

**LEARNING STYLES OF AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE
STUDENTS:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE**

Cornel Pewewardy

A review of theories, research, and models of the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students reveals that American Indian/Alaska Native students generally learn in ways characterized by factors of social/affective emphasis, harmony, holistic perspectives, expressive creativity, and nonverbal communication. Underlying these approaches are assumptions that American Indian/Alaska Native students have been strongly influenced by their language, culture, and heritage, and that American Indian/Alaska Native children's learning styles are different—but not deficient. Implications for interventions include recommendations for instructional practice, curriculum organization, assessment, and suggestions for future research.

Introduction

Mind-body, body-mind, what's the relationship? The links are one of the strong foundations supporting brain-compatible learning. The links are also one of the strong foundations supporting the concept of brain-compatible or brain-friendly learning (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 1990). In recent years, the research by cognitive neuroscientists on the cerebellum into brain processing, brain growth, and brain dominance has led educators to take another look at traditional instructional methods of teaching (Cain & Cain, 1991). Learning styles researchers (Browne, 1984, 1986a, 1986b, 1990; Calliou, 1998; Davidson, 1992; More, 1987, 1989; Osborne, 1985; Pepper & Henry, 1986; Ryan, 1992; Sawyer, 1991; Swisher & Dehyle, 1987; Swisher & Pavel,

1994; Wauters, Bruce, Black, & Hocker, 1989) have added to understandings of how heredity, experiences, environment, linguistics, and cultural differences affect the teaching and learning of American Indian/Alaska Native¹ students.

Purpose of the Research

Studies indicate that American Indian/Alaska Native students have distinct cultural values, such as conformity to authority and respect for elders, taciturnity, strong tribal social hierarchy, patrimonial/matrilineal clans, and an emphasis on learning, which are deeply rooted in the teachings of the elders. These cultural traits are exhibited in family socialization patterns, which are quite different from those of other ethnic groups (Yellow Bird, 2001; Yellow Bird & Snipp, 2002). Historically, these cultural values, in turn, play a dominant role in the teaching and learning process of American Indian/Alaska Native students.

The purpose of this research was to review the literature on American Indian/Alaska Native learning modalities and cognitive styles in order to draw conclusions that serve as indicators as to how educators may provide instruction/learning opportunities that are compatible with American Indian/Alaska Natives students' learning styles. Ultimately, the teaching and learning relationship between American Indian/Alaska Native students and their teachers must be a primary focus of research and practice (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999).

Learning Styles—Fact or Fiction

The idea of American Indian/Alaska Native learning styles is not without criticism (Brown, 1979; Chrisjohn & Peters, 1989; Harris, 1985; Shepard, 1982; Stellern, Collins, Gutierrez, & Patterson, 1986). For example, Bland (1975) holds that there is no such thing as an American Indian/Alaska Native student learning style. Moreover, Kleinfeld and Nelson (1991) contended that studies of teaching methods adapted to American Indian/Alaska Native students' "so-called" visual learning styles provided virtually no support for the hypothesis that culturally adapted instruction increased achievement. In another study, Stellern, Collins, Gutierrez and Patterson (1986) argued that American Indian/Alaska Native students are not necessarily right hemisphere dominant; therefore, there is no need to adapt instruction especially geared to the right-brained learner. Chrisjohn and Peters (1989) echoed this concern and warned educators to be cautious of research related to right-brained American Indian learners. In fact, these authors suggested that learning styles research was one of the "latest fashions" in education.

It is true that the determination of an "Indian" learning style may be harmful due to the danger of stereotyping. There is no absolute or generic "Indian learning style" (MacIvor, 1999). Although some research may identify patterns of learning among some American Indian/Alaska Native groups, there are significant variations among tribes and individuals. In fact, a wide variety of individual differences have been identified. As Worthley (1987) pointed out, diversity within any culture is the norm.

In addressing the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students, one must be mindful that there are approximately 510 federally recognized American Indian entities (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1991), each with its own unique government and

social system. Within these groups, there are at least 200 traditional tribal languages (Fleming, 1992). These separate cultures and language groups vary significantly from one another in values, spiritual beliefs, kinship patterns, economics, and levels of acculturation (Whitbeck, Hoyt, Stubben, & LaFromboise, 2001). Moreover, American Indian/Alaska students differ dramatically from each other, even within their own communities (Swisher & Deyhle, 1989). Other factors, such as degree of assimilation and assimilation versus American Indian/Alaska Native identity must also be considered, because these factors obviously affect learning style (Haynes Writer, 2001; Pewewardy, 1998a).

Vygotsky (1978) contended that all learning is socially mediated. In trying to explain the developmental and cultural-historical approach to learning, Vygotsky (1986) suggested three concepts: higher mental functions, cultural development, and mastering one's own behavioral processes. Although Vygotsky's theory embraced all higher mental functions, Vygotsky himself was primarily interested in the development of language in its relation to thought. Subsequently, all successful learning takes place within cultural frameworks that include acceptable teaching practices within one's home, or base structure (Klug & Whitfield, 2002). From the behavioral standpoint, learning style is related to the tendency to seek situations compatible with one's own learning style (Keefe, 1987).

However, a "cultural personality" is more than a myth or stereotype, particularly when it involves culture and language (Greymorning, 2000). As Walker, Dodd, and Bigelow (1989) pointed out, there is little reason to expect children who grow up on reservations to have the same cultural experiences as children who grow up in the

mainstream culture. Relative isolation on reservations and tribal differences suggest uniqueness. Individuals within a culture tend to have a common pattern of learning when members of their culture are compared to members of other cultures (Worthy, 1987). In many cases, the way individuals talk, write, read, and listen are specific to their own culture. In other words, one's culture refers to what is shared by a group of individuals. In addition, to being shared, culture is learned and thereby influences learning styles. Learners are not genetically predisposed to be one way or the other; they learn "how to learn" through socialization processes that occur within societies (Vygotsky, 1986). These "cultural patterns are an interrelated, interwoven, and virtually inseparable groups or cluster of traits, that taken together, produce an established and typical result such as a way of thinking, living, and acting" (Good, 1973, p. 65).

Learning styles, in the context of this study, refers to the composite of characteristic "cognitive, affective and physiological factors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how a learner perceives, interacts with and responds to his or her learning environment" (Keefe, 1987). The cognitive factors are the information processing habits, which represent a person's typical modes of perceiving, thinking, remembering, and problem-solving (Messick, 1969). The affective factors deal with motivational processes—attention, expectancy, and incentive—viewed as the learner's typical modes of arousing, directing, and sustaining behavior. The physiological factors involve biologically based modes of responses that are founded on sex-related differences, personal nutrition, health, and accustomed reaction to the physical environment.

Therefore, certain generalizations based on research can be made regarding the impact of culture on the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students (Bahr

& Bahr, 1993; Haukoos & Satterfield, 1986; Jolly, 1996; Lam-Phoon, 1985; More, 1989; Murk, 1994; Nuby, 1995; Philips, 1972, 1983; Swisher & Deyhle, 1987; Tharp & Yamauchi, 1994; Vogt, Jordan, & Tharp, 1987). These cultural differences deserve recognition, and where resultant behavior indicates uniqueness, educational programs or procedures should be altered accordingly (Walker, Dodd, & Bigelow, 1989). The following review offers educators a synthesis of a large body of research and discusses strategies for maximizing learning for American Indian/Alaska Native students.

Historical Basis of the Problem: A Curriculum of Genocide

Prior to the invasion of the American Indian/Alaska Native settlements in the Americas (Zinn, 1999) and the imposition of the Euro-American educational system, many tribal nations had their own very diverse educational systems. These systems were culturally responsive² to the needs of the American Indian/Alaska Native students—designed to educate the child informally through observation and interaction with parents, relatives, elders, and religious and social groups. In essence, traditional Indian educational practices provided the skills needed for any tribal society to function adequately within their natural environment. However, with few exceptions, the written history of Indian education relates attempts to apply a White man's education and educational processes to American Indian/Alaska Native students.

A historical review of the early debates about American Indian/Alaska Native student mental capacities and the need for American Indian/Alaska Native students to overcome their "innate inferiority," as measured by intelligence tests (Gould, 1996;

Guthrie, 1998) provides educators with information that can help them understand the contemporary issues related to Indian education.

The conventional “deficit syndrome” as an educational ethos and practice has been used to address the needs of American Indian/Alaska Native students despite evidence suggesting that American Indians/Alaska Native students have definite cultural values and traits that affect learning and academic achievement, For example, Lucien Levy-Bruhl’s (1926) *How Natives Think (Les Fonctions Mentales dans les Societes Inferieures)* hypothesized that American Indians came from undeveloped and uncivilized peoples; were inferior races; had primitive, savage, and unintelligible mentalities; and had simple and artless logical reasoning processes.

Historians, in particular, wrote Indians out of their textbooks for whatever insecure reasons of justifying the past actions of America’s heroes, racial bigotry, or White guilt. By ignoring the dark episodes of the destruction of Indians and their cultures, historians in effect denied that these ever happened. (Fixico, 1998, p. 86)

Therefore, long before educators became interested in learning styles research, it was generally assumed by non-Indian researchers that American Indian/Alaska Native children lacked the innate intelligence and ability to succeed in formal school programs (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; Gould, 1996; Guthrie, 1998; Kaulback, 1984). Fixico (1998) asserted that it is ethically wrong to use research to subvert the fair historical representation of other peoples, leaders, and non-mainstream events. Mihesuah (1993) contended that researchers should not look upon American Indian/Alaska Native populations as curiosities, and suggested that those who conduct research on American Indian/Alaska Native students need to ask themselves seriously why they are doing

such research. Who is ultimately benefiting? According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), the word *research* is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism:

The word itself, “research” is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world’s vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful. It is so powerful that indigenous people even write poetry about research. The ways in which scientific research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world’s colonized people. It is a history that still offends the deepest sense of our humanity. (p. 1)

Historically, the federal government’s assimilation strategy removed many American Indian/Alaska Native children from their families, and entire generations lost access to traditional parenting models, culture, language, and values (Duran & Duran, 1995). In reality, most American Indian/Alaska Native populations were defeated not by military force, but by politically structuring educational institutions for American Indian/Alaska Native students to mold a colonial ethos (Pewewardy, 1998b).

Since its invasion of America, white society has sought to justify, through law and legal discourse, its privileges of aggression against Indian people by stressing tribalism’s incompatibility with the superior values and norms of white civilization. (Williams, 2000, p. 103)

The beginning of contemporary American Indian/Alaska Native education is the story of how Euro-American policymakers sought to use the schoolhouse—specifically the boarding schools—as an instrument for annihilating and acculturating many Indian youth to “American” ways of thinking and living (Adams, 1995). Using a variety of techniques, United States social policy, in general, endeavored to eliminate the cultures,

the religions, and the languages of American Indian/Alaska Native groups (Forbes, 2000; Tinker, 1993). Moreover, most United States federal and state initiatives focused on changing the Indian without allowing for cultural differences or taking into account traditional Indian patterns and practices (Dejong, 1993; Szasz, 1999). The concept of deculturalization³ demonstrates how cultural prejudice and religious bigotry can be intertwined with democratic beliefs. Deculturalization combines education for democracy and political equality with cultural genocide⁴—the attempt to destroy cultures (Alfred, 1999; Griffin, 2000; Spring, 2001), an act that was condemned by the United Nations (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2002).

Thus, the primary focus of early United States government policy was changing American Indian/Alaska Native ideas about the family, work, gender roles, child rearing, nature, accumulation of wealth, and political structures (Spring, 1996). Entwined in this tragedy has been the basic assumption that a generalized, broad-based definition of intelligence could be created. The logic of a single score to represent an individual's potentiality to learn or to declare the intellectual capacity to learn is a Holy Grail in the American educational profession (Huff, 1997). Consequently, the propriety of assigning blanket terms to all problem-solving behaviors has resulted in a highly debatable issue. Overall, schools have an obligation to all students to become more sensitive to society's indebtedness to Indian people for their valuable contributions to contemporary America (Butterfield, 1983). This has become obviously apparent given the current debate on high-stakes standardized testing and its relationship with a wide variation of cognitive lifestyles of American society, especially in the natural learning processes of American Indian/Alaska Native students. According to Jones and Ongtooguk (2002), high-stakes

testing alone will not solve the pressing educational problems of Alaska Natives. The next section provides an overview of new approaches and findings toward understanding the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Natives based on language and cultural strengths that bridge home and school learning.

Current Approaches and Findings Toward Understanding the Learning Styles of American Indian/Alaska Natives Students

Prior to the 1980s very little information about the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Natives was documented. Nor was much attention paid as to how to address the needs of these students (Swisher, 1990). Currently, or within approximately the last 25 years, researchers have approached the topic of learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students in a variety of ways. Some have looked at cognitive style (Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, & Cox, 1977), whereas others have been concerned with perceptual strengths—visual, auditory, or kinesthetic (Swisher & Pavel, 1994). Some have looked at personality type as indicative of a learning style (Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Nuby & Oxford, 1997). In August of 1989, a special issue of the *Journal of American Indian Education* dedicated an entire edition to learning styles research articles. Currently, there are numerous ways in which one might approach the topic of learning styles. For the purpose of this article, the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students are approached using the following classifications:

1. Field-Dependence/Field-Independence
2. Perceptual Strengths (Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic)

3. Reflectivity Versus Impulsivity
4. Classroom Management and Behavior
5. Role of the Family, Tribe, and Elders
6. Teacher/Pupil Relationships
7. Cooperation Versus Competition

Field-Dependence/Field-Independence

A review of the literature supports the argument that field-dependence or global processing is a learning style tendency among American Indian/Alaskan Native students (Annis & Frost, 1973; Berry, 1979; Benjamin, 1987; Browne, 1986a; Browne & Bordeaux, 1991; Cattey, 1980; Chrisjohn & Peters, 1989; Das, Kirby, & Jarman, 1992; Davidson, 1992; Diessner & Walker, 1989; Dinges & Hollenbeck, 1978; Irvine & Darlene, 1995; Kaufman & Kaufman, 1983; Kirby, 1984; Killbride & Robbins, 1968; Macias, 1989; Miller, 1990; More, 1990, 1993; Nuby & Oxford, 1996; Raburn, 1980; Rhodes, 1989, 1990; Ross, 1982, 1989; Scott, 1979; Shortman, 1990; Stairs, 1994; Stellern, Collins, Gutierrez, & Patterson, 1986; Swisher, 1991; Swisher & Dehyle, 1987, 1989; Tharp & Yamauchi, 1994; Walker, Dodd, & Bigelow, 1989; Wallis, 1984). Field-independence and field-dependence refer to how students learn, rather than what they learn. According to Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, and Cox (1977), the field (or one's surroundings) affects the learner's perceptions along a continuum between field-dependence and field-independence. For example, if a learner is field-dependent, he or she is unable to perceive elements or (him or herself) as separate from his or her environment. These learners are holistic or global learners. They begin with the whole picture and establish meaning only in relation to the whole. It is very difficult for the field-

dependent student to discern important details from a confusing background. Generally, the field-dependent, global, right brain dominant is highly visual/spatial, integrative, relational, intuitive, and contextual (parts-and-whole-together). The learner's thinking is not linear or hierarchical. This learner is concerned with life and all its relationships. It is not unusual for these learners to listen to the views of others before making quick judgments. Authority figures are often looked to for guidance. In fact, field-dependence is likely to develop in cultures that are highly collective and family-oriented (Nuby, Ehle, & Thrower, 2001).

On the other hand, field-independent learners tend to be analytical, logical, and temporal (sequencing). They prefer to compete to gain individual recognition and are generally task-oriented. These learners often prefer classroom activity that involves abstract, impersonal work (Kinsella, 1995; Worthley, 1987). These learners can easily divide the whole into subcategories based on differences. They can see easily that material can be divided and subdivided into minute pieces and that those pieces add up to the whole. Field-independence often occurs in cultures in which personal autonomy and formal organization in the family are emphasized, as in the White culture (DuBray, 1985; Light & Martin, 1986; Stauss, 1993). And it is often true that in White classrooms information is frequently presented in an analytical, sequential manner. This places the field-dependent learner at a great disadvantage.

Perceptual Strengths: Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic

Findings support the view that American Indian/Alaska Native students are visual learners (Alhelm, 1973; Annis & Frost, 1973; Bates, 1997; Bland, 1975; Bryant, 1986; Foreman, 1991a; Gardner, 1980; Gilliland, 1999; Greenbaum & Greenbaum, 1983;

John, 1972; John-Steiner, 1975; Karlebach, 1986; Kaulback, 1984; Kleinfeld, 1973, 1979; Kleinfeld & Nelson, 1991; Lipinski, 1989, 1990; More, 1984a, 1984b; Philips, 1972; Ross, 1989; Samples, 1979; Steinberg, 1974; Tafoya, 1989; Trent & Gilman, 1985; Wilcox, 1996). Visual learners learn best when they are able to see the material they are expected to master. They tend to learn best when the teacher provides a myriad of visual learning opportunities such as graphs, films, demonstrations, and pictures. American Indian/Alaska Native students are taught by observing parents or elders (Red Horse, 1980). When skills are taught, parents or elders generally teach through demonstration. Children watch, and then imitate the skills. For example, the father, mother, or elder might teach the child a skill by modeling. Children are expected to watch, listen and then do. Therefore, many American Indian/Alaska Native students appear to perform best in classrooms with an emphasis on visualization, especially in mathematics.

Traditionally, the mathematics taught in schools seldom includes overt connections with tribal culture (Slapin, 1998). Consequently, many students view mathematics as a spectator sport rather than one in which they can participate. For the American Indian/Alaska Native students, this cultural disconnection poses additional obstacles for achievement in mathematics (Barta, et al., 2001; Leap, et al., 1982).

Mathematics has always been used in situations where American Indian/Alaska Native students count, measure, design, locate, explain, trade, dance, and play (Bradley, 1984; Brenner, 1998; Callaghan, 1969; Closs, 1997; Creative Associates, 1980; Green, 1978; Hadfield, 1990; Hankes, 1993; Mather, 1997; Moore, 1982, 1988a, 1988b; Nelson, Joseph, & Williams, 1993; Renker, 1982; Schindler & Davison, 1985;

Sleeter, 1997; Wall & Scott, 1990). The art of beadwork encompasses all of these behaviors including dancing. Beadwork provides a hands-on demonstration of math in action and can be used as an effective vehicle for teaching mathematics. There is virtually no mathematical concept (appropriate for elementary students) that cannot be illustrated using beadwork (Barta, 1999).

Students who speak American Indian/Alaska Native languages should have a chance to learn mathematics terminology in their Native language and then to relate this knowledge to the English language mathematics vocabulary (Davison, 1992). Comparing and contrasting American Indian/Alaska Native mathematics teaches students lessons about the diversity among American Indian/Alaska Native cultures. Mathematics to many American Indian/Alaska Native students is related physically to one's being and religiously to one's soul. Mathematics connects one to his or her universe in many different ways by incorporating language, culture, and daily living practices (Lipka, 1994). Trade and currency provide insights into the complexity of American Indian/Alaska Native life through the use of complex algebraic expressions on a multiplicative scale. In this conception, mathematics is not in the activities of cultural practice, but these activities have the potential for mathematics to be constructed through symbolism and systematization (Presmeg, 1999). Viewing mathematics in this way opens the door to a reconciliation of ethnomathematics and academic mathematics (Ascher & D'Ambrosio, 1994; Davison, 1989). But this view of the nature of mathematics contrasts strikingly with the students' limited opinion of what mathematics is (Whitman, et al., 1997).

Reflecting upon how American Indians/Alaska Native students traditionally used mathematical concepts assists in developing a new awareness about how students perceive Western mathematics, especially if presented from a Eurocentric perspective (Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA], 1998; Nelson, et al., 1993). Conversely, the majority of White children begin school as auditory learners. These learners have been bombarded with information since early childhood. Young children are encouraged to express ideas in the form of speech. Therefore, most can listen to instruction and then follow those instructions without difficulty. Consequently, in the typical White classroom, the learning experience is often primarily limited to oral instruction, beginning with primary school and becoming more predominate in the secondary grades (Wickett, 1997). This mode of instruction places the American Indian/Alaska Native student at a very real disadvantage. On the other hand, culturally relevant ethnomathematical curricula connect the student with his or her heritage. It is the bridge between his or her world on the reserve, reservation, or in the community and the different world that may often exist in the school setting (Barta, et al., 2001).

Reflectivity Versus Impulsivity

Research indicates that Native American/Alaska Native students tend to be reflective (Appleton, 1983; Beckett, 1986; Connelly, 1983; Das, Kirby, & Jarman, 1992; Dumont, 1972; Guilmet, 1976; Hall, 1991; Heffron, 1984; John, 1972; Little Soldier, 1997; Macias, 1989; McShane & Plas, 1994; Nuby & Oxford, 1997; Ogbu, 1978; Philips, 1972, 1983; Robinson, 1987; Tafoya, 1989). Reflection is defined as the tendency to stop to consider options before responding, often resulting in greater accuracy in conceptualizing problems (Hollins, 1999). Conversely, being impulsive is the tendency

to respond immediately, more fluently, yet inaccurate problem-solving often occurs. In other words, there is a difference in the time period in which the student contemplates before arriving at conclusions. For example, some students' conversations may have a longer "wait time" between responses. Learning may be enhanced by teachers "tuning in" to the students' rhythms of conversation and movement (MacIvor, 1999). A reflective student does not need immediate closure. Instead, she or he is more open-oriented, delaying decision-making until all evidence is collected before coming to a conclusion or acting in response to a situation. When posed with a question or problem, American Indian/Alaska Native students tend to be reflective learners, examining all sides of an issue, as well as possible implications and solutions related to the problems. Therefore, they are careful to make sure that the answer to a problem is known before responding. It is not uncommon, therefore, for American Indian/Alaska Native students to spend much more time watching and listening and less time talking than do White students (Gilliland, 1999). As Hilliard (2001) pointed out, reluctance to try to solve a problem may be associated with the fear of being shamed if one does not succeed, which may account for the seemingly passive behavior of the American Indian/Alaska Native student. Unfortunately, teachers may mistake this behavior as disinterest or lack of motivation.

Differences in home learning style and school learning style often become manifest when the American Indian/Alaska Native child goes to school. In the typical White classroom, American Indian/Alaska Native children avoid unfamiliar ground, where trial and error or the inquiry method is employed (Lacy, 2002). Instead, children often begin school believing that a respectful attitude toward a task involves doing a task well

(Porter, 1997). Performing an activity according to a recommended or correct form is as important as the purpose or the goal of the activity. If a task cannot be done well, there is no need to engage in the activity at all (Longstreet, 1978).

The sense of time for an American Indian/Alaska Native also appears to mirror a sense of reflectivity. Many American Indian/Alaska Native students have more flexible concepts of time than do members of other cultural groups (DuBray, 1993). The American Indian/Alaska Native student has been taught that time and punctuality are of little importance in the grand scheme of things (Cleary & Peacock, 1998). Therefore, students may be tardy for class or assignments might be late. The American Indian/Alaska Native student would tend to feel that being closure-oriented might lead to inaccurate decisions. Instead, having a high tolerance for ambiguity and being open-oriented (open to flexible time) are prized. The American Indian/Alaska Native student might then relish comprehending a problem, holding out for all available data. This is considered more important than coming to rapid conclusions about a topic, problem, or assignment.

According to Clarke (1997), when people define *Indian culture* as lacking future orientation and living day-to-day, it appears as though society has added legitimacy to the observations of outsiders who have stereotyped a people on the basis of race, rather than the economic conditions forced on a people by segregation on reservations. Thus, when an American Indian/Alaska Native child is late for school because she or he had to help a single working mother feed younger siblings, some individuals define that child's tardiness as *Indian time*. When someone fails to get to a meeting on time

because the car broke down, we explain the incident as “living on Indian time,” rather than confronting the real reason for the situation, which is most often linked to poverty.

Classroom Management/Behavior

Studies indicate that people from different cultures attribute disciplinary problems to different causes and use different techniques to motivate students to behave in acceptable ways (McDade, 1993). Some cultural groups rely on the use of rewards and consequences; others do not (Radin, Williams, & Coggins, 1993). Research indicates that American Indian/Alaska Native worldviews and social behaviors are at odds with White values and behaviors (Bert & Bert, 1992; Burgess, 1978; Chilcott, 1985; Green, 1977, 1978; Light & Martin, 1985; Medicine, 1981; Ogbu, 1978; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Sra, 1990; Tafoya, 1989; Tharp, 1989). As Deyhle (1995) pointed out, Navajo students rebel against the stringent discipline so prevalent in White high schools. Threats of physical punishment and force are unacceptable and ineffective methods of behavior control in Navajo cultures (Vogt, Jordan, & Tharp, 1987). For Navajos, neither extreme of being “tough” or “nice” is appropriate. In fact, punishment, contingent reward, or any openly manipulative effort to control the behavior of others, including children, is a violation of cultural values (Tharp, 1989).

Navajo adults are generally more reserved in their affectionate displays but are highly respectful of the child's individuality and of children's sovereignty over their own persons (Batchelder, 2000). Research also indicates that more culturally specific management routines are compatible with many American Indian/Alaska Native cultures, especially the Navajo, where ignoring misbehavior or lowering one's eyes, indirectly referring to the misdeed and praising honorable behavior works better than

punishment (Bert & Bert, 1992). Navajo youth are unlikely to exhibit the same level and configuration of traditionalism due to the varying impact of mainstream society (Willeto, 1999). Clearly, the question of diversity in traditionalism warrants investigation in some tribal cultures.

In traditional American Indian/Alaska Native cultures, obedience is approached through explanations of the desired behavior, often through a grandparent, who serves as the major disciplinarian. In addition, the grandparent often serves as the one who teaches character education, noninterference, or self-reliance (Good Tracks, 1973) as well as desired standards of moral behavior. American Indian/Alaska Native children are seldom, if ever, struck by an adult whether parent, uncles, aunts, or grandparents (Tharp, 1989).

Often American Indian/Alaska Native children respond more effectively if the teacher gives the student warnings of bad behavior couched in community terms like, “What would people say—they will laugh at you.” Historically in schools, shame or embarrassment were common disciplinary tools with American Indian/Alaska Native children (Cleary & Peacock, 1998).

On the other hand, humor can be a useful teaching strategy when working with American Indian/Alaska Native learners of all ages. Humor is important in bringing Indian students together and reaffirming bonds of kinship (Herring, 1999). Laughter relieves stress and serves to reaffirm and enhance the sense of connectedness that comes from being part of the group (Garrett & Garrett, 1994). Nevertheless, teachers are cautioned to use humor very discreetly and to ensure tribal specificity (Taylor, 2001).

Tribal Role of the Family/Elders

Research indicates that the family, the elders, and the tribe play an important role in the teaching/learning process as related to the American Indian/Alaska Native student (Anderson & Ellis, 1995; Alexson, 1985; Bahr & Bahr, 1993; Berman, 1993; Cattey, 1980; Cazden, 1982; Gill, 1982; Good Tracks, 1973; Gridley, 1974; Hamamsay, 1957; John, 1972; Jordan, 1984; Kaulback, 1984; Kluckhohn & Leighton, 1962; Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961; Lee, 1976; Light & Martin, 1985; Littlebear & Martinez, 1996; Lum, 1986; Nuby, Ehle, & Thrower, 2001; Pepper, 1985; Pepper & Henry, 1986; Pewewardy, 1994; Philips, 1972; Red Horse, 1980, 1983; Reyhner, 1992; Rhodes, 1988; Robinson-Zanartu, 1996; Sanders, 1987; Stauss, 1993; Ward, 1993). Although the Indian family structure varies from tribe to tribe, some generalizations may be made. In particular, many American Indian/Alaska Native students see the family as an extension of themselves. Relatives like aunts, uncles, and grandparents who may live in separate households often make major contributions in raising children. This extended family concept may also include cousins and sometimes formal adoptees from outside the family unit. It is not unusual for children to stay in a variety of different households. This type of family structure provides a sense of belonging and security, which forms an interdependent system (Pewewardy, 1994). Status and rewards are often derived from adherence to tribal structure. The White teacher who sees the generic "American" family unit as primary often misunderstands the extended family concept of American Indian/Alaska Native students.

American Indian/Alaska Native students are taught to treat family members with respect, especially elders (Cornelius, 1999; Ross, 1996). Social acceptance and

approval are sought from older members of the family. They are a source of wisdom and serve as teachers of traditions, customs, legends, and myths. Grandparents, especially, have symbolic leadership positions in family communities. Children often see on a daily basis grandparents who have a role in child rearing and discipline. Even as a child grows older, the commitment to grandparents continues. For example, Apache and Navajo children are taught to carefully observe the lives of their parents and grandparents. By observation, students are taught by example (Bahr & Bahr, 1993).

The tribe is of fundamental importance as related to cultural identity (Haynes Writer, 2001; Mihesuah, 1998; Weaver, 2001; Wildcat, 2001; Yellow Bird, 1995). Problems involving the formulation of an "Indian" identity may be great for many American Indian/Alaska Native students, with youngsters sometimes seeing themselves as primarily "Indian," and sometimes moving in the direction of White values (Garrett & Pichette, 2000). Peer pressure to conform to mainstream school norms causes many American Indian/Alaska Native students to adopt assimilationist values in schools, especially for those students who attend public schools (Pewewardy & Willower, 1993).

Although it is impossible to describe a common set of cultural values that encompass all tribal groups, most share common values of noninterference, time-orientation, sharing, cooperation, coexistence with nature, and extended family structure (Garrett & Wilbur, 1999; Yellow Bird, 2001). For students living on reservations, relationships and tribal affiliation are culturally strong and in many ways quite different from their non-Indian peers or even American Indian/Alaska Native students living in urban areas (Lobo & Peters, 2001). Social stratification and honors are obtained by

maintaining conformity to tribal norms. Traditionally the tribe, through the extended-family structure, is responsible for the education of all children (Pewewardy, 1994).

The tendency to place the family, tribe, and elders in such high esteem is very much in contrast with European American culture (Deloria, 2001). Instead of focusing on collectivism, the White culture is highly individualistic, with an emphasis on capitalism, youth, and self (Weenie, 2000). This may very well present a problem in the school setting. American Indian/Alaska Native students have special needs that warrant a teacher's cultural understanding. Differences in language, approaches to learning, cherished cultural values, and familial traditions present special challenges that teachers need to consider in designing instruction and assessment (Lipson & Wixson, 1997).

Teacher/Pupil Relationships

Findings indicate that the teacher of the American Indian/Alaska Native student plays a tremendous role in the teaching and learning process. His or her teaching style or method can have a significant effect on whether students learn or fail (Almeida, 1996, 1998; Archibald, 1988; Banks & Banks, 2001; Betz, 1991; Butterfield, 1983, 1994; Burgess, 1978; Dehyle, 1983; Foreman, 1991b; John, 1972; Jolly, 1996; Leacock, 1976; More, 1984b; Nuby, 1995; Ortiz & Garcia, 1988; Pepper & Henry, 1986; Pewewardy, 1999; Shortman, 1990; Smith, 1999; Tafoya, 1989; Tamaoka, 1986; Whyte, 1986; Wyatt, 1978). It is apparent that many teachers do not have an understanding of the degree to which culture affects learning styles (Swisher & Dehyle, 1989). Many are not able to identify the learning style differences and to employ culturally responsive techniques to address the needs of culturally different populations. Often teachers view

differences in approach to learning as problems inherent in the students themselves, rather than as a lack of understanding by the teacher (Nuby, Ehle, & Thrower, 2001). Unfortunately, many teachers ignore culture and its impact on learning both in “content” and “style,” rather than devising methods and techniques through which culturally diverse individuals approach problem-solving.

As Sleeter (1993) pointed out, White teachers often have a knowledge of race based on their own life experiences and vested interests. The idea of what is “correct” comes from the White perspective. The perspective of most White teachers about race is “dysconscious racism,” defined by Joyce King (1991) as a form of racism that accepts without cultural awareness the dominant White norms and privileges. For many American Indian/Alaska Native students, this is an impaired consciousness or a distorted way of thinking about race because the dominant mainstream orientation of most non-Indian teachers is centered within a White male, middle-class worldview (Howard, 1999; Landsman, 2001; Stalvey, 1997).

When teachers fail to recognize cultural differences among learning styles, students may react in negative ways to instruction (Ladson-Billings, 2001). Consequently, when students have a learning style that differs from the instructional style of their teachers, cultural incongruence appears in the teaching and learning process. This situation usually happens when the teacher does not understand the cultural and personal reasons for these differences. The classroom can become a place of inequity, where some American Indian/Alaska Native students receive what they need and others do not. Often students become disenchanting with school and suffer as a result of social, economic, and educational policies (Nuby & Oxford, 1997).

Lack of understanding is not necessarily the fault of the teacher. Many teacher education programs do not provide the kind of experiences that allow prospective teachers to develop the skills necessary to identify and address the learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students. They are uninformed about cross-cultural differences and how to employ culturally responsive pedagogy. Many teachers are faced with limited understanding of diverse cultures and linguistic patterns other than their own and the possibility that this limitation negatively affects their students' ability to become successful learners (Montgomery, 2001). In order for teachers to be effective with diverse students, it is crucial that they recognize their own worldviews; only then will they be able to understand the worldviews of their students (McAllister & Irvine, 2000). Too many teacher education programs do not include the extensive study and research necessary to understand the American Indian/Alaska Native student (Tippeconnic, 1983). The result is often limited, mixed with inaccurate knowledge.

American Indian/Alaska Native students often encounter difficulties in school because their culturally accepted ways of displaying competencies differ from those expected by the teacher in typical White schools (Ward, 1993). In essence two contrasting learning styles are involved. Traditional American Indian/Alaska Native learning focuses on process over product, legends, and stories as traditional teaching paradigms, knowledge obtained from self, and cognitive development through problem-solving techniques (Tafoya, 1989). This concept is very different than what is expected in the typical White classroom.

Matching teaching styles with learning styles is important for maximizing the learning of Native American/Alaska Native students (Stairs, 1999; Swisher & Dehyle, 1987;

Swisher & Pavel, 1994). Inappropriate and mismatched learning styles are common threads that weave in out of the literature describing a large number of learners' inability to achieve in the traditional classroom (Shortman, 1990). In fact, two contrasting learning styles are often involved in the education of Native American/Alaska Native students—that of the school and that of the community (Archibald, 1988).

Cooperation Versus Competition

Research indicates that American Indian/Alaska Native students tend to favor cooperation over competition (Brown, 1980; Dumont, 1972; Lewis & Ho, 1989; Little Soldier, 1989; Nel, 1994; Nuby, 1995; Nuby, Ehle, & Thrower, 2001; Nuby & Oxford, 1996, 1997; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Swisher, 1990; Walker, Dodd, & Bigelow, 1989; Wax, Wax, & Dumont, 1989; Wilcox, 1996). The typical American Indian/Alaska Native student lives in a world of people. To them, people are all important. Possessions are of value mainly because they can be shared. In contrast to White culture, most students do not equate the accumulation of property as a measure of a person's worth or social status. One's worth is based on the ability and willingness to share. One who has too many personal possessions is suspect. The thought is that getting rich may not be possible or even desirable, especially if one looks after the needs of others.

American Indian/Alaska Native students prefer harmony, unity, and a basic oneness. There is security in being a member of the group rather than being singled out. Students do not want to be shown to be either above or below the status of others. Competition does not produce motivation. American Indian/Alaska Native students often feel "put on the spot" or ashamed if the teacher points out their superior work to the class. They may find it necessary to quit doing good work to regain their place in the group.

On the other hand, many American Indian/Alaska Native students prefer cooperative learning strategies (Cajete, 1999). They find activities enjoyable that bring them together with friends or acquaintances in shared group activities (Ward, 1993). This holds particularly true for athletic events (Ager, 1976; Mills, 1999; Nuby, 1995; Oxendine, 1988; Swisher & Deyhle, 1989). Competition is unfair and situations are avoided if one student is made to look better than another does. As Swisher and Deyhle (1989) pointed out, Indian children hesitate to engage in an individual performance before the public gaze, especially where they sense competitive assessment against their peers and equally do not wish to demonstrate by their individual superiority the inferiority of their peers. In addition, to brag about one's self and personal abilities are, for most tribes, considered to be most ill mannered (Tafoya, 1989). However, as Adams (1995), Mills (1999), and Oxendine (1988) pointed out, in team sports, where performance is socially defined as benefiting the group, American Indian/Alaska Native students can become excellent competitors.

Relationship to Current Practice

In order to better understand the social position of American Indian/Alaska Native communities in contemporary society, educators must critically examine the history of one of the very tools through which we hope to achieve social equity—education. As current education reform and initiatives are being proposed, considered, and enacted, educators and policymakers must learn the lessons of educational history. As presented earlier in this article, the troubling feature of the conventional educational ethos and practices with respect to improving the achievement of American Indian/Alaska Native

students is the “deficit syndrome.” Far too many educators attribute school failure to what American Indian/Alaska Native students don’t have and can’t do. Thus, many tribal communities have viewed traditional education as the cornerstone to self-determination and mobility. As a result, American Indian/Alaska Native students have a long history of engagement with and struggle for equitable schooling.

The work to create culturally responsive schools for American Indian/Alaska Native students today will fall to practitioners who will require encouragement, support, and a conceptual framework for developing significantly better conditions for teaching and learning. Meanette Kape’ ahiokalani Padeken Ah Nee-Benham and Joanne Elizabeth Cooper’s (2000) book, *Indigenous Educational Models for Contemporary Practice*, Lyn Ellen Lacy’s (2002) book, *Creative Planning Resource for Interconnected Teaching and Learning*, and Beverly Klug and Patricia Whitfield’s (2002) book, *Widening the Circle*, all provide a variety of promising practices that links the best thinking (theory and inquiry) on Indian education with the best practices (leadership, teaching, and learning) across diverse American Indian/Alaska Native communities.

The reform movement of the 1990s and 2000s provides a rare opportunity for education practitioners. They have a mandate to broadcast their virtues, revitalize tired practices, relabel some strengths, and alter some weaknesses. Learning styles research like this will help them augment their own intuition with some general ideas and principles.

Implications for Educators

An obvious conclusion from the findings indicates that the culture of the American Indian/Alaska Native student plays a major role in learning style. It is true that Indian

students should not be stereotyped or all placed in the same category because the inherent abilities of the students within any American Indian/Alaska Native group are varied as in any other group of students. However, it can be concluded that a greater number of American Indian/Native Alaska Natives have definite learning style tendencies such as strength in the visual modality and a preference for global, creative, and reflective styles of learning.

Because of the distinct learning style preferences of American Indian/Alaskan Native students, there is a pressing need for teachers to employ culturally responsive teaching techniques. When American Indian/Alaska Native students are confronted with White teachers who do not understand the Indian students' learning style preferences and cultural values, the result is often "cultural discontinuity" or lack of "cultural synchronization" between students and their teachers. The outcome of this pedagogy is miscommunication between students and teachers, resulting in hostility, alienation, diminished self-esteem, and eventual school failure (Halpin, Halpin, & Whiddon, 1980; Pewewardy & Willower, 1993). Future teachers must be reflective practitioners who possess the observational, empirical, and analytical skills necessary to monitor, evaluate, and revise their teaching techniques based on the learning styles of students they teach.

Future teachers must have experience with Indian students during their teacher training programs. They need to understand and respect the students' cultural knowledge base. This includes studying the history and culture of Indian students that incorporate their values, stories, music, and myths (Pewewardy, 1999). Future teachers also need to be cognizant that classroom practices must be compatible with the

American Indian/Alaska Native students' linguistic language styles, cognitive functioning, motivation, and the social norms to which they are accustomed. The implication is that each learner must be viewed as an ever changing "cultural being," and a product of unique tribal cultures.

The teacher must also be aware of the fact that even though a large number of White learners prefer lecture, sequence, and the building of a concept from details, a greater percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students learn best when holistic strategies are employed. They learn best when they are presented first with the big idea, then seeing the details that relate to it, rather than the longer process of building the generalities from the details (Gilliland, 1999). They readily see the overall picture before they concern themselves with details. This information is especially useful for White social studies teachers who are prone to present concepts step-by-step from small details. Instead, the teacher should be concerned with whole emerging patterns; then perhaps let the students learn through stories, parables, pictures, imitations, music, and poetry.

Because many of the values of the American Indian/Alaska Native students are taught through storytelling, students can benefit from this type of instruction. Teachers can utilize stories and legends that teach morals; thus values can become a part of the students' subconscious minds and influence their way of thought. Moreover, the oral literature of the community and storytelling within a teacher's class can be the basis of beginning instruction in reading and writing. In addition, it is beneficial for the teacher to tap into the real lives of Indian heroes, past and present. Telling the stories of real life people and discussing what made them great can help shape the character of American

Indian/Alaska Native students. Thus, the involvement of elders or grandparents should be promoted. They can serve as great sources of cultural knowledge, and serve as story, myth, or legend tellers.

A review of the literature also suggests that the teacher must be cognizant of the tendency for the American Indian/Alaska Native student to avoid competition. Instead, the student prefers situations that are nonconfrontational (DuBray, 1993). Learners who hold these cultural values tend to view displays of knowledge in the classroom as one person gaining at the expense of others. Since approval from the tribal peer group is more important to them than approval from the instructor, such learners will refrain from voluntary classroom discussion. Thus, class participation is often incompatible with their cultural values. Instead, many American Indian/Alaska Native students prefer activities that promote cooperation. Therefore, the teacher should capitalize on this spirit of cooperation. Subsequently, cooperative learning is an excellent way to lessen competition and help students develop a sense of teamwork and pride in one's group. Allowing students to work in groups or pairs to tutor peers or to tutor younger children is also an excellent teaching strategy. American Indian/Alaska Native students enjoy sitting in groups or circles using group problem-solving techniques. The use of team games is also very congruent with their learning styles. Activities should be avoided that increase positive self-talk; for example, "something I like about myself" should be avoided. While this strategy might work well in the White classroom, it may be detrimental in the American Indian/Alaska Native classroom.

As in any effective teaching and learning situation, the teacher must provide multiple means of assessment. Portfolio assessment, paper-and-pencil tests, non-standardized

tests, and criterion-referenced tests used in conjunction with norm-referenced, formal standardized assessment provide the teacher with a better view of the learners' capabilities. Often when single methods of assessments are employed, low achievement results. This does not necessarily mean that the American Indian/Alaska Native student is not motivated or not familiar with the material. Instead, testing procedures may be incompatible with learning style preferences as well as language and culture (McShane & Plas, 1994).

It is extremely important that the teacher be aware that low achievement does not necessarily reflect lack of motivation. Instead, complex personal and societal factors such as feelings of injustice and discrimination, poverty, and dysfunctional family life may contribute to low self-esteem and feelings of rejection, isolation, and anxiety. The teacher must recognize these contributing factors in school failure and provide culturally relevant materials and activities that promote self-confidence. For example, the inclusion of information about famous Indian athletes, actors, singers, artists, or writers can help promote a sense of pride in the Indian student. Such activities send a strong message to students that a teacher cares about his or her students and what is important to those students.

The learning styles research is open to criticism on several levels. First, only a few styles (e.g., field-dependence/field-independence, reflectivity/ impulsivity) have been researched extensively; few have compared students within or among their tribal nations. Second, this research rarely is linked to issues regarding teachers' learning styles and/or teaching pedagogies. And, perhaps most importantly, there is little evidence to suggest that distinguishing students according to their learning styles

makes any significant differences in their academic performances. Finally, the bulk of the learning styles research has been conducted with children rather than adults (Conti & Fellenz, 1991). Consequently, it is unclear how or whether the current findings apply to the field of adult Indian education (Aragon, 2002; Charter, 1996). Each of these areas needs further research before we can accept or reject the saliency of learning styles as a way of addressing the needs of American Indian/Alaska Native students.

Much of the learning styles research on American Indian/Alaska Native students has as its ideological base the primacy of the individual and individual differences. However, this may be an ideological blind spot that prevents researchers from understanding the role of tribal culture in supporting students' learning and teachers' instructional decisions. Thus, we may need to turn to other disciplines for additional insights into school performance.

Conclusion

This research indicates that curriculum or educational models that select one body of information to be presented to all students at a set time and at some forced rate cannot possibly accommodate all learners. Valid school reform is that which considers students' differences and strengths. It is no longer possible to deny the existence of cultural assets and variations among culturally different groups. Although educators verbalize that all children, regardless of age, race, or religion, have an equal right to effective education, they have not realized the extent to which ethnic and cultural differences influence learning and achievement (Dunn, Gemake, Jalali, & Zenhausern, 1990).

The failure of programs aimed at reducing dropout rates and the inability to produce effective communication between majority and minority members are, in part, due to misconceptions and stereotypical notions about American Indian/Alaska Native students. Educators must guard against stereotypical views gleaned from representations of a culture in the literature that ignore the dynamic lived realities of the people. Although such literature is a first step, it must be supplemented with real interaction with students, parents, and the community (MacIvor, 1999). New models and approaches must evolve that not only deal with these misconceptions, but also, more importantly, operate within a framework of equal respect for the similarities and differences among Native American/Alaska Native students.

Researchers have not begun to scratch the surface of the profound pedagogical traditions of American Indian/Alaska Native students. These traditions remain for educators to see today in the form of traditional tribal educational practices. However, during the past 500 years, every attempt has been made to dismember all independent American Indian/Alaska Native educational attempts, root and branch, and to defame and stigmatize anything that survives in order to disconnect American Indian/Alaska Native students from their ancestors.

Despite attempts to report the links between learning styles research (especially on language and thought), the vast majority of research on learning with American Indian/Alaska Native students made direct claims of deficits up until the 1960s (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997). Although the formal aspects of a Western education have served the colonizers' primary intent of oppression and assimilation (Duran & Duran, 1995), educators now have the unprecedented opportunity to integrate teaching beliefs

surrounding cultural identity and language (Haynes Writer, 2001; McAlpine, Eriks-Brophy, & Crago, 1996). To maximize learning of American Indian/Alaska Native students, teachers can also infuse a traditional, culture-based curriculum (Cornelius, 1999; Harvey, Harjo, & Welborn, 1995), returning to the teaching and learning of art (Cajete, 1994) and the elders (Ross, 1996). It is important to learn from a variety of perspectives about educational excellence, especially from the learning styles' strengths of American Indian/Alaska Native students. Educators who conduct research in American Indian/Alaska Native communities must understand the historical relationship between tribal communities and academia (Lomawaima, 2000), ascertain compliance with tribal law (Bowe Katy, 2002), draw upon the wellspring of culturally responsive traditions, and help determine the overall beneficial effects the research will have for American Indian/Alaska Native communities.

In order to provide a viable educational environment for American Indian/Alaska Native students, teachers should try to identify the learning styles of their students, match their teaching styles to students' learning styles for difficult tasks (Lippitt, 1993), and broaden "deficit thinking" learning styles through easier tasks and drills. All students, regardless of ethnicity, stand to benefit from an understanding of different cultural values. The implementation of programs targeted toward the learning styles of students of varying cultures is consistent with American values, such as tolerance of difference and equality for all. An understanding of cultural values of others such as respect for elders that characterizes the American Indian/Alaska Native cultures is likely to become increasingly desirable as the percentage of elderly Americans increase in the coming years. Similarly, learning the American Indian/Alaska Native value of associating

and living in harmony with nature may become essential as we run out of natural resources. As we become an increasingly diverse society, we must learn to understand and know how to work with other cultures that differ from our own.

Last, but certainly not least, when differences in learning styles are addressed, the American Indian/Alaska Native student will become motivated and encouraged to succeed. Personalization of educational programs make learning more meaningful to all involved. Ultimately, American Indian/Alaska Native students must believe that there is respect for their cultural backgrounds. Without this knowledge, the results can be disastrous. “Many educational traditions and practices have been lost or only remain in the memories of survivors of the indigenous peoples’ holocaust” (Spring, 2000, p. xi). If Americans are to embrace diversity, the conscious and unconscious expressions of racism within our society must be identified and done away with (Pine & Hilliard, 1990). There is no choice. Schools can no longer afford to cast themselves as the guardians of the status quo, of some idealistic view of mainstream America that ignores the diversity of a multicultural, multiracial, and multitribal society.

Cornel D. Pewewardy (Comanche-Kiowa) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Teaching and Leadership, School of Education at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas. His research and teaching initiatives focus on ethnic stereotyping in American sports culture, culturally responsive teaching, rhetoric sovereignty, and social justice education. Dr. Pewewardy teaches courses in critical multicultural education and the education of Indigenous peoples.

Endnotes

1. Given the multiplicity of worldviews and perspectives on the important issue of terminological identity, the term *American Indian/Alaska Native* is used in this article

to refer to the descendants of the original inhabitants of the U.S., rather than *Native American*. Whenever possible, however, I attempted to refer to “American Indian/Alaska Native” by their preferred tribal community, tribal affiliations (e.g., Choctaw, Chickasaw Nation, etc.). But I understand that group members may self-identify themselves using broader terms, such as Indigenous Peoples, to place their tribal identities in a wider, more global context.

2. Culturally responsive teaching centers the classroom instruction in multiethnic cultural frames of reference (Gay, 2000).
3. Deculturalization is the educational process of destroying a people’s culture and replacing it with a new culture (Spring, 2001).
4. According to Churchill (1994), the term *genocide* was coined by Polish jurist Raphael Lemkin in 1944 by combining the Greek *genos* (“race” or “tribe”) and the Latin *cide* (“killing”).

References

- Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Ager, L. P. (1976). The reflection of cultural values in Eskimo children’s games. In D. Lancy & A. Tindall (Eds.), *The anthropological study of play: Problems and*

prospects (pp. 79-86). Cornwall, NY: Leisure Press.

Alexson, J. A. (1985). *Counseling and development in a multicultural society*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Alfred, T. (1999). *Peace, power, righteousness: An indigenous manifesto*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Alhelm, F. A. (1973). A comparative study of preferences of Anglo and American Indian children for particular visual qualities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 34(10A), 6346.

Almeida, D. A. (1996). *Countering prejudice against American Indians and Alaska Natives through anti-bias curriculum and instruction*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 400 146)

Almeida, D. A. (1998). Indigenous education: Survival for our children. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 31(1), 6-10.

Anderson, M. J., & Ellis, R. (1995). On the reservation. In N. A. Vacc, S. B. DeVaney, & J. Wittmer (Eds.), *Experiencing and counseling multicultural and diverse populations* (3rd ed., pp. 179-198). Bristol, PA: Accelerated.

Annis, R. C., & Frost, B. (1973). Human visual ecology and orientation anisotropies in acuity. *Science*, 182(4113), 729-731.

Appleton, N. (1983). *Cultural pluralism in education: Theoretical foundations*. New York: Longman.

Aragon, S. R. (2002). An investigation of factors influencing classroom motivation for postsecondary American Indian/Alaska Native Students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 41(1), 1-18.

Archibald, J. (1988). *Ourselves, our knowledge, establishing pathways to excellence in Indian education implementation: Challenges and solutions*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia, Faculty of Education, Mokakit Indian Education Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 217)

Ascher, M., & D'Ambrosio, U. (1994). Ethnomathematics: A dialogue. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 14(2), 36-43.

Bahr, S., & Bahr, H. M. (1993). Autonomy, community, and the mediation of value: Comments of Apachean grandmothers, cultural change, and the media. *Family Perspective*, 27(4), 347-374.

Barta, J. (1999). Native American beadwork and mathematics. *Winds of Change*, 14(2), 36-41.

Barta, J., Abeyta, A., Gould, D., Galindo, E., Matt, G., Seaman, D., & Voggessor, G. (2001). The mathematical ecology of the Shoshoni and implications for elementary mathematics education and the young learner. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 40(2), 1-27.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Batchelder, A. (2000). Teaching Diné language and culture in Navajo schools: Voices from the community. In J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard, & W. S. Gilbert (Eds.), *Learn in beauty: Indigenous education for a new century* (pp. 1-8). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University, Center for Excellence in Education.

Bates, C. (1997). *Alaska Native education: Some recommendations from this corner*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 151)

Beckett, M. (1986). *The adult Navajo learner: Learning styles and corresponding teaching strategies*. Unpublished manuscript.

Benjamin, S. (1987). Low cost learning strategies produce high quality education on the Navajo Indian reservation. *Performance and Instruction*, 26(5), 12-15.

Berman, T. L. (1993). The impact of federal policy on American Indian women and families. *Family Perspective*, 27(4), 471-484.

Berry, J. W. (1979). Research in multicultural societies: Implications of cross-cultural methods. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 10(4), 415-434.

Bert, C. R., & Bert, M. (1992). *The Native American: An exceptionality in education and counseling*. Miami, FL: Independent Native American Development Corp. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 351 168)

Betz, D. (1991). *International initiatives and education of indigenous peoples: Teaching and learning to "Dance in Two Worlds."* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 561)

Bland, L. (1975). *Visual perception and recall of school-age Navajo, Hopi, Jicarilla Apache and Caucasian children of the Southwest including results from a pilot study among Eskimos and Athabascan school-age children of North Alaska* [Monograph #5]. Kennewick, WA: Human Environment Research Service.

- Bowekaty, M. B. (2002, Winter). Perspectives on research in American Indian communities. *Jurimetrics*, 42, 145-148.
- Bradley, C. (1984). Issues in mathematics education for Native Americans and directories for research. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 15(2), 96-106.
- Brendtro, L. K., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- Brenner, M. E. (1998). Adding cognition to the formula for culturally relevant instruction in mathematics. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 214-244.
- Brown, A. D. (1979). The cross-over effect: A legitimate issue in Indian education? In *Multicultural education and the American Indian* (pp. 55-74). Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.
- Brown, A. D. (1980). Cherokee culture and school achievement. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 4(3), 55-74.
- Browne, D. B. (1984). WISC-R scoring patterns among Native Americans of the Northern Plains. *White Cloud Journal*, 3(2), 3-16.

Browne, D. B. (1986a). *Learning styles and Native Americans*. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 297 906)

Browne, D. B. (1986b). *Whole language: An approach to reading that fits Native
American reading styles*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296
861)

Browne, D. B. (1990). Learning styles and Native Americans. *Canadian Journal of
Native Education*, 17(1), 23-35.

Browne, D. B., & Bordeaux, L. (1991). How South Dakota teachers see learning style
differences. *Tribal College*, 2(4), 24-26.

Bryant, H. W. (1986). *An investigation into the effectiveness of two-strategy training
approaches on the reading achievement of grade one Native Indian students*.
Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1991). *American Indians today: Answers to your questions*
(3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1998). *American Indian standards for mathematics education*.
Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Office of

Indian Education Programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
No. ED 420 487)

Burgess, B. J. (1978). Native American learning styles. In L. Morris, G. Sather, & S. Scull (Eds.), *Extracting learning styles from social/cultural diversity: A study of five American minorities* (pp. 41-53). Norman, OK: Southwest Teacher Corp. Network.

Butterfield, R. A. (1983). The development and use of culturally appropriate curriculum for American Indian students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 61(1), 49-66.

Butterfield, R. A. (1994). *Blueprints for Indian education: Improving mainstream schooling*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 898)

Cain, R., & Cain, G. (1991). *Teaching and the human brain*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cajete, G. A. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki.

Cajete, G. A. (1999). The Native American learner and bicultural science education. In K. G. Swisher & J. W. Tippeconnic III (Eds.), *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education* (pp. 133-160). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse and Rural Education and Small Schools.

Callaghan, V. A. (1969). *Mathematics in the Mayan, Aztec, and Inca cultures*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maine, Orono.

Calliou, S. (1998). Us/them, me/you: Who? (Re)Thinking the binary of First Nations and non-First Nations. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22(1), 28-52.

Cathey, M. (1980). Cultural differences in processing information. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 20(1), 23-29. (Incomplete bibliography reported by Cathey)

Cazden, C. B. (1982). Four comments. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Glatthorn (Eds.), *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education* (pp. 209-226). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Charter, A. (1996). Integrating traditional aboriginal teaching and learning approaches in post-secondary settings. In *Issues in the North* (Vol. 1). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403 091)

- Chilcott, J. H. (1985). Yaqui worldview and the school conflict and accommodation. *Journal of American Indian Education, 24*(1), 21-31.
- Chrisjohn, R. D., & Peters, M. (1989, Special Issue). The right-brained Indian: Fact or fiction? *Journal of American Indian Education, 77-83*.
- Churchill, W. (1994). *Indians are us? Culture and genocide in Native North America*.
Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Clarke, A. S. (1997). The American Indian child: Victims of the culture of poverty or cultural discontinuity? In R. D. Taylor & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *Social and emotional adjustment and family relations in ethnic minority families* (pp. 63-81). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cleary, L. M., & Peacock, T. D. (1998). *Collected wisdom: American Indian education*.
Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Closs, M. P. (1997). (Ed.). *Native American mathematics*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Connelly, J. B. (1983). Recategorized WISC-R score patterns of older and younger referred Tlingit Indian children. *Psychology in the Schools, 20*(3), 271-275.

Conti, G. J., & Fellenz, R. A. (1991). Teaching adults: Tribal colleges must respond to the update needs—and talents—of adult students. *Tribal College*, 2(4), 18-23.

Cornelius, C. (1999). *Iroquois corn in a culture-based curriculum: A framework for respectfully teaching about cultures*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Creative Associates. (1980). *State of the art report on mathematics achievement of students of Black, Hispanic, and Native American origins*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 194 319)

Das, J. P., Kirby, J., & Jarman, R. F. (1992). Simultaneous and successive synthesis: An alternative model for cognitive abilities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 82(1), 87-103.

Davidson, K. L. (1992). A comparison of Native American and White students' cognitive strengths as measured by the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children. *Roeper Review*, 14(3), 111-115.

Davison, D. M. (1989). An ethnomathematics approach to teaching language minority students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 776)

Davison, D. M. (1992). Mathematics. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian students* (pp. 241-250). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Dejong, D. H. (1993). *Promises of the past: A history of Indian education*. Golden, CO: North American Press.

Deloria, V., Jr. (2001). The perpetual education report. In V. Deloria, Jr. & D. R. Wildcat (Eds.), *Power and place: Indian education in America* (pp. 151-161). Golden, CO: Fulcrum Resources.

Deyhle, D. (1983). Measuring success and failure in the classroom: Teacher communication about tests and the understandings of young Navajo students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 61(1), 67-85.

Deyhle, D. (1995). Navajo youth and Anglo racism: Cultural integrity and resistance. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 403-444.

Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: From assimilation to self-determination. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 113-194). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Diessner, R., & Walker, J. L. (1989, Special Issue). A cognitive pattern of the Yakima Indian students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 84-88.

Dinges, N. G., & Hollenbeck, A. R. (1978). Field dependence-independence in Navajo children. *International Journal of Psychology, 13*(3), 215-220.

DuBray, W. H. (1985). American Indian values: Critical factor in casework. *Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 66*(1), 30-37.

DuBray, W. H. (1993). American Indian values. In W. DuBray (Ed.), *Mental health interventions with people of color* (pp. 33-59). Saint Paul, MN: West.

Dumont, R. V. (1972). Learning English and how to be silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 344-369). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Dunn, R., Gemake, J., Jalali, F., & Zenhausern R. (1990). Cross-cultural differences in learning styles of elementary-age students from four ethnic backgrounds. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 18*(2), 68-93.

Duran, E., & Duran, B. (1995). *Native American postcolonial psychology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Fixico, D. L. (1998). Ethics and responsibilities in writing American Indian history. In D. A. Mihesuah (Ed.), *Natives and academics: Researching and writing about American Indians* (pp. 84-99). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fleming, C. (1992). American Indians and Alaska Natives: Changing societies past and present. In M. Orlandi, R. Weston, & L. Epstein (Eds.), *Cultural competence for evaluators* (pp. 147-171). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Substance Abuse Prevention.
- Forbes, J. D. (2000). The new assimilation movement: Standards, tests, and Anglo-American supremacy. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 39(2), 7-28.
- Foreman, K. (1991a). A dramatic approach to Native teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 18(1), 73-80.
- Foreman, K. (1991b). Native teaching and learning/dramatic teaching and learning. *Youth-Theatre Journal*, 5(3), 16-20.
- Gardner, R. C. (1980, November 6-8). *Learning styles: What every teacher should consider*. Paper presented at the Rocky Mountain Regional Conference of the Fifth International Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 059)

- Garrett, J. T., & Garrett, M. W. (1994). The path of good medicine: Understanding and counseling Native Americans Indians. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 22*(3), 134-144.
- Garrett, M. T., & Pichette, E. F. (2000). Red as an apple: Native American acculturation and counseling with or without reservation. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*(1), 3-13.
- Garrett, M. T., & Wilbur, M. P. (1999). Does the worm live in the ground? Reflections on Native American spirituality. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 27*(4), 193-206.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gill, S. D. (1982). *Native American tradition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gilliland, H. (1999). *Teaching the Native American*. Dubuque, IO: Kendall Hunt.
- Good, C. V. (Ed.). (1973). *Dictionary of education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Good Tracks, J. G. (1973). Native American non-interference. *Social Work, 18*(6), 30-34.

Gould, S. J. (1996). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Green, R. (1977). *American Indian mathematics education: A report*. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Green, R. (1978). Math avoidance: A barrier to American Indian science education and science careers. *Bureau of Indian Affairs Education Research Bulletin*, 6(3), 1-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 084)

Greenbaum, P. E., & Greenbaum, S. D. (1983). Cultural differences, non-verbal regulation, and classroom interaction: Sociolinguistic interference in American Indian education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 61(1), 16-33.

Greymorning, S. (2000). Culture and language: The political realities to keep trickster at bay. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 20(1), 181-196.

Gridley, M. E. (1974). *American Indian women*. New York: Hawthorn.

Griffin, P. R. (2000). *Seeds of racism in the soul of America*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Guilmet, G. M. (1976). *The nonverbal American Indian child in the classroom: A survey*.
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 336)

Guthrie, R. V. (1998). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. Boston:
Allyn and Bacon.

Hadfield, O. D. (1990, October 12). *Mathematics anxiety in the Navajo reservation
school*. Paper presented at the annual National Convention of the School
Science and Mathematics Association, Cincinnati, Ohio. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 334 083)

Hall, M. (1991). Gadugi: A model of service-learning for Native American communities.
Phi Delta Kappan. 72(10), 754-757.

Halpin, G., Halpin, G., & Whiddon, T. (1980). The relationship of perceived parental
behaviors to locus of control and self-esteem among American Indian and white
children. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 111(2), 189-195.

Hamamsay, L. S. (1957). The role of women in a changing Navajo society. *American
Anthropologist*, 59(1), 101-111.

Hankes, J. E. (1993). A call for collaborative research to investigate the "Indian Math"
problem. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 387)

- Harris, J. H. (1985). Teaching to the right brain: Historical perspective on a contemporary educational fad. In C. T. Best (Ed.), *Hemispheric function and collaboration in the child* (pp. 231-274). New York: Academic Press.
- Harvey, K. D., Harjo, L. D., & Welborn, L. (1995). *How to teach about American Indians: A guide for the school library media specialist*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Haukoos, G. D., & Satterfield, R. (1986). Learning styles of minority students (Native Americans) and their application in developing a culturally sensitive science classroom. *Community Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 10(3), 193-201.
- Haynes Writer, J. (2001). Identifying the identified: The need for critical exploration of Native American identity within educational contexts. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(4), 40-47.
- Heffron, K. (1984). Native Indian children interface with computers. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 11(3), 15-26.
- Herring, R. D. (1999). *Counseling with Native American Indians and Alaska Natives: Strategies for helping professionals*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hilliard, A. G. (2001). Race, identity, hegemony, and education: What do we need to know now? In W. H. Watkins, J. H. Lewis, & V. Chou (Eds.), *Race and education: The roles of history and society in educating African American students* (pp. 7-33). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hollins, E. R. (1999). Becoming a reflective practitioner. In E. R. Hollins & E. I. Oliver (Eds.), *Pathways to success in school: Culturally responsive teaching* (pp. 11-28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Howard, G. R. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huff, D. J. (1997). *To live heroically: Institutional racism and American Indian education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Irvine, J. J., & Darlene, E. (1995). *Learning styles and culturally diverse students: A literature review*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 722)
- John-Steiner, V. (1975). *Learning styles among Pueblo children: Final report*. Washington, DC: National Institution of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 129 503)

John, V. P. (1972). Styles of learning—styles of teaching: Reflections on the education of Navajo children. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 331-343). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Jolly, E. (1996, February 14-17). *Inferential leadership: Lessons from Native American storytelling*. Proceedings of the fifth annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 543)

Jones, K., & Ongtooguk, P. (2002). Equity for Alaska Natives: Can high-stakes testing bridge the chasm between ideals and realities? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(7), 499-503.

Jordan, C. (1984). Cultural compatibility and the education of ethnic minority children. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(4), 59-71.

Karlebach, D. G. (1986). *A cognitive framework for deriving and interpreting learning style differences among a group of intermediate grade Native and Navajo non-Native pupils*. Unpublished dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Kaufman, A. S., & Kaufman, N. L. (1983). *Kaufman Assessment Battery for children*.
Minneapolis, MN: American Guidance Service, Circle Press.

Kaulback, B. (1984). Styles of learning among Native children: A review of the research.
Canadian Journal of Native Education, 11(3), 27-37.

Keefe, J. W. (1987). *Learning style: Theory and practice*. Reston, VA: National
Association of Secondary School Principals.

Killbride, P., & Robbins, M. (1968). Linear perspective, pictorial depth perception and
education among the Baganda. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 21(2), 161.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and miseducation of
teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 133-146.

Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding and empowering diverse learners in the ESL
classroom. In J. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp.
170-194). Boston, MA: Hienle & Heinle.

Kirby, J. R. (1984). *Cognitive strategies and educational performance*. New York:
Academic Press.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1973). Intellectual strengths in culturally different groups: An Eskimo illustration. *Review of Educational Research*, 43(3), 341-359.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1979). *Eskimo school on the Andreafsky: A study of effective bicultural education*. New York: Praeger.

Kleinfeld, J., & Nelson, P. (1991). Adapting instruction to Native Americans' learning styles: An iconoclastic view. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22(2), 273-282.

Kluckhohn, C., & Leighton, D. (1962). *The Navaho*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Book/American Museum of Natural History.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Klug, B. J., & Whitfield, P. T. (2002). *Widening the circle: Culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Lacy, L. E. (2002). *Creative planning resource for interconnected teaching and learning*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). The power of pedagogy: Does teaching matter? In W. H. Watkins, J. H. Lewis, & V. Chou (Eds.), *Race and education: The roles of history and society in educating African American students* (pp. 73-88). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lam-Phoon, S. A. (1985). A comparative study of learning styles of Southeast Asian and American Caucasian college students on two Seventh Day Adventist campuses. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 109A 2234. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrin Springs, MI, 1982)
- Landsman, J. (2001). *A white teacher talks about race*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.
- Leacock, E. (1976). The concept of culture and its significance for school counselors. In J. I. Roberts & S. K. Akinsanya (Eds.), *Schooling in the cultural context* (pp. 418-426). New York: David McKay Company.
- Leap, W. L., McNet, C., Cantor, J., Baker, R., Laylin, L., & Renker, A. (1982). *Dimensions of math avoidance among American Indian elementary school students* (Final Report). Washington, DC: The American University.
- Lee, D. (1976). *Valuing the self: We can learn from other cultures*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Levy-Bruhl, L. (1926). *How Natives think: Les Fonctions Mentales Dans Les Societes Inferieures*. London, England: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Lewis, R. G., & Ho, M. K. (1989). Social work with Native Americans. In D. R. Atkinson, G. Morten, & D.W. Sue (Eds.), *Counseling American minorities : A cross cultural perspective* (3rd ed., pp. 65-72). Dubuque, IA: Wm C. Brown.

Light, H. K., & Martin, R. E. (1985). Guidance of American Indian children: Their heritage and some contemporary views. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 25(1), 42-46.

Light, H. K., & Martin, R. E. (1986). American Indian families. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 26(1), 1-5.

Lippitt, L. (1993). *Integrating teaching styles with students' learning styles*. Washington, DC: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 068)

Lipinski, T. A. (1989). The role of vocational counseling for the American Indian student. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 10(1), 31-37.

Lipinski, T. A. (with colleagues). (1990). Visuospatial and verbal-sequential performance of rural remote Alaskan Native, Urban Alaskan Native, and Urban Alaskan white male children. *Research in Rural Education, 6*(3), 43-47.

Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1997). *Assessment and instruction of reading and writing disability: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Littlebear, R. E., & Martinez, A. (1996). *A model for promoting Native American Language preservation and teaching*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 395 736)

Little Soldier, L. (1989). Cooperative learning and the Native American student. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(2), 161-163.

Little Soldier, L. (1997). Is there an Indian in your classroom? Working successfully with urban Native American students. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(8), 650-653.

Lipka, J. (1994). Culturally negotiated schooling: Toward a Yup'ik mathematics. *Journal of American Indian Education, 33*(3), 14-30.

Lobo, S., & Peters, K. (2001). *American Indians and the urban experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Lomawaima, K. T. (2000). Tribal sovereigns: Reframing research in American Indian education. *Harvard Educational Review, 70*(1), 1-21.

Longstreet, W. S. (1978). *Aspects of ethnicity: Understanding differences in pluralistic classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lum, D. (1986). *Social work practice and people of color: A process-stage approach*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Macias, C. J. (1989, Special Issue). American Indian academic success: The role of Indigenous learning strategies. *Journal of American Indian Education, 43-52*.

Maclvor, M. (1999). Redefining science education for aboriginal students. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations' education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 73-98). Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Mather, J. R. C. (1997). How do American Indian fifth and sixth graders perceive mathematics and the mathematics classroom? *Journal of American Indian Education, 36*(2), 9-18.

Medicine, B. (1981). "Speaking Indian": Parameters of language use among American Indians. Arlington, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 052)

Messick, S. (1969). *The criterion problem in the evaluation of instruction*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 3-24.

McAlpine, L., Eriks-Brophy, A., Crago, M. (1996). Teaching beliefs in Mohawk classrooms: Issues of language and culture. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 27*(3), 390-413.

McDade, K. (1993). Multi-cultural perspectives on parenting. *Family Perspective, 27*(4), 323-346.

McShane, D. A., & Plas, J. M. (1994). Wechsler scale performance patterns of American Indian children. *School Psychology Review, 13*(1), 8-17.

Mihesuah, D. A. (1993). Suggested guidelines for institutions with scholars who conduct research on American Indians. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 17*(3), 131-139.

Mihesuah, D. A. (1998). American Indian identities: Issues of individual choices and development. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 22*(2), 193-226.

Miller, R. (1990). *What are schools for? Holistic education in American culture*. Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.

Mills, B. (1999). *Wokini: A Lakota journey to happiness and self-understanding*. Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.

Montgomery, W. (2001). Creating culturally responsive, inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 4-9.

Moore, C. G. (1982). *The Navajo culture and the learning of mathematics*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 708)

Moore, C. G. (1988a). The implication of string figures for American Indian mathematics education. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 28(1), 16-26.

Moore, C. G. (1988b). Mathematics-like principles inferred from the petroglyphs. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 27(2), 30-36.

More, A. J. (1984a). *Okanagan/Nicola Indian quality of education study*. Penticton: Okanagan Indian Learning Institute.

More, A. J. (1984b, July 25-27). *Learning styles and Indian students: A review of research*. Paper presented at the Mokakit Indian Education Research Conference, London, Ontario, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 028)

More, A. J. (1987). Native American learning styles: A review for researchers and teachers. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 27(1), 17-29.

More, A. J. (1989, Special Issue). Native Indian learning styles: A review for researchers and teachers. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 15-28.

More, A. J. (1990, August 13). *Learning styles of Native Americans and Asians*. Paper presented at the 98th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 535)

More, A. J. (1993). *Adapting teaching to the learning styles of Native Indian students*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 493)

Murk, P. (1994, November). *Learning styles and lessons from the medicine wheel: A Native American philosophy, a proposed integrated model*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, Nashville, Tennessee. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 387)

Myers, I., & McCaulley, M. (1985). *Manual: Guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nee-Benham, M. K. P., & Cooper, J. E. (Eds.). (2000). *Indigenous educational models for contemporary practice: In our mother's voice*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nel, J. (1994). Preventing school failure: The Native American child. *The Clearinghouse*, 67(3), 169-174.

Nelson, D., Joseph, G. G., & Williams, J. (1993). *Multicultural mathematics: Teaching mathematics from a global perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nuby, J. F. (1995). *Learning styles: A comparative analysis of the learning styles of Native American and African American secondary students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tuscaloosa, AL, University of Alabama.

Nuby, J. F., Ehle, M. A., & Thrower, E. (2001). Culturally responsive teaching as related to the learning styles of Native American students. In J. Nyowe & S. Abadullah (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Diverse perspectives* (pp. 231-271). Victoria, BC: Trafford Publishing Company.

Nuby, J. F., & Oxford, R. L. (1996, November 6-8). *Learning style preferences of Native American and African American secondary students as measured by the MBTI*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 422)

Nuby, J. F., & Oxford, R. L. (1997). Learning style preference of Native American and African American students as measured by the MBTI. *Journal of Psychological Type, 26*, 1-15.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2002). *Working group on Indigenous populations*. Retrieved August 6, 2002 from www.Unhchr.ch/indigenous/ind_wgip.htm

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Ortiz, A., & Garcia, S. (1988). A pre-referral process of preventing inappropriate referrals of Hispanic students to special education. In A. Ortiz & B. Ramirez (Eds.), *Schools and the culturally diverse student: Promising practice and future directions* (pp. 32-44). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Osborne, B. (1985). Research into Native North Americans' cognition: 1973-1982. *Journal of American Indian Education, 24*(3), 9-25.

Oxendine, J. B. (1988). *American Indian sports heritage*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Pepper, F. C. (1985). *Effective parent and community involvement practices. Effective practices in Indian education: A teacher's monograph*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Pepper, F. C., & Henry, S. L. (1986). Social and cultural effects of Indian learning style: Classroom implications. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 13*(1), 54-61.

Pewewardy, C. D. (1994). Culturally responsible pedagogy in action: An American Indian magnet school. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 77-92). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pewewardy, C. D. (1998a, June). Will the "Real" Indians please stand up. *MultiCultural Review, 7*(2), 36-42.

Pewewardy, C. D. (1998b). Our children can't wait: Recapturing the essence of Indigenous schools in the United States. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 22(1), 29-34.

Pewewardy, C. D. (1999). Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students. In E. R. Hollins & E. I. Oliver (Eds.), *Pathways to success in school: Culturally responsive teaching* (pp. 85-100). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pewewardy, C. D., & Willower, D. J. (1993). Perceptions of American Indian high school students in public schools. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 26(1), 52-55.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Reservation*. New York: Longman.

Pine, G. J., & Hilliard, A. G., III. (1990). Rx for racism: Imperatives for America's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(8), 593-600.

Porter, M. (1997). *Kill them before they grow: Misdiagnosis of African American boys in America's classrooms*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Presmeg, N. C. (1999). Culturally mediated instruction in mathematics: Strengths and barriers. In E. R. Hollins & E. I. Oliver (Eds.), *Pathways to success in school: Culturally responsive teaching* (pp. 35-46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Raburn, J. (1980). *Field independence and the effect of background music on film understanding and emotional responses of American Indians*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 412)

Radin, N., Williams, E., & Coggins, K. (1993). Paternal involvement in childrearing and the school performance of Native American children: An exploratory study. *Family Perspective*, 27(4), 375-391.

Red Horse, J. (1980). Family structure and value orientation in American Indians. *Social Casework*, 68(10), 462-467.

Red Horse, J. (1983). Indian family values and experiences. In G. J. Powell, J. Yamamoto, A. Romero, & A. Morales (Eds.), *The psychosocial development of minority group children* (pp. 258-272). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Renker, A. (1982). *Dimensions of math avoidance among American Indian elementary school students* (Final Report). Washington, DC: The American University.

Reyhner, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Teaching American Indian students*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rhodes, R.W. (1988). Holistic teaching/learning for Native American students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 27(2), 21-29.

Rhodes, R. W. (1989). Native American learning styles. *Journal of Navajo Education*, 7(1), 33-41.

Rhodes, R. W. (1990). Measurements of Navajo and Hopi brain dominance and learning styles. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 29(3), 29-40.

Robinson, R. (1987). Exploring students' images of the developing world. *Geographical Education*, 5(3), 48-52.

Robinson-Zanartu, C. (1996). Serving Native American children and families: Considering cultural variables. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 27(4), 373-384.

Ross, A. C. (1982). Brain hemispheric functions and the Native American. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 21(3), 2-5.

Ross, A. C. (1989, Special Issue). Brain hemispheric functions and the Native American. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 72-76.

Ross, R. (1996). *Returning to the teachings: Exploring aboriginal justice*. New York: Penguin Books.

Ryan, J. (1992). Aboriginal learning styles: A critical review. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 5(3), 161-183.

Samples, B. (1979). New modes of knowing. *Media and Methods*, 15(10), 39-41.

Sanders, D. (1987). Cultural conflicts: An important factor in the academic failures of American Indians. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 15(2), 81-90.

Sawyer, D. (1991). Native learning styles: Shorthand for instructional adaptations? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 18(1), 99-105.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.

- Schindler, D. E., & Davison, D. M. (1985). Language, culture, and the mathematics concept of American Indian learners. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 24(3), 27-34.
- Scott, S. A. (1979). Comparative linguistic processing, dichotic listening, and cerebral listening. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40(3-A), 1368-1369.
- Shepard, L. A. (1982). Definitions of bias. In R. A. Berk (Ed.), *Handbook of methods for detecting test bias*. Baltimore, MA: John Hopkins University Press.
- Shortman, P. V. (1990). Whole brain learning, learning styles and implications on teacher education. In M. M. Dupuis & E. R. Fagan (Eds.), *Teacher education: Reflection and change* (pp. 66-82). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 647)
- Slapin, B. (1998). Two plus two or why Indians flunk. In B. Slapin & Doris Seale (Eds.), *Through Indian eyes: The Native experience in books for children* (4th ed., p. 21). Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles American Indian Studies Center.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Sleeter, C. E. (1997). Mathematics, multicultural education, and professional development. *Journal of Research in Mathematics Education*, 28(6), 680-696.

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How White teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York: Routledge.

Spring, J. (1996). *The cultural transformation of a Native American family and its tribe, 1763-1995: A basket of apples*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spring, J. (2000). From the series editor. In Maenette Kape' ahiokalani Padeken Ah Nee-Benham & Joanne Elizabeth Cooper (Eds.), *Indigenous educational models for contemporary practice* (pp. xi-xiii). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spring, J. (2001). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States* (3rd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sra, D. (1990). *A comparison of East Indian American and European American students*. Unpublished manuscript.

Stairs, A. (1994). Indigenous ways to go to school: Exploring many visions. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15(1), 63-76.

Stairs, A. (1999). Learning processes and teaching roles in Native education: Cultural base and cultural brokerage. In M. Battiste & Jean Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 139-153). Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Stalvey, L. M. (1997). *Three to get ready: The education of a White family in inner city schools*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stauss, J. H. (1993). Reframing and refocusing American Indian family strengths. *Family Perspective*, 27(4), 311-321.

Steinberg, R. H. (1974). Psychometric and operative intelligence in an Indian school population. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 35(5-B), 2449.

Stellern, J., Collins, J., Gutierrez, B., & Patterson, E. (1986). Hemispheric dominance of Native American Indian students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 25(2), 8-17.

Swisher, K. G. (1990). Cooperative learning and the education of American Indian/Alaska Native students: A review of the literature and suggestions for implementation. *Journal of American Indian Education, 29*(2), 36-43.

Swisher, K. G. (1991). *American Indian/Alaska Native learning styles: Research and practice*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 175)

Swisher, K. G., & Dehyle, D. (1987). Styles of learning and learning of styles: Educational conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan Native youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8*(4), 345-360.

Swisher, K. G., & Dehyle, D. (1989, Special Issue). The styles of learning are different, but the teaching is just the same: Suggestions for teachers of American Indian youth. *Journal of American Indian Education, 1-14*.

Swisher, K. G., & Pavel, D. M. (1994). American Indian learning styles survey: An assessment of teacher knowledge. *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13*, 59-77.

Swisher, K. G., & Tippeconnic, J. W., III. (1999). Research to support improved practice in Indian education. In K. G. Swisher & J. W. Tippeconnic III (Eds.), *Next steps:*

Research and practice to advance Indian education (pp. 295-307). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse and Rural Education and Small Schools.

Szasz, M. C. (1999). *Education and the American Indian: The road to self-determination since 1928*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Tafoya, T. (1989, Special Issue). Coyote's eyes: Native cognition styles. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 29-42.

Tamaoka, K. (1986, October 17-19). *Congruence between learning styles of Cree, Diné, and Metis students, and instructional styles of Native and non-Native Teachers*. Paper presented at the Mokakit Conference of the Indian Education Research Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 667)

Taylor, D. H. (2001). Laughing till your face is red. *Red Ink*, 9.2(10.1), 80-84.

Taylor, R. L. (1994). *Minority families in the United States: A multicultural perspective* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tharp, R. G., & Yamauchi, L. A. (1994). *Effective instructional conversation in Native American classrooms*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 896)

Tharp, R. G., & Yamauchi, L. A. (1994). *Effective instructional conversation in Native American classrooms*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 896)

Tinker, G. E. (1993). *Missionary conquest: The gospel and Native American cultural genocide*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Tippeconnic, J. W., III. (1983). Training teachers of American Indian students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 61(1), 6-15.

Trent, J. H., & Gilman, R. A. (1985). Math achievement of Native Americans in Nevada. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 24(1), 39-45.

Vogt, L. A., Jordan, C., & Tharp, R. G. (1987). Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 276-286.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Ed. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Walker, B. J., Dodd, J., & Bigelow, R. (1989, Special Issue). Learning preferences of capable American Indians of two tribes. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 63-71.
- Wall, K., & Scott, M. (1990). Using Native American dice games to teach mathematics concepts. *Tower Review*, 7(2), 18-23.
- Wallis, P. (1984). Holistic learning—A must with American Indian students. *Momentum*, 14(1), 40-42.
- Ward, C. J. (1993). Explaining gender differences in Native American high school dropout rates: A case study of Northern Cheyenne schooling patterns. *Family Perspective*, 27(4), 415-444.
- Wauters, J. K., Bruce, J. M., Black, D. R., & Hocker, P. N. (1989, Special Issue). Learning styles: A study of Native American and non-Native Students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 53-62.
- Wax, M., Wax, R., & Dumont, R. (1989). *Formal education in an American Indian community*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Weaver, H. N. (2001). Indigenous identity: What is it, and who really has it? *American Indian Quarterly*, 25(2), 240-255.

Weenie, A. (2000). Post-colonial recovering and healing. In J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard, & W. S. Gilbert (Eds.), *Learn in beauty: Indigenous education for a new century* (pp. 65-70). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University, Center for Excellence in Education.

Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., Stubben, J. D., & LaFromboise, T. (2001). Traditional culture and academic success among American Indian children in the Upper Midwest. *Journal of American Indian Education, 40*(2), 48-60.

Whitman, N. C., Nohda, N., Lai, M. K., Hashimoto, Y., Iijima, Y., Isoda, M., & Hoffer, A. (1997). Mathematics education: A cross-cultural study. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(1), 215-232.

Whyte, K. J. (1986). Strategies for teaching Indian and Metis students. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 13*(3), 1-20.

Wickett, M. S. (1997). Uncovering bias in the classroom—a personal journey. *Yearbook* (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics), pp. 102-106.

Wilcox, D. J. (1996). *A visual strategy for teaching written expression: Meeting the challenge presented by students of Native American heritage*. Paper presented at the 14th annual Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Education

Research Association, Detroit Lakes, Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 543)

Wildcat, D. R. (2001). Prelude to a dialogue. In V. Deloria, Jr. & D. Wildcat (Eds.), *Power and place: Indian education in America* (p. vii). Golden, CO: Fulcrum Resources.

Willeto, A. A. A. (1999). Navajo culture and family influences on academic success: Traditionalism is not a significant predictor of achievement among young Navajos. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 38(2), 1-24.

Williams, R. A., Jr. (2000). Documents of barbarism: The contemporary legacy of European racism and colonization in the narrative traditions of federal Indian law. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 94-105), Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., Goodenough, D. R., & Cox, P. W. (1977). Field dependent and field independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 1-64.

Worthley, K. M. E. (1987). *Learning style factors of field dependence/field independence and problem solving strategies of Hmong refugee students*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Stout, Wisconsin.

Wyatt, J. D. (1978). Native involvement in curriculum development: The Native teacher as cultural broker. *Interchange: A Journal of Educational Studies*, 9(1), 17-28.

Yellow Bird, M. (1995). Spirituality in First Nations storytelling: A Sahnish-Hidatsa approach to narrative. Reflections: Narratives of professional helping. *A Journal for the Helping Professions*, 1(4), 65-72.

Yellow Bird, M. (2001). Critical values and First Nations peoples. In R. Fong & S. Furuto (Eds), *Cultural competent social work: Interventions* (pp. 61-74). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Yellow Bird, M., & Snipp, C. M. (2002). American Indian families. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *Minority families in the United States: A multicultural perspective* (pp. 227-249). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zinn, H. (1999). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.