultural hybrids with their pueblo hair bobs and head bands, velveteen Navaho shirts, and fringed buckskin leggings. (p. 4)

At that time this was written, Hollywood was great on educating the U.S. public about Indians and some of this perception no doubt was evidence in the BIA personnel, else, why would he have written it? An *Indian Education* article written in 1944 by Dr. Ruth Underhill, the BIA’s supervisor of Indian education and a student of Columbia University professor Dr. Franz Boas who is considered the father of American anthropology, was titled Indian-White Equality. She wrote:

CAN an Indian do anything a white man can do? Yes, say the scientists. There is no proof that any group of people—Indians, Solomon Islanders, Negroes or whites has, less mental capacity than any other group. Within any group there may be bright and dull individuals or even family lines that stand out. There is no such thing as inferiority of a whole people.

The average man raises his eyebrows and some visitors to Indian reservations have raised them very high. If an Indian can do everything, they object, why doesn’t he do it? Where are the Indian doctors, lawyers and businessmen? Why are so few young people interested in high school, much less college? The worker in Indian education grows accustomed to being told by the old timers: These people are like children. They can’t learn much after they are twelve years old.

Our answer to this objection has been too brief. It is not enough to say that the speaker is wrong, because some of his facts, are right. The full blood doctors and lawyers are few, the businessmen almost non-existent. True, many Indians do not care for that kind of success and that is another subject. But what of the ones who do care? They have had the some opportunity as a white boy to take a job and put themselves through college. In fact, they have had more help than most white boys can expect. Yet the facts are plain and the average onlooker wants to know: What is the matter with the Indian?

Honoring Our Teachers

In answering him we need to make it plain that an Indian's inborn capacities, like those of any other human being, are potential only. They can become actual under favorable conditions, just as seeds grow with rain and sun, or children learn to talk if they hear human speech. Without such incitement, the best seed and the brightest child will fail to develop. The incitement, for what our world calls success, comes from a drive that is generated in white children almost from birth, a drive compounded of desire, belief in oneself, a sense of public approval and a conviction that success is possible.

These are not an Indian's birthright. Once he believed in himself because of a vision or a series of ceremonies which could make success certain. With that conviction gone, he must generate his belief almost without help. His people will not approve, for they fear and distrust the kind of success he plans. The few white teachers who encourage him will seem a pitiable support in a world which thinks Indians are children. How can he have conviction of success? The scores of achievement stories which have built up the hopes of his white neighbors have never applied to Indians. Often he has recognized this fact by high school age, and it is no wonder his enthusiasm drops.

"Give a dog a bad name and hang him," is an ancient proverb based on true psychology. Social scientists of today would word it: "Give a whole group an inferior position and, it is very hard for any individual to overcome it."

For instance, take the position of women in the 1880's. Then, it was believed by men and women alike that no female brain could understand politics or business. Women would faint at any excitement and they "would make monkeys of themselves" if they tried to "ape" men. Therefore very few of them did try. Most succeeded in being exactly as helpless as the world thought them, and the case was proved.

Yet women's work today proves that the whole idea was pure bunkum. The fluttery female of the 1880's could have been an air pilot or a Rosie the Welder if she and the world had wished it so. The change has not been in the female brain, for evolution cannot work such miracles in less than a hundred years. It has been in the woman's own attitude and in that of the world around her.

The same thing has happened with another "inferior" group, the southern Negro. Observers have averred sincerely that he was "childish," unable to go beyond grade school, and fit only for manual labor. Statistics show that when these very same Negroes have moved to the north, in an encouraging environment, away from the drag of membership in an inferior class, their very I. Q.'s have jumped. They are moving into one professional position after another and the obstacle to their going further is not their own ability, but the attitude of the white group.

Equality, then, depends on social factors as well as on innate ability. The arguments against many a minority group would crumble

if it were recognized that its capacities cannot show themselves until given opportunity. Okies, hillbillies, and foreign born immigrants, can all look like undesirable elements while subject to ill health, poverty and social ostracism. Indians also can find themselves in a dead-end road if they are emotionally unprepared for life in the white world; if whites discourage them and if they feel themselves beaten before they have begun. It is this lack of incitement which constitutes one of the real problems of the Indian Service today. We have not found the way to prepare an Indian emotionally for our version of success. We have not given him confidence. Nor has the country as a whole consented to release him from his position in a "child-like" minority, regarded with pity and patronage. Such a situation is not changed over night. It will take, years of effort by both whites and Indians, but at least we see in what direction the effort should trend. We see that criticism of an Indian's "incapacity" is really a criticism of the white group which gives his capacity no chance to grow. (Underhill, 1944, pp. 1-2)

Non-Indigenous Teachers of Indigenous children need to approach them as humans with cultural behaviors that differ from their own. They should seek to understand the children as humans, not as stereotypes.

Top-down Innovation: Fort Wingate and SIPI

During 1964 and 1965 I was assigned to two curriculum development projects. The first was to develop the English language curriculum at the new Navajo Ft. Wingate High School just east of Gallup, New Mexico. The second was to work with others on developing the program for the new Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (SIPI). Both new schools were built and still operate today. The ideas for the two projects emanated from higher up administrators with the idea that developing an up-to-date curriculum should accompany a new school. At the time, the idea of developing a new up-to-date curriculum before the new school opened seems a good idea. One should remember that this was before Indian self-determination and in both situations, Indian people who would send their members to the schools were not involved in the planning.

At Fort Wingate, education specialists at the area and central office levels met periodically to develop a modern high school curriculum for the school. My particular assignment was to develop the English curriculum. Mr. Alvin Warren, then attached to the Navajo Area, headed the curriculum development activity. I learned that Mr. Warren was a brilliant and dedicated educator and also an Indian. The location of the school as well as the pre-construction curriculum development activity emanated from Hildegard Thompson.

Ft. Wingate High School's location was on land that in the nineteenth century was a cavalry fort for soldiers assigned to monitor Navajo activities. The work started at the old Ft. Wingate Elementary School. Visiting this school for the first time was very interesting. The old cavalry barracks were still in use as a dormitory, and off to one side in the principal's office was an old Army strong

Honoring Our Teachers

box, an artifact from the nineteenth century cavalry days. The new high school was to be built about half a mile north of the elementary school campus.

I don't remember how long the committee met, but I do remember the general English courses I outlined for the curriculum. For English I suggested ESL instruction, especially at the ninth grade level. Absent any language census data on the students, it was a safe assumption that they almost all spoke English as a second language. It was also a safe assumption that they had received no modern ESL instruction. So, ESL was developed for the ninth grade. Regarding English literature, I selected complete books to read, some aloud in class. No anthologies were to be purchased. Paperback editions of the selected books would be purchased and given to the students to keep and start their own home library. Writing was also to be an important part of the curriculum, but only after English speech was learned.

What happened is instructive. A new principal was hired and he selected the key department heads for the school. He hired an Sioux for English. I met with the man and tried to discuss with him the needs of the students and the curriculum the committee had developed. He smiled, and told me that he was an experienced English teacher and had been successful in teaching Indian students for several years. He said that he would adopt the South Dakota state curriculum. I was stunned. But, then I remembered that BIA Indian schools in South Dakota, by law, were required to teach the curriculum of the State of South Dakota.

No Navajo meeting of parents or tribal officials was held regarding the adoption of the South Dakota curriculum for the new Ft. Wingate Navajo boarding high school. This also taught me that involvement of the Washington Office education specialists was meaningless in the face of Area Office control. The new principal supported his newly hired English Department Head. The Navajo Area Office didn't resist the establishment of the curriculum committee, they simply quietly ignored it. Needless to say, I made no more visits to Ft. Wingate High School to monitor the implementation of the South Dakota curriculum.

The story behind SIPI is also interesting. Around 1964, Senator Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, a powerful senator, was getting ready to retire. He said, "I want to give something to the Indians of New Mexico. This new vocational school will be my parting gift to New Mexico Indians." The BIA told Senator Anderson they didn't want the new school. To which he and his staff replied, "The Indians of New Mexico are going to get a new vocational school so BIA get ready for it." The Area Director of the Albuquerque did just that. He convened a program (curriculum) development committee, and I was assigned to work as a member of it.

Initially, SIPI was to be a joint education activity of the Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Our first meeting was with Mr. Lewis Savedra of APS. He was developing what was to become the Albuquerque Vocational Technical School and now Central New Mexico College (CNM). APS assigned Savedra an old unused high school building in which we first met. The idea was that, perhaps, the Federal Government, through BIA, would provide some of the funding for this new joint education venture. This joint venture

died almost as soon as it was mentioned and did so because of Federal statutes which did not allow Indian appropriations to be used for non-Indian education purposes.

I researched the Southwest job situation in anticipation of a curriculum to respond to these needs. As is still the case, many jobs in New Mexico were government jobs. This included all levels of government municipal, county, state and Federal. There were only a limited number of industries in New Mexico and many required high level technology and related education. Nonetheless, there were vocational education needs within this economic landscape. Certainly, clerical, bookkeeping, accounting and auto mechanics were needed. The committee was instructed not to replicate the curriculum at Haskell Institute in Kansas, at that time the flagship BIA Indian boarding school, but to develop one based on Southwest Indian needs and was also concerned about societal and economic changes. They wanted to make the facility a flexible one in which partitions could be easily moved to accommodate new program needs. We even designed study carrels, some of which would support a computer.

Well, the Albuquerque Area Office hired a former Haskell Superintendent as the first SIPI Superintendent. He didn't bother to look at the work of the committee but forthrightly stated: "I know what is needed in the program because I was superintendent of Haskell for several years. SIPI will follow the Haskell curriculum."

There are several people and institutions that should be involved in changing a school program. I would recommend that the process start with the people, including students, who will or do attend the school. These local people should be provided information (demographic, research, evaluation curriculum content, etc.) supporting the innovation. If, in spite of the information provided, the local people decide against the change, this should be the end of the innovation effort. Professional educators should take the lead in the innovation.

The above two experiences reflect authoritarian educational activity. By this I mean decisions were made within the civil service structure of the Federal Government. There was no involvement of the Indian people who would send children and youth to the schools. Regardless, both schools were constructed and are still in operation 40 years later.

Testing, Testing, Testing

After Hildegard Thompson retired there were a succession of Directors (Assistant Commissioners) of the Education Program none of whom had experience in the education of Indian/Natives. Usually, they wanted to immediately conduct an evaluation of the total 48,000 students. The irony of this situation was that Madison Coombs was on their staff, and they had only to ask him about the results of the three system-wide evaluations that had been conducted since 1944 (Peterson, 1948; Anderson, et.al., 1953; Coombs, et.al, 1958). Coombs could have told them anything they wanted to know, and then some. However, they apparently wanted to do their own testing. While they did pay for system-wide testing, there was no follow-up whatsoever of the test results.

Honoring Our Teachers

My experiences with testing started in January of 1964 when I joined the Field Technical Unit staff at Brigham city, Utah. A fellow education specialist was Farlie S. Spell who was taking the lead technical task of assisting the Navajo Education office with a large scale testing of Navajo children. I well remember Spell's meticulous, competent and intelligent managing of data, even though it was all in those days done manually, i.e., pencil, paper, 5 X 8 cards, desktop calculator, etc. She was well into a longitudinal evaluation that was finally completed in 1970 (Spell, 1968). There are few documents that describe in detail the complexities of using standardized tests with Indian children. Some excerpts from the preface of her report follow:

A test is only a sample of a pupil's performance. Results should be used with caution, but they should be used for what they are worth. It should be kept in mind that at best - even for the child for whom the test was constructed - grade placements are merely relative. They give only some indication of a level of achievement. Then there is always the possibility of a margin of probable error.

It should be emphasized that a norm is only an average - again based on the Group selected for the development of the norm. So far as standardized tests are concerned - few, if any, Indian children would have been included in that group - thus the importance of establishing Navajo Area norms.

It is hoped the following report on the status of the Navajo Area Testing Program will be helpful to field personnel in appraising achievement of individual pupils as it relates to their accomplishments on a particular test. However, it is assumed that in no case will any child's achievement be assessed only by achievement test scores.

Spell and the Committee went forward with their testing project. One interesting feature of their work was to consult the publisher of the Stanford Achievement Test, Harcourt, Brace and World. The company's lead testing expert, Dr. Roger T. Lennon, Director, Test Department suggested "that the Navajo Area Testing Committee disregard the company's grade level designation of batteries. He stated that Stanford Achievement Tests were power tests and that the timing element was adequate for pupils to record their knowledge of each sub-test." In 2017 this would be classified as an "Accommodation," which in 1966 or thereabouts was a "Recommendation" from the testing company. In any event the BIA Navajo Area was trying to be fair to Navajo children and at the same time use a standardized test which when administered under normal circumstances would provide inaccurate scores.

The Navajo Area Testing Committee struggled from 1963 to 1970 to develop strategies that provided fairness in the use of commercial, standardized evaluation instruments (tests). They also struggled to maintain the integrity of their Area testing program while the Central Office mandated its own testing activities. Thus:

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education

In the fall of 1966, the Central Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contracted with Twingo-Enki Corporation for a service-wide evaluation of Bureau schools using the California Achievement Tests. Since the Navajo Area was in the fourth year of a five-year study using Stanford Achievement Tests and because it was possible to compare the data gathered from California and Stanford Achievement Tests, Navajo Area requested that pupils in Bureau schools within the jurisdiction of the Navajo Area not be included in the California Achievement Testing program. At this time, the Area agreed to supply Twingo-Enki Corporation with Stanford Achievement Test statistical data by which an evaluation of the schools' instructional program could be made.

Here, as was constantly a preoccupation of the new leaders of the BIA Education Program, the Area Director organization of the BIA which was implemented in 1952 under President Eisenhower, was in place and provided a basic conflict between the Central Office and the Navajo Area Office. The lesson to be taken from this conflict is that the Navajo Area was operating schools for the Navajo speaking children while the Central Office was viewing the education program in an inexperienced and mostly baffling way when it came to evaluation of the education program.

The report quotes Dr. Lennon's lecture on "Testing and the Culturally Disadvantaged Child":

Those who see in these differences, evidence of the unfairness of these tests are quick to point to the type of material in the tests as loaded against the underprivileged child. If one examines the typical intelligence test, he will see that it consists of a set of questions largely verbal in character, having a decided academic flavor, and ordinarily including, in addition to the verbal material, numerical material that looks as if it depends somewhat on success in arithmetic learnings despite the test-maker's goal that it depend very little on school instruction. Children from culturally deprived¹ homes, by this line of reasoning, simply have not had an opportunity to learn the sorts of things that are covered in these intelligence tests. Therefore, one must expect that they are not going to do so well as the children from more fortunate homes, where there are plenty of books, where there is an intense interest on the part of the parents in academic and verbal sorts of things. Yet, on the basis of performance on these tests, we proceed to label, or mislabel, the culturally deprived child as dull, or slow-learning, and pattern our instruction of him accordingly. All too often we use the result as a basis for curtailing the educational opportunities to be afforded this culturally disadvantaged youth, on the ground that he is lacking in the capacity to profit from them. This seems to me the essence of the charge of unfairness leveled at these tests for children from culturally deprived backgrounds.

Honoring Our Teachers

How is it that with a major test publisher in the 1960's was expressing this understanding of the culturally different, and that leading education researchers in the 21st century approach standardized testing of this group as *tabula rasa*, a blank slate? A first task of any doctoral student entering into a dissertation research is to "Review the Literature" and when highly skilled researchers ignore this fundamental procedure, what can be expected. Keep in mind this comment is taken from the publishers leading expert on testing, not an in-house BIA Education employee.

The struggles of the Navajo Area Testing Committee continued especially during 1966 and 1967 when the directorship of the BIA Education Program changed from an inexperienced person to a non-education, inexperienced person. Intelligence (I.Q.) tests entered the fray. Again, in the Fall of 1967, the Central Office contracted for an evaluation of Bureau education programs. Economic Systems Corporation (ESC) received the contract for this evaluation. In 1966, the Navajo Area requested that schools within its jurisdiction be excluded from an achievement testing program. Instead, it would prefer that several ability assessment tests, other than the California Test of Mental Maturity, be field tested with a Navajo population to identify one which would best indicate likelihood of pupil success in mastering the work of the school. The Central Office agreed that the project had merit and amended the contract with ESC. Dr. Judith Blanton, representing the corporation, met with the Testing Committee on January 22, 1968, to discuss a proposal for field testing various native ability assessment tests. The proposal provided for testing approximately 1000 children in grades 2 through 8 using Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests, Goodenough-Harris Draw A Man Test, and the Chicago Non-Verbal. Examination. The Committee discussed with Dr. Blanton the merits of each of the tests. The Goodenough-Harris test could be group administered but required hand scoring, which tended to be somewhat more subjective than desirable. The other tests were machine scorable and therefore, more objective.

Dr. Blanton suggested that the Goodenough-Harris might provide useful data for children in the Beginner and first grades. The Committee felt that this was true and agreed that the tests would be given to approximately 200 Beginner and first grade pupils whose teachers were native speakers of Navajo. The Committee then set about the task of identifying the variables that might influence the test scores. It was agreed that possible exposure to experiences that were non-Navajo in nature were more likely to come to those children living near reservation boundaries. It was hypothesized that each Agency should pair schools, if feasible, that would test this hypothesis. Other variables such as language of the home, years in school and chronological age were to be reflected in an information sheet for each child and/or a description of the school location, facilities, and staff. Dr. Blanton assured the Committee that all such identified variables would be taken into account in determining Navajo norms for each of the tests. The Committee in effect, almost demanded a quasi-research approach to I.Q. testing, which the testing contractor did not, but agreed to the Area stipulations.

Dr. Blanton, responding to a request of the Committee, agreed to conduct a one-day inservice training session for teachers and supervisors involved in the testing program. The session was to be held in Window Rock, Arizona, on March 11, 1968. She agreed that her corporation would provide a consultant who would attend the training session. The consultant was to work with BIA personnel in an effort to provide the most favorable testing conditions. Dr. Blanton was to instruct the teachers and supervisors in the proper administration of the tests. In February of 1967, the short form of the California Test of Mental Maturity was given to Navajo students in boarding and day schools on or near the Navajo Reservation. At least 10,000 students were represented in the test results which computed the language I.Q., non-language I.Q., total I.Q. and mental age.

This saga continued until Spell wrote a 1970 report. There was no follow-up report on the usefulness of all this work to provide a fair use of standardized tests. However, knowing Spell and her fellow education specialists at the Area Office, I am confident that they all worked constantly with the schools and that the norms and other work were used by teachers and administrators.

It is interesting to note that neither the Twinco-Enki Corporation or the ESC testing contracts produced a wide-spread report distributed throughout the 215 schools (77 boarding, 135 day schools, 1 trailer school and 2 hospital schools) enrolling 56,238 Indian/Natives which comprised Education operations. As an assistant division chief and division chief of the Central Office Education program I never observed or had discussed with me these two testing activities. Further, I was not provided a report of these two testing contracts though I am sure they existed. For all practical purposes, these testing activities were a waste of money and time.

BIA Education personnel, teachers and administrators have always been involved in any testing that has taken place. They have administered the test, scored them and some have even done the reporting. Coombs in the 1950's depended on BIA Area personnel to administer tests that were used for the data which he and his colleagues analyzed. It is unfortunate that all too often the test results were used to criticize the teachers who did the work of gathering data. This has not changed, especially with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Studies and Testing

Many educational studies were done in the 1960s. One was the Abt Associates system analysis, program development and cost-effectiveness modeling of Indian education study. This was an evaluation project that used the classic "Discrepancy Model." This model first clarified program goals and objectives. Second, using different strategies (but in this case not standardized tests) it investigated the program at all levels to determine the status of the program. Third, it compared the goals and objectives against the program status and highlighted the differences. In the end, Abt produced five volumes of verbiage none of which was taken seriously or ever implemented. Abt spent a great deal of effort and time determining what they thought were, or should be, the objectives of the education program. Their major finding was that the goals of high school students were different

Honoring Our Teachers

from that of the teachers and administrators. Nothing new in this finding. With good reason the teachers and administrators placed a high priority in keeping the students in school through to graduation with academic quality being secondary to this goal. Abt would rather have placed a priority of academic education and the retention of students as secondary or even lower priority. I worked with at least six schools to implement the “New” curricula that was being produced in mathematics, science, English and social studies. Several schools had science and math teachers attending summer institutes to learn the new curricula and how to teach it. Apparently Abt did not discover these innovations about which I was a first-hand observer.

The Abt study produced a myriad of “Models” on every aspect of the Education program. But, with the Area Director organization prevailing, the Assistant Commissioners for Education had only a slight chance of implementing change let alone even one of the Abt models they might have adopted. In the end, the Abt study was interesting but little more.

In 1966 Madison Coombs was the BIA Education official responsible for research. He had the in-depth experience of monitoring as well as conducting total system evaluations since about 1956. Willard Bass (1971) was contacted by Coombs and a contract was awarded so that work could begin in 1966. The purpose of the evaluation was the same as in 1944, to measure the differences in quality, if any, between BIA Federal schools and public schools. The findings of Bass’s study were not surprising. He found that when background characteristics are controlled on each student, there are no differences between school quality. This finding could have been used by legislators crafting the No child Left Behind Act of 2001.

In 1968 I was invited to the University of Michigan to present a paper in a conference on “Foreign Language Testing.” It seemed that in 1968 there had been considerable language testing of American Indians, Alaska Natives and Canadian Indians and Eskimos.² The purpose of the paper was to review the research and studies that concerned language testing of North American Indians that involved at least 100 children or adolescents and used standardized testing procedures and followed some form of research design. It can be said that previous to 1930 there was very little testing of American Indian school children. A look at the curriculum of Indian schools of the early part of the century indicates that the English language required was very functional and closely related to agricultural tasks (U.S. Office of Indian Affairs, 1901). To my knowledge, there is no test available that reflects what was considered important in the English language instructional program in 1901. However, “promotional tests” were referred to as a part of the curriculum that was used prior to 1928 (USBIA, 1951, p. 5). These were tests given to the children at the end of each year to determine whether or not they would be promoted to the next grade. It is not known just what promotional tests were designed to evaluate, especially regarding English.

The New Deal of the 1930s ushered in the Indian Reorganization Acts and a new concept of Indian Affairs. A part of the new look of the thirties was the anthropological and sociological field work done on the Indian populations of

the various reservations. A later landmark study discussed the performance of Indian children on conventional tests and pointed out some obvious problems (Havighurst, 1957). A good part of the study concerned the problem of I.Q. testing of Indian peoples. The English language dimension of the Havighurst's study used the English section of a conventional standardized achievement test battery to measure verbal ability. The Indian children did poorly on the test.

There was a good bit of activity in testing Indian children with achievement tests starting in 1946 and continuing to through 1968, with the ten year period 1946-56 being the most active. The tests used were designed for native English speakers and the test scores of Indian children were compared to national norms. Peterson (1948) reported on testing that was designed to measure progress over a twelve year period, 1934 to 1946, when there was a definite philosophy and direction articulated for federally operated Indian schools. The tests used for this study included reading, vocabulary and language. According to the study, Indian children did not do as well as their non-Indian counterparts. The next study (Anderson, 1953) was designed to verify Peterson's findings and to measure any further progress. The results of these studies are generally known and are still valid today. Some significant conclusions were:

1. That the Indian children generally scored lower than non-Indians.
2. That achievement scores for Indian children were higher at the lower elementary levels than they were for the junior and senior high levels. As Indian children advance through the grades, they fall progressively further behind when compared to the norming group.
3. That full-blood Indian children make lower scores than those with mixed-blood. This was interpreted as a difference in cultural background rather than innate intellectual difference.

It is also significant that these studies commented on the fact that most Indian children in Federal schools spoke a language other than English before entering school. This prompted statements concerning the necessity of teaching oral English first before going to the content subjects. This general recognition of the importance of the non-English speaking problem is a significant factor regarding the testing efforts.

The earliest standardized testing done with the Alaskans was reported by Anderson and Eells (1935). The Stanford-Binet Mental Ability, Goodenough Mental Activity, Stanford Achievement, and a mechanical ability inventory were used. A discussion of the curriculum was included and comment was made about the role of English in the instructional program. One interesting technique described concerned changing the Stanford-Binet test so that it would have a closer correlation with the Alaskan native environment. The next comprehensive study of native Alaskan educational status was made by Ray (1958). This study was general in scope and had some interesting objective data concerning the achievement and retardation of Alaskan native children. Language was treated as a problem but test data were based on native English speaking instruments.

Honoring Our Teachers

Testing Indian children and youth from 1960 to 1968 took place in different geographic locations and is more difficult to evaluate because of the widespread and often uncoordinated efforts. A very comprehensive study of minority groups completed under contract with the U. S. Office of Education (Coleman, 1966) had an "American Indian" category and does report verbal quantities. It is difficult to determine just what Indian population was included in Coleman's study and to what extent the more tradition-oriented individuals who inhabit the Indian reservations were tested. In general, Coleman's study reported similar findings to Peterson, Anderson and Coombs's studies.

A more specific study (Ohannessian, 1967) was done by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) that was conducted by a team of linguists and a psychologist. They studied the attitude of teachers of Indian children and made several recommendations regarding the English instructional program for Indians in federally operated schools. Another study conducted by the BIA based on standardized achievement tests concerned the reading progress of secondary students in boarding schools (Spell, 1968). Most of the students reported in the test were ESL speakers and their reading scores at the high school level correlate with previous findings about the upper level achievement of Indian students.

Because my major preoccupation is with curriculum development, the language of the students is of great importance to me. In the case of the BIA and the students for whom it operates schools, there were few reliable psycho- or socio-linguistic studies which would help determine the language of our school population. Even if the language of the school population were known in any exact manner, we would still have difficulty reflecting progress in the instructional program since the available testing instruments do not measure some important language features.

Tests are needed to help us identify the level of second language proficiency in order to group students for purposes of learning. Once this need is overcome, then tests are needed to show progress and challenges. Although two types of test needs have been mentioned, the situation is further complicated by the fact that the students are of all ages, starting at five and continuing sometimes to 21 years old. As has been shown with the TOEFL test, some Indian students even at the high school level have serious problems with ESL.

The CAL report (Ohannessian, 1967) recommended research projects that would involve linguists in sociolinguistic studies, styles of learning among the various Indian communities and attitudes of Indians toward English. Information gleaned from research related to any or all of these topics would be very helpful to the instructional program for North American Indian children.

In addition to the CAL recommendations is the interest in bilingual education programs. The BIA started bilingual education in a modest form only to have it cut short by the advent of the Second World War. Since then it has been difficult to get it started again. Gaarder (1967) listed the usable tribal language orthographies and called for bilingual programs where there are at least 1,000 speakers of a tribal language. If bilingual programs develop for Indian children, there will be a need for tests unique to this language learning situation.

BIA helps establish TESOL

In 1964 I was assigned to attend the organizational meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) held in the old Ramada Inn in Tucson, Arizona. The BIA Education group consisted of Mrs. Thompson and others from Washington, DC, Dorothy Hanlon and myself from the Field Technical Office. This organizational meeting was sponsored by the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). It seems that the MLA and NCTE had for quite a while been discussing the need for such an organization as TESOL. Knowing the Indian language situation, BIA was invited to attend this organizational meeting. NCTE was at that time headed by Dr. Jim Squires with whom I became acquainted and attended evening discussions in his motel room. These discussions were philosophical and very stimulating to me. TESOL is now a well established and respected international professional organization.

A second TESOL organizational meeting was held in New York City during which Jim Squires recommended me for the Executive Committee. I served on this Committee for three years. One happening stands out. Sometime during 1967 when there was strife among minorities and professional organizations, Jim Alatis who was a Georgetown University professor and the first Executive Officer of TESOL called me to discuss what to do about aggressive minorities. At the time Blacks had taken over the headquarters of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) and Jim was worried that the fledging TESOL might suffer a similar fate. I mentioned that the TESOL membership was deeply involved with minorities. I suggested that TESOL should give minorities a legitimate voice in the affairs of the organization. I suggested that he create the "Socio Political Affairs Committee" which he did and which exists to this day. During my time in TESOL, this committee was always given a serious voice before the annual conference attendees. It seemed only fair and legitimate that an organization primarily concerned with the language of minorities should provide the a real voice within the organization.

I should also stress that the BIA "helped" financially with the creation of TESOL. The main players were the Modern Languages Association (MLA) and (National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). The BIA merely joined membership in numbers and participated in early TESOL activities. One of these activities concerned a 1,000 teacher workshop initiated by Dr. Benham of the BIA Navajo Area and contracted to TESOL. The workshop was held at the then new BIA Ft. Wingate High School. Dr. Alatis explained to me that this workshop provided the initial funding for the headquarters office before annual membership dues began to be felt.

NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged

As mentioned above, I was at the initial meeting in the spring of 1964 in Tucson where the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the Modern Language Association initiated the creation of the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). I was part of the group Mrs. Thompson

Honoring Our Teachers

assigned to attend the meeting. As mentioned above, it was there that I met Jim Squire then Executive Secretary of NCTE. Later in early 1965 Squire requested from Mrs. Thompson that I be a member of the U.S. Office of Education funded project to the NCTE Task Force (1965) on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged. Mrs. Thompson granted permission for my participation. The Task Force was an activity related to President Johnson's War on Poverty.

Participation in the Task Force visiting schools in various parts of the U.S. was very educational and provided an important element in my own education. It was extremely stimulating to visit schools in Michigan, Milwaukee, New York City and Philadelphia. The NCTE (1965) developed a book on the work of the Task Force that to his day is noteworthy in its findings. The Preface of the book includes the following:

When Congress and the President committed the nation less than two years ago to unprecedented war upon poverty, the basic importance of education in every sector was at once clear. Without the skills, the knowledge, the understandings that only training of the mind provides, there can be no durable solutions to the age-old human problems of vocational incompetence, slum housing, social disjuncture, and intellectual atrophy that are the fated products of poverty. Without literacy and without the experience of literature, the individual is denied the very dignity that makes him human and a contributing member of our free society.

NCTE, aware of its unique position of leadership in the nation's effort to rid itself of the curse of poverty, responded quickly to the call. Meeting in February 1965, the Executive Committee of the Council concluded that the great need of the moment was for information about the hundreds of independent and uncoordinated programs in language and reading for the disadvantaged that had sprung up in every part of the country. So compelling was this need that the Committee determined to establish a National Task Force which would survey and report upon individual programs throughout the nation. So urgent, indeed, did the Committee judge this need that rather than wait upon the delay and the uncertain possibility of government or foundation support, it decided to underwrite the not inconsiderable cost of the Task Force from the Council's own funds. From schools, universities, and related educational agencies, it enlisted a force of 22 experts and three consultants who met in Chicago in March for briefing. Within two months, visiting in teams, the Task Force had observed and reported in detail upon 190 programs for the disadvantaged, both rural and urban, in all sections of the United States. They visited 115 districts and agencies in 64 cities and towns. By the end of June, three months after the project began, the members of the Task Force with five consultants met at French Lick, Indiana, to review their findings and to plan this report.

That so massive a project was completed in so short a time can be attributed only to the willing cooperation and often personal sacrifice on the part of many

individuals. My own contributions to the Task Force were contained in the many pages of reports I submitted to the NCTE. One of my reports was quoted in the report in the chapter on high schools. One Task Force member saw Keats "The Eve of St. Agnes" taught successfully to a class of Negro students, which the following observation points out:

The interesting aspect of this visit was that the students were actively participating. Upon leaving, I was more dubious than ever about the worth of "programs" as contrasted to the "gifted teacher." I had just observed a very artistic teacher work with Keats and do so with a high degree of success. Judging from my experience, it would appear that the teacher who has philosophical insight enough to extract the human elements from life and from literature is the most effective teacher of the culturally disadvantaged. Perhaps what I am trying to say is that the average teachers are superficial in their approach, and consequently what they personally and professionally perceive in life is commonplace and meaningless to the culturally disadvantaged student. (NCTE, 1965, p. 139)

My summary report to NCTE also reflected much of what my 50 years of experience:

In every city visited there was a "regular" program around which most school people circulated and to which most educational efforts were directed. This "regular" program had an aura of a sanctity which placed it almost within the realm of a religious belief. One main aim of the English programs for the culturally disadvantaged was to give the students a creative compensatory program only to the extent that it would enable the student to enter and participate in the "regular" program. I couldn't help but believe that the "regular" program, judging from my brief glimpses of it through classroom doors left ajar, was comfortable to the teacher but perhaps represented for the student a Procrustean bed....

A. The effective programs of English for the culturally disadvantaged had as a central element freedom for the teachers to use whatever curriculum materials they felt effective. This allowed teachers the freedom necessary to be very creative in the teaching efforts.... Great emphasis was placed on student interest in what was studied. Motivation to learn and the selection of materials that had high interest for the students was considered to be of paramount importance.... Effective teachers of English to the culturally disadvantaged are dedicated individuals and have the "missionary spirit". They feel that they are needed and are very concerned and compassionate toward the students.

B. There appears to be scattered sources of printed material for the culturally disadvantaged which reflects what could be considered

Honoring Our Teachers

a paucity of materials, when in fact this not be the case. Teachers and administrators were always eager to know of published materials which might have application to their challenge. They generally reflected the impression that there wasn't much suitable material available on the commercial market....

F. Most programs did not have a strong element of inservice education but where it did there was generally a broader application of special materials and techniques related to teaching English to the culturally disadvantaged. This led to the conclusion that a strong inservice education program for teachers and administrators is one method whereby general, system-wide effectiveness regarding English instruction can be enhanced.

G. School personnel who understand the disadvantaged child think content based material, the social and personal problems of humanity are best suited as a foundation on which to structure the English curriculum. As an example, in *Gateway English* the unit approach was used and such themes as "Coping" and "Who Am I?" were unit titles. At Boys Training School in Michigan they studied newspapers and current events.

Both the programs visited dealt primarily with emotionally disturbed children. I question whether this is the type which the NCTE Task Force should visit. In both cases the programs were heavily financed and, thus, separated themselves from the education of the masses of culturally disadvantaged sets by providing services which would be almost impossible to copy on a very large scale. I found that the large group of culturally disadvantaged students, those which occupy the ambiguous classification of "regular program students", are assumed to be normal and without need of any special or unique educational provisions. Whether this is the case or not, the large masses of students who weren't emotionally disturbed were being subjected to the same old stuff in the same old way. Are there any programs which attempt to deal with the educationally disadvantaged on a large scale? The program visited worked respectively with 130 and 160 students. I question the applicability of educational programs for the emotionally disturbed to the education of the masses of culturally disadvantaged students.

Admittedly, the participation on the NCTE Task Force was not directly related to teaching Indian/Native but it did broaden my perspective beyond the BIA Education Program operations. In a sense, it seemed to clarify my understanding of education innovation and the relationship of such activities to the "Regular" program of a school. Education innovation is invariably an uphill, usually a steep hill, battle.

Bilingual Education

Adams (1946) in her history of Indian education mentions that the Collier Administration of the New Deal brought on board linguists and anthropologist to help direct the BIA's programs. And there was Robert (Bob) Young, a regu-

lar BIA employee who in time became the foremost Navajo linguist and who with Morgan produced the Navajo language dictionary and the "Government Orthography." Bob told me that he headed to Navajo from Northwestern about 1935 so he could complete his graduate work on an Athabascan language. He was assigned to work at the sheep dip station at Ft. Wingate where he met Willie Morgan, which started a life long collaboration. Bob was not accorded the formal title of a linguist, but he was nonetheless a distinguished linguist in his own right. The same can be said for Irene Reed of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks who became interested in the Eskimo Yuk dialect and on her own developed an orthography for it. Both the Young-Morgan and Reed orthographies were used in BIA funded bilingual programs. I might also note that Bob Young gathered field notes on Canadian Athabascan speakers. Bob's fluency in Navajo was classical and complete.

My interest in bilingual education was spawned while teaching at the one-teacher Arctic day school where in 1954-56 all the children spoke English as a second language and entered the school with very limited or no English capability. It occurred to me that speaking Eskimo would have been a huge advantage in teaching English. Then, when I was working in Washington, Frank Darnel (1972) of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks was able to sponsor the first Circumpolar Education conference held in Toronto. I attended along with Assistant Commissioner Zellars and two others and observed how other countries had developed bilingual texts for aboriginal children in the Arctic regions of the world. Why not the BIA doing the same thing for Eskimos – and other tribal speaking peoples?

One of the first things I learned about bilingual education is that it is fraught with emotionalism and politics. It is not possible to establish a bilingual education program without careful attention to these two factors. The technical, linguistic aspects are fundamental to pedagogy, but are secondary to politics and emotionalism. While pedagogically sound, bilingualism can be and was challenged even by tribal members who learned via an English-only approach in the authoritarian confines of a boarding school. And then there are the non-Indian teachers and administrators who feel threatened by anything as Indian as the language being included in the school program. After all, the purpose of schools was to educate Indians to behave as non-Indians.

The evaluator of the first bilingual program in Alaska compared an English only school to the one implementing instruction in Eskimo and English. The data favored the English only approach. He did not know that this was a normal outcome of a bilingual program at the primary level and that test scores began to favor the bilingual program, if the bilingual program was continued, at grades three and four when the bilingual students would out perform English only students.

History of BIA Bilingual Education

Evelyn Bauer, a BIA Central Office Education Specialist, was asked to develop a history of BIA bilingual education for Indians (Bauer, 1969; 1970). Her excellent research established a benchmark for the BIA's bilingual education program that evolved from 1968 throughout the 1970's. She reported:

Honoring Our Teachers

A combination of depressing academic achievement-test results, and an interest in innovative and possibly successful programs around the country involving students that have much in common with our own, has led the Bureau of Indian Affairs to a serious examination of approaches to educating Indian students which may hold a greater promise of success than we have enjoyed in the past. The most promising of these approaches is that of bilingual education, i. e., the use of some combination of the student mother tongue and English to transmit academic content, and to foster the child's development in both languages.

Interest in bilingual education, or at least in the inclusion of mother tongue in the classroom, is not new in the Bureau. Reversing what had been a long-established policy in the treatment of American natives, i. e., their assimilation into the mainstream culture at the cost of their culture, their language, and their separate identity, the Bureau, under the direction of Willard W. Beatty, set out in the late thirties to promote native-tongue literacy among Indian adults and young people. At that time, almost 9 out of every 10 Navajos were non-English speaking and the need to convey information to adult Navajos had become acute. In addition, there was a growing awareness of the failure of Indian children to adapt to an English language curriculum at the beginning levels.

An alphabet limited to the keys found on a modern typewriter (thereby eliminating a number of symbols which had been used previously and greatly simplifying the diacritical markings) was developed by Oliver LaFarge, the novelist, and Dr. John P. Harrington, a linguist with the Smithsonian Institute. A pre-primer, primer, and first reader in English and Navajo titled *Little Man's Family*, with text by J. B. Enochs, a former Bureau teacher, was followed by the *Little Herder* stories and the *Prairie Dog Fairy Tale* by Ann Nolan Clark, another Bureau teacher. Preparation of the Navajo text was handled by Robert Young, Edward Kennard, Willetto Antonio, and Adolph Bitany. In the fall of 1940, Kennard, Young and Bitany began to introduce the reading and writing of Navajo into reservation schools. Materials prepared for adults included accounts of technical programs such as soil conservation, livestock management, water development, health, sanitation, and disease control. Native Navajo speakers were taught to read and write Navajo and were then employed to work as interpreters with doctors, scientists- teachers, and other technicians.

A monthly newspaper printed in Navajo proved valuable in communicating to the Navajo information on activities of the Tribal Council, as well as national and world news.

World War II, with its drain on personnel and funds seems to have been at least partially responsible for the end of the native literacy program. Many of the linguists and native teachers who had been involved were assigned to the Army Special Services Branch to teach Indians,

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education

(It is interesting to note that the Navajo language was used as an Army code—one which was never deciphered by the Japanese)

A second example of a Bureau project which made use of native language is the Five-Year Program which began in the mid-forties. This was a period in which it was not possible to accommodate in the immediate area all the Navajo children who desired schooling and as a consequence, a large part of a generation was growing up illiterate. Space was available in Bureau boarding schools in other areas and this was made available to Navajo youths from 12-16 years of age with little or no previous schooling. Since most of these students had no English, it was necessary to make extensive use of Navajo. In the first three years of this program, a teaching team consisting of an English-speaking teacher and a native-speaking instructional aide, gave instruction in Navajo and English. Ideas were first introduced in Navajo by the aides, and followed up by an English presentation. As students progressed, the amount of English increased. However even after English became the chief medium of instruction, Navajo was still employed to determine how well students had understood the material presented to them in English.

Both Rough Rock and Rock Point, Bureau elementary schools located in Arizona, have been including in their programs, reading instruction in Navajo and Navajo culture. Rough Rock also has formal instruction in Navajo-as-a-second-language for non-Navajo speakers.

Navajo Beginners, first- and second-graders would be taught science, social studies, and health in Navajo with summaries in English. By the third and fourth grades, English would become the language of instruction, with Navajo being used when necessary, with the exception of fifth- and sixth-grade units on Navajo studies, which would continue to be taught in Navajo. Mr. Holm suggests that activities having to do with Navajo mythology, singing, dancing, and public speaking might be offered as voluntary after-school activities. Navajo-speaking aides or teachers would work closely with English-speaking teachers in the lower elementary grade;

Mr. Holm's program is in effect at this time [1969] and we should have an evaluation of it by the end of this year. It seems very likely that if the program is measurably successful, it may well serve as a model for other programs of this nature on the Navajo reservation.

Although Navajo has been the chief area of concentration in the past, and will most likely continue to be so because of the size of its population, there has been much interest recently in Alaskan native groups. A project has been submitted which proposes to develop curriculum materials for the teaching of Inupiat (Northern Eskimo) and Kutchin and upper Tanana (Athabaskan) Alaskan native dialects at the fourth-grade level. This program would, over a five-year period, prepare similar materials down through the first year.

Honoring Our Teachers

The Juneau Area of the BIA is preparing a bilingual proposal at this time and it is likely that others from this area will follow. Both the Rock Point and Rough Rock experiments will continue to develop, with increased emphasis being put on evaluation, especially in the areas of reading and ESL. (Bauer, 1969)

Bauer included references to her paper, which I have eliminated from the above excerpt.

Navajo Reading Study and the Navajo Orthography Conference, 1969

The Navajo Reading Study was a recommendation of CAL in one of its reports. The idea was to study the teaching of reading in the Navajo language to ESL first graders. Bernard Spolsky (1975) in a later article described how the study started in 1969. I was one of the BIA officials who met with Spolsky in 1969 and asked that he start the project. This was, without a doubt, one of the most productive and innovative “interventions” in Navajo education since the late 1930’s. It was much more than the earlier 1930’s activities because there were in 1969 enough school facilities on the Navajo Nation to support its school age population.

Wayne and Agnes Holm took leave from Rock Point School and were important staff members of the project. Wayne completed his doctoral dissertation at the University of New Mexico in 1972, which contributed to the study of Navajo orthography (Holm, 1972). The project produced many excellent academic papers all on some aspect of the Navajo language, either linguistics and/or education. It is important that Robert Young (1972) was also on the staff. He produced with William Morgan a comprehensive dictionary of the Navajo language (Young & Morgan, 1943).

Wayne and Agnes must have taken with them much of their learning in the Reading Study back to Rock Point where they implemented perhaps the most exemplary Navajo bilingual program to ever exist, the Rough Rock School notwithstanding.

I was able to obtain from Mr. Zellers financial support for a contract to the CAL to sponsor a Navajo Orthography Conference. Siraripi Ohannessian (1969) was the Principal Investigator for the contract and subsequent conference. At that time we were aware of the Young-Morgan work on writing the Navajo language. However, if a formal innovation of Navajo-English education, teaching in the two languages, was to be initiated by the BIA, it was necessary to adopt a writing system for the Navajo language. One of the Attachments to the report was brief paper prepared by Sarach C. Gudschinsky. Her introduction states a basic reason for having the conference:

Unfortunately the problem of orthography is one of the most explosive in the world. Differences about alphabets have frequently caused shooting wars, riots, and serious political division. In some languages, competing groups using different orthographies have actually

perpetrated large competing literatures. In the light of all this, it seems important that major revisions of an orthography be undertaken only if there are severe problems with its readability, or is social opposition to it makes it unusable.

I was somewhat surprised that Ohanessian had discovered seven Navajo orthographies that were presented at the conference. I had more or less thought that the “Government System” developed earlier by Young and Morgan was a lone one. Not so. Since there were other orthographies extant, the importance of the conference increased and ultimately served to clear the air when the Young-Morgan orthography was adopted.

Rough Rock Demonstration School and Indian Self-determination

There was no more important innovation in Indian/Native education in the last half of the 20th century than the establishment of Rough Rock Demonstration School. I by chance happened to be in Window Rock when Dr. Buck Benham and Wayne Holm were discussing options of what to do with the messy situation at Lukachukai school. The mess was a conflict between the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) community program and the BIA regular program at the school. The background to the establishment of Rough Rock is described in Broderich Johnson’s (1968) book on the school. Dr. Benham told me that the Washington Office had instructed the Navajo Area Office to make Dr. Roessel’s OEO program a success. It was not to fail.

Buck discussed the situation with Wayne and asked for his thoughts on the situation. Wayne, according to Buck, suggested that BIA give Dr. Roessel and his allies the new school at Rough Rock and let them run it as they saw fit. Then Buck called me in to his office and told me about the instructions from Washington and his discussion with Wayne and asked what I thought of Wayne’s suggestion. I said that it sounded like a good idea to me and a good way to solve the problem. At this time no philosophical discussion on Indians taking over BIA programs (Indian Self-Determination in Education) was part of the discussions. Establishing Rough Rock was merely following an instruction from Washington and solving a difficult problem. The BIA has always had enormous authority to deal with Indian Affairs and giving the OEO program a complete new school was possible.

It should be noted that this decision did in no way involve the Navajo community at Rough Rock. Dr. Roessel with his expertise and experience with Navajo communities, after accepting the school, began immediately to involve the Navajo community in the school program. One of his first actions was to establish a Navajo board of education for the school. And, next, was to hire as many Navajos as possible as teachers and staff and to create a curriculum the foundation for which was Navajo culture and language. His one key teacher was Anita Pfeiffer, a fully Arizona certified teacher who had the responsibility for developing the Navajo curriculum, including for teaching to the Navajo language. It was my privilege to work with Anita on several activities in the 1980’s and

Honoring Our Teachers

1990's. In one discussion, she related to me how she developed her own Navajo writing system when she started at Rough Rock in 1966.

I had never met Bob Roessel and knew of him only through others, until I was called to the BIA Commissioner's Office. I don't remember the exact date, but it was probably in 1968 or thereabouts. On this day the Assistant Commissioner for Education was not available, and I received a phone call to "Represent Education in the Commissioner's Office." I had no idea about the meeting but went dutifully to the Commissioner's Office. I entered the office and found Dr. Roessel, the Commissioner and an aide to the Commissioner in a meeting. Dr. Roessel was in the midst of describing the Blessing Ceremony of a new building at Rough Rock School. He was animated in his speech and before I knew it he had reached for a ruler and was on the floor describing how the Navajo Prayer Stick (the ruler) seemed to take on powerful elements and began to vibrate, so he indicated. I was more or less dumbstruck by the demonstration and said nothing but only waited for the meeting to end. No questions were asked. Roessel (2002) wrote an autobiography entitled "*He Ledeth Me*" *An Account of how God/Jesus/Holy People Have Led Me Throughout My Life* that reflects his spiritual beliefs.

Earlier in late 1966 the American Anthropological Association was meeting in Washington downtown at a hotel. The then head of BIA was Carl Marberger. He had agreed to serve on a panel but had other more important matters to attend to. So, I was assigned to be his replacement at the panel. The main topic of the panel was Rough Rock and the main message was, "At last, Indians are running their own school. More importantly, it is highly successful." Various members of the audience rose and spontaneously expressed their heartfelt support for Rough Rock. One must remember that at that time Indians were very critical of anthropologists for "Using Indians" to promote careers in the academic community. I thought that Rough Rock was providing a platform for them to relieve their guilt. Well, the Rough Rock part of the meeting went far into the noon hour and when at about ten minutes to one, the panel chair said, "We have a representative from BIA Education and would you like to say something." I responded to the effect that my comments would be irrelevant to the meeting and we all needed to go to lunch, which we did.

These experiences notwithstanding, in 1992 I had the opportunity to work with Bob Roessel on the Navajo Teacher Education Program, which he and Anita Pfeiffer were initiating. In my view, Bob Roessel was one of the most dynamic innovators in the history of Navajo education, and also one of the most prolific innovators in the history of Indian/Native education. One could not ask for a better environment to work within than Anita leading the Navajo Nation's Division of Education and Bob taking the lead in producing new certified Navajo elementary level teachers.

Johnson's (1968) history of Rough Rock expresses the situation as I remember it without any attempts to gloss over the facts as they happened. Indian Self Determination in Education became a reality to solve an administrative problem. After it became a reality with the leadership of Dr. Bob Roessel, it became a national policy and was established in statute with the passage of P.L.

93-638 in 1975. It is with considerable satisfaction that Indian Self Determination had its origin in an Education decision made by a Creek Indian, Dr. William J. Benham, and two dynamic innovators, Dr. Bob Roessel and Dr. Wayne Holm, years before the passage of P.L. 93-638. I was privileged to have witnessed the decision making process.

The Kindergarten Program

The implementation of the Kindergarten Program in the BIA Education Program was one of the most important experiences of my career. I would like to report about a detailed research effort on the part of the Education Program prior to the acceptance by the Congress and consequent funding, but this was not the case.

During a few months in early 1967, when the Assistant Commissioner for Education position was vacant, Madison Coombs was Acting Assistant Commissioner. As he described the Kindergarten initiation to some of us, we sat back and listened with wonder and black humor. It seems that one day an acquaintance of Madison's who worked at the Johnson White House call Madison. He said, "Madison, does BIA have Kindergartens?" to which Madison replied, "No." His friend said, "Get ready for them as this is a good year for Kindergartens." Albeit, without field participation in decision-making, we at the Central Office got ready for the Kindergarten Program.

At that time I was Assistant Chief of the Curriculum Development and Review Division. A long-time education specialist was the Chief of the Division. Mr. Zellers was newly hired as Assistant Commissioner and had given the Division new positions for various curriculum specialists. One of these was an education specialist in Early Childhood Education. There were several applicants. The Chief of the Division selected a woman newly graduated from Bank Street College's Early Childhood program. Bank Street had and has a strong Early Childhood Education Program. Her contacts in the early childhood education field were very helpful in developing the BIA *Kindergarten Curriculum Guide*.

The Kindergarten Program made a significant change in thinking for the BIA Education Program. For the past 30 years the entry age for Indian children was six years with a birthday on or before September 1. The child was then placed in the Beginner grade and for the second year of school, in the first grade. The assumption was that Indian/Native children entering school at age six would not speak English and needed the Beginner year to learn English. But, things were changing. Many Indian/Native children were entering school at age six speaking English and the Beginner year was no longer appropriate. In the kindergarten schools the Beginner classification was dropped but continued for such tribes as Navajo and Choctaw and Eskimos where entering six-year-olds spoke English as a second language.

Not all the schools operated by BIA offered the Kindergarten Program. For the 1969-70 school year the BIA's kindergarten enrollment totaled 1,681 students with the largest number (615) in the Navajo Area. It was a constant problem to keep boarding schools from boarding the kindergarten children. It was official

Honoring Our Teachers

policy that kindergarten children not be boarding students. Since there were 23 boarding schools that received a kindergarten program, this meant there were 23 problems. In 1968 when the program was implemented many primary, well traveled roads had been paved on many reservations so that running busses to pick up children was possible. However, the Education Office's School Facilities Division had implemented a draconian rule that children could not be counted to justify a new facility if they lived within two miles of a bus stop. Anyone familiar with the Navajo and other reservation, on which 16 of the 23 boarding school kindergartens were implemented, knew that dirt roads which link to paved roads can be impassable for days, even weeks, at a time during winter months. This thinking supported boarding kindergarten children in boarding schools that received a new or remodeled kindergarten facility.

Assistant Commissioner for Education Charles Zellers did an excellent job of implementing the Kindergarten Program. The curriculum guide developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC, 1968) is comprehensive and detailed enough so that isolated, rural schools enrolling Indian/Native children implementing the program would find it very useful. The training workshop was held at the Navajo Dilcon School in the summer of 1968.

Styles of Learning Conference, 1968

If there is such a thing as, "Indian/Native Education Thought," and I believe there is, the 1968 Styles of Learning Conference reflects a benchmark of Indian/Native thought. The famed Meriam Report (1928) is the beginning of serious Indian/Native education thought. From then on one may reference other important activities and related publications such as the "National Study of Indian Education" (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972) and find a comprehensive set of research type activities and sub-projects and gain an overall picture of the 1972 general Indian/Native picture. Regarding histories there are the Adams (1946), Szasz (1974) and Reyhner and Eder (2017) that provide important general pictures of the past situations in Indian/Native education. Then there are Congressional studies, notably the Kennedy (1969) and the *American Indian Policy Review, Task Force Five* (1976) history. More recently there was the Review of Research by Deyhle and Swisher (1997) and its excellent coverage of research. On the other hand, in my view, none of these can equal the intellectual quality of the 1968 Styles of Learning Conference.

Unfortunately, I found that the various Directors of BIA Education after Willard Beatty left in 1952 had little or no interest in Indian/Native education thought, especially thought originating from Indian/Native cultures and languages. Even though I was a Division Chief in the BIA's Office of Indian Education Programs from 1968 to 1979, it was impossible to get a Director of Education interested in the importance of Indian/Native culturally based styles of learning. Even though the BIA had an official assigned responsibility of "Research" the focus remained from 1946 to 1972 on evaluation of education at the school level aimed at public vs BIA schools comparative qualities.

One cannot be too critical of the BIA Directors and Assistant Commissioners as they alone did not control Indian/Native policy. The Congress has historically controlled Indian/Native policy (Tyler, 1973) which for at least the years of my experience, was basically devoted to phasing out Federal education responsibility of Indian/Natives and transferring all BIA schools to the public schools. Indian self-determination has placed an obstacle in the path of this historic policy, but not all together. The administration of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, which also make Indian education a trust responsibility, was used to turn over the curriculum of all Federally funded schools to the states in which the school was located (Hopkins, 2009).

It is interesting that the concept of “Styles of Learning” pertaining to Indian/Native education remains alive. For example, Karen Swisher (1994) conducted research based on suggested Indian cultural values. Her references cite several learning styles articles and papers. However, she seemed to imply that over the years there was an academic shift from cultural values to psychological values, hence, the academic field of psychology has become involved with Styles of Learning. Recently there was an article in the *Albuquerque Journal* that referenced learning styles and their use in contemporary classrooms (Landsmann, 2010). The author of this article said: “. . . I visited a classroom a couple years ago and saw four students crowded near radiators. I asked why and was told, ‘Their learning style is that they like to be warm.’”

Courtney Cazden and Vera John (1971), a Navajo, reviewed research on American Indian students and discuss tests of learning prior to school entrance, learning through looking, learning through language, and values which may interfere with school achievement. In their discussion of values they discuss the Indians’ concepts of time, their disposition to conform to nature rather than dominate it and their passivity. However, they try not to over-generalize and give specific examples from studies of different tribes that any teacher of Indian students should read.

Concluding Observations

I worked my entire 25 year career in the BIA under the Area Organization and the Area Directors. The central office and area office education officials were advisors to the Area Directors who had line authority to the schools. It was frustrating to the central office directors when it became an issue that an area director was selecting a principal or education specialist the central office did not believe appropriate. This was a common happening. Area directors commonly approached their Education responsibilities by ignoring the technical advisors at the central office level and often their own area technical staff. Willard Beatty had his office in Chicago and had line authority to all schools and field staff. This changed with President Eisenhower and Hildegard Thompson and remained so until passage of P.L. 95-561 in 1978, which by statute placed the Education Program outside the control of the area directors.

In summary, from 1952 to 1978, a period of 26 years, no system-wide BIA Education innovation was possible. Any education innovation promoted from

Honoring Our Teachers

the central office was merely a suggestion to area directors. There is another organizational point to be made. During the 1964 to 1970 years the BIA was organizationally under the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). When I had to defend a bilingual education add-on to the Interior-BIA budget requests to Congress, I had to talk to a BLM super grade agronomist who had the responsibility of presenting and defending the budget to the Office of Management and Budget and before Congress. He was very willing to listen and try to understand that most Indian/Native children in BIA schools spoke English as a second language. I explained that their languages were non Indo-European with unique phonology and syntactical structures. I said, "Indian/Native languages have different sounds from English and often we don't even know enough about the language to tell when a word begins and/or ends." Apparently anything this complex was not worthy of presenting to Congress. He was baffled by my presentation and needless to say, the add-on did not go forward. Just as importantly, I failed to communicate effectively to an important non-education professional.

U.S. Education and Indian/Native Education. Indian/Native education, historically, has been a function of U.S. education, public and/or private. As near as I can tell, all aspects of Indian/Native education emanated within U.S. public/private education. During 1964-1970 the TESOL innovations came from outside the Indian/Native education program. When Indian/Native schools were turned over to states, BIA responsibility ceased, as reported continuously in the *Statistics Concerning Indian Education*.

In 2002 when President Bush signed NCLB, which placed primary emphasis on accountability, this was in an authoritarian manner laid on all BIA funded schools. Nothing new here. When one reads the two history of Indian Education books (see e.g., Adams, 1946; Szasz, 1974) this becomes ever more apparent. But, with NCLB and the emphasis on testing, one would have hoped that the "Accommodations" apparently discovered as needed to test Spanish and other speaking immigrant children, the researchers would have immediately looked to the education of the country's only aboriginal population, Indian/Natives. Not so, Jamal Abedi (2004), the leading researcher of Accommodations had not one reference to the education of U.S. Indian/Natives. Faralie Spell's careful and quality work in the 1960s and Anderson and Eells (1935) research on Alaska Natives were not seriously recognized by leading U.S. education researchers. One can only hope that someday U.S. education will take the education of Indian/Native seriously enough to look at the many quality activities it reflects that could be helpful to states and the nation in general.

Notes

¹Terms like "culturally deprived" were frequently used in the 1960s and are deemed unacceptable by many today because of the dominant culture ethnocentric bias in them that devalues Indigenous cultures.

²Eskimo was a term used in the 1960s and before by outsiders for the Inuit and Yupik people of Alaska and Canada.

References

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4-14 (January/February 2004)
- Adams, E. C. (1946). *American Indian education*. Morningside Heights, NY: King's Crown Press.
- American Indian Policy Review Commission. (1976). *Task Force Five, Report on Indian education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Helen M. Scheirbeck, Chairwoman, Indian Education Task Force.
- Anderson, D., Eells, W. (1935). *Alaska Natives, A survey of their sociological and educational status*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bass, W. P. (1971). *An analysis of academic achievement of Indian high school students in federal and public schools*. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.
- Bauer, E. (1969). *Bilingual education in BIA schools*. Paper delivered at the TESOL conference, March 1969. Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_ED030089/ERIC_ED030089_djvu.txt
- Bauer, E. (1970). Bilingual education in BIA schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4(3), 223-229
- Beatty, W. (1944). *Education for action*. Chilocco, OK: Chilocco Agricultural School. (*Indian Education* articles from 1936 – 1943)
- Beatty, W. (1953). *Education for cultural change*. Chilocco, OK: Chilocco Agricultural School. (*Indian Education* articles from 1944 – 1951)
- Cazden, C. B., & John, V. (1971). Learning in American Indian children. In M. L. Wax, S. Diamond & F. O. Gearing (Eds.), *Anthropological perspectives on education*. New York: Basic Books.
- CAL - Center for Applied Linguistics. (1967). *The study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, No. OE-38001.
- Colliou, R. C. (1965). Second language instruction for Indian children. In *The education of Indian children in Canada* (pp. 75-79). Toronto: Ryerson.
- Coombs, L. M., et al. (1958). *The Indian child goes to school: A study of inter-racial differences*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Coombs, L. M., et al. (1962). *Doorway toward the light*. Lawrence, KS: Haskell Institute, U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: From assimilation to self-determination. In *Review of Research in Education* (pp. 113-194). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association
- Fuchs, E., & Havighurst, R.J. (1972). *To live on this earth, American Indian education*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co..

Honoring Our Teachers

- Gardner, R. C. (1967). A survey of the attitudes of educators of American Indian children. Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada, Research Bulletin No. 66.
- Gottlieb, D. (1964), Teaching and students: The views of Negro and White teachers. *Sociology of Education*, 37(4), 345-353.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1957). Education among American Indians: Individual and cultural aspects. *The Annals*, 311, 105-115.
- Holm, W. (1972). *Some aspects of Navajo orthography*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico.
- Hopkins, T. R. (1952, December). Is it a man's job? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 3, 105-106.
- Hopkins, T. R. (1967). *Navajo high school student performance on TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language): A report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (Mimeo.)
- Hopkins, T. R. (1977). *Assessing the transition of Indian school control from federal to tribal*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, College of Education.
- Hopkins, T. R. (1978). Concho School, A program description of an elementary boarding school for Indian children. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, College of Education.
- Hopkins, T. R. (2009). *Evaluating American Indian and Alaska Native education*. Located on the Alaska Native Knowledge Native Network, University of Alaska, Fairbanks. <http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/Curriculum/Articles/History/TomHopkins/Evalind.html>
- Johnson, B. H. (1968). *Navajo education at Rough Rock*. Rough Rock, AZ: Rough Rock Demonstration School.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Landsmann, L. (2010, Jan. 26). Learning isn't all about style. *Albuquerque Journal*, B1.
- Macgregor, G. (1941, Dec. 15). Stage Indians. *Indian Education*, 5(65), 4-5.
- Meriam, L. (1928). *The problem of Indian administration*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- McLachlan, J. (1970). *American boarding schools, A historical study*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- NAEYC. (1968). *A kindergarten curriculum guide for Indian children, A bilingual-bicultural approach*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children and U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- NCTE - National Council for the Teachers of English. (1965). *Language programs for the disadvantaged*. Champaign, IL: Author. Available at <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED036506.pdf>
- Ohannessian, S. (1967). *The study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ohannessian, S. (1969). *Report of conference on Navajo orthography*, Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Available on-line as an Eric

A History of American Indian and Alaska Native Education

- Clearinghouse document ED 044 668.
- Peterson, S.. (1948). *How well are Indian children educated*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Pfeiffer, A., Hopkins, T. R., Pfeiffer, C., & Pfeiffer, T. (2006). *Status of the Navajo language and culture for education assessment purposes*. Albuquerque, NM: College of Education, University of New Mexico. (Mimeo)
- Pratt, R. H. (1964). *Battlefield and classroom, Four decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. New Haven: Yale University Press, with an Introduction by Robert M. Utley.
- Ray, C. K. (1958). *A program of education for Alaskan Natives*. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska.
- Reyhner, J., & Eder, J. (2017). *American Indian education: A history* (2nd Ed.). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Roessel, R. (2002). "He Leadeth Me": *An account of how God/Jesus/Holy People have led me throughout my life*. Round Rock, Arizona: Author.
- Spell, F.(1968). *Achievement testing for research and administrative purposes*. A Report, U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C. 1968 (Mimeographed).
- Spell, Faralie.(1968). *Achievement testing for research and administrative purposes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (Mimeographed).
- Spolsky, B., & Holm, W. (1971). *Literacy in the vernacular: The case of Navajo*. *BIA Curriculum Bulletin*, 3.
- Spolsky, B. (1975). Linguistics in practice: The Navajo Reading Study. *Theory Into Practice*, 14(5), 347-352
- Spolsky, B. (1977). American Indian bilingual education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 14, 57-72.
- Swisher, K. (1994). American Indian learning styles survey: an assessment of teachers knowledge. *Journal of educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13, 59-77.
- Szasz, M. (1974). *Education and the American Indian: The road to self-determination, 1928-1973*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Thompson, H. (1964). *Education for cross-cultural enrichment*. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute Publication Service.
- Tyler, S. L. (1973). *A history of Indian policy*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Underhill, R. (1944, Nov. 1). Indian-White equality. *Indian Education*, 8(108), 1-2.
- USBIA, (1951, Sep. 15). Fifteen years of Indian education. *Indian Education*, 211.
- USBIA. (1979). *Statistics concerning Indian education, FY 1979*. ERIC Clearing House ED 202 641. By 1979 the Haskell and Chilocco vocational printing shops had closed. The edition of the statistics was apparently contracted to the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards and was not generally

Honoring Our Teachers

- available within BIA. The FY 1979 Statistics was compiled by Evelyn Leading Fighter.
- USCA 25 §292b. (1983). *Establishment of single system of education in Alaska; transfer a Indian schools to State of Alaska*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co. Cumulative Annual Pocket Part, p. 50.Sahmaunt's
- United States Senate. (1969). *Indian education: A national tragedy – A national challenge*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, Report No. 91-501.
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1901). *Course of study for Indian schools*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1944). Education for action. Washington, D. C..
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1951, Sep. 15). Fifteen years of Indian education. *Indian Education*, 211.
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1953). *Education for cultural change*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1952-1964). *Indian Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1953) *Minimum essential goals. For all levels beginners through twelve*. Washington, DC: Author
- U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. (1977). *Statistics concerning Indian education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs.
- Young, R. W., & Morgan, W. (1943). *The Navajo language*. Phoenix, AZ: Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Young, R. W. (1967). English as a Second Language for Navajos. U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Window Rock,, Arizona.
- Young, R. W. (1972). *A brief history, Navajo reading study progress report*. Albuquerque, NM: Navajo Reading Project, University of New Mexico.
- Zintz, M. V. (1963). *Education across cultures*. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown Co.