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ABSTRACT

This dissertation used a mixed method to develop an analytical model from a random selection of one of eight secondary history textbooks for instances of Indians to determine if the textual content: 1) constructs negative or inaccurate knowledge through word choice or narratives; 2) reinforces stereotype portraits; 3) omits similar minority milestones in United States history and politics; and 4) contained the enactments of political milestones in the development of US history and politics with regard to personhood and sovereignty of the American Indian. The methods used to evaluate secondary history textbooks are content manifest and critical discourse analysis and a modification of Pratt’s ECO analysis which measures judgment values of descriptive terms. Data mining includes word choice, events, contributions, and governmental relations as these refer to the American Indian. Unexpected outcomes from this research resulted in a spider graph of four relational power axes to visually display diametrically opposed ideological discursive formations. Textbooks introduce students to authoritative content within the public school environment to impart national historical experiences that will shape their national identity, ideology and culture. Negative or inaccurate instances of the United States relationships with 566 American Indian Nations can affect social and political issues of Indian People today. This work will contribute to the field of American Indian Studies, Curriculum and Instruction, Cultural Studies, Critical Discourse, Critical Pedagogy, Indigenous Theory and Pedagogy, Popular Culture, Social Justice, Language Studies, Identity, Ethics, American Indian and Public Education.
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

In the age of digital information, students have begun to develop an attitude about nationalism and to discriminate differences between various genders, groups, cultures, and races outside the classroom. The rhetoric of informal spaces of public art, exhibits, museum collections, television, movies, and the internet remain at the forefront of these affective media communications. This media contributes to a social construct of knowledge. The potential target populations in constructing or maintaining an existing social definition of stereotypes are people who are different from the white mainstream Americans in skin color, religion, ethnic heritage, politics or gender:

Social constructions of social groups are created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion and the like. The social construction of knowledge refers to the way facts, experiences, beliefs, and events are constructed and certified as ‘true.’ (Schneider and Ingram as cited by Ashley & Jarratt-Ziemsaki, 1999, p. 57-58)

Beneficial or burdensome policies can be incorporated into legislation when the social constructs of the target population identify the social groups as either worthy or undeserving citizens of the United States. The early foundational social constructs of citizenship begins in the public schools for the majority of United States citizens. The public school curriculum relies substantially on textbooks as a source of knowledge.

In formal spaces, public schools carry a tremendous burden of educating students, the up-and-coming citizens, with a consensus of attitudes, values, and knowledge. The formal education of students’ cultural experiences and national attitudes occurs during
the reading of history textbooks. Textbooks introduce students to an authoritative content within the public school environment to impart national historical experiences that will shape their national identity, ideology, and culture (Hunter, 1995). Michael Apple and Linda Christina-Smith, editors of *Politics of the Textbook* (1991), contend that “what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations and struggles among identifiable class, race, gender/sex, and religious groups”. Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) assert that the context within a textbook produces cultural and national organized knowledge systems of a society. The written text is the dominant modality through which Western epistemology transfers knowledge. Research is a prime example of the power and validity associated with textual documentation and representation of knowledge.

The textbook becomes a political act in the production of curricula when it is framed by the dominant cultural ideology and affirms “the central values, interests, and concerns of the social class in control of the material and symbolic wealth of society” (McLaren, 1989, p. 172). Religious groups dominated the central education of settlers, immigrants, and early Indian education. The United States (US) government began to look at textbooks as a way of regulating information being disseminated by teachers (Apple, 1991). After the Civil War, the government was compelled to create stability and unity by promoting a national culture through textbook regulation. Racial segregation and state regulation of curricula and textbooks sought to minimize civil discourse through the practice of objectivity influenced by the Populist movement (Kearl, 2011). Textbook publishing became profitable and corruptible as districts, states, and government agencies
adopted purchasing policies (Hunter, 1995; Ravitch, 2004). The business of textbook publishing has continued to focus on profit which is directly related to textbook adoption policies and timelines. The objectives and concerns involved with textbook adoption ride the storms of political agendas, not the accumulated knowledge or progression of American society.

Public discourse of the content in textbooks occurs after large social changes, such as the advances made by the Civil Rights movement. Another example of social change in textbooks is the case of African American representation in the Civil War era, and the “freedom” or humanization that began after this period of internal conflict in American history. A third example occurred in 1920 when World War I had influenced the women’s right to vote and increased equality for women’s liberation in American society. This research revealed current issues about textbook bias are being debated in many locations across the United States.

The Texas State Board of Education in 2010 decided to change attitudes in their textbook content to promote their designated forefathers who reflected Christian values and eliminated civil rights activists, Caesar Chavez and Thurgood Marshall, from the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) test (Blake, 2010; Shorto, 2010). This prejudice affects over 4.7 million Texas schoolchildren and our nation’s future voters. The first link in the domino effect the Texas textbook adoption policy will have on the country nationally will start with California, then New Mexico, and then all other open territories (Jobrack, 2012, loc. 577- 590). The purchasing power of Texas textbook
adoption policy affects what goes into print nationally and limits the availability of unbiased history.

Another example is legislation in Arizona that bans ethnic studies in public schools and withholds funding from any school that does not comply. The Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) took Arizona state legislation further and banned books of diverse ethnic and cultural studies from the public schools. The removal of seven oppositional books:

*Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* by Rodolfo Acuña,
*Rethinking Columbus: The next 500 Years* by Bill Bigelow,
*Critical Race Theory* by Richard Delgado,
*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by Paulo Freire,
*Message to AZTLAN* by Rodolfo Gonzales,
*500 Years of Chicano History in Pictures* by Elizabeth Martinez(ed.), and
*Chicano! The History of the Mexican Civil Rights Movement* by Arturo Rosales from the Mexican-American Studies (MAS) classrooms are in response to a list generated through Judge Lewis Kowal’s decision (Herreras, 2012) that MAS promoted “social or political activism against white people” (Wallechinsky & Brinkerhoff, 2011). Apple (2000) classifies text, supplemental readings, or books that are not part of the textbook as “oppositional” readings that challenge the “doxa” of American history. Doxa is what Pierre Bourdieu (1977) defined as society’s common knowledge, social construction of knowledge, or official truths. Stereotypes and prejudice are the doxa in public discourse
that remains unchallenged in the textbooks when omission of the target population’s experiences in the social and political development of United States are not addressed.

Exposure to the formal or official knowledge and facts about US government and history (civics) begins in the public school. The accepted official knowledge base of US history and the emergence of a nation are presented in classroom textbooks. Textbooks play an integral role in the reproduction of the selective tradition of American history:

While there have been significant advances in how textbooks depict the experiences of previously marginalized groups such as women, African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, and the poor since the 1960s, textbooks continue to include these groups through the limiting practice of mentioning [omission], which limits the possibility of resistant teachings or readings of textbooks. This is because […] textbooks abject knowledge [is] deemed unfit for the curricular body of American history. (Kearl, 2011)

Profits and kickbacks have influenced textbook publishing to accommodate the larger markets produced by state adoption policies such as in Texas, California, and Florida who generate one-third of total revenue. This net profit was 5.5 billion dollars for K-12 school textbooks and 4.55 billion dollars in Higher Education in 2010 as reported by the Association of American Publishing (AAP). “Educational publishers are defensive about their products. They have constructed a powerful trade association--the school division of the Association of American Publishers--to protect their positions. AAP lobbyists in Sacramento, Austin, and Tallahassee are determined to preserve the lucrative business of state adoptions” (Phi Delta Kappan, 2005, retrieved from American Textbook Council,
2012). According to the Phi Delta Kappan (2005), article “Textbook Publishing” the business of textbook publishing produces an inferior selection of outdated manuscripts that no longer rely on authors who are experts in their field, but contributors, censors, and special pleaders concerned about their interests and goals.

Publishing companies’ prime objective is profit and that means they will produce what increases the potential adoption of their textbooks. The publisher whose textbook is accepted by the state adoption policies of Texas “is guaranteed to generate significant revenue” (Jobrack, 2012, loc. 577). With a baseline set by Texas, “the publisher will incorporate the other states’ guidelines and then produce a national edition for the open territory states and New Mexico. It would be cost prohibitive to create a completely different program for each state” (loc. 583). The textbooks adopted by Texas will influence the nation’s core curriculum and, according to Jobrack’s insider knowledge, will contain minor adjustments to be “Californiaorized,” then submitted to New Mexico and other open territory states. In the publishing marketplace, “open territory” is defined as states, districts or schools that do have a textbook adoption policy. “There are 21 ‘adoption’ states, where state funds can only be used to buy books on an approved list. In other states, publishers sell freely to thousands of individual districts. But the adoption states, especially California and Texas, set the pattern for the whole country” (NEA, 2012). According to the National Education Association there is a political solidity on the issue of textbook adoption based on research presented by Loewen and Ravitch to eliminate it.
Other historical factors that influence changes in textbook content have been social and political movements such as those seen during the Civil War and Civil Rights Movement, or a presidential change of office. Modern American Indians make up less than two percent of the American population\(^1\), hardly enough to influence the textbook market or create a social movement. The modern American Indians’ status as a minority in the US population should not be an issue when one of the five criteria released in March 1, 2012 by State Instructional Materials Review Association (SIMRA) states that there be “Equity and Accessibility: [curriculum] Materials are free from bias in their portrayal of ethnic groups, gender, age, disabilities, cultures, religion, etc., and contain accommodations for multiple learning styles, students with exceptionalities, English Language Learners, and cultural differences” (SIMRA, 2012). Portrayal of the struggles and strife experienced by people of diverse heritage in American society will create an understanding of unresolved racial tensions and stereotype issues that plague social cohesion.

Americans’ heritage and history have been built on American Indians’ knowledge and resources as articulated in a Western paradigm of prosperity and property. Discussion of the government’s treatment and policies toward American Indians is limited, if mentioned at all, in United States history or civic textbooks (Hunter, 1995). Studies of the official representation or education about the American Indian in history textbooks conducted since 1970 (Barclay, 1996; Cadwell-Wood & Mitten, 1992; Costo & Henry, \(^1\) Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/cb09-ff20.html)
1970; Sanchez, 1996) revealed “distortion, omission, over-representation, romanticism, and tokenism” (Sanchez, 2007, p. 312). Tony Sanchez’s (2007) most recent study concluded that there were improvements in terms of depth and accuracy in textbooks from 1998 to 2003, but they still contained “unexplained generalizations, omissions, and other inaccuracies” (p. 316). Five of fifteen history textbooks examined by Sanchez had a rating of 1 out of 5, with 1 “indicating a sketchy, distorted, and generally poor diction of Native cultures” (p. 314). The publication dates of 2003 and 2004 for three of the history textbooks in Sanchez’s study indicate a possible trend toward inaccurate or omitted representation of American Indians. The textbooks surveyed by Sanchez that poorly-rated were the most recent published: *America: Pathways to the Present—Modern American History* by Andrew R. L. Cayton, Elisabeth Israels Perry, Linda Reed, Allan M. Winkler (2003), published by Pearson Prentice Hall; *America: Past and Present* by Robert A. Divine, T.H. Breen, George M. Fredrickson and R. Hal Williams (2003); *Out of Many, 4th Edition* by John Mack Faragher, Mari Jo Buhle, Daniel H. Czitrom and Susan H. Armitage (2004). Three textbooks rated a 4 were published between 1997 and 1998, none of the 15 history textbooks surveyed received the highest score of 5.

The United States, a democratic government, agrees that its citizens should be treated equally and have equal rights. In 1924 the Indian Citizenship Act granted citizenship to all indigenous people located within the United States. This Act of Congress did not bring full citizenship, religious freedom, and voting rights to all Indians. Seven states discriminated against American Indians’ dual citizenship status “based on exemption from real estate taxes and the mistaken notion that Indians were under
guardianship, or lived on lands controlled by federal trusteeship” (Peterson, 1957, p. 121). In 1978, the establishment of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act allowed American Indians to practice, express, and exercise their traditional religions.

Equity for all citizens, regardless of race, ethnicity, class, and gender is a foremost concern for multicultural educational reform. *The Journal of Social Issues* introduces James Banks as the “father of multicultural education” (Banks, 2006, p. 607) for his reform of Black representation in textbooks:

> The stereotypical racist images in textbooks were contrasted with what and who he knew of people in his family and community. These experiences and his early contemplations about “why were the slaves represented as being happy in textbooks?” (Banks, 2006, p. 2), set the stage for Banks’ indelible legacy to intergroup relations. . . .Banks stresses that interventions must take into account the diversity of participants or students; what may work for one group, say the majority group, may not necessarily work for minority groups.” (Editors’ introduction, Banks, 2006, p. 607)

Banks’ (1993) article “Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice” discusses inequality within education. He presents five major goals of multicultural education curriculum reform: (a) content integration, (b) knowledge construction, (c) prejudice reduction, (d) equitable pedagogy, and (e) an empowering school culture and social structure. A prime example of the powerful influence of educational reform and civil rights that has occurred is the inclusion of Black history, Black culture, and African civilizations in textbooks and in academia. Banks concludes
that representation and inclusion can affect racial attitude positively. His research “indicates that the experiences—as well as the intergroup attitudes—of racial and ethnic groups in the United States has to be described in less global and more nuance and complex ways” to assist students in developing “positive intergroup attitudes” (Banks, 2006, p. 608). The American Indian, however, has been historically disregarded in history, cultural diversity, civilizations, and politics in textbooks.

The formation of literature on indigenous societies has been written as if indigenous societies were not complex, had little to contribute to modern progress, and are vanishing. Indigenous scholars and other culture-conscious researchers question the many anthropological and historical studies that have been the foundations of tribal specific data for bias and misinformation. A clash of ideologies, Western and Indigenous, has led Americans to believe that Indians must fully give up their heritage and rights to appreciate the nation’s prosperity. American Indians continue to adapt their dual citizenship to maintain their language, culture, and political rights as US citizens. This struggle has largely been obscured in textbooks and could be addressed in topics such as that of Manifest Destiny and the Dawes Act.

Cornel Pewewardy (1998) affirms in “Fluff and Feathers: Treatment of American Indians in the Literature and the Classroom,” that there exists a significant “need for culturally responsive teachers for American Indian children in American schools today. According to Vavrus (1997), public school educators as a group have a colonial mind set” (p. 69). As cited by Pewewardy, there are three obstacles identified by Almeida (1996) that impede efforts in education reform in educating American Indian students: 1)
lack of training, 2) racist portrayals of Native Americans in the larger society, and 3) difficulties in locating sources of trustworthy materials (p. 69). These concerns point to the omissions and lack of quality information about American Indians, which reinforces popular images, stereotypes, and mis-information. These portrayals are rarely challenged or recognized by mainstream educational systems, or by the students.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) defines American Indian or Alaska Native as a person who is a member of a federally recognized tribe or village (FRTV) in the United States. “A federally recognized tribe is an American Indian or Alaska Native tribal entity that is recognized as having a government-to-government relationship with the United States, with the responsibilities, powers, limitations, and obligations attached to that designation, and are eligible for funding and services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.”\(^2\) The United States Census allows the self-identification of a person as American Indian and Alaska Native without verified membership in a FRTV. The US Census uses the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) 1997 classification as “‘American Indian or Alaska Native’ refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.”\(^3\) The self-identified American Indian could be excluded from membership of a FRTV due to enrollment policies of each FRTV, many of which require a Certificate of Degree of Indian Blood (CDIB) or Certificate of Degree of Alaska


Native. The CDIB requirement may prove an individual to be a full blooded American Indian, but when their ancestors originate from different tribes, they may not enroll in either of their parents’ FRTV. This trend in FRTV policies may be the demise of FRTV as each generation diminishes the FRTV members.

In this examination, the term "Indian," and other associated terms such as American Indian, native, Native American, and indigenous, will include any indigenous people who lived during or survived the colonization of North America, and are represented in history textbooks. Tribal-specific research data will be defined by using the name associated with the archived research and the preferred cultural-historical name of the referenced American Indians. The delimitation of this research is the focus on one racial minority, the American Indian, within the United States. The digitally accessible textbooks reviewed are not the complete scope of publications in circulation. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval will not be required because this study is an exploratory survey of public textbooks, will not include more than three case studies, and will not engage living human subjects.

Significance of the Study

"'You mean to tell me that Indians still exist? I thought they were all gone.' This statement came from a student in an introductory college-level history class in which we were discussing Native American responses to European contact and conquest” (Wadsworth, 2006, para. 1). The findings of this survey of American Indian representation will assist educators such as Wadsworth in understanding how textbook bias can affect social relationships and construe stereotypical attitudes in students, such
as reported by Denise Barragan (2000) in her research, *Native Americans in Social Studies Curriculum: An Alabama Case Study*, and in case studies about mascots conducted by Stephanie Fryberg (2002), *Really? You don't look like an American Indian: Social Representations and Group Identities*. The social and economic well-being of students who identify as American Indian is at risk when misrepresentation, omission, generalizations, redirections, and inaccuracies place students in a position to defend, describe, contend, or represent *all* American Indians.

Tribal relationships with local, state, and federal government become strained when policymakers work with knowledge that may be biased by Indian and European conflicts that occurred during colonization or limited by the official textbook knowledge or American Indians’ resistance to colonial rule (Bruyneel, 2007). This research strives for critical discourse about power relationships inherent in textbook production, and investigates if there is a need for textbook reform in American Indian representation.

James O. Barbre’s (2006) *Power of Depiction: A Textual Analysis of Secondary-Level History Books Currently in Use in Toronto, Ontario and Stillwater, Oklahoma* states, “the legitimacy inherent in any historical account lies in the power of depiction” (p. 1). Historical depiction of the colonization of North America has been a traditional story of uncivilized and underdeveloped land populated by indigenous people and their respective nations who were treated as criminals and captives by a developing nation of Europeans.

A known issue about American Indian representation is the tendency for all Indian nations and tribal societies to be portrayed as one race. This leads the novice to
assume that all Indians share the same social-cultural histories, beliefs, experiences, knowledge, and physical characteristics (Henry, 1970; Fryberg, 2002; Mihesuah, 2004; Tehee, 2010). The complexity of tribal societies that have survived colonization and efforts to terminate them are evident in political relationships between the 566 federally recognized tribes and the US government. In addition to the recognized tribes or nations, there exist 70 state-recognized tribes⁴, for a total of 636 American Indian Tribes within US borders. The average US citizen may not be exposed to the histories, contributions, societies, politics, and treaties that have negotiated the sovereignty of each federally recognized tribe, but the legacies of each federally recognized tribe or Indian nation are a part of the founding history that all Americans share. The American history textbook should depict the political and governmental relationships with the American Indian nations and policies that forged the expansion and colonization of the United States.

Richard J. Paxton’s (1999) article, “A Deafening Silence: History Textbooks and the Students Who Read Them,” compares and contrasts the history textbooks created for kindergarten through secondary schools, and for adult audiences. Paxton’s findings conclude that “students rarely questioned the trustworthiness of their textbooks, nor do they question [an] author’s intent or search for possible bias” (p. 321). In 2008, James W. Loewen’s Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Book Got Wrong stressed that there exists a lack of inquiry and critical thinking from students using textbooks as their primary source of instruction. The formulation of social history in

⁴ The term "State recognized tribe" means any tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community--(l) that has been recognized as an Indian tribe by any State. Retrieved Feb 27, 2012 from http://definitions.uslegal.com/i/indian-tribe/
America history textbook production is relative to ten major historical themes, most of which reflect US military involvement and social archetypes that demonstrate European superiority. Loewen updated the first edition of his book in 1995 to include six more textbooks, including a recent edition of The American Pageant (2006), The American Journey (2000), The Americans (2007), America: Pathways to the Present (2005), A History of the United States (2005) and Holt American Nation (2003). Loewen proposed that public opinion comprised of parents influenced publishers’ content and adoption committees. Are adoption committees influenced by parents or social paradigms and profit margins?

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this dissertation is to evaluate eight history textbooks for occurrences or associations of the term “Indian,” and to determine what the textual content is constructing as a knowledge base for students through: 1) word choice or narratives, and 2) the enactments of political milestones in the development of US history and politics with regard to personhood and sovereignty of the American Indian. This study will investigate if the primary and occasionally mandated sources in classroom instruction, the history textbooks, communicate prejudice about the American Indian. The issue is that if textbooks contain bias that is not distinguishable between historical stereotypes or popular media representations of the American Indian, then there is no official knowledge or accurate historic evidence to contest inaccurate media or outdated information about them. The modern American Indian well-being and social relations are affected (Fryberg, 2002; Tehee, 2007) not only personally, but also politically (Cook-Lynn, 2007; Deloria, 1995; Ashley & Jarratt-Ziemski, 1999; Bruyneel, 2007).

The manifest analysis will lead this inquiry and provide words for Evaluation Coefficient (ECO) analysis, a quantitative instrument, designed by David Pratt (1972). To address limits found in the first two methods, the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will evaluate word choice, events, contributions, omissions, and government relations in the textual discourse about American Indians.

Research Questions:

The following wide-ranging research question directs this study: Whose interest, needs, and concerns does the text represent when informing the reader about American
Indians? A quick review of a history textbook found that a section dedicated to the voting rights of citizens of the US failed to mention the date and history of American Indians’ right to vote. If students have no information about the progression of United States and federally recognized tribal members, they will act on issues, such as the sovereignty of Indian Nations’ property, mineral, water, and civil rights, from the perspective of a conqueror with paternalistic motives. In 1999, former governor of Minnesota, Jesse Ventura worked from his limited knowledge of the Chippewa’s sovereignty and rights granted in their 1837 treaty with the United States, and stated: “If those rules apply [treaty], then they ought to be back in birch-bark canoes instead of 200-horsepower Yamaha engines with fish finders” (as cited by Bruyneel, 2007, introduction, loc. 50).

Omissions about the dual citizenship of American Indians and their treaties in Ventura’s education diminish the presence, existence, needs, and interests of a modern American Indian Nation, the Chippewa. The invisibility of historical relationships with the federal and state government, as demonstrated by Ventura, displayed a common prejudice about federally recognized American Indian Tribes. According to Jeffrey Ashley and Karen Jarratt-Ziemski (1999):

Failure to dispel stereotypes is of particular concern because several scholars have noted how certain target populations become socially constructed as either "deserving" or "undeserving" groups, and further that "deserving" groups generally become beneficiaries of public policies while "undeserving" groups ("the other") remain targets of public policymaking that serves to disadvantage them. (p. 57)
Similar omissions serve to support a hegemonic culture whose moral abjection of the historical treatment of the American Indian remains in the shadows of current political and social issues such as who can teach indigenous languages, whose culture and history will be taught, and what policies govern Indian people. In order to answer these research questions, this investigation poses further questions to be considered:

1) How are American Indians portrayed in secondary history textbooks? Is the information obscure or rich in detail? Is there diversity in tribal-specific representation?

2) Is there inherent bias (Curwen, 1978; Pratt, 1972) or misdirection in the discourse within those texts?

3) Are there omissions of important history?; and

4) Is there evidence of modern nations and their people?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this dissertation focuses on critical discourse and indigenous theory. Critical discourse analysis approaches the text within the social political issues to understand factors that influence power, justice, and equality. Indigenous theory is a new area in academia, and this work will contribute to the corpus of indigenous research, whose scholars have diverse expertise in various disciplines.

Critical Discourse

In this evaluation the researchers and their methods of inquiry incorporated are Norman Fairclough’s *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (1995)
for the framing the institution and relationships of power. Sandy Grande’s *Red Pedagogy* (2004) is a critical theory, “that remains rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis” (p. 166). Fairclough’s discussion of relationships of power as reproduced through institutions, and the ideological frames between citizens will provide a grounding framework for this research. This investigation mainly draws from these four sections from Fairclough: 1) language, ideology and power, 2) discourse and sociocultural change, 3) textual analysis in social research, and 4) critical language awareness (p. ix, 1995). His analysis of social institutions found that they constrain “subjects” (people who are members of, or employed by a social institution) as a qualifying condition of membership through an institutional ideology and the supporting language code (p. 39, 1995). Textbooks are an extension of the social framework of the institution’s economic and political power as an ideological representation and an extension into public discourse.

As defined by Fairclough, “ideological discursive formations” and their reproductions in language are “naturalized” and enter into the “public” discourse as a matter of “accepted” fact (p. 42, 1995). The position of the representation is “determined by the state of class struggle” (Pecheux as cited in Fairclough, 1995, p. 40). Instances of ideological representations or ideological discursive formations are expressed in languages, texts, or images. In the instance of a representation, this “common knowledge” or “official knowledge” (Bourdieu, 1977) is transferred to each successive generation and contains the potential of rarely having its historical significance contested. Exactly how a symbol or image gains a popular definition and becomes “common sense”
or “naturalized” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 27-53) in a society is dependent on two factors: exposure and discourse. A concrete example of this occurs in public art.

Signs, symbols, or public art are visual metaphors that are constructed and accepted by the political or social climate, whose meaning is translated by social institutions, transferred from the dominant society to frame the other as discussed by Derrida (1986), and resist contested epilogue. An example is the Oñate statue commissioned and erected in El Paso, Texas (Valadez, 2008). In 1895, the Spanish Conquistador Juan de Oñate was appointed to colonize what are now the states of New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado. He terrorized the Acoma, Hopi, and Zuni communities by authorizing the maiming of Indian men, raping of Indian women, and placing survivors into servitude from each township. Establishing the monolithic Oñate statue in the colonized territories of persecuted Indian tribes who experienced these atrocities incites historical distress to their descendants, and inflicts psychological trauma. The meaning of monolithic public images are created, shaped, funded, and reproduced through privileges by an institutional frame which convey the ideological discourse and practice “constrained by social conventions, norms, [and] histories” (Fairclough, p. 71). In colonized societies such as the United States, institutions like museums, local, state, and national governments, schools, and other academic settings historically perpetuate colonial conquest through the informal and official education of a nation’s citizens (Fairclough, 1995; Foucault, 1972; Willinsky, 1998). The glorification of Oñate signifies that his actions were just and were praiseworthy to the public officials and the institution of the McKee Foundation in El Paso, Texas.
Imagery creates a profound and powerful discourse which, when introduced into educational curriculum material, becomes embedded in the foundation of the learner’s knowledge. The utilization of imagery and art can indicate a meaning or imply a history that fits into a normalized schema constructed by the dominant society and sustained by prevailing political attitudes. The meaning associated with an image is employed by the dominant society and structures of power expressing cultural values and is reinforced through textual descriptions.

In the same context, the textbook reproduces ideological discursive formations as “naturalized,” or common sense in the social institution of the school. “Ideological discursive formations” are what is said and what can be said within an institutional setting. In Misty Rodeheaver’s (2009) dissertation, *An Analysis of US History Textbooks: The Treatment of Primary Sources*, the “dominant discursive” in historical text is the effort for the content to be based in fact. The interpretation, however, promotes the major stakeholders’ ideas of American national identity, such as demonstrated in Texas’s recent changes in their textbook adoption policies and state standards.

In the framing of a public institution such as public schools, one cannot ignore the economic commodity of the textbook. What textbook sells in Texas and California is often what is reprinted with slight modifications and then made available to smaller districts and schools. The textbooks “are published within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources, and power” (Allen Luke as cited in Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, p. 2). Beverlee Jobrack (2012) provides an insider’s perspective about textbook publishers in her book, *Tyranny of the Textbook: An Insider Exposes How*
Educational Material Undermines Reform. Jobrack contends that “curriculum is the substance of what is taught,” (loc. 72), but a focus group of teachers who review textbooks were captured by cover design and “cleverly” labeled features not curriculum design (loc. 202). She defines curriculum “as the teaching, learning, and assessment activities and materials that are organized and available to teach a given subject area” (loc. 72). Her position as editor in Merrill publishing was transitioned in twenty years to three other publishing companies. While working for McGraw-Hill, she saw the acquisition of “Optical Data, Open Court, the Tribune educational properties, along with several other companies” (loc. 215). Jobrack found that design, highlighted labeling and appealing features were primary factors in textbook sales, not research-based strategies or effective learning materials.

In 1962, the Open Court Publishing Company founded by Blouke Carus, an engineer by profession, created children’s books to increase the reading ability of children and introduce them to classic literature. He had a personal interest, his own child was not learning in the public school system. Carus created and tested his books for the schools and the books proved to substantiate his success with measured results of higher reading scores. Open Court failed to procure the funds for textbook adoption in California. “In 1996, the company was sold to SRA/McGraw-Hill, which revised the books to meet the market's demands, enjoyed the right political climate, and saw the healthy sales that eluded the Carus family” (Ravitch, 2007, p. 80). It was the institutional framework, political discourse, social constructs, and the “fads” of American education
that killed the economic success and production of meaningful content. Anyon (1979) as cited by Hunter (1995) stated:

If school knowledge is examined as a social product, it suggests a great deal about society that produces and uses it. It reveals which groups have power. Omissions, stereotypes and distortions that remain, [in] “updated” social studies textbook accounts of Native Americans, Blacks, and woman reflect the relative powerlessness of these groups. (p. 382)

Omission has become a powerful method in controlling whose story is told in history textbooks.

The paternal voice in the establishment of American government began by segregating the American citizens through gender, race, and ownership of property. “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness—,” only White European men had rights and freedoms afforded by the Declaration of Independence. In 1852, Frederick Douglass contested the Declaration of Independence statement that “these truths…all men are created equal” in his oration of “The Meaning of July Fourth for the Negro”:

I say it with a sad sense of the disparity between us. I am not included within the pale of glorious anniversary! Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us. The blessings in which you, this day, rejoice, are not enjoyed in common. — The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity
and independence, bequeathed by your fathers, is shared by you, not by me. (as cited by Stampp, K. M., & Foner, P. S., October 01, 1952)

Douglass bravely stated the obvious before the Civil War and ratification of the 14th Amendment in granting citizenship to “those born as slaves” in 1868. Two years later, in 1870, the 15th Amendment would be ratified to allow Black people to vote.

In comparison, American Indians would not be granted citizenship until after World War I to honor the patriotism of over 8,000 American Indian soldiers, and 6,000 who were volunteers. In 1924, Congress passed the Indian Citizenship Act which extended citizenship and voting rights to all American Indians. Religious freedom was not enjoyed by American Indians until 1978 with the passing of American Indian Freedom of Religion Act which states:

On and after August 11, 1978, it shall be the policy of the United States to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and Native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites" (Public Law 95-341, 42 U.S.C. 1996 and 1996a).

Over two-hundred years in suppression of the unalienable Right to religious freedom almost eliminated many American Indian nations’ culture, language, and knowledge. Textbook bias is not limited to gender, race, class, or nationality, but religious preferences, unless you’re a Christian from Texas.

---

Indigenous Theory

Indigenous Theory crosses disciplines as proposed by Elvira Pulitano’s (2002) *Towards a Native American Critical Theory*: “Some of the most recent critical works produced by Native American authors signal the beginning of what I refer to as a ‘Native American critical theory,’ a complex hybridized project, in which Western discursive strategies are subsumed within the narratives of Native American oral traditions and Native epistemologies” (p. vii). The diversity of the American Indians of North America and their scholars is evident in historical cultural and political references, linguistics, archeology, and Native American studies in academia. Material for American Indian Studies crosses disciplines from anthropology, education, law, and history, to name only a few. Pulitano points to the collective American Indian scholars in her study as having “cultural and ideological diversity” (p. 288), making it challenging to have one approach or methodology. She does find two common assumptions within the scholarship:

1. The idea of inscribing the functions and nature of the oral tradition onto the written page, revitalizing and re-imagining a tradition too often reduced, in the Euramerican imagination, to merely cultural artifact and too often theorized as a symbol of the predicted vanishing race. . . .

2. The idea of conveying in writing the dynamic quality of the oral exchange so that, despite the confinement of the printed text, the vitality and power of language are still maintained. (p. 287-288).

The practice of categorizing American Indians as a “cultural artifact” and a “vanishing race” form an ideological position of unequal economic and political power allowing the
Western epistemology to dominate. When the official instruction of textbooks within public schools characterizes American Indians in positions of powerlessness, with low status, and as irrelevant to a student’s knowledge base of American nationality, such “ideological discursive formations” reproduce and carry forth the unimportance of American Indian history and of modern American Indians. “Indians have been represented as savages and Caucasians have been portrayed as superior to Indian people (Wood, 1981 as cited by Hunter, 1995, p. 3). The knowledge base of the average American’s education about the US begins in the public schools. The core curriculum is divulged from the textbooks. Depictions or omissions build the cognitive foundation of future citizens who will face issues based on their early experiences and knowledge. If those associations or the ideological discursive formations are not addressed in the K-12 setting, adults have to rethink and re-educate themselves to make sound decisions that are not based on their early public education.

The contemporary Indian stereotype associations of savage, enemy, and terrorizing can be seen in the public discourse of the news and government code words. The naming and use of “Geronimo” (as cited from an interview with PBS NewsHour, CIA Director Leon Panetta) as a secret code word for Osama bin Laden during the Navy Seals’ raid to kill America’s contemporary terrorist” (Juan Gonzalez, PBS NewsHour, Democracy Now, May 6, 2010). Geronimo is a famous Apache patriot who fought to preserve Apache values and personhood against US and Mexican forces in the 19th century after his family was murdered by invading colonists. American Indian author and
activist, Winona LaDuke’s response to the code name was, "The reality is that the military is full of native [Indian] nomenclature. You’ve got Black Hawk helicopters, Apache Longbow helicopters. You’ve got Tomahawk missiles. The term used when you leave a military base in a foreign country is to go 'off the reservation, into Indian Country.' So what is that messaging that is passed on? It is basically the continuation of the wars against indigenous people” (PBS NewsHour, 2011). If one substitutes the code word for Osama bin Laden with Custer or Jefferson, the discrimination becomes apparent.

Jefferson’s Indian policies of termination and expansion of US territory into the land occupied by the Cherokee was considered “peaceful and reasonable” through legislation of the Georgia Compact (1803) and then the Indian Removal Act (1830). The leading books on the Jacksonian period, written by respected historians (The Age of Jackson by Arthur Schlesinger; The Jacksonian Persuasion by Marvin Meyers), do not mention Jackson's Indian policy, but there is much talk in them of tariffs, banking, political parties, [and] political rhetoric. If you look through high school textbooks and elementary school textbooks in American history you will find Jackson the frontiersman, soldier, democrat, man of the people--not Jackson the slaveholder, land speculator, executioner of dissident soldiers, [and] exterminator of Indians. (Zinn, 2009)

The acts of peaceful policies were not negotiated between the Cherokee and any other unmentioned Indian nation that survived the Indian Removal Act. Using the iconic and social archetype of Geronimo for a prominent terrorist in 2010 can only lead one to
conclude that American Indians still pose a threat to the US government’s ideological stance of superiority and dominance.

*Red Pedagogy* by Sandy Grande (2004) transliterates the historical relationship between American Indians and the United States. She proposes the future development of Indigenous theory to re-establish social organization, maintain tribal sovereignty, and affirm indigenous knowledge. She calls for a critical discourse about current practices and language used in indigenous nations. Grande frames her position in Western thought using critical educational theory, essentialism, postcolonial discourse, and postmodern discourse. She challenges indigenous scholars, especially women, to forge a “Theory of Indigenista” (p. 127), finding common ground in feminist theories. In a seminar at Cornell University in 2005 entitled, "Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project: Toward a Theory of Indigenista," Grande had this to say: "The primary project is decolonization," she said of her proposal. "If we seek a turn toward genuine democracy, it will be imperative for schools to be reimagined as sites for social transformation. The imperative before us—particularly indigenous scholars—is to engage a process of unthinking our colonial roots and rethinking democracy" (Aloi, Grande on *Red Pedagogy*, 2005). The title of this article published in Chronicle Online from the Cornell University website is “Educator Grande wants to rethink U.S. democracy in accounting for treatment of Native Americans.” The term “rethinks” signifies the cognitive adjustments required from educators and the general public when addressing American Indians in the context of democracy, federalism, US relationships, or conduct.
Vine Deloria’s (1995) *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact*, cautions mainstream scientists against disregarding American Indian oral traditions as fictional entertainment, and encourage American Indian scholars to critique science as theory. The main theory or myth of Western science is the Bering land bridge, which is the genesis in many histories written about America and the Indian. His investigations into archeology found evidence that contested the Bering land bridge theory. Deloria counters the scientific history-myth of North American evolution with the living testimony and memories of some American Indian Elders, descendants of the first North American civilizations. Deloria validates the elder orators by not writing their shared knowledge. Instead, he locates published facts to reiterate their knowledge. He hopes that the Elders will publish their own stories, or at least pass on their knowledge before forthcoming generations become absorbed in the “modern consumer society” (p. xv). “Every society needs educated people, but the primary responsibility of educated people is to bring wisdom back into the community and make it available to others so that the lives they are leading make sense” (p. 4). Deloria finds “scientists may not have intended to portray Indians as animals rather than humans, but their insistence that Indians are outside the mainstream of human experiences produces precisely these reactions in the public mind” (p. 8). According to Deloria, the scientific dialog reduces Indians to “a prehuman level of ignorance” (p. 7) and stereotypes. The ideological discursive formations that built the nomenclature of American Indians as pre-human and animal further categorized the generalization of all indigenous people in North America as Indians.
Indians were designated as a foreign nation of people associated with Columbus’s first encounter of the indigenous people of the Caribbean and the subsequential annihilation of the Arawaks. Most terms of distinction associated with American Indians bring forth a diachronic development and stance of power favoring the White European in the English language. There is lack of research discussing how the American Indians’ ideological discursive formations are associated with the natural environment and animals have an inclusive semantic domain that shares their experiences in the world. Western minds have ideological discursive formations that associate dominion over their natural environment and animals. The Western mind claims power over Indians by utilizing English words that are associated to the natural environment and animals. The colonial Indians may not have recognized the power of these associations because in their worldview the association was not derogatory.

Economic and political efforts are affected by the expectations and inferences that American Indians: 1) have disappeared, 2) are an insignificant minority, 3) are an elite class dutifully support by the US government or casino revenue, and/or 4) are of one ethnicity or culture (Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemski, 1999; Bruyneel, 2007; Deloria, 1997; Fleming, 2010; Henry, 1970; Grande, 2004; Mihesuah, 1996; Tehee, 2007). A collective assumption is that American Indians need to give up their worldview, language, knowledge, and land to benefit from the nation’s American European knowledge, thought, experience, and socio-economic status.

Understanding the diversity and political affiliations of American Indians is necessary for continued social and political relationships between the 566 federally
recognized tribes that reside within the US (Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemska, 1999; Bruyneel, 2007; Cook-Lynn, 2007; LaDuke, 2011). Despite the voices, literatures, protests and verified facts from many indigenous scholars in respected fields of study, inclusion of American Indian history with the United States in history textbooks is either omitted or generalized. The value of a balanced dialog about the indigenous peoples’ history, as related to US History in secondary textbooks before and after Columbus, continues to be a contested issue in curriculum design, textbooks, and formal education at all levels.
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1997, historian Donald Fixico, Ed., of *Rethinking American Indian History* concludes in his essay, “Methodologies in Reconstructing Native American History,” that:

Overall, the complexity of American Indian life and reality has been underrepresented by scholars and writers, who have produced more than thirty thousand books about Native Americans. In attempts to alert scholars to this issue, articles have appeared in print periodically to explain the status of Indian history, or to call for new Indian history by questioning methodologies and theories for analyzing or writing Native American history. (p. 117)

The multifaceted societies and complexity of American Indian cultures and lives that survived colonization are understated or misdirected in history. The need to objectively account the interactions between Indians and frontier encounters created a new discipline in history from 1957 to 1980, called ethnohistory. This encouraged communication with American Indian communities to understand culture, infrastructures, original occupation of territories, and how their communities were organized. The methodologies used to categorize American Indian communities “include oral history, environmental history, biographical history, ethnohistory, women’s history, quantitative history, agricultural history, demographic history, and narrative history” (p. 118-119). Fixico accounts for research in each field, stating that he has not exhausted the list of authors reconstructing Indian history. Will the literature of American Indian history be reflected in secondary history textbooks?
Christine Sleeter (2008), in “Critical Family History, Identity, and Historical Memory” uses her own family history to model her “claiming historical history” methodology. Sleeter points out that people who identify as White are uncomfortable discussing multicultural issues, because they consider themselves as being Americans and racial-free. Her investigation found that people, including her own family, were claiming to be of Cherokee descent to avoid being racially classified as Black, which historically would have limited their legal status. In colonial America having 1% blood from Negro descent classified a person as Black. One myth she uncovered was that the often-heard “Cherokee Princess” was construed as an explanation for dark skin to avoid being racially and politically categorized as Black. Sleeter constructed a three-column chart that:

Situated each person within a historical and social context by using histories that described and analyzed the specific locale and time in which the person lived…Down the left-hand column were chronological details about individual ancestors gleaned from databases. In the middle column I described local historical contexts in relationship to specific family members, working roughly in decades. The right-hand column described social and cultural contexts, including additional accounts by historians regarding the diverse peoples who lived in the area of each ancestor. (p. 118)

A shift of consciousness and identity occurred for Sleeter when she “began to research the historic and cultural contexts of peoples’ lives, asking (1) who else lived in the county or town and (2) what political, economic, and social relationships existed among groups
at that time” (p. 121). This method of inquiry analyzed Sleeter’s “remember origins” and “situated [it] within a historic context.” Sleeter cautions that there can occur some psychological distress when one discovers the historical origins of their family as not being racial-free. Sleeter’s investigation inadvertently addresses one common myth and stereotype—my grandmother was a Cherokee Princess.

Between 1876 and 1965, the Jim Crow Laws segregated black people from the white population and claiming an Indian linage was a method of explaining one’s dark skin. The Cherokees, Chickasaw, Choctaws, Creeks, and Seminoles nations had occupied the land east of the Mississippi before the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and it was reasoned that some could have escaped the Indian removal and married into the colonizing population. The Treaty of New Echota negotiated by some Cherokees traded all Cherokee land east of the Mississippi for $5 million, not all Cherokees agreed to this.6 The news of the money still fresh in Americans minds combined with the Jim Crow Laws set precedence for the preferred heritage of Cherokee and the myth of the Cherokee Princess.

Richard J. Paxton’s (1999) article, “A Deafening Silence: History Textbooks and the Students Who Read Them,” compares and contrasts the history textbooks created for kindergarten through secondary school, and for adult audiences. According to Paxton, “students rarely questioned the trustworthiness of their textbooks, nor do they question [an] author’s intent or search for possible bias” (p. 321). The textbook “content can present a point of view that potentially has a positive or negative impact on the

impressions children form of people of color” (Litcher & Johnson, 1969; McKeown, 1974; Pecoraro, 1972; Yawkey, 1973 as cited by Hunter, 1995, p. 25). The foundation of emotional well-being, classification, social interactions, and identification begin in childhood and early educational experiences. This is the most important reason that the representation of American Indians in textbooks must continue to be critically examined and monitored.

Rhetoric Shadowed by War

“Remembering that the foci of history are not the same for everyone helps to determine the point of perspective from which history is viewed, and verify the claim that one’s perception of reality influences one’s understanding of history” (Fixico, 1997, p. 126). The education of Americans about American Indians is powerfully influenced by military conquest and the historical hierarchy of language and text that generally dehumanized and devalued the more than 566 federally recognized Indian Tribes. The progression of contested observational history portraying Indians in textbooks with a stereotypical image or biased attitude is found in Textbooks and the American Indian by Jeanette Henry and the American Indian Historical Society (1970). Then again in 1987, Calvin Martin, Ed., of The American Indian and the Problem of History called for essays about the theme of his introductory article, “Metaphysics of Writing Indian-White History,” to answer a “fundamental question: what is the ontological, phenomenological, and epistemological agenda each of us brings to bear on the history of Indian-white relations?” (p. 6). The term metaphysics academically refers to Aristotle and his writings on physics, but traditional is found in philosophy.
Two decades later Fixico’s 1997 book, *Rethinking American History*, included essays from various disciplines that addressed the issue of “scholarship about American Indians” adding dimension and depth to many indigenous societies in the US. American Indians are the only Americans who have dual citizenship when both parents are born in the US and have a nation-to-nation relationship with the federal government. This unique relationship between Indians and the federal government is not only one of policy, but should be taught in the history textbooks at all levels as well.

At the local grocery store newsstands, in movies, magazines and printed media, audio books, children’s books, adult literature, on television, and sports mascots contain stereotypes of American Indians. Past academic scholars of anthropology, archaeology, art, law, linguistics, science, and history have interpreted and reproduced the historical lexicon and rhetoric of the American Indian as an inferior race (Bird, 1964; Bataille, 2001; Bordewich, 1997; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Cook-Lynn, 2007; Fear-Segal, 2007; Fryberg, 2002; Grande, 2004; Hill, 2008; Huhndorf, 2001; LaDuke, 2005; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Mihesuah, 1996; Smith, 1999; Stedman, 1982; Williams, 2005).

Elizabeth Bird, Ed. (1964), of *Dressing in Feathers: the Construction of the Indian in American Popular Culture* collected essays about the biased and stereotypical portraits of Indians in the public discourse for the sake of entertainment. When American Indians history is omitted from early education or reduced to the national holidays of Thanksgiving and Columbus Day, the social construct and information about Indians is guided by popular culture and the media.
Eighteen years later, in Raymond W. Stedman’s (1982) *Shadows of The Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture*, he exclaims that “primary source materials [stereotypes of American Indians] for [his] study were both omnipresent and inexhaustible” (p. xv). Examples of the appropriation of American Indian cultures by European Americans in the past and present are covered in Shari M. Huhndorf’s (2001) *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination*. Gretchen M. Bataille (2001), editor of *Native American Representations: First Encounters, Distorted Images, and Other Literary Appropriations* in which contributors reveal historical inaccuracies and stereotypes existing not only nationally but internationally about American Indians. In 2008, Jane H. Hill’s *The Everyday Language of White Racism* discusses the US’s linguistic appropriations in attempts to marginalize American Indians’ knowledge and history. A majority of the observations and research presented by Stedman, Huhndorf, Bataille, and Hill are present in America today, not only in popular culture, but in the academic setting and literature.

Fergus M. Bordewich’s (1996) research, *Killing the White Man’s Indian: Reinventing Native Americans at the End of the Twentieth Century* confronts popular myths and misconceptions that effect issues in tribal politics and policies. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience 1875-1928* by David Wallace Adams (1995) chronicles the use of education in an attempt to eliminate the American Indians future through the systematic shaping of their Indian children’s culture, language, and religion by removing them from their parents and reintroducing them back
into their Indian communities after the children had been enculturated in the Western ideology and religion.

In Jacqueline Fear-Segal’s (2007) *The White Man’s Club*, she concurs with Adams that the training of Indians for citizenship through education as a racial agenda of elimination. Fear-Segal agrees with Sandy Grande’s *Red Pedagogy* (2004) in that “the history of Indian education often neglects discourse about colonization, genocide, and acculturation and instead focuses on the survival of identity, community, and culture” (p. vii). This has created a reactive shift in Indian communities’ discourse to define traditional and contemporary values. Taiaiake Alfred “defines ‘self-conscious traditionalism’ as an intellectual, social, and political movement to reinvigorate indigenous values, principles, and other cultural elements best suited to the larger contemporary political and economic reality” (Alfred 1999, 81 as cited by Grande, p. 166). Grande calls for a critical awareness from scholars in American Indian education through theories and methods that support critical discourse and promote the roots of their heritage, culture, language, and nation. The status of American Indians as a nation-within could be perceived as a threat to the status quo of elite colonialism whose foundations rested upon the accumulation of wealth as first defined in the *Declaration of Independence* by ownership of property (by a white male).

effort to explicitly explore ways of knowing and systems of knowledge that have been actively repressed for five centuries” (p. vii). Deloria affirms that the American Indian student attending college is confronted by Western science’s depiction of American Indian cultures and traditions “as mere remnants of a superstitious, stone-age mentality that could not understand or distinguish between the simplest of propositions” (p. 3). Wildcat states the three key principles for building “an indigenous model of politics and ethics, which builds on an American Indian metaphysics of power and place” (p. 87) have to be based on the American Indian’s perspective.

The first is a worldview which acknowledges that the living and non-living entities of the physical world hold an equal relationship with humans. The second is that the goals of indigenous theory are “practical and utilitarian” and “advocate an understanding of public sphere” that encompass the American Indian’s worldview. And thirdly, that the principles of a dynamic world, “not static” will produce models that support the indigenous ontogenesis as the accumulation of culture and knowledge (p. 87-89). The indigenous ontogenesis is the power canon of each American Indian nation as a feature of resistance and persistence to remain a separate, but an equal nation within a nation.

elements that have fostered negative inter-group: relations between Euro-Americans and American Indians” (p. 181). Five case studies conducted by Fryberg (2003), indicate “significant implications for the psychological functioning of both majority and minority group members” (p. v) were exposed to stereotypical images. Fryberg’s findings registered heightened self-esteem for Euro-Americans and a diminished self-esteem for American Indians in each case study.

Devon A. Mihesuah’s (1957) *American Indians: Stereotypes and Realities* was still being reprinted in 2009 as a vital source of exposing the misinformation that has continued to be passed on to school children. Mihesuah contests the following twenty-four stereotypes regarding American Indians by saying that they: are all alike; were conquered because they were inferior; had no civilization until Europeans brought it to them; arrived in this hemisphere via the Siberian Land Bridge; were warlike and treacherous; had nothing to contribute to Europeans or the growth of America; did not value or empower women; have no religion; welcome outsiders to study and participate in their religious ceremonies; are a vanished race; are confined to tipis, wear braids and ride horses; have no reason to be unpatriotic; like having their picture taken; get a free ride from the government; affairs are managed for them by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); are not capable of completing school; cannot vote or hold office; have a tendency toward alcoholism; claim their grandmother was an Indian; are all full bloods; have an “Indian name”; know the history, languages, and cultural aspects of their own tribe and all other tribes; are stoic and have no sense of humor; and that if they had united, they could have prevented the European invasion. Mihesuah says, “Educators and scholars
should strive for objective truth that is a real version of United States history, without side-stepping the ugly events in our nation’s past such as slavery, massacres of Indians, religious intolerance, segregation, sweat shop labor, and stereotyping” (p. 116). These conflicts and incidents crafted the freedom each American cherishes and were paid for by collective voices of our past. To silence them, not only discredits their value, but can cause us to repeat past mistakes.

*Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* by Linda T. Smith (1999) validates non-Western research methods for revitalizing indigenous communities by using as a model her own indigenous community in New Zealand, the Maori. Smith juxtaposed Western and Maori ways of knowing, displaying the rich and complex heritage of the Maori. Winona LaDuke’s (2005) *Recovering the Sacred: the Power of Naming and Claiming* discusses contemporary issues facing indigenous communities dealing with racism and environmental controversies. A decade after Fixico’s *Rethinking American History*, the theme of revisioning history continues in Elizabeth Cook-Lynn’s (2007) *New Indians, Old Wars*, whose political writing addresses the unique position of American Indian nations as sovereign nations within the boundaries of a nation.

Kevin Bruyneel’s (2007) *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*, defines the unique political status of American Indians sovereignty as the division that sets them outside the category of race in the United States government. Bruyneel frames his political analysis using the “temporal boundaries” (loc. 69) in narratives about indigenous people’s “economic and political
development, cultural progress, and modernity” (loc. 69), as an approach to “transcend disciplinary boundaries” (loc.68) in academia. Using a “boundary-focused approach” (loc.70), he sheds light on the struggle of US indigenous people with “colonial rule in the modern American liberal democratic settler-state” (loc.72). Bruyneel states that by placing the American Indians in \textit{colonial time} they are thereby constrained to the past, “unable to be modern, autonomous agents” (loc.235). He defines \textit{colonial time} as “an expression of what Johannes Fabian calls ‘Typological Time,’ which is measured, not as time elapsed, nor by reference to points on a (linear) scale, but in terms of socioculturally meaningful events or, more precisely, intervals between such events” (loc.235). The colonial typological time allows for dualistic distinctions that place the colonized in a “primitive or traditional” (loc.239) state of being associated in the colonizer’s ideology as the colonized being “incapable of modern agency and independence” (loc.239). “The colonial discourse of progress, along with its component civilized-savage dualism, was a familiar [theme] within U.S.-indigenous relations well before the Civil War period, from as far back as the founding [of land] through the removal era” (loc.1070). The expression of the colonial dualism is seen in common phraseology such as: black and white, civilized and savage, inside and outside, which correspond to value judgments of positive (+) and negative (-). Colonial dualism is a function in Western ideological discursive formations.

Melissa Tehee’s (2007) \textit{Attitudes and Bias towards American Indians: Measurement and Theoretical Considerations} developed the “Attitudes toward American Indians” (ATAI) scale. It “combines and updates items from two unpublished scales
(Trimble, 1973; Willis Esqueda, 2005) and incorporates new items” (p. 12). Tehee added contemporary language, addressed current issues, and added other items “to ensure a full range of coverage of areas of contention and to address prevalent stereotypes” (p. 12). Her ATAI scale comparison of ethnic and racial groups found “the need to explore [specific] social psychological attributes” to obtain accurate scales and measurements which “capture their [Indians’] unique worldview” (p. 26). Tehee’s studies found:

Since many U.S. citizens are often uneducated about American Indian history and culture, they turn to stereotypes to guide the formation of their attitudes.

Numerous people are not aware of the original formation of the stereotypes they may be inclined to use. In point of fact, the stereotypic images do not fit the lifeways or thoughtways of modern American Indians. Stereotypic images are embedded early as children are exposed to them in their homes, communities and in schools, (Ancis, Choney, & Sedlacek, 1996). Textbooks, for example, contain historical omissions and fabrications about events concerning American Indians. Personal and tribal attributes about American Indians are typically distorted to support these lies, (as cited in Tehee, p. 6, Loewen, 1996; Tibbits & Combs, 2006).

These stereotypes remain unchanged due to lack of exposure, experience, and understanding of the modern American Indian (Tehee, 2007).

Tehee’s stereotype theory conveys that American Indians share a unique history with European immigrants that are different from African Americans, such as being indigenous to America before the United States government sanctioned genocide, granted
sovereignty, and established personhood. This caused a relationship that built the stereotypes of today: enemy, ally, and dependent. Her research results indicated that most Americans continue to hold strong stereotyped prejudices about American Indians. Whether or not American Indian nations engaged in war against US military forces, they have felt the effects of act of war and the policies of the US government in eliminating their indigenous epistemology.

The Textbooks

A study supported by the National Science Foundation found that in the US "the dominant instructional tool continues to be the conventional textbook and long-time big sellers [established publishing houses] continue to dominate the market" (as cited by Strahan and Herlihy, 1985, Shaver, Davis, and Helberg, 1979, p. 151). The top ten publishers are, in order from high to low sales in 2008 as reported by Michael Hyatt (2008): Random House, Pearson, HarperCollins, Simon & Schuster, Hachette, Scholastic, Thomas Nelson, Holtzbrinck, Tyndale House, and John Wiley. Michael Hyatt, CEO of Thomas Nelson Publishers, reports that his company maintains:

…Two lists internally. First, we track the Top Ten Trade Publishers. (Publishers, whose books are primarily sold through retail booksellers as opposed to, textbook publishers.) The various imprints are consolidated into their parent companies…for example, HarperCollins includes William Morrow and Zondervan; Simon & Schuster includes Free Press, Pocket Books, Howard Books, Scribner, etc. (see Michael Hyatt blog, 2008)

The commercial market is divided into retail sales and textbook sales. "Texts are caught
up in a complicated set of political and economical dynamics” (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, p. 184). Independent publishers have been absorbed into four publishing companies—Pearson, McGraw-Hill, Houghton Mifflin, and Reed Elsevier (Phi Delta Kappan magazine essay as posted by ATA, 2011) and subsidiaries of these four companies. Large profits can be reaped by publishers that have their textbooks adopted by states with large populations that have statewide textbook adoption policies, such as Texas, California, and Florida.

Textbook consolidation is not evident in the public eye. The illusion of choice in textbook publishing companies and textbook selection is evident when viewed graphically and economically.

Figure 1 Consolidation of publishers and independent publishers, 2010 (Jobrack, 2012)
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Americans believe they have a choice in textbook selection, but the reality is that only 10% of the publishers are independent of the three large corporation that dominate the market: 1) McGraw-Hill founded in 1888 consolidated 35 publishers; 2) Houghton
Mifflin Harcourt founded in 1832 consolidated 40 publishers; and 3) Pearson founded in 1724 consolidated 54 publishers as of 2010 (Jobrack, 2012).

Ravitch and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute (2004) concluded that the corporate market of textbooks is directly affected by textbook adoption. Publishers have an invested interest, 5.5 billion dollars net sales revenue for K-12, in publishing textbooks that meet standards set by states whose textbook adoption policies capitalize one third of the text book publishing market. Texas alone can generate about 1.8 billion dollars of net sales revenue. Jobrack’s (2012) insider perspective shows how one state, Texas, can roll a single textbook manuscript out to our nation.

Another significant factor is that many textbooks are reprinted with little change to the content. The content of many reprints do not have substantial modifications based on protested historical discourse. Instead the modifications in textbooks are based on political agendas to omit or rewrite a biased history as recently exhibited in Arizona and Texas (see Blake, 2010; Herreras, 2011; Short, 2010; Wallechinsky and Brinkerhoff, 2011; Jobrack, 2012). The 75 percent of the textbook market is dominated by three multinational publishing houses—Pearson, McGraw-Hill, and Houghton Mifflin (Jobrack, 2012, loc. 947), and “the content of history books has been crafted to satisfy demands of many such groups and to sidestep controversy in major book-buying states like California, Texas, and Florida” (Ravitch, 2004, p. 15). It is not uncommon for the textbooks purchased to only be updated in cycles of four to five years coinciding with the three major textbook adoption states: Texas, California and Florida. This cycle begins with dates provided by the Association of American Publishers (AAP) who was
assembled by the educational publishing giants. “Educational publishers are defensive about their products. They have constructed a powerful trade association -- the school division of the Association of American Publishers -- to protect their positions. AAP lobbyists in Sacramento, Austin, and Tallahassee are determined to preserve the lucrative business of state adoptions” (Phi Delta Kappan, 2005 as posted by ATA, 2011). The commercial market analysis of the textbooks is beyond the scope of this research, but is important to note when considering the question: Whose interest, needs, and concerns does the text represent?

“A Consumer's Guide to High School History Textbooks” a report by Diane Ravitch (2004) reviewed twelve widely used history textbooks using a panel of historian experts. The criteria for analysis that is similar to this study are: “1. Accuracy: Is the text accurate in its presentation of facts and major historical issues?; 2. Context: Does the text present historical events and ideas in a context that enables the reader to understand their significance?; 5. Lack of Bias: Is the text free of political or ideological bias?; 6. Historical logic; Is the text free of presentism and moralism?; 9. Historical Soundness: Does the text give adequate attention to political, social, cultural, and economic history?; 12. Graphics: Do the graphics and sidebars in the text contribute to the reader’s interest and understanding of history?” (For the complete list see Appendix A: Ravitch).

The experts, all scholars in the field of history, were divided into two panels, one for American history and the second for world history. The highest points possible for each textbook was 480 points. The reviewers’ overall comments were also recorded. Each reviewer’s resulting scores for a textbook were averaged for a final grade. The
average score for the results of six American history textbooks was 66% and 61% for world history textbooks. “Based on the results from the reviewers’ assessments of the six American history texts, *The American Journey*, written by Joyce Appleby, Alan Brinkley, and James M. McPherson and published by Glencoe, earned the highest overall score” (p. 19). It scored 78%. “Of the six world history textbooks that were reviewed, *World History: People & Nations* earned top marks. . . .published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston, but neither has an identified author” (p. 20). This disjointed and unexplained manner of presenting themes and images spanned not only grade levels, but publishers, “as if writers buy the information from a database” (Ravitch, p. 21). This conclusion is conferred in Jobrack’s (2012) insider account of textbook publishing. Jeffrey Mirel, one of the reviewers of American history textbooks stated, “One major flaw in the U.S. history texts is that they consistently define multiculturalism in relation to race or color, but not ethnicity or religion” (p. 22). Ravitch and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, for whom she conducted the research, now advocate for the end of textbook adoption policies at the district or state level.

In conclusion to the report, they say that the policy of textbook adoption has monopolized the market and degraded the quality of production. The study was produced in 2004 and textbook adoption policies in America have not changed. The unrelenting desire for profit and the politics of the textbook produce a narrow path to enlightenment. Race is the undercurrent in the flowing river of history textbooks, unseen and only addressed when someone drowns.
Politics of Knowledge

Paulo Freire said, “Education is a political act” (Cox, 1990). In *Pedagogy of Freedom*, Freire (1998) states that “education never was, is not, and never can be neutral or indifferent in regard to the reproduction of the dominant ideology or the interrogation of it” (p. 91). Freire had firsthand knowledge about the consequences of advocating for educational reform and equity issues in educational systems. Because of his activism in educational reform, Freire was imprisoned for seventy days and then exiled from his native country, Brazil, for fifteen years before the government allowed him to return. He is quoted as saying, “Washing one’s hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral” (Freire, 1985, p. 102).

Education is a method of controlling the public discourse through the government’s institutional policies in the structure of language used to describe concepts, ideas, methods and people.

After finding sparse research on American Indians’ achievement, David E. Wright, Michael W. Hirlinger, and Robert E. England (1998) wrote *The Politics of Second Generation Discrimination in American Indian Education: Incidence, Explanation, and Mitigating Strategies* in which they presented a theoretical model of assessing and correcting second generation school discrimination of Indian students. “Re-segregative policies are labeled second generation discrimination because in theory they occur after schools have been desegregated” (p. 2). Wright’s et al., research also verified neglect in the examination of American Indian politics and policies in political science and policy research nationally. The importance of this oversight is clear. Citing Wilmer,
Melody, and Murdock (1994: 269, 274), they state:

The worst kind of elitism is that which ignores other cultures, other peoples, other political or economic systems. By ignoring those who are different, stigmatized as “other,” we not only deny their existence, but also recognize no dignity or “value” in these “others.” The discipline of political science has certainly been guilty of such neglect with regard to Native Americans. [We] have largely left the study of native peoples and their political systems [as well as policies affecting them] to sociologists and anthropologists and have, therefore, denied the role that [they] continue to play in the political and economic processes of this country. (p. 2)

Wright’s et al., research examined second generation discrimination in 128 American public school districts that had at least 1,000 students and a five percent American Indian enrollment. They found that currently “American Indian students are denied educational opportunities offered to whites” through academic grouping and discipline (p. 4). Using the base student enrollment criteria by Wright et al., over 128,000 students will be exposed to discrimination institutionalize on over 6,400 students who identify as being American Indians. In effect the public schools are modeling the implementation of policies that discriminate and deny equal access of education to American Indian students.

In agreement with Freire, in The State and the Politics of Knowledge by Michael Apple and Petter Aasen (2003), Apple states that “by refocusing our attention on those areas that have been historically neglected, a much more subtle picture of the relationship between the state and education can be built” (p. 4). This refocusing occurs as David

These ideological language differences are discernible to language researchers such as Sheilah Nicholas (2009) who wrote “*I Live Hopi, I Just Don't Speak it*”--*The Critical Intersection of Language, Culture, and Identity in the Lives of Contemporary Hopi Youth* and Pierre Bourdieu’s (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Nicholas’ investigations into Hopi identity and language use found the youth of a Hopi community speaking only English, but identifying themselves as Hopi. The Hopi youths’ identity was not centered on speaking Hopi, which is considered central to being Hopi, but using the English language to communicate their Hopi culture. Bourdieu’s (1991) discussions of a social hierarchy that occurs within the linguistic exchanges of language as instruments in discussing power relationships within a society describe how ideological differences can occur within one language.

Sandra Wachholz and Bob Mullaly’s (2001) article, “The Politics of the
Textbook: A Content Analysis of the Coverage and Treatment of Feminist, Radical and Anti-Racist Social Work Scholarship in American Introductory Social Work Textbooks Published Between 1988 and 1997,” affirms that textbooks are the primary source of information that “dominate what students learn,” and that social science textbooks play a political role by “reflecting the interests of capitalism and patriarchy” (p. 51). Their study sampled fourteen American introductory social work textbooks using Agger’s (1991) article “Critical Theory of Text” as the theoretical framework, whose content analysis demonstrated that when feminist, anti-racist, and radical social work was present within the textbooks, they were “discredited in ways that reduced their political charge and transformative potential” (Wachholz and Mullaly, p. 51-52). Wachholz and Mullaly state that the triad scholarships of these three perspectives share a common vision “of a society based on cooperation rather than competition, collectivism rather than individualism, diversity rather than sameness, and equality rather than inequality” (p. 52). The researchers found these same dualities were used to assess judgment values in the textbooks.

The historical theories from Marxism to Critical Discourse used to analyze textbooks introduce Agger’s (1991) “Critical Theory of Text.” His four precepts are summarized thus: (1) textbooks play a political role in society; (2) scholarship that falls outside the mainstream discourse is all too often “dismissed as ‘unsuitable’—or else it is processed through a referee system and found wanting with respect to mainstream empiricist criteria of validity and worth” (p. 55-56); (3) textbooks serve as instruments that contribute to the formation of attitudes that orient individuals to the preservation of
the current relations of production and reproduction, rather than to innovative action and social transformation. Agger contends that this induces individuals to participate in the current social order, rather than to try to change it; and (4) if incorporation of discursive scholarship occurs, it is largely a symbolic gesture to appease various voices of dissent, and is treated in ways that neutralize their political impact and transformative potential (p. 55-56).

Textbook Bias Studies

Each decade since 1949 has produced studies that contend that there is bias in textbook representation of Indians. In the 60-plus years since, the textbooks have served to dehumanize and demoralize the descendants of American Indians in the public’s eyes. Conclusions arrived at by the American Council on Education study and Rupert Costo’s (1970) *Textbook and the American Indian*, as cited by Curwen (1978), found two diametrically opposite, but stereotypic views of Indians:

The first was that of cruel, bloodthirsty Indians whose rights were unquestionably superseded by the interests of white pioneers. The second was that of the noble redskin, a high-minded son of nature. Almost without exception, no convincing picture of Indians as a group, or of the cultural characteristics of Indian life, past, or present was presented. (Kane and B'nai B'rith, 1970, p.113)

Stereotypes of American Indians

In *Textbooks and the American Indian* (Henry, 1970), thirty-two Indian scholars, native historians, and Indian students examined more than three hundred books. Most of the information about American Indians was found to be derogatory, to contain
misinformation, distortions, or omissions of important history (p. 11). Henry et al., asked nine questions and had the criteria of eleven benchmarks that place American Indians in the present, and was objective about their history (see Appendix B). The reviewers found such textbooks in use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to teach American Indian students.

In 1972, David Pratt in *How To Find And Measure Bias In Textbook* developed a quantitative instrument, the Evaluation Coefficient (ECO) Analysis, to measure the relationship between the attitude (independent variable) conveyed when describing the American Indian (dependent variable). Using the ECO instrument, Pratt evaluated words that expressed favorable or unfavorable value judgments, using a team of inter-raters for validating his findings. Pratt concluded that French-Canadians were significantly more favored than other represented groups such as “Arabs, Blacks, and Indians in 65 textbooks” (p. 28).

Linda A. Curwen’s (1978) *The Image of the North American Indian: An Inquiry into Textbook Bias* study of social studies and English textbooks authorized in New Brunswick, Canada between 1960 to 1975, used Pratt’s ECO analysis. Curwen cites six previous studies which concluded that there is bias toward Indians in textbooks. She found that only seventeen of ninety-eight textbooks contained at least ten instances of “Indian.” Her findings were favorable for ten of the seventeen textbooks. Overall, this study was favorable due to the criterion that at least ten words had to be found in the textbooks using “Indian” as a subject.

Curwen found that books that had an unfavorable reference of fewer than ten
occurrences were not eligible for ECO analysis. The textbooks eliminated “refer[red] to Indians during a given historical period but only did so incidentally and without elaboration” (p. 24). She concluded that the omission of Indians could have reflected the lack of literature on North American Indians in Canada in 1978. In the US, there is now a considerable amount of literature and scholarship from Indian country and academia which retorts distortions and provides valid research. Therefore, Curwen’s observations of omissions in textbooks should not be a contemporary issue.

In Sally Hunter’s (1995), *A Portrayal of American Indians in Elementary and Secondary United States History/Social Studies Textbooks*, five researchers, three of whom were Native American scholars, reviewed thirteen social studies and history textbooks by these four major publishing companies: (1) Houghton-Mifflin, 1990, 1991, 1993; (2) Glencoe, Macmillan, McGraw-Hill, 1990, 1993, 1994; (3) D. C. Heath, 1986, 1991, 1993; and (4) Harcourt Brace Jovanovich and Holt, Rinehart Winston, Inc., 1991, 1994. Hunter used mixed methods in her study. The reviewers were trained in ECO analysis and content analysis. The reviewers “found a disproportionate use of terms such as, ‘fight,’ ‘war,’ and ‘attack’ in reference to American Indians” (p. 140), emphasizing negative portrayals of American Indians in the textbooks. Some of Hunter’s conclusions are: (1) modern Indians live in the past, and no longer exist due to lack of information about them; (2) “The ideology of the text does not change; subtleties and point of view are not corrected in spite of insertions of positive entries. . . .It is more difficult for texts to change the ideology that relates to themes and issues of concern to American Indians, than to remove openly stereotypical terminology and illustrations. . .
.and ideological subtleties persist” (p. 153). Repetition of content and images of American Indians had very little explanation of each entry. The publication dates show how the same title of a textbook was of little concern in creating a distinguishing marker from other versions.

The historian James W. Loewen (1996) conducted a critical review of twelve high school textbooks in Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong. He found that various textbook publishers were actually consolidated to produce seven or eight history books. Loewen examines each for their treatment of ten major topics, from the settlement of the Americas to the Vietnam War.

A major theme in the textbooks is the idea of the Beringa, which suggests that the original Americans, or Indians were not “very bright” since they had just walked to America, and after occupying the land had not utilized North American resources (like the Europeans did) since “vast areas were untouched by a human presence” (p. 99). The utilization of North American resources by respective indigenous nations could have been overlooked because the European colonizers were looking for evidence of their own culture. An example would be in farming and land management, the Puritans would have not recognized the strategic placement of three agricultural crops, corn, beans and squash on a mound. Their experiences in agriculture had crops lined in rolls, therefore categorizing farming and sophistication with a European model of civilization.

Loewen stresses that the Beringa hypothesis “fits their [the historian textbook writers] overall story line of unrelenting progress [manifest destiny]” (p. 97), despite contesting evidence from the field of archaeology and linguistics. The procurement of the
colonizers’ religion began the era of cultural imperialism. He found misinformation, minimal treatment, and a lack of differentiation between different tribes of American Indians. Loewen found that an ideology is being taught, though often with jumbled and confusing layouts filled with images and “busy work” that do not engage students in critical analysis of history. Ravitch’s panel of experts found the same content layout confusing and lacking quality in their 2004 study.

In the article, “Superficiality and Bias: The (Mis)Treatment of Native Americans in U. S. Government Textbooks,” Jeffrey S. Ashley and Karen Jarratt-Ziemski (1999) used content analysis (word count) and social constructionism for bias and the “fostering of misunderstanding” to analyze sixteen “leading American government and democracy textbooks being used at the college level” (p. 49). They examined the way American Indians were being addressed in college level textbooks and expected to find “adequate and accurate coverage of the role of American Indians in the American governmental system, but did not” (p. 49). Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemski conceded that:

Many of the misconceptions facing Native Americans today may be intentionally perpetuated and spread for individual political gain. Of course, if [the American] society were better informed such manipulation would prove to be more difficult. Accurate and more complete textbook coverage of Native Americans, American Indian issues, and tribal sovereignty will not solve the problems stemming from misconceptions and bias, but it is a place to start. (p. 60)

The concept or dates of statehood and personhood are usually addressed in history textbooks, but rarely are the nation’s development of policies governing American
Indians addressed. The failure to recognize the separate legal status or the intergovernmental negotiations when the US government becomes involved in American Indians nations is never discussed in the subject of federalism in the college history textbooks. A nation’s history would not need laws or policies for nations or people who do not exist.

“The Depiction of Native Americans in Recent (1991-2004) Secondary American History Textbooks” by Tony Sanchez (2007) examined fifteen secondary school American history textbooks to evaluate the accuracy in depicting Native Americans. Sanchez’s study was in response to the evaluations conducted by Henry (1970) and Loewen (1995). Sanchez’s criteria used an authenticity guideline based upon what he considers to be the Five Great Values of the Great Plain’s Tribes: generosity and sharing; respect for elders and women; getting along with nature; individual freedom and leadership; and courage (see Appendix A, Sanchez). The intercoder reliability and content/construct validity produced results that indicate only three of the fifteen textbooks rated above average.

Three of the history textbooks had been published in the late 1990s. The history textbooks in his study that were published in 2003 and 2004 had a score of less than average, on a scale of 1-to-5, five being the highest and most favorable value. The findings are significant to this study, because it occurred within the last decade. Since history textbooks are purchased in 4- to 5-year cycles, there is a likelihood that the textbooks are still in circulation. Sanchez’s findings show a trend of accurate cultural depiction declining in the secondary history textbooks after the publication year of 2004.
The limitations of Sanchez’s study are the criteria of the Five Great Values reflecting the tribes in the Great Plains (a regional “cultural depiction”) (p. 313), may not reflect the values of all American Indian nations.

Sanchez also noted that a distinguished male American Indian such as Sitting Bull, was referenced as “Chief,” which is not accurate. This generalization of distinguished leaders as a stereotypical categorization furthers to simplify the complex organization of American Indian societies. Designations of the complex and integrated roles that a single member of an Indian Nation have never been fully explored, defined, or verified by their respective tribal specific authority.

Michael Simpson’s (2010) recent research, “American Indians at Wounded Knee in Current U.S. History High School Textbook” analyzes using the appraisal system and judgment analysis on two history textbooks covering the event at Wounded Knee. As cited, the judgment framework “is highly determined by cultural and ideological values and individual experiences (Coffin, 2002, p. 521; Appraisal website, 2005).” Simpson found bias against the Sioux, favoring the US Cavalry with the omission of important facts that placed the Sioux in a dire position. “Rarely, in my review of textbooks do I find the explicit language found in my paper on late 19th century school textbooks (Simpson, 2006, p. 1). However, as a teacher in American Indian schools, my students and I really questioned any improvement. History still felt like a weapon” (p. 1). Simpson stress that the judgment system based upon the linguistic work by Halladay’s Systemic Functional Literacy and refined by Coffin to find non-explicit bias (Coffin, 1996; Martin & White, 2005, p. xi; Coffin, 2006, p. xiii as cited by Simpson, 2010). Using a value judgment
system increases the possibility of finding bias and quantifies the results, but the understated positioning of authority (power) over a subject by omission is not addressed.

*Textbooks in Transition: The Incorporation and Abjection of Race, Class and Gender in High School American History Textbooks 1960s-2000s* by Benjamin Kearl (2011) uses four theoretical frameworks: incorporation, abjection, structures of feelings, and ideological quilting, to “demonstrate how textbook depictions of these historical events structure students’ present educational experiences with race, class, and gender” (p. i). He chronicles the controversy of social knowledge that has affected textbook writing since the inception of American culture and heritage. Kearl takes a diachronic approach to demonstrate how textbooks have limited the students’ educational experience to reproduce social political concerns. The cultural politics of the textbooks define and fix a dominant class meaning of historical events for reproduction into the dominated classes. He argues that textbooks “render the historical legacy of whiteness invisible,” “abject intersections of race and poverty,” and abject political resistance of the 1960s.

*Reading into Racism: Bias in Children's Literature and Learning Materials* by Gillian Klein (1985) describes how to identify and combat racial bias in materials used in libraries and schools. Klein states, “There is no such thing as an unbiased book,” (p. 1) and those views are fixed for anyone to read in the future. She states that complete objectivity is not obtainable and may not be desirable, for it produces benign reading. The question readers should ask is “Whose bias is being reflected” (p. 3)? Authors of ethnic origins, or the dominated group, can imbibe the prejudices of their environment and education and perpetuate it unquestionably. “Racism in books can have many causes—
from the unthinking and insensitive passing of prevailing attitudes, to the conscious strategy of rendering the ‘other’ as ‘lessor’, in order to attack or exploit them. […] where the dominated group are just simple, happy people in need of our paternalistic protection, we have justified the dominant group’s behavior” (p. 4). Klien cites Luis Neves Falcon as observing that “the printed word [is] considered quasi-sacred in most dependent societies, in fact becomes a tool for transmitting to the children of dominated parentage the notion of their insufficiency and their natural inferiority” (p. 5). Images and illustrations can confirm racist attitudes.

Books are the main medium of information of all ages and are the foundation for the educational system, which leads to higher studies. “Each time a student uses a book to find out or check an item of knowledge, the importance and authority of the printed world is also being reinforced” (p. 11). She states that not all books should be available for review when they perpetuate stereotypes, because that reinforces the power that the dominate group has over the ‘others.’

Klein’s twelve criteria for selecting materials are similar to other authors reviewed in this chapter, with an emphasis on multicultural education (see Appendix A, Klein). She reprints Ossie Davis’s study of Roget’s *Thesaurus* which contrasts synonyms of the word “whiteness” and “blackness.” The results were that for 134 ‘whiteness’ synonyms, 44 were favorable or pleasing with only 10 words with a mild negative connotation, and that for 120 ‘blackness’ synonyms, 60 are distinctly unfavorable, with an additional 20 related directly to race (p. 27). Klein works towards empowering teachers, libraries, and students with meaningful literature and learning materials.
CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

Russell Bishop (2005) raises the question, “Whose interest, needs, and concerns does the text represent?” This question cannot be addressed fully without conducting a critical hermeneutical analysis using the theoretical lens of critical discourse to evaluate content, meaning, and power. This evaluative survey will compare and contrast categories defined by the placement of American Indian representations in textbooks. It will also study the depth of objective versus official knowledge in the textbook content, omission of events such as sovereignty or personhood, and the language used to convey the history of Indians in America.

The Sampled Textbooks

The eight sampled textbooks will be mined for publication date, International Standard Book Number (ISBN), and instances of American Indian representation through keyword searches which indicate “Indian,” other specific tribal names as found in the textbook, and determine if there are value judgments. This method of digital searching for key words is a similar exercise performed by Jobrack (2012) when she was an assistant editor for Charles E. Merrill (loc. 194-195). The ISBN is a ten-digit number that uniquely identifies books and book-like products published globally. The ISBN will be useful in distinguishing similar titles published in different years by the same author and publisher.

The collected data where the American Indian is represented will be documented from collected high school or secondary school textbooks. The textbooks examined are
removed from their physical manifestation with the omission of all images with the exception of one, Danzer et al. (2009). Danzer’s textbook will include an analysis of textual captions of visual content as relevant to American Indian heritage, history, economics, and politics. The eight secondary history textbook provided by the Disability Resources Center at the University of Arizona, which are digital text in a PDF or Word document of the hardcover textbooks without images are:


The publication date ranges of the selected books are from 2004-2009 and the top three publishers represented are Pearson, McGraw-Hill, and Houghton Mifflin. Using Boolean logic for word searching in Adobe Acrobat X PRO and Word 2010, the investigator can be assured of having exhausted the resources of the textbook.

The search conducted for each word will find “words that contain part (the stem) of the specified search word. For example, a search for opening finds instances of open, opened, opens, and openly.”7 The inquiry began with the following word set: Indian, American, American Indian, native, and Native American and expanded as other words may signify American Indian representations. Specific tribal names will be collected if located in the context of the keyword search or index. Keywords associated with other racial groups such as Black, Italian, Irish, Jewish, Mexican, etc. will be added for comparison and were expanded to include “American.” Using Boolean logic for word searching provided by the two software programs, the investigator can be assured of having exhausted the resources of the textbook.

Descriptive words on the subject of Indians will be collected for ECO analysis to code for value judgment (+, 0, -). In conjunction, words associated with Indians will be searched for in the text for an Ideology Discursive (ID). The data gathered from the

---

publishers, with the exception of *The Americans* by Danzer, G. et.al. (2009) will be limited by the omission of images and with a focus on the history textbooks that have been digitized from publishers. If time permits, the textual communication (captions) of visual imagery will be included in the data sets.

Validating Findings and Plan of Analysis

This investigation will utilize four methods of analysis to discover the social discourse inherent in history textbooks: (1) a manifest/textual analysis approach as demonstrated by Ashley and Jarrett-Zienski (1999) and Wachholz and Mullaly (2001) through word count to be compared with other racial group representation; (2) collecting key descriptors for ECO analysis designed by Pratt (1992), where the isolation and rating of words are analyzed for value judgments; (3) modification of Sleeter’s (2008) method of claiming historical memory to validate a null set or omissions of important events in American Indian history with the US; (4) critical examination for lexical inferences to stereotypes (Mihesuah, 1957,1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001; Henry, 1970; Ashley and Jarrett-Ziemski, 1999), and narratives that constrain the American Indian to conflicts in colonization and create a “static” image based on “colonial time” as defined by Bruyneel (2007).

The collected key descriptors (words) will be the ECO word list, and will use the quantitative instrument, ECO analysis (Pratt, 1972), to measure the attitude (independent variable) conveyed when describing the American Indian (dependent variable). Pratt designed the ECO analysis to determine bias measured through use of words such as savage, primitive, wild, or barbarian (see Appendix A Pratt for list). Using the word list
collected to describe American Indians, an intercoder agreement with two other persons will be used to check for reliability in coding the ECO word list as neutral (0), favorable (+) or unfavorable (-) to weigh their value judgments.

It is expected that a modification of Pratt’s original ECO word list will be required for the lexicon, through the use of synonyms (Pratt, 1972; Curwen, 1978). The original criteria of at least ten words are required for a textbook to be analyzed in this method. Since neutral statements or omissions will not be reflected in the ECO analysis, the list of key descriptors discovered in the textbooks will be compared to other instances of ethnicity, historical events, and culture to discern the common inference.

Since American Indians are sometimes described as a racial group, they will be compared to the treatment of similar racial groups within the textbook, such as Anglo, Chinese, Japanese, Black, Mexican, Italian, Irish, German, and Jewish. Wachholz’s and Mullaly’s (2001) manifest analysis approach, or textual analysis, will be modified to text related to Native American/American Indian representation in the textbooks. The analysis will be done by word count, and then will compare enumerations of similar categories to historical accounts for each racial group as exemplified by Ashley’s and Jarratt-Ziemski’s (1999) investigation of college textbooks. Single words found in the index or references will be counted and labeled with a “B” (see Table 1 Coding Key – Shadowwalker, 2012, Chapter 4), then subtracted from the total instances contained in the body of the text. This will provide a separate count for the text in the content and the textual references will produced the manifest content results.
If the expected instance of American Indian representation is not quantified by text within topics such as encounters, government policies, laws, or personhood, it will be coded as a null instance or omission and further contrasted to comparable historical or social events. If it is not present, a modification of Sleeter’s (2008) method for claiming historical memory will be used. Three columns are created to catalog data: chronological details of the important figures in American history, local historical context in the development of government for the nation and state, and the social and cultural context of each geographical area the important figures resided in.

The focus of this historical chart will be the national or state historical text in relationship to racial groups or minorities, when American Indians are designated as one racial category. The last column describes social and cultural context in which Indians are represented or omitted in historical accounts in history textbooks, in comparison to other races or minorities. The data will be analyzed for omissions of historical events and facts that are accurate and objective. American Indian representation should demonstrates the same “effectiveness and achievements” of other diverse cultures, and does not “reduce all non-western societies to the exotic, the primitive or quaint” (Klein, p. 17-18). This method of analysis will address any null set or instance where American Indians should be represented based on comparison with other ethnic groups, historical events, and/or important people in history.

In addition, the textual representation of American Indians contained in the textbooks will be explored, using critical discourse analysis. For instance, in one textbook the dates for the right to vote for Blacks and women were included, but the date for the
right to vote for American Indians was not mentioned. Utilizing the textual location of words from the word set signifying American Indians, the content surrounding key descriptors will be analyzed for value judgments.

Simultaneously, while mining the textbook content for value judgment, the data collected will be further evaluated using Mihesuah’s (1957) twenty-four stereotypes as mentioned in Chapter Two, Henry’s (1970) “General Criteria” (see Appendix A, Henry), and the five themes: 1) relative space devoted to Native Americans and native American issues; 2) accuracy of discussion-potential for fostering misunderstanding; 3) Native American[s] being a homogenous unit; 4) failure to recognize separate legal status or role in intergovernmental systems or federalism; and 5) separate unique legal and political status different from other racial minorities, from Ashley’s and Jarratt-Ziemski’s (1999) investigation to determine accuracy and quality of American Indian representation.

The investigation has yet to determine the lexical quality and the narrative that will emerge. The sociopolitical emphasis in the textbooks’ framing of American Indians will be the critical textual analysis that “is most concerned with. . .discursive formations and their productivity” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 140) in relationships of power. This type of discourse analysis will provide a useful method through which to view the textual representations that are encountered in this research. Words that express a possible ideological stance will be coded as an Ideological Discursive (ID).

The final analyses will assess if the narratives use “temporal boundaries” by associating American Indians as “static people,” locating them in the past, in what is called “colonial time,” separate from “advancing people,” the modern American
(Bruyweel, 2007). Based on previous studies, instances that move the Indian into a contemporary or modern time will be coded as contemporary (C). The time span (years) encompassing this designated code has yet to be determined.

The rationale for combining both quantitative and qualitative data is to improve understanding, to contribute to the field of education, curriculum, public policy, Indigenous theory, and to advocate for change, if necessary, in American Indian representation in textbooks.

Textual Analysis Sample

As mentioned in the introduction to this evaluation, the textbook analyzed is *The Americans* by Danzer, et.al. (2009). Unit 1, entitled “American Beginnings to 1783,” begins with a two-page fold of the painting “Penn’s Treaty with the Indians” by Benjamin West, and an index to the four chapters in this section. The chapters are not in chronological sequence, but have overlapping time frames: “Chapter 1- Three Worlds Meet Beginnings to 1506”; “Chapter 2- The American Colonies Emerge 1492-1681”; “Chapter 3- The Colonies Come of Age 1650-1960”; “Chapter 4- The War for Independence 1763-1783”. Pages two and three have another two-page painting with the caption, “Native Americans observe the arrival of a European ship.” There is also a split timeline, one entitled “Americas” and the other entitled “World.” The timeline begins with this note: “c. 20,000 B.C. Asian peoples begin migrating to America across the Beringia land bridge” and ends with “c. 1500 Iroquois League is formed.” There is no content within the chapter about the Iroquois League. The findings suggest that the “tense” of the text affects the reader’s interpretation of American Indians. For example,
since American Indians are often referred to in the past tense and as one racial group, readers may assume that the American Indian no longer exists (Wadsworth, 2006).

The title of the painting “Penn’s Treaty with the Indians,” (Danzer et al., 2009, p. 1) implies that the treaty was made between all “Indians.” Replacing “Indians” with specific “complex societies” (Wadsworth, p. 4) or the Indian nation, the caption would read, “Penn’s Treaty with the Tamanend”. A more accurate description, which would introduce the American Indians as complex societies, could read: William Penn spoke to delegates from the Tamanend nation of the Turtle Clan in negotiating a treaty of peace. For ECO analysis, the original caption selection does not provide a descriptive word to perform a quantitative analysis for bias. Although this is a neutral description, it implies that all Indians agreed to Penn's Treaty, but a modified caption holds the prospect for modeling the cultural diversity of American Indians.

A Null Set

An example of a null set is demonstrated in Danzer’s et al. (2009) history textbook section about voting rights. The textual content describes voting rights with dates and events for Blacks, women and citizens of Arkansas, but does not mention American Indians. American Indian citizenship or Tribal sovereignty is not mentioned in the majority of selected textbooks which profess to teach students about United States government, but which go into detail about state sovereignty (Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemske, 1999).
Exploratory Site Visits for Textbook in Use

The list of textbooks in the classroom in 2010 was collected through a site visit at the Mescalero Apache School (MAS) in Mescalero, New Mexico and the Tucson High Magnet School (THMS) located in downtown Tucson, Arizona. The MAS textbooks serve the Mescalero Apache students in April of 2010 were:


MAS textbook selection had two independent textbook publishers: University of New Mexico Press and First Nations Oweesta Corporation. Two of the top three publishers represented at MAS are Houghton and McGraw-Hill. TUSD has a textbook adoption policy for the school district. The textbooks at TUSD are:

Textbook adoption of one publishing company, McGraw-Hill, is evident in the TUSD selection with the exception of Zinn (1980) *A Peoples History of the United States*. Harper & Row published Zinn’s book and was consolidated into Pearson (Jobrack, 2012, Table 2.1 Consolidation of Educational Publishers as of 2010, loc. 949-1112). There is a recent publication of Zinn (2009) *A Peoples History of the United States*, but it was not a resource at THMS. The preliminary analysis of history textbooks in circulation at a rural and urban secondary school validates the need for research in the production and the quality of the content.

Vigilance is required as political controversy mandates whose history is printed. There is still bias in the secondary history textbooks based on the judgment value analysis conducted by Simpson in 2010 and on the textual analysis sample in 2011. The evaluated textbooks are still in circulation in many public schools including districts that have American Indian populations.
CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS

The digital format of the textbooks contained no graphics or images, which resulted in the number of pages in the digital textbook to be less than those in the printed hardcovers for three textbooks: 1) *A People’s History of the United States*, Zinn (2009) the hardcover page totals provided by descriptions at Amazon was 768 pages compared to the 441 pages in the digital format (DF) provided by the publisher. 2) The 326 pages of *A History of New Mexico, 3rd Revised Edition* by Roberts and Roberts (2004) was reduced to 177 DF pages. 3) The independent textbook conversion from hardback cover to digital format not provided by the publishers, for *The Americans*, Danzer, et.al. (2005) ratio was 1155 content pages total to 827 DF pages. It was interesting to note that the Danzer, et al. (2005) textbook had three pages of listed authors, consultants and reviewer, 12 pages of acknowledgements listed by chapters, and 87 reference pages for a total of 102 pages displaying expertise in the topic of history. *The Americans*, Danzer, et.al publishing dates for 2003 and 2004 showed no change in hardback cover pages at Amazon and was listed as 1123 pages. A full analysis of Danzer’s et al. *The Americans* 2003 and 2004 publications dates was not conducted in this study.

The total page count increased in the digital format for the following three textbooks: 1) for *The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21st Century (California Edition)* Danzer, et al. (2006), the ratio was 1152 to 2140 DF; 2) for *Out of Many: A History of the American People, Combined Volume (6th edition)*, Faragher et al. (2009) the ratio was 1238 to 2028 DF; and 3) in *World History: Patterns of Interaction*, Shabaka et al. (2005)
the ratio was 1376 to 1528 DF. The expectation was a reduction in pages as demonstrated in textbooks by Zinn (2009), Roberts and Roberts (2004), and Danzer (2005) occurring with the elimination of images and graphics. One rationale for the page reduction for the Danzer et al. (2005) digital conversion was the independent scanning and reproduction of the textbook in digital format. The digitizing of the hardcover textbook focused on the textbook content eliminating key features and assessment. Other digital conversions of secondary history textbooks were provided by the publishers for students with disabilities that affect reading.

The hardcover textbooks descriptions for two editions of United States Government: Democracy in Action, Remy, R. C. could only be retrieved for the publishing date of 2007 and listed the page number total as 898 pages. The electronic versions showed United States Government: Democracy in Action, Remy, R. C. (2008) to contain 1029 DF pages and United States Government: Democracy in Action, Remy, R. C. (2006) to have 963 DF pages. The digital manuscript page number total for each publication date does not distinguish between copyrights, credits, content, and index. It is speculated that for Remy’s textbook the increase in digital formatting was due to Amazon’s count reflecting only content pages and the retrieved DF contained the textbook’s entire manuscript. Due to time constraints, the enumeration discrepancies between Amazon and retrieved digital manuscripts were not verified.

A classification model to test methodology for analyzing text was developed from a random selection of one in eight secondary textbooks as listed in Chapter III. The book used for developing a model was Zinn’s (2009) A Peoples History. This edition is not to
be confused with *A Peoples History of the United States* by Zinn (1980) found in the exploratory site survey at THMS, but is the latest revised reprint. Zinn’s *A Peoples History* is available from the secondary history textbook selection list. The coding key for this evaluative study was developed as the textbooks were mined for data (see Table 1 below) using Adobe Acrobat X Pro.

Table 1 Coding Key – Shadowwalker, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Page number</td>
<td>Location of found term or descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Instance or descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>Used for ECO analysis word list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Number of instances from word search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Number of words about topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 0 -</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Value judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rE</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Redundant Manifest entry subtract from total index count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Index pages</td>
<td>Number of pages listed in the index for term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>Empty set for term or count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Table of contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Bibliography, notes, books, articles or references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Sorting code for critical discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Non-specific Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Specific Indigenous Nation or geographical region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Nation or nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Dual American (any hyphenated nationality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>Race count for comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Ideological discursive formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Instance occurs within war time discourse or during war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Term used in cited historical quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>CDA ECO</td>
<td>Associated Descriptive found only in reference to Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Refers to language groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Distinguished person of importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Possible omission of Indian personhood or sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Contemporary manifest within fifty years [year]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dependent variable (term or word) was mined for number of instances using Boolean logic and the data exported in a format of comma separated values (CVS) file. The CVS file is a comma delimited data file that contains the document name and title, and the total number of instances found. On the same spreadsheet are all the records of each instance listed by page number and an extracted sample of the surrounding text. Textual content that appeared before and after an instance was analyzed to clarify the designated codes. The cvs files were named according to the term sought, such as Indian, Black, or Spanish American and saved as an Excel worksheet (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2 CVS file for Spanish American](image)

The instances were coded as “B,” when located in titles of books, articles, and journals in the content, or found in bibliographic references and the index at the end of the textbook. All the instances of a term classified as "B" were subtracted from the
content count. Bibliographic references at the end of the textbook content, books, articles, or journals were not included in the content manifest, but used for the index manifest count to determine importance of a subject or term. If the instance was located in a chapter title or table of contents (TOC) it was coded as “TOC” and subtracted from the content count, but then added to the index count. An example for CDA code TOC is “Columbus, the Indians, and Human Progress Chapter 2 - Drawing the Color Line” (Zinn, 2009, DF p. 3). The numbers of pages referenced in the index listing were enumerated as a separate count for the index total.

The results of the index manifest count are the pages listed in the index of the textbook and then subtracting redundant entries of pages. A tally of redundant page numbers were recorded in the column labeled “rE,” and subtracted from the enumerated total of the index pages listed in the index of the textbook. This eliminated instances of cross references to the same textual content within the textbook. Instances that received the code of TOC were added to the index count. Although the term American was used in both the content and index manifest, it is only included to set a fixed reference point to compare with racial groups and American Indians.

The total content manifest count only includes instances with coded variables of B with the na-STEM subtracted. The non-applicable (na) relationships to the dependent variable was a term that was a stem of the dependent variable and not associated with race (R) or nationality (N). The stems of the terms were coded as “na-STEM.” An example of this is a search for an instance of black and a resulting instance of blacksmith. In blacksmith, smith is a stem of black. Blacksmith would be subtracted from the
aggregated content count. If blacksmith was also listed in the index as a subject, that instance would also be subtracted from the index results. The code of na-STEM was also applied if the instance was unrelated as a dependent variable such as Indiana or blackmail.

Instances of the term American for nationality were added to compare the grouping of terms “American Indian” with the other social groups. Such instances were coded as “AN,” for example American Negro or White American. This code was used for the critical discourse analysis, not the manifest analysis. The percentage of the dependent variable represented in the textbook was calculated using index pages listed plus TOC and subtracting redundant pages (rE), then dividing by the total number of pages for the digital textbook. This procedure was repeated for the terms English, Indian, American Indian, Black, African, Mexican, Japanese, Japanese American, Irish, Italian, Spanish, and Spanish American (see Table 2).

As in the research conducted by Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemski (1999), it is speculated that index references and a simple word count would reveal subject areas of importance in the textbook (p.49). The Content Manifest Analysis (CMA) results are graphically represented in the bar chart of Figure 3. The legend for (CMA) does not reflect all race and nationality variables included in this study, but the CMA chart does. The highly referenced social groups are American, Indian, and Black in Zinn (2009).
The resulting percentage for total index instances in each category of race or nationalities for the manifest index count of Zinn’s (2009) history textbook are American 14.6%; English: 0.3%; Indian: 15.1%; American Indian: 0.1%; Black: 10.2%; African: 0.4%; Mexican: 3.5%; Japanese: 0.1%; Japanese American: 0.1%; Irish: 1.2%; Italian: 1.2%; Spanish: 3.0%; and Spanish American: 2.0%. The manifest index results are not expected to reflect all races, nationalities, or dual citizenships represented in the body of the history textbook. An indicator of importance placed on a subject in the content of a textbook such as race or nationality is its quick reference listing in the index. The number of pages allocated to a topic or subject designates its ranking within the body of textbook.

From the index manifest count, the subject of Indians is referenced 15.1% higher than American: 14.6% and Black: 10.2%. Zinn’s inclusion of Black history and political activism occurred after he was a faculty member at Spelman College. His history
textbook sets a reference point for authors who are inclusive of social groups who were historically not represented in history or higher education.

Table 2 Manifest Count from Zinn, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>instance</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>na-STEMs</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>index pgs</th>
<th>TOC</th>
<th>rE</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigger</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Irish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This content manifest analysis indicates a high representation of “Indians” in the history textbook, but this is evaluating instances of the specific nouns (a dependent variable). The results reflect the quantity of occurrences, not the quality or depth of knowledge provided about American Indians. Nor does it demonstrate the dialectic relationship between social groups and the ideological discursive formations inherent in the text.

In order to evaluate the context of an instance to be classified and coded using the coding criteria in Table 1, the instance was located in the pdf file and a passage or more textual content was copied and pasted into the original cvs file. The data in the Excel spreadsheet was further analyzed for obtaining the counts for each coded value. Each coded value equaled one point and was aggregated for an accumulative total within each category for each racial group and reference to American Indians.

There were thirteen categories available for critical discourse analysis (CDA). Each instance could receive a dispersed score of 13 points, but it was unlikely. The points were not used as an accumulative value but the textbook as a whole was analyzed using the assigned categories within each analysis: manifest for content and index, ECO word list and CDA. The totals for each was tabulated into two areas of appraisal: manifest count and critical discourse, in a separate Excel spreadsheet and produced the following results for the manifest count (see Table 2) and the aggregated critical discourse (Table 3). The CDA codes for Contemporary, “C,” instances that occurred within the past fifty years, language reference labeled “L,” and Gender, “G,” were excluded from Tables 2
and 3. Social groups eliminated from the critical discourse analysis were Mexican American (null set), American Irish, Italian, Italian American, and Spanish.

Table 3 Aggregated Critical Discourse from Zinn, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>ns</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To analyze relationships of power, instances within eight CDA categories were aggregated for each racial group and compared to American Indians: 1) Ideological Discursive formations, 2) War, 3) Historical quote, 4) non-specific descriptive, 5) Specific descriptive, 6) Nation or Nationality, 7) American in conjunction with a nationality or race, and 8) Race. The classification of an instance as an ideological discursive (ID) occurs when a term within the discourse of the textbook represents or is identified as a judgment, or displays an ideological discursive formation that creates
supremacy of one social group over another (Fairclough, 1994, p. 132-133). An example of an instance for Indian collected is:

The Reverend Theodore Parker, Unitarian minister in Boston, combined eloquent criticism of the war with contempt for the Mexican people, whom he called ‘a wretched people; wretched in their origin, history, and character,’ who must eventually give way as the Indians did. (Zinn, DF p. 90)

The assigned codes for the above passage were: ns, R, ID, W, and H. Indians are non-specific and generalized as a racial social group, R. The historical quote, H, is from the Mexican War period and war is a term used in the descriptive passage, W. The ideological discursive formation is in the historical quote: "a wretched people; wretched in their origin, history, and character," which places a negative judgment value on Mexicans with the term “wretched.” This ideological discursive formation is then associated to Indians and predicates power relationship within the text, “give away as Indians did” for the Mexicans and “wretched” for the Indians.

Another ideological discursive formation occurred when the reader was misdirected with text constructing a knowledge base of American Indians by omitting atrocities committed by Columbus that led to the extinction of the Arawak, also known as the Taino. The same text generalizes Indians as one racial social group, Native Americans, as shown in a passage from *The Americans* by Danzer et al. (2005) with the bold heading of:
The Impact on Native Americans

The Taino who greeted Columbus in 1492 could not have imagined the colonization and outbreaks of disease that would soon follow. While the Taino resisted Spanish control, there was little they could do against the viruses and diseases that accompanied the new settlers. (p. 28)

And, found again, in The Americans by Danzer et al. (2006) under the same heading:

The Impact on Native Americans . . .

The arrival of the Europeans devastated Native Americans by another means: disease. The Taino, for example, had not developed any natural immunity to measles, mumps, chickenpox, smallpox, typhus, or other diseases Europeans had unknowingly brought with them. Consequently, the Taino died by the thousands once they were exposed. (DF, p. 183)

The updated publication of The Americans by Danzer et al. (2009) remains unchanged, hence:

The arrival of the Europeans devastated Native Americans by another means: disease. The Taino, for example, had not developed any natural immunity to measles, mumps, chickenpox, smallpox, typhus, or other diseases Europeans had unknowingly brought with them. Consequently, the Taino died by the thousands once they were exposed. (DF, p. 183)

The blatant misdirection of information leads the reader to believe that the extinction of the Arawak civilization, called Taino by Columbus, was an indirect and passive result of disease, not the cruel torture, genocide, and sadistic actions of Columbus’s sailors. The
iron swords and developed combat skills of the Spanish colonizers were far superior to the Arawak’s sea and agricultural technology. The clash of ideologies proved to be fatal for the Arawak. The ideological discursive formation is introduced to the reader by associating the term “unknowingly” to the Europeans as if an unintended genocide of many Native Americans was not related to colonization and conquest.

The instance was coded for further mining of textual data surrounding the search term and for additional judgment terms for ECO word list analysis. An example of a negative judgment value assigned to a term was demonstrated in the historical quote taken from *A Peoples History*, “wretched.” If an initial value judgment could be assigned due to a strong position of a positive, neutral, or negative effect (+,0,-), it was assigned. Otherwise further inquiry of the instance was indicated by no assignment within the ECO category and was to be further reviewed within the body of text.

The additional criterion for critical discourse analysis (CDA) was the textual structure of power relationships for a variable, such as reproduced in events or acts of war. These instances were coded as "W" for War, and a Historical quote as "H." When there was an identifiable specification of groups of people, such as an indigenous nation or name of a federally recognized tribe, or a specific geographical region, the instance received a code "S." Examples of federally recognized tribes (nations) are Mescalero Apache, Hopi, Tewa, and Tohono O'odham.

People other than Indians were categorized as a specific group or other instances of racial groups and were also given an identifiable specific descriptive such as a geographical location of a city, state, region, and class. For comparison, they were coded
as “S.” An example is “demonstrations of Irish workers in New York, Boston, and Lowell against the annexation” (Zinn, 2009, digital format p. 91). This one instance for Irish was coded as R, W, and S. The “demonstrations of the Irish workers” is contained within the same paragraph where their organizational meeting was “called the war plot” (Zinn, 2009, digital format p. 91, para. 7). This paragraph demonstrates the reproduction of power structures in a historical event, but contains no direct historical quote. In the text and historical account, the Irish have completed the lexicon migration from immigrant and dual nationality to race. An instance of nation or nationality produced in the context of citizenship was coded as "N," and a dual nationality which included “American” plus dual citizenship or in conjunction with a racial group was coded as "AN," and any racial group as "R."

One of the objectives of this explorative survey is focused on the relationships of Indians in the text and the tendency of generalizing Indians as one ethnic group. Therefore, unless a region was the nomenclature of the Indians in that region, the instance would not receive the classification (S), but was designated as non-applicable (na). As an example, the Great Plains Indians was coded as "na" and "R." The Great Plains region consists of 68 federally recognized tribes. For the purpose of this study, Great Plains Indian is not a specific Indian nation.

If contemporary instances of Indians occurred, the instance was coded as "C" and the year was recorded. There were other classifications such as a distinguished person of importance, labeled as "D," and languages other than English were indicated by "L." The
instances coded as "C," "D," and "L" references were mined for historical charting; however, they will not be included in this study.

The instances coded as "ID," "W," "H," "ns," "S," "N," "AN," and "R" were mined for critical discourse to discover any social inequality and power relations in the textbook. The results were tabulated (see Table 3) and presented in a spider chart with a zero instance charted in the center with the radiating axes reflecting the total number of instances (see Figure 4). Each race or nationality had eight data series that produced aggregated values to be represented in the spider chart. What emerged were four relational axes: war↔nation, historical quote↔dual nation, non-specific↔race, and specific↔ideological discursive (see Figure 4).
An in-depth approach to visualize the CDA results was used to isolate controversial racial groups and juxtapose them with the aggregated results for English, American English, and native. For Zinn’s textbook, native was used to describe the birth of a person within a nation, usually American but not specific to Indian. The comparison groups chosen for textual representation in the history textbook to analyze their
ideological discursive as minorities in American society are: Black (Figure 5), Mexican (Figure 6), Japanese (Figure 7), and the target variable, Indian (Figure 8).

Unexpected results occurred when utilizing the spider chart. The eight axes provided dialectical relationships that reflect social structures and practices of American society when the dialogue of race and nationality appear in the history textbook. For the textual representation of social structures, the evaluated instances of Black and Negro weighed in as the highest as a category of race and along the power relational axis of race and non-specific (see Figure 5).
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Figure 5 CDA for Black and Negro classified as race.
Instances of Mexican rarely shifted off the relational axis of war and nation (see Figure 6). There was a null category for Mexican American and only one instance of American English.

Japanese and Indian people shared a political social event of internment camps, which is another label for concentration camps used by the United States government to imprison people based on race, nationality, or heritage. The instances for Japanese have a strong relational axis between war and nation (see Figure 7).

![Figure 6 CDA for Mexican mainly aggregated between war and nation.](image)
Direct formal or informal dialog of war between the indigenous nations of North America and invading nations or colonies was classified as war (W). Nomenclature associated with nation-to-nation relationships such as policies, agencies, departments, and military involvement was used to code an instance associated with Indians or American Indians as war. The strongest relational axis was between race and non-specific indigenous nations. Nation and ideological discursive had a comparable substantial count of instances (see Figure 8).
Figure 8  CDA Indian in history textbook.

The textual reproduction of non-specific tribes and indigenous nations was confirmed by the tabulated results, even with Zinn’s intent to be inclusive of Indian history and the strong representation in the content and index manifest count. The unique dual citizenship held by American Indians was not addressed in discourse or by a significant count of instances designated by “S,” which would have named specific tribes at various colonial time periods. Zinn did address the topic of Columbus with specific details and his annihilation of the indigenous people, the Arawaks. There were almost parallel occurrences between historical quotes and specific indigenous nations, but the relationship between these two categories was not fully investigated and they do not appear on the same relational power axis. A strong direct ideological discursive about war was not found. Even though much of the textual discourse involved government removal of Indians from occupied land, or state and civil rebellion, references were obscured.
The critical discourse classification model for analyzing textbook content is not complete until the ECO word list is tabulated and analyzed. The ECO analysis has been modified to focus on terms that are discursive in their association with the dependent variable, Indian. The interesting findings of a preliminary ECO analysis were terms that were exclusively associated with the target variable of Indian, as designated by the code “AS,” a descriptive found only in reference to Indians. The AS collected term set found using the search feature afforded through electronic file formats and recording the number of instances was: aboriginal:1, aborigines:3, adorn:1, ambiguous:1, clan:1, confederation:3, hospitality:2, maiden:1, specimens:1, tawny:1, terrorizing:1, headmen:1, hunting ground:2, and the legendary association of indigenous people of North and South American to the Bering Straits:1.

Another ECO word set extracted, but not exclusive to Indians, had a negative value judgment symbolized by a negative sign: guerrilla:6, savage:9, herd:4, naked:3, and stubborn:1 instance. Neutral values were discarded from the analysis. The formula used to calculate the Coefficient of Evaluation (ECO Analysis=Evaluation Coefficient Analysis) is 100 x Favorable divided by sum of Favorable and Unfavorable. The value calculated for this word list is 3.4 out of 100 possible points. This number is extremely low and does not reflect a thorough ECO analysis, but it demonstrates the procedure (Pratt, p. 22) as an effective quantitative method for locating bias. The determining factor in a complete analysis is the procedure of intercoder reliability. The logic of the selection of terms relied on the textual representation of instances. ECO analysis will not be conducted on the remaining textbooks, but will be explored in future research.
The content and index manifest count results showed a high profile of Indians in the textbook. Critical discourse analysis found Indians to be referenced in general terms as one racial group. American Indians’ status as sovereign nations within the US was never addressed. Terms or discourse to describe nation-to-nation relationships were not clearly identified. Indian wars were not clearly described, but the author did voice that Indians were invaded by other nations and colonies. It is interesting to note that the ideological discursive showed a clear power relationship with race, even with a low count of specific nations being represented. The quantitative method developed in utilizing the content manifest analysis conducted in the first textbook will be used as a predictive model for the remaining collected textbooks.

The limit of this study was that the inter-coder reliability required to validate and replicate the findings was not performed. As a predictive model, the initial investigation holds great potential for future scientific studies. The research calls for this analytical method to be conducted by scholars who are interested in the critical discourse of text and the ideological discursive associated with race and nationality. This explorative study demonstrates the critical discourse classification model for analyzing textbook content.
CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS

With Texas’s hold of the market in the field of textbooks, Texas can eliminate advances made by Caesar Chavez and Thurgood Marshal in civil rights and the reclassification of capitalism and slave trade as “free-enterprise system” and “Atlantic triangular trade.”8 “Because the Texas textbook market is so large, books assigned to the state's 4.7 million students often rocket to the top of the market, decreasing costs for other school districts and leading them to buy the same materials.”9 Ravitch and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute advocate for textbook adoption policies to end as the method of introducing accountability at the micro-level of classroom instruction and the macro-level to reduce the monopoly of “a handful of multinational publishing houses,”(three to be exact). To counter this new awareness of textbook content and state adoption policies, one of the three, McGraw-Hill have begun the digital customization of online textbooks, which McGraw-Hill say frees the schools and teachers from the market of textbook adoption policies.

The infrastructure needed or the cost per student for courses online is not addressed. The majority of Indian Nations lack the infrastructure required to gain access to textbooks online. The issues of access to digital materials from any student’s home

---


may unintentionally limit parent’s participation in their children’s formal education. The ability to substitute sections of curriculum over another has the potential of making the American story a consensus of white history and not the complicated and culturally diverse heritage of American people today. The ideology of Western thought is institutionalized through education and all supporting curriculum material and the digitalization of materials will not remove historical bias or the dominant ideological discursive formations.

What about the ideological discourse that is dominant in the textbook? Evident in the design of a classification model for analyzing history textbooks in this study is the inability for an author to recognize text that reinforces the historic dialogue of social power structures. The hegemonic power relationships are being sustained by the institutional framing of academic discourse through translations of indigenous worldviews using outdated sources. The instance of terms collected such as head men, hunting grounds, naked, and young could easily be translated into modern terms of council and sustainable living, while naked and young indirectly imply the stereotypical stance that Indians are childlike and unsophisticated. Modernizing the American Indian and their ancestors with words afforded through higher education will demonstrate the sophisticated and complex societies that have been overlooked and buried.

The misdirecting of conflict between indigenous nations and the colonizers as an “unintentional” outcome of contact as seen in Danzer’s et al. *The Americans* 2009 edition should alert all citizens of the injustice and redirecting that can occur within the textbook. The historical dialog of valuing American conquest over ethnic societies and their
cultures set the United States as a warring nation, not a culturally diverse democratic nation.

The power of naming, classifying, structuring, and creating a worldview is what an ideology does for a society. All languages have a hierarchy innate in the linguistic dialogue, but there are ideological differences emphasized by each language. An example is the Western ideological discursive formation engaging terms used for animals and non-human beings to position the Western society over “others,” and in this case American Indians. Words that were extracted from the history textbooks such as herd, tawny, specimens, and adorn equate the Indians in a Western linguistic hierarchy of less than human. Indians have seen animals, non-human beings, and the environment as material placed in their care. Animals were not seen as less than being human, but as an extension of life-affirming values. Western civilization’s canon of dominium over all that man views has been a driving force in the development of the US; whereas many indigenous nations, such as American Indians, historically view the human-being as co-conspirator in the ecological development of their region, not as a lord over all that is visible.

Historical quotes from citizens that have a command of the English language reveal value judgments placed on others within the American society. Historical quotes from people who lack fluency in English, the dominant literacy of American politics, bias a reader in judging that person and their culture as “less than” and inferior to the dominant class. The transfer of history, language, culture, and ideology for social groups who reside outside the American institutional structures and their production is based in direct social interaction of the family and their respective communities. For many
cultures, this transfer of knowledge is not textually represented, but occurs when oral
dialog can be exchanged. The reproduction of textual content and the consequences it has
had for American Indians can explain the resistance in the Elders of their respected
communities to engage in textual documentation.

The legal standing of the diachronic discourse is based on the written text.
Testimonies are recorded and transferred to a textual representation. The power of textual
representation is an issue in politics and education, but that should not diminish a
citizen’s voice or the unrecorded oral dialogue. The authentication and studies involved
protecting and transferring knowledge in an oral exchange between the expert and the
initiate can be seen in a fraternal organization of the Free Masons. The oralification of
knowledge has as its canon the personal presence of a linage associated to the
ontogenesis of a civilization’s knowledge or culture. It is ironic that indigenous
knowledge was discredited as hearsay when historically the expert certified by the
community educated the novice in this direct manner.

What happens, when Western and Indian societies clashed and the dominant
language of English is used to describe the value system of a society not based on
domination or the accumulation of wealth? Blatant instances of judgment values in the
textbook were: stubborn, savage, terrorizing, and guerilla. The value set of these
adjectives are negative and is assigned through a judgment value of positive and negative.
This furthers a colonial narrative that Indians were not smart or sophisticated and
operated outside of political and legal jurisdictions. In the textbooks, the foundation of
knowledge about American Indians begins with descriptions, terms, omission, and
misdirection that empower Western ideology and place the American Indian in a powerless position of past conquests. Domination is achieved through deception to obtain the desired results or profits without total disclosure, as evident in the US’s past treaties and present policies when negotiating with American Indian nations and textbook production.

In Chapter 4, the spider chart (Figure 8) of relational power axes shows the dynamic flux of power relationships attributed to naming specific nations, classifying social groups as a race rather than citizens of a nation, and rhetoric that places value judgments on culture wars. The issue with historical quotes is that they bring to the forefront nomenclature which discriminate and reproduce misunderstandings using racial terms. For example, the term nigger was perpetuated by occurring 26 times when it was used in historical quotes in the textbook that was reviewed for this study. In the textbook, there were words such as specimen, herding and terrorizing used only to describe Indians that associated them as inferior. Historical quotes need clarification and accountability in the formation of American memory for students. Omitting discursive events about American Indians such as the Indian Wars, voting rights, dual citizenship, religious rights, and sovereignty continue to negate the modern American Indian. The power afforded to the dominant class to depict American history is a white consensus of the American Indian.

Much of the criteria requested by researchers such as Klein, Mihesuah, Henry, Sanchez, et al., in addressing the treatment of American Indians, could be easily corrected by naming any one of the 566 specific tribes involved in historical incidents
and stating what their current modern position is in the US. The tendency to generalize American Indians as one social group might be a conscious effort to disarm each Indian nation’s political power as a nation-within-a-nation and make them just one more racial group in the cultural evolution of the United States.

The tabulation of instances in this study when classifying Indians as a race and a non-specific nation demonstrate the relational power axis involved when juxtaposed against Black people, who were stripped of their culture, language, nation, and rights (see Figure 5). There is little power in naming one’s culture as a race, but there is power in the constant negotiation of people as a nation or citizen. The precedent established as a nation-within-a-nation is designated by “American Indian” and not as a native American, which is a term that can be used to describe any person born in the US. This ideological discursive of race and nationality is reflected in history textbooks that profess the conquests and conflicts of war.

The findings also propose that diachronic relationship of nationhood is imbedded in the term “Indian.” The migration of “Indian” as a race occurs in the recent terms of “native” and “native American” which has no precedence or clout for the American Indian as a nation-within-a-nation. When the term American was used in conjunction with a race, an immigrant’s nationality, or previous nationality, there was a migration from the relational power of nation into the hegemonic structure of race. The equality of citizenship with people who had dual nationality was designated as AN in this study, and was a strong indication of the ideological discursive formations on negotiating power with the government in the textbook. The migration of an immigrant from dual
nationality to race was sudden in the textbook discourse. The second generation immigrant born in the United States then wore their ancestry as a cloak of race.

What factors increase the generalization of race and diminish a person’s status as having rights to equal discourse or pragmatic rights? The implications of this study demonstrate how powerful the nomenclature of race is in controlling and limiting the power of social groups within a nation. This study contends that the four dialectical axes of relationships: 1) war \(\leftrightarrow\) nation, 2) historical quote \(\leftrightarrow\) dual nation, 3) non-specific \(\leftrightarrow\) race, and 4) specific \(\leftrightarrow\) ideological discursive, are a starting point for continued critical discourse. It is this researcher’s desire to use this research to analyze discourse about Indian people and to cultivate the American Indian communities’ well-being and status in personhood and sovereignty.

“There is a need for more quantitative studies in Indian education,” said William Demmert (2006) in the first collaborative teleconferenced course between four universities, called “Cultivating Native Well-being through Education.” This study has answered his call in looking at old issues in new ways. The developed classification model for analyzing history textbooks can be used for any race or nation to find where power struggles lie within the text and to identify the four dialectical axes of relationships.

In Demmert’s course, Amanda Homes (2006) presented her paper “Indigenous Perspectives on Well-Being” in class, with a leading quote from Danny Lopez, a Tohono O’odham elder and language activist, “People used to say the hindag (culture) should be incorporated into the curriculum. Really, the curriculum needs to be incorporated into the
hindag.” The order of representation demonstrates the importance in the position of the subject on a relational axis of power, and its linguistic hierarchy. It can be inferred that culture is more important than curriculum. What would the institutional course title be if the order is changed? The answer to this question is that the title for the class would be: Cultivating Education’s Well-Being through a Native Culture. This illustrates how important the stance and positioning of English words are in establishing power relationships and the diachronic institutional discourse that subjugate the indigenous perspective and Indian nations.

The national and recent protests against the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) in Tucson, Arizona have been about the exclusion of the dominant population’s Latin culture and history from the curriculum. The legal ruling has been seen as a subversive civil class action to influence the Hispanic population education. Before the development of “ethnic studies” in TUSD, the Mexican, Hispanic, and Chicano students had had low achievement scores and little college potential. Ethnic students in classrooms where the core curriculum is the textbook become disinterested in learning and educational achievement. They are highly represented in the low socioeconomic class. Post-ethnic studies statistics showed the program had a remarkable increase of academic achievement and proved of great value for ethnic and non-ethnic students and their families. The ethnic students’ power in discourse is limited by the European and official knowledge of American society when the textbooks do not reflect the culture and history of its local citizens and supplemental curriculum to cover those topics is discarded and
omitted. TUSD is using education to reduce the prospective pool of college graduates and maintain a dominant power over ethnic students’ futures.

The effective domination of power by institutions occurs in the act of removing representation of a social group such as a class, specific population, or nation from the institutional framing of education or government history. The invisibility or omission of important social events in the diachronic journey of the multicultural nation of America allows for the generalization of social groups for the purposes of influencing or directing the actions of a nation’s citizens into a hegemonic government stance defined through the classification of the social group as a race. As a race, the power of a citizen’s representation is diminished as a civil and human rights issue to a status of less than the identification of one’s nationality. As Pratt concurs:

For [a] person to be able to contribute equally, they must have equal status. Having equal status will presumably mean having equal discoursal and pragmatic rights and obligations…having equal status also means having equal control over the determination of concepts presupposed by Grice’s maxims: over what for interactional purposes counts as ‘truth’, ‘relevance’, adequate information, etc. (Pratt, 1981, p. 13 as cited by Fairclough, 1996, p. 47)

Therefore, the vitality of a social structure and democratic government which agrees that its citizens should be treated equally and have equal rights should include the historical treatment of all its citizens in the local, state, and national perspective. This treatment of all people as citizens with a diverse history will guard against the discrimination of a
nation citizen though a social classification of race which disempowers a citizen’s heritage and history. The social classification of race allows an institution and government to control social status, discourse, and education through intemperate policies and procedures.

The acts of the Holocaust against the Jews and other government classified “undesirables” occurred in the United States long before Germany gained notoriety for its acts of genocide against its citizens. The colonization of America resulted in similar atrocities against the indigenous populations. If one thinks that the treatment of the American Indian is in the past, or that history textbooks need only be concerned with capitalistic and nationalistic conquests for the dissemination of a nation’s sociopolitical history, then consider the implications for someone who has an American Indian heritage.

At the micro-level of the educational experience, when the researcher was in high school, the history textbooks did not reflect the Apache, Spanish or any other racial or national heritage that was involved in New Mexico or US history. As a high school student, I was in constant critical dialogue with teachers about the “invisibility” of the dominant population in New Mexico of Indians and Hispanics. The researcher of this dissertation did not graduate from high school because of failing marks in history. To obtain the alternative high school degree, the researcher entered into the government solution of vocational training and equivalent high school diploma, the GED, at a Job Corps facility in Roswell, New Mexico. The GED has five tests: language arts reading, language arts writing, social studies, science, and mathematics. The researcher’s highest
score across the tested subjects in was social studies which included history, geography, civic and government.

As another example from the not so distant past, in 1886 there were only 35 Apaches consisting of women and children who resisted confinement to an Indian reservation. Geronimo, who was a highly respected and distinguished member of the Apache resistance, negotiated terms of surrender with General Cook in Skeleton Canyon. These terms were not honored by the US government. Instead, then-US President Grover Cleveland ordered the removal of all Apaches, young and old, who were of Chiricahua lineage from all the reservations in the Southwest region. A substantial majority of the imprisoned Chiricahua Apaches was not involved in the final Apache resistance to American colonization and many had established farms and ranches.

A seven-year-old Warm Springs Apache boy was also removed by force by the US Calvary and walked to awaiting trains with Geronimo and other Prisoners of War. The Prisoners of War (POW) status was designated for all the families, including children born during the 28 years of incarceration. Five-hundred-twenty Apache people whose lineage was designated by the US Calvary as Chiricahua descent were removed. Their first stop was an inadequate facility called Fort Marion, Florida, then from there to a concentration camp in Alabama. They eventually ended up at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

Neil Smith's oral citations from his father and mother confirm that his grandfather, the seven-year-old Apache boy, was relocated from the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona to the barracks at Mount Vernon, Alabama. Oswald Smith was a name that was given to him by the US Calvary, so that he could receive the commodities
rationed to the POWs. The boy was removed from family and friends to be reassigned to a foster home and attend Carlisle Indian Industrial School. He survived the boarding school experience at Carlisle Indian Industrial School to be reunited with the Chiricahua band in Fort Still, Oklahoma.

The Carlisle Indian Industrial School was designed and administered by Captain Richard Henry Pratt whose motto was, “Kill the Indian in him and save the man” (Adams, 1995, p. 52). This motto was similar to Pratt’s military career which was “the only good Indian is a dead Indian” (p. 52). Pratt was seen as a humanitarian in his efforts to save the Indians, and his new career in education was funded by the US government and materialized a profitable business in the United States. Even today, profits generated from the educational market exceed billions of dollars as seen in textbook publishing. When the military could not eliminate the Indians, the government turned to education as the means of isolating, conforming, institutionalizing and severing the Indian children’s bond to their parents and the ontogenesis of their heritage.

Oswald Smith enlisted in the US Calvary as an Apache Scout three times, each term was a three-year increment in a special branch authorized by the War Department known as Indian Scouts. His third term of enlistment ended at Fort Sill Oklahoma. When he completed nine years of US military service, he was re-incarcerated with the surviving Chiricahua Apache POWs at Fort Sill Oklahoma, where he married Gertrude. In 1914, Oswald and Gertrude Smith, along with other Chiricahua POWs, accepted the offer of the Mescalero Apache Tribe to become members of the tribe. This did not release the families from POW status, but held the potential outcome that they would not be
relocated or removed, again. The released Chiricahua families who had profitable businesses of farming and ranching in Oklahoma suffered great economic loss when they moved to Mescalero, New Mexico. Their children were born into POW status, and one of their sons was Hopkins Smith who is Neil’s father. Neil Smith is one of the first generation of Chiricahua Apaches to be born free of the government restrictions of POW status, and he is my father.

In 2003, after being accepted into the Language, Reading and Culture department at the University of Arizona, an American Indian woman enlisted the assistance of Duane Yazzie, a Navajo from Dine Country. She had walked past a fraternity since registering for classes at the College of Education. For three weeks, there had been some sandstone beside the dumpster in the alley at a fraternity house on campus. The garbage trucks had not picked up the sandstone slabs. The sandstone was covered with a greasy residue. She thought they could be cleaned and used at her home in Mescalero, New Mexico. The sandstone slabs could not be lifted by one person, but on that day, Duane was in the truck so she asked for his help. He agreed and they pulled into the alley to grab four slabs. As they were loading the slabs into the truck, another truck speedily entered the alleyway hitting the taillight and scraping the side of her truck.

She immediately confronted the fraternity student and took pictures of the white paint streaks from her truck that was visible on the left-side of his gray truck. The fraternity student wanted to enter his fraternity house, but she insisted on having his driver’s license to hold onto until he returned. He claimed he would pay for the damages,
but said his money was in the fraternity house. He did not want her to call the police
because he feared his insurance would go up and his dad would be angry with him.

He returned with a group of young men who were dressed like the ranchers and
cowboys in New Mexico and girls adorned in feathers and face paint in attempts to
imitate Indians. The students then surrounded her and Duane and began hackling her and
Duane with slurs of “trash digger” and “trash nigger.” A student came forth demanding
she return the fraternity member’s driver’s license, claiming he owned the alleyway as
the property owner of the fraternity house and there was no legal jurisdiction for her
grievance. She immediately called 911 and the University police were sent to the
location.

The fraternity and sorority members, dressed as cowboys and Indians, continued
their badgering until a policeman arrived. The house owner had a private consultation
with the policeman. When she noticed the verbal exchange and asked to tell her story, the
policeman threatened her with being arrested. The policeman also threatened to leave if
no police incident was going to be reported.

Eventually, there was a standoff between her and the fraternity member. She
negotiated a value for the taillight in exchange for his license and no police report. After
receiving the cash, she left the scene only to be followed by the policeman and pulled
over. The policeman demanded a return of the cash from her, but she had already
contacted the sergeant on duty to report the actions of the policeman. The sergeant came
and consulted with the policeman determining that the exchange of money for the
driver’s license had been a civil matter and outside the policeman’s jurisdiction. Soon,
she and Duane were released from restraint but the incident caused psychological distress in both the American Indians’ lives. She eventually stopped walking by the fraternity on her way to classes due to constant accostment from fraternity members and Duane graduated from LRC, “but I was always, always hesitant to walk near that area, especially on my way to classes in the SIRLS building. I was also worried about seeing those undergraduate students at the student recreation center on campus” (Yazzie, personal communication, April 25, 2012). The appropriation of American Indian culture seen by the fraternity and sorority is not new to the American experience, but it was new to me. Did the actions of the fraternity and policeman reflect their American textbook education?

   The stoic “Indian” is silent, because the Western ears are deaf. If Western scholars and the general public were not “rebuilding” the foundations of their elementary educational experience to include Indians, it would not require extensive time and effort to research and authenticate their respective fields of study. If the elementary educational experience of K-12 included specific American Indians federal relations, Indians would have a political status as equals in the American journey. But when professors are “rebuilding” the foundations of a total cognitive structure of a national identity that excludes Indians as vibrant modern nations within the US, misunderstandings will continue to occur. Additionally, there is a great deal of psychological distress experienced when one discovers that the historical origins of the American nation involve acts of genocide and deception.
Whose interest, needs, and concerns does the text represent when informing the reader about American Indians? This study found the economic gains reaped by publishers whose textbooks are adopted and that the adoption policy is in the hands of selection committees whose national identity was shaped through public education. The core curriculum of public education is based on the textbook. Textbooks reflect marketing strategies—not the quality, cultural complexity, and depth of the democratic evolution—in depicting the American experience.

How are American Indians portrayed in secondary history textbooks? They are depicted in a colonial past as a conquered race. The surviving sovereign nations within the United States are barely mentioned, except as one racial group. Is the information obscure or rich in detail? Some authors or publishers included textual representation but the ideological discursive formations portrayed American Indians as inferior to Western man. Is there diversity in tribal-specific representation? Although, there were instances of tribal-specific representation there is a predominant disposition to classify over 566 Federally Recognized tribes of American Indians as one racial group. Is there inherent bias (Curwen, 1978; Pratt, 1972) or misdirection in the discourse within those texts? This study produced a classification model for analyzing textbook content which found bias and redirection or misdirection of issues and incidents that affected the outcomes of American Indians. The words used to represent American Indians were unsophisticated and reproduced institutional structures that ignore their modern presence and perseverance. Are there omissions of important history? The American colonizer did not take over unoccupied land, anywhere an immigrant homesteaded or a European
developed commerce was Indian country. Yet, there is a profound omission of the American Indian nations’ conflicts and resolutions. Is there evidence of modern nations and their people? I agree with Pewewardy, there is only fluff and feathers.

Strategies for analyzing textbooks:

1. Get two copies: one hardcover and the second a digital manuscript.
2. Do a search and find in the digital format to locate topics you want addressed in the curriculum.
3. Check for judgment value and political stances in the text when discussing areas where disagreement or conflict might arise.
4. Use more than one source for instruction. Never rely solely on the textbook, even if the author or authors are your ally.

Students should be taught how to critically analyze and discuss text. Classroom exercises could include exploring their own family experiences or history to make history meaningful to their present day life. History textbooks by Danzer lack quality and depth needed to depict American Indians. This study found all history textbooks by Danzer et al, *The Americans*, to misdirect the reader into stereotypes about American Indians. Danzer et al also used descriptives that placed negative judgment values on Indians and portrayed European conquests as passive events in Indian genocide.

Questions for further research are: During which generation do people adopt a national identity and discard their heritage? Does that action affect the policies and procedures of a nation’s institutions? Most importantly, we as a nation should be concerned about the education level of the people we vote into office. When representing
people, politicians should represent the people. They should not represent the people with outdated values and ethics based on centuries of misinformation. American society should show the evolution of democracy and humanitarian values.

A sophisticated society values the human experience and does not hold power over people who are born without the most obvious physical attributes of limbs and senses, nor the color of their skin. Members of societies that have stepped in to assist those individuals, who are designated by deformity, disability, or race such as those in organizations for the deaf, blind, mentally and physically challenged, elevate the human experience into a dimension of unseen emotional and intellectual heights that could not otherwise been experienced or possible.
APPENDIX A - CRITERION

Klein Criteria for Literature 1985


1. Select books which aim at a world view. Avoid books which equate the white man with 'civilization', those with patriarchal or white philanthropically approaches to other peoples, or which reduce all non-western societies to the exotic, the primitive or the quaint. These views may be evident in both what is said and what is not said: omissions can be equally damaging.

2. Select books that are factually accurate and up-to-date- the maps and illustrations as well as the text.

3. Select books which present peoples with a variety of attributes, whether of personal characteristics or life-styles; not those where whole cultural groups or individuals are portrayed as stereotypes ['the attribution of supposed characteristics of the whole group to all its members' David Milner, (1975), Children and Race].

4. Select books which use language with care: do Africans live in homes or in huts; are they ruled by kings or by chiefs; do they jabber and shriek; do they speak a language or merely a dialect; are whole peoples ever described as 'childlike' or 'savage'?

5. Select books that give students information about a variety of cultures and societies, showing their effectiveness and achievements, whether historic or present-day. Discovering Africa's Past by Basil Davidson (Longman, 1978), for example, clearly illustrates that there were important and stable civilizations in Africa long before it was 'discovered' by the Europeans.

6. Select books that could equally well be used 'in an all-black classroom and an all-white classroom', and those which 'would not give pain to even one black child' (from Rae Alexander in Interracial Books for Children, Autumn 1970).

7. Select books which show children of different cultures and races carrying out the activities illustrated be it in mathematics, design and technology, the sciences, music, etc.

8. Teachers of world studies and economics can be guided by the publications of the World Studies Project and paper by David Hicks, “Images of the World” (available from the London University Institute of Education). Each culture has its own values, and it is
by these that it should be judged. 'Poverty' should not be defined as merely a lack of Western goods. The reasons for the poverty of certain nations should be set in the historical and political context.

9 Science teachers should be on guard against any assumptions in textbooks that it is scientifically viable to classify people in terms of race. This type of classification can lead to the implication that one 'race' is biologically superior to others. See: Race, intelligence and IQ, a booklet from the National Union of Teachers and Bias in biology books: some points to look for by Sue Watts (from Room 465, County Hall, London SE1).

10 Many religious education teachers acknowledge a special responsibility to avoid the approach that there is only one true doctrine. R.E. teachers are well placed to demonstrate that all religions provide a moral and social framework. The article by W. Owen Cole in Education 3-13 (Autumn 1981) recommends some useful resources.

11 Teachers of English could consider their classroom books in terms of the fiction criteria outlined under personal reading. One possible approach is to consider the recommended syllabuses suggested by Scilla Alvarado (in No.3 of the English magazine) representing Afro-Caribbean, Asian and black American authors at all levels up to GCE A level.

12 Reading schemes need scrutiny. If they show only white middle-class girls (helping mum) and white middle-class boys (kicking footballs) they are likely to be quite irrelevant to many of the children in the class.
1. Is the history of the American Indian presented as an integral part of the history of America, at every point of this nation's development?

2. Does the text explain that the first discoverers of America were those Native peoples whom Columbus described improperly as "Indians?"

3. Is the data contained in the text accurate?

4. Does the textbook faithfully describe the culture and lifeways of the American Indian at that time in history when the Europeans first came in contact with him?

5. Is the culture of the Indian described as a dynamic process, so that his social system and lifeways are seen as a developmental process, rather than a static one?

6. Are the Contributions of the Indians to the Nation and the world described?

7. Does the textbook accurately describe the special position of the American Indian in the history of the United States of America socially, economically, and politically?

8: Does the textbook describe the religions, philosophies, and contributions to thought, of the American Indian?

9: Does the textbook adequately and accurately describe the life and situation of the American Indian in the world of today?
ECO Word List - Pratt 1972

Note: The values are based on judgments by students in Grades 11 and 12 and in a teacher education program. An asterisk beside a word indicates that there was significant disagreement between the two groups regarding the value to be assigned to the word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>able +</th>
<th>bickering -</th>
<th>clean +</th>
<th>dear +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement +</td>
<td>bitter -</td>
<td>clever +</td>
<td>dedicated +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admirable +</td>
<td>blind -</td>
<td>cold -</td>
<td>delicate +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced +</td>
<td>blood-thirsty -</td>
<td>colorful +</td>
<td>delightful +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adventurous +</td>
<td>boastful -</td>
<td>common 0</td>
<td>dependent 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid -</td>
<td>bold 0</td>
<td>complex 0</td>
<td>deserter -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agile +</td>
<td>brave +</td>
<td>conscientious +</td>
<td>determined +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert +</td>
<td>bright +</td>
<td>conspirator -</td>
<td>devoted +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amazing +</td>
<td>brilliant +</td>
<td>corrupt -</td>
<td>devout +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious +</td>
<td>butcher -</td>
<td>courageous +</td>
<td>dictator -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry -</td>
<td></td>
<td>courteous +</td>
<td>dirty -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardent* 0</td>
<td>calm +</td>
<td>coward -</td>
<td>disgruntled -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive +</td>
<td>capable +</td>
<td>crafty 0</td>
<td>dishonest -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audacious 0</td>
<td>careful +</td>
<td>criminal -</td>
<td>disloyal -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>charitable +</td>
<td>cruel -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backward -</td>
<td>charming +</td>
<td>cultured +</td>
<td>drunk -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbarian -</td>
<td>chivalrous +</td>
<td>daring +</td>
<td>eager +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful +</td>
<td>civilized +</td>
<td>dauntless +</td>
<td>elegant +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloquent +</td>
<td>free +</td>
<td>heathen -</td>
<td>insane -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enduring +</td>
<td>friendly +</td>
<td>helpful +</td>
<td>insolent -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic +</td>
<td>furious -</td>
<td>hero +</td>
<td>inspired +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic +</td>
<td></td>
<td>honest +</td>
<td>inspiring +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced +</td>
<td>genius +</td>
<td>honorable +</td>
<td>intelligent +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert +</td>
<td>gentle +</td>
<td>horde -</td>
<td>interesting +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremist -</td>
<td>gentleman +</td>
<td>horrible -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gifted +</td>
<td>hospitable +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure -</td>
<td>glorious +</td>
<td>hostile -</td>
<td>just +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair +</td>
<td>good +</td>
<td>howling -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faithful +</td>
<td>goodwill +</td>
<td>humble +</td>
<td>kind +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false -</td>
<td>gracious +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>famous +</td>
<td>grave 0</td>
<td>idealistic +</td>
<td>late -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fat -</td>
<td>great +</td>
<td>idle -</td>
<td>lazy -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful -</td>
<td>greedy -</td>
<td>ignorant -</td>
<td>liar -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearless +</td>
<td></td>
<td>imaginative +</td>
<td>lively +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeble -</td>
<td>handsome +</td>
<td>impatient -</td>
<td>lovely +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferocious -</td>
<td>happy +</td>
<td>important +</td>
<td>loving +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fierce -</td>
<td>hard 0</td>
<td>independent +</td>
<td>loyal +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiery 0</td>
<td>hardworking +</td>
<td>industrious +</td>
<td>lurking -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine +</td>
<td>hardy +</td>
<td>inferior -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foolish -</td>
<td>haughty -</td>
<td>infidel -</td>
<td>magnificent +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign 0</td>
<td>healthy +</td>
<td>ingenious +</td>
<td>martyr 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massacre -</td>
<td>peaceful +</td>
<td>raiding -</td>
<td>selfish -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean -</td>
<td>pillager -</td>
<td>reasonable +</td>
<td>sensitive +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menacing -</td>
<td>pious 0</td>
<td>rebel* 0</td>
<td>serious +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merciless -</td>
<td>pitiless -</td>
<td>reckless -</td>
<td>shrewd 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistaken* 0</td>
<td>pleasant +</td>
<td>remarkable +</td>
<td>shrieking -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mob -</td>
<td>pleasurable +</td>
<td>renegade -</td>
<td>simple 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate* 0</td>
<td>plotting -</td>
<td>renowned +</td>
<td>sincere +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modest +</td>
<td>plunderer -</td>
<td>resourceful +</td>
<td>skillful +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murderer -</td>
<td>polite +</td>
<td>respected +</td>
<td>slaughter -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutinous -</td>
<td>poor 0</td>
<td>respectful +</td>
<td>slow -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural +</td>
<td>primitive -</td>
<td>resentful -</td>
<td>soft +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice +</td>
<td>problem -</td>
<td>rich 0</td>
<td>splendid +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noble +</td>
<td>promising +</td>
<td>right +</td>
<td>strange 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal +</td>
<td>proper* 0</td>
<td>rioter -</td>
<td>stricken -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notable +</td>
<td>proud +</td>
<td>robber -</td>
<td>striking +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prowling -</td>
<td>rough -</td>
<td>strong +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outrage -</td>
<td>pure +</td>
<td>ruthless -</td>
<td>successful +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outstanding +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sullen -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality +</td>
<td>sacrificial 0</td>
<td>superb +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagan -</td>
<td>quarrelsome -</td>
<td>sad -</td>
<td>superior +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panic-</td>
<td>quick +</td>
<td>savage -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient +</td>
<td>quiet +</td>
<td>scheming -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriotic +</td>
<td>scholarly +</td>
<td>sweet +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathetic +</td>
<td>traitor -</td>
<td>unskilled -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treacherous -</td>
<td>untrustworthy -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talented +</td>
<td>trickery -</td>
<td>useful +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenacious 0</td>
<td>troublesome -</td>
<td>well-known +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrible -</td>
<td>true +</td>
<td>vain -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrified -</td>
<td>trustworthy +</td>
<td>valiant +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrifying -</td>
<td></td>
<td>valuable +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorist -</td>
<td>ugly -</td>
<td>venerable* 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thief -</td>
<td>uncivilized -</td>
<td>vicious -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatening -</td>
<td>undisciplined -</td>
<td>victorious +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thrifty +</td>
<td>uneducated -</td>
<td>vigorous +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tireless +</td>
<td>unfriendly -</td>
<td>violent -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolerant +</td>
<td>unreliable -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough* 0</td>
<td>unselfish +</td>
<td>warlike -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After reviewers and textbooks were selected, each reviewer was asked to grade each text according to the following twelve criteria. (For the full set of instructions, see http://www.edexcellence.net/institute):

1. ACCURACY: Is the text accurate in its presentation of facts and major historical issues?
2. CONTEXT: Does the text present historical events and ideas in a context that enables the reader to understand their significance?
3. ORGANIZATION: Does the text offer a well-organized, coherent narrative that emphasizes the most important eras, cultures, events, and ideas in U.S. (or world) history?
4. SELECTION OF SUPPORTING MATERIAL: Does the text illustrate the most significant events, ideas, and individuals with relevant, accurate, vivid, and interesting stories?
5. LACK OF BIAS: Is the text free of political or ideological bias?
6. HISTORICAL LOGIC: Is the text free of presentism and moralism?
7. LITERARY QUALITY: Does the text have a writing style that engages the reader?
8. USE OF PRIMARY SOURCES: Does the text make good use of well-chosen primary source documents?
9. HISTORICAL SOUNDNESS: Does the text give adequate attention to political, social, cultural, and economic history?
10. DEMOCRATIC IDEAS: Does the text give appropriate attention to the development of democratic institutions, human rights, and the rule of law?
11. INTEREST LEVEL: Are students likely to want to learn more about history as a consequence of reading this textbook?
12. GRAPHICS: Do the graphics and sidebars in the text contribute to the reader’s interest and understanding of history?

In addition to rating the books according to these specific criteria, reviewers were asked to explain what they liked most and disliked most about each textbook, thus giving them ample opportunity to expand their comments beyond the narrow confines of a numerical grid.
Native American depictions in recent history textbooks.

Value 1: Generosity and Sharing
1. Do the Native American people share their possessions?
2. Do they give/share selflessly and humbly?
3. Is the revered bounty of Mother Earth shared?
4. Are they encouraged by family, friends, or tribe to develop and share their talents for the good of all?
5. Are they represented as uniquely separate individuals as well as members of the group?
6. Are children portrayed as “lovingly taken care of” by family, relatives, and non-relatives?

Value 2: Respect for the Elderly and Women
1. Are male/female elders shown proper respect for their wisdom?
2. Are they portrayed as appropriate role models with whom the young can identify?
3. Are women portrayed as integral, respected, and important, instead of detached and subservient?
4. Are the younger depicted learning from elders, especially through story-telling?
5. Are elders portrayed speaking to the younger without interruption?

Value 3: Getting Along with Nature
1. Are Native Americans depicted as respecting the natural harmony of nature, but not as compulsive environmentalists?
2. Are there references to entities possessing a spirit or power to be respected?
3. Is the family unit depicted, teaching children love, responsibility, and life?
4. Is the humanness of Native Americans recognized, i.e., laughing, playing games, having fun, being with family and friends, etc.?
5. Is a language of respect utilized in referring to Native Peoples, i.e., avoidance of offensive and stereotypic terminology?
6. Are they portrayed as speaking “broken” English?
7. Is their spirituality/religion respectfully portrayed via ceremony, or is it referred to as superstitious, heathen, meaningless, or trivialized ceremonies, dances, songs, or “war whoops”?
8. Are they depicted with a wide range of physical features, avoiding the “Red Man” stereotype?
9. Are they dressed in culturally authentic garb, or are they all wearing feathers and headdresses regardless of the culture?
10. When depicted in contemporary times, are they dressed in “mainstream” garb depending upon the setting?
11. Do they have stereotyped surnames, or authentic translations, including “European” names?
12. Are ceremonial artifacts correctly depicted and explained, such as fetishes, medicine bundles, the wearing of turquoise and silver, the medicine pipe or calumet (not “peace pipe”), etc.?
13. Are they portrayed eating a diverse diet, and using utensils or just their hands?
14. Is accurate information provided concerning dwellings (or do they all seemingly live in tipis?), duties of adults and children, ceremonies, and practices?
15. Are they portrayed as contemporary people and not a past people who mysteriously disappeared and no longer exist?

Value 4: Individual Freedom
1. Are the Native American people depicted as accepting responsibility for the consequences of a chosen action or decision?
2. Are they portrayed as not imposing their individual will upon others because of a chosen action?
3. Is the leadership of the tribe properly depicted via multiple chiefs, the role of women in leadership, the Tribal Council, and the leadership operations for the good of the tribe?

Value 5: Courage
1. quad Is the courage of individuals heroically depicted as an effort to give to or protect one’s people, or is it referred to as “fanatic,” “savage,” “massacre,” or other terms that give the impression of a totally warlike culture?
2. Are they humble in their exploits and never personally boasting?
3. Are they portrayed as stoics, unable or unwilling to express emotion (unless around strangers)?
4. Do they show proper reverence for the gift of life?
5. Is there a distorted impression that non-Native Americans brought a “superior” civilization to Native Americans such that Native cultures and achievements are demeaned, or are Native civilizations depicted as complex and sophisticated?

Additional Considerations
1. Is the author(s) a true Native American?
2. Is there evidence that the author(s) consulted a Native American?
3. Do the photos/illustrations accurately reflect specific tribal/cultural traditions, symbols, and/or art forms?
Digital Format (DF) Secondary History Textbooks
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