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Introduction

I know what challenges the children have. It is harder now for them then when I was in school. I will always tell them that they have a chance for success and to stay in school regardless. The racism now is more prevalent due to the spear fishing treaty issues. Sometimes I dread the future for my child and nieces and nephews. I hope they are strong and make it. They will need to be. So, I don’t see my year with each class as one where I just need to get them through the year, but as one of spending time with beautiful Indian children who deserve the best that I can give them so that they may find success in future years. I know that these children hold the key to the success of my Tribe’s future. The phrase “The children of today are the leaders of tomorrow” always sticks in my mind. I know that the phrase may not make much difference for non-Indian teachers working with Indian children. I know that non-Indian teachers have never experienced racism for being Native, and I have. Nor have they experienced lack of effort on the part of their own teachers in encouraging the children to reach for the sky. Things like these make me different from non-Indian teachers and therefore my teaching is different. Little things like teaching the children about Natives being the first people and that Columbus isn’t as important as the books make him out to be are important to me. I tell them that the language must be learned so that our ancestors aren’t forgotten and our culture stays intact. Their success is my success. This is how I am different from a non-Indian teacher.

From the reflective journal of a first-year teacher.

In the spring of 2002, over 500 American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian pre-service teachers completed Native teacher preparation programs (NTPPs) and took their places as teachers in classrooms of Native students across the country. Most of the programs from which they graduated were funded through the United States Department of Education’s Office of Indian Education professional development grants aimed specifically at increasing the number of Native teachers for Native students. The members of this select teacher corps will become the vanguard in a movement to find effective ways of educating Native youth within systems where the transmission of “Native culture and knowledge” and the development of “the skills and talents needed to function successfully in modern tribal society and in the multiple societies of the United States and the world” will be inclusively embraced (Charleston, 1994, p. 30). Eight of these individuals also took on a second new role in their professional lives, as each became the focus of a case
The Native Educators Research Project, which examines issues of Native language and culture as they occur and exist both within NTPPs and in the elementary classrooms of the teachers who graduate from them, is a product of a series of assemblies and investigations by American Indian educators and leaders through which they systematically identified problems and posed solutions for effectively meeting the educational needs of Native students. The reports of two such events, the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force of 1991 and the White House Conference on Indian Education in 1992, spawned an historic Executive Order signed by President Clinton in 1998. Executive Order 13096 reaffirmed the federal government’s responsibility for the education of American Indian and Alaska Native students, recognised the “unique educational and culturally related academic needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students,” and directed agencies to collaborate on implementing strategies identified by the two reports. The same Order also called for a comprehensive research agenda to “evaluate promising practices” and the “role of native language and culture in the development of educational strategies” (Cohen, 2000). The Native Educators Research Project is responsive to this research agenda and it focuses on the professional development of Native educators, one of the major programmatic initiatives derived from the work of the Task Force and the White House Conference and the ensuing Executive Order.

Native Teachers – Native Language and Culture

From a tribal and Native American perspective, the creation of lifelong learning environments and meaningful educational experiences for both the young and adults of a tribal community requires a language and cultural context that supports the traditions, knowledge, and language(s) of the community as the starting place for learning new ideas and knowledge. There is a firm belief within many tribal communities and (among) Native educators that this cultural context is absolutely essential if one is to succeed academically and to build meaningful lives as adults. (Demmert & Towner, 2003)

A growing body of research supports the understanding that educational experiences grounded in heritage languages and cultures bear a strong relationship to healthy identity formation:

By not teaching Native children their own language and ways of doing things, the teachers are telling them that their language, knowledge and skills are of little importance. The students begin to think of themselves as being less than other people. The messages from the school and the media, and other manifestations of Eurocentric society, present Native students with an unreal picture of the outside world as well as a distorted view of their own, which leads to a great deal of confusion for students about who they are and where they fit in the world. This loss of identity leads to guilt and shame at being Native and turns to depression and apathy (Kawagley, 1999 p. 37).
Demmert (2004) reiterates this understanding, stating: “From the colonial period in America, educators told us that being Indian is not good, that knowing the language and . . . practicing the culture is not good. The long cycle of poverty that followed reinforced that.” But he adds, “Now we have entered a period that says ‘wait a minute’—” (2004, p. 7).

There is also strong support in the literature that improved academic performance is associated with educational experiences structured around local knowledge, culture, and language (Barnhardt, 1999; Cleary & Peacock, 1998; Hakuta, 1996; Reyhner, 1990; McCarty, Yamamoto, Watahomicie, & Zepeda, 1997). Education programs incorporating the cultures and values of Native communities are vital attributes of many Indian education programs today and teachers are viewed as the most essential link between these aspects of community and the processes of schooling (Pavel, 1999). Native children, like other minority students can be “disabled” or “empowered” as a direct result of interactions between teachers and minority students and between schools and minority communities (Cummins, 1989). Research on the interaction between students and their teachers in American Indian classrooms has found that the teacher can be a critical factor in academic performance (Bowker, 1993; Cleary and Peacock, 1998; Coburn and Nelson, 1989; Coladarci, 1983; Deyhle, 1992; Dumont and Wax, 1976; Erickson and Mohatt, 1982; Philips, 1983; Swisher, Hoisch, and Pavel, 1991; Wax, Wax, and Dumont, 1964; Wilson, 1991) and that cultural dissonance in the educational setting is greatly diminished when students and teacher share the same culture (Erickson and Mohatt, 1982; Kleinfeld, 1972; Philips, 1983; Wilson, 1991.)

Swisher and Tippeconnic (1999) note that the interaction between teachers and learners is the most basic one that takes place in schools and is a determinant of whether students will persist or not. They add, "A mutually respectful and caring relationship is essential to educational success. We believe that a good teacher is a good teacher, but when there is a good Native teacher, the relationship between Native student and teacher is enhanced” (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999, p. 302). Because the probability of situating education within the context of the Native students’ culture and language, thus decreasing cultural dissonance and increasing academic performance, is greater when the teacher shares the students’ culture, professional training of Native teachers to meet this challenge has become a high priority.

The Native Educators Research Project

The Native Educators Research Project has two primary aims. It first attempts to explicate the programmatic elements within the diverse environments of existing teacher preparation programs that support or influence Native pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward the inclusion of Native language and culture in the learning environment and prepare them to effectively situate their teaching within the cultural context of their students’ lives. Secondly, it examines the participants’ experiences as teachers to understand the factors in the teaching environments that either support or thwart the teachers’ efforts to incorporate language and culture or otherwise situate learning within the local context. The results of
this study have significant implications for sound models and effective practices in the professional development of Native teachers. The key questions guiding the investigation are:

1. *What are the attitudes of Native pre-service teachers toward the inclusion of language and culture in schooling?*

2. *How do teacher preparation programs impact these attitudes?*

3. *What are the standard components of programs that evidence their specific interest in meeting the needs of Native students?*

4. *What factors exist in the teaching environments to support or thwart teachers’ efforts to incorporate language and culture or situate learning within the local context?*

5. *Do the teachers perceive that students’ learning, academic achievement and social development are enhanced by the inclusion of language and culture in their classrooms?*

Research during the first phase of the four-year project was focused by questions one through three. Questions four and five were addressed in the second phase through multiple case studies.

**A Dual Conceptual Framework**

**Community-Based Education**

Over the last 40 years, policies that drove assimilationist systems of education for Native students have been replaced by ones intended to encourage indigenous control over educational systems. Stephen May explains that a consequent move toward indigenous community-based education developed:

...as a response to the long historical colonisation, subjugation, and marginalisation of indigenous peoples. It is predicated on, and framed within the wider principle of self-determination—a principle which is being articulated increasingly by indigenous peoples and their supporters, in both national and international arenas. (1999, p. 1)

The concept of *community-based education* is one of two theoretical perspectives that inform our examination of the interaction of language, culture and schooling in a variety of contexts and settings in this study. The process of Community-based education begins with people and their immediate reality. Above all, it allows them to become meaningfully involved in shaping their own futures through schools and other agencies in their community. . . .Meaningful school reform often depends on this kind of participation, in
which people renegotiate and reconstruct the ways in which a school relates to its
community’s interests.” (Corson, 1999, P. 10)

In her doctoral thesis at the University of Toronto, Jackie Daigle, a First Nations person,
studied indigenous communities in North America that had successfully reformed and
restructured their schools as community-based institutions. She specifically identified the
areas of reform and the paths of transformation from existing mainstream patterns toward a
community based structure (Corson, Pp. 12, 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF REFORM</th>
<th>MAINSTREAM PATTERN</th>
<th>COMMUNITY-BASED PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance Approach Structures</td>
<td>external structures→</td>
<td>community-based internal structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Methods/Goals/Structures</td>
<td>consensus/integration→</td>
<td>conflict/ transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Of Education</td>
<td>homogeneity→</td>
<td>liberating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>assimilation/dominant culture→</td>
<td>bicultural/integration approach and preservation of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>non-recognition of the minority language→</td>
<td>minority language preservation and revitalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Economic And Political Development</td>
<td>dependent on external structures→</td>
<td>growth of self reliance and self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rates</td>
<td>low→</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community As Resource</td>
<td>exclusionary→</td>
<td>inclusionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>top down→</td>
<td>→bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formal→</td>
<td>→informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programmed→</td>
<td>→process-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institution-centred→</td>
<td>→locality-centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reactive→</td>
<td>→proactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. From Mainstream to Community Based Structures.

As illustrated in Table 1, involvement of the school’s community is central to the
transformation, “not just to communicate the work of the school to parents, but to draw on
the community’s knowledge, expertise, cultural practices to shape the work that schools do
and make it relevant to the lived experience of children” (Corson, p. 9). Marjane Ambler
notes that in tribal colleges, which represent a highly successful form of community based
education, “administrators care not only about what happens to the student but also about
how the community is transformed by their graduates” (2005, p.8). There is an
expectation that the community members become the experts, the advisors and controllers
of the educational system; their values begin to shape educational outcomes and the
promotion of native cultures and languages becomes integral to the process. Corson notes:
“the indigenous languages become available as recognised political voices at the same time
as the people’s political will begins to assert itself” (P. 17.) As the transformation proceeds,
it becomes necessary to reduce the influence of outside forces and agencies and the
community “begins to supplement and even displace the professionals from the areas that
are more properly the responsibility of people who have the same cultural interests as the children” (p. 12). Thus the professional development of teachers who are members of the community and who can forward the movement toward community based education becomes a vital concern.

**Cognitive Theory of Culture**

Community-based education assumes a cultural context as essential to the success of Native students. Jerome Bruner, a pioneer in the field of cognitive psychology, supports this understanding explaining that “culture shapes the mind…it provides us with a tool kit by which we construct not only our worlds but our very conception of ourselves and our powers. . . . Learning, remembering, talking, and imagining: all of them are made possible by participating in a culture” (1996, pp. x-xi).

This cognitive theory of culture provides the second perspective that guides the exploration in this study. The argument that culture consists not just of behaviours but “rather of shared information or knowledge encoded in systems of symbols” has been proposed by many in the discipline of anthropology—Geertz, Goodenough, Hall, Schneider and Wallace, to name just a few (Andrade, 1984, p. 88). Goodenough defines culture as both a set of mutually held beliefs, routines, customs, principles of organisation and action, as well as each individual’s personal expression of them. Culture that is shared by a group consists of a mutually apprehensible range of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting. (Goodenough 1981 p. 104).

This view of culture as a system of shared cognitive codes and maps, assumptions about values and world view, and norms of appropriate behaviour departs from theories that ultimately reflect culture as a stereotypic, static, objective reality, or a “product” of the carriers of the culture. It is predicated on variation from place to place and from time to time, acknowledging that it exists in every context and plays a role in the way that people function.

In the present study, the dual conceptual framework—community based education and a cognitive theory of culture—facilitates examination of the interaction of language, culture and schooling in a variety of contexts and settings. It encourages and seeks the expression of a broad range of “emic” cultural and linguistic-related perspectives represented in a diverse array of Native communities and the schools that serve them while embedding the analysis in a concept of education that incorporates ideals advocated by Native communities and educators today.

**Methodology**

Historically, research conducted within academic institutions has privileged Western knowledge and worldview and until recently, such research in the area of Indian education “has made little difference in the academic achievement of Indian youth” (Deyhle and Swisher, p. 116). Consistent with the reigning Western paradigm, research from a cross-cultural perspective has in fact often resulted in the devaluation of cultures rather than authentic analysis. Duran and Duran (1995) offer that to be “palatable to the academy,”
research on colonised peoples has had to “take on a ‘lactification’ or whitening,” noting that “cross cultural implies that there is a relative platform from which all observations are to be made, and the platform which remains in our neocolonial discipline is that of Western subjectivity” (pp. 4-5). They add that the notion that “other cultures do not have their own valid and legitimate epistemological forms” amounts to the ultimate in “psychological and philosophical imperialism,” or what Spivak refers to as “epistemic violence” (p. 25).

Linda Tuhiwai Smith, leading theorist on the decolonisation of Maori speaks to the authority and validity of indigenous knowledge stating: Our survival as a people has come from our knowledge of our contexts, our environment... We had to know to survive. We had to work out ways of knowing, we had to predict, to learn and reflect, we had to preserve and protect... we had to have social systems that enabled us to do these things” (1999, p. 12-13.) Smith has this cautionary advice for researchers:

When undertaking research, either across cultures or within a minority culture, it is critical that researchers recognise the power dynamic which is embedded in the relationship with their subjects. Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical framework, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate, and to draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgements, and often downright misunderstandings. They have the potential to extend knowledge or to perpetuate ignorance. (p. 176)

Duran and Duran (1995) posit that it is now possible for indigenous people to enter a new era of constructive individual and collective awareness to forward a new paradigm that would accept “knowledge from differing cosmologies as valid in their own right” and thus would legitimise native epistemological forms (p. 1, 6). In much of the recent literature, the recurring themes of sovereignty, self-determination, and tribal control, as well as a rejection of “the age-old deficit and stereotypic approaches to education” can be read as an indication of such a paradigm shift in indigenous educational research (Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999, p. 295).

While much about this emergent indigenised or decolonising paradigm awaits clarification, certain of its inherent assumptions and postulations have been articulated. These include:

1. The research must legitimise native epistemological forms and privilege authentic knowledge developed by indigenous researchers (Duran & Duran, 1995; Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999).
2. Researchers must be cognisant and respectful of tribal sovereignty and local control of research. Where local guidelines for the conduct of research exist they must be followed (Crazy Bull, 1997; Lomawaima, 2000).
3. A socio-historical context must be understood and kept at the forefront of the work and the political nature of conducting research with indigenous populations must be given consideration (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Crazy Bull, 1997; Duran & Duran, 1995; Smith, 1999).
4. The research must benefit native people by providing solutions to critical issues facing their governments and communities; it must give something back to the researched community (Deloria, 1969; Lomawaima; 2000; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Swisher & Tippeconnic, 1999).

5. Research must be carried out in ways that are culturally appropriate; it must be humble, ethical, respectful, reflexive and critical (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Lomawaima, 2000; Peacock, 1997).

These standards guided the research process throughout the study influencing the selection of researchers, the design of instruments and protocols, the methods of analysis, and the overall conduct of the project.

Collaborative Team Approach to Research

As noted above, researchers have tremendous power in the selection of data or information and, more importantly, as the interpreter of its meaning. This understanding served to guide the selection of researchers for this culturally diverse and geographically broad study.

A collaborative team of 17 experts from universities and tribal communities across the country was assembled to design and guide the study. Twelve of the researchers were native and all were selected for their commitment to American Indian education, their experience conducting research in native communities, and their demonstrated scholarly ability. Members of the investigative team serve on faculties at Washington State University, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, University of Kansas, Northern Arizona University, University of Alaska – Fairbanks, Arizona State University, University of Hawaii-Hilo, and the Kootenai Culture Department in Montana. Each individual served as a fully participating co-researcher in guiding the project and each assumed responsibility for research sites according to geographic location and prior professional experience with programs or institutions.

Facilitated by a research co-coordinator, members of the team corresponded and met often to strategise, develop protocols, design instruments, share findings, collaborate on analyses and interpretation, and present the study at national and international conferences. The collaborative team approach was time-intensive and often logistically demanding, but it served to illuminate exemplary practices and processes within the diverse programs and classrooms, honouring the uniqueness of the varying contexts, privileging the voices of the participants, and validating local knowledge.

Research Design

At the initial planning meeting in February of 2002 the team produced a two-phase design for the study that would accommodate the dual focus necessary to understanding, the dynamic interplay between individuals and the two separate contexts in which they lead their lives during the course of this study—first as pre-service teachers enrolled in Native teacher preparation programs and later as new teachers in their own classrooms. They additionally defined the roles and responsibilities of each member of the team and identified and formulated an analysis plan for existing data bases and bodies of literature that would inform various aspects of the project.
Phase One research focused broadly on the NTPPs across the country and the pre-service teachers enrolled in the program. In Phase-Two, the focus narrowed to case studies of selected participants in their new roles as classroom teachers. The general framework relied on standard case study methods such as interviews, observations, and surveys (Stake, 1994). It involved collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data from a variety of time periods and sources, proceeding from individuals, to programs, to schools and classrooms. Component studies focused on individuals, groups, and educational settings served as embedded units of analysis within the central case studies (Yin, 1984). Findings ascend from initial, specific units of analysis, such as perspectives and experiences of the teachers in training, to progressively more general units of the study, such as outputs of teacher training programs, implementation of theory into practice in schools, and ultimately, student learning and social development.

The Participants and Sites

In the initial phase the project focused on approximately 500 American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian pre-service teachers and the 28 professional development programs in which they were enrolled. Twenty-two of the programs were funded by Office of Indian Education Professional Development grants and were located in Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, North Carolina, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Montana, and Idaho. A smaller number of the participants were enrolled in programs in universities or postsecondary institutions in Alaska and Hawaii.

In Phase Two, eight individuals were selected to be participants in case studies during their induction year as teachers. The case studies were located in Arizona, Wisconsin, Washington, Montana, Hawaii, and Alaska.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection in Phase One was geared toward (1) understanding the demographics of the participants and their attitudes toward the place of Native language and culture in schooling, and (2) descriptive information about the programs in which they are enrolled. Participants were administered a survey designed by the research team and consisting of short-answer, Likert-scaled, and open-ended questions to elicit information of the first type. Program information was obtained through guided interviews with directors and the less obtrusive collection of documents such as syllabi, grant proposals, and reports (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 1-3). Utilising NUD-IST and SPSS software programs, quantitative and qualitative data were catalogued, coded, and entered into the appropriate databases for analysis. Qualitative and quantitative data were integrated as appropriate to produce descriptive statistics related to both individuals and programs (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, pp. 90-176).

The baseline data compiled in Phase One provided the context and the foundation for the case studies in Phase Two, which were instrumental to understanding how the new teachers were affected by the issues articulated in research question four:
4. What factors exist in the teaching environments to support or thwart the teachers’ efforts to incorporate language and culture or otherwise situate learning within the local context?

Data collection in the case studies was guided by the following proposition, which has its genesis in the findings from the pre-service teacher surveys and analyses of the content, context, and processes of the teacher preparation programs in which they were enrolled:

*The new teacher who believes that students’ Native language and culture should be integrated in the classroom and who has received professional training to accomplish this will encounter factors within their teaching environment that either support or thwart their efforts.*

This proposition allows the research to focus on the “uniqueness and complexity” of the participant and their “embeddedness and interaction” with the context (Stake, 1995, p. 16). Stake has noted:

*The real business of case study is particularisation, not generalisation. We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does. There is emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself.* (p. 8)

A multiple case design, however, produces more compelling evidence and adds robustness to the study (Yin, 1994, pp.44-45). A procedural manual and rigorous protocol were developed by the investigative team and applied uniformly in all the cases thus promoting greater reliability of the findings. Training was conducted with the case study researchers to assure understanding and uniform application of the protocol (Yin, p. 54). Construct validity was assured by the use of multiple sources of evidence, repetition of the sources across sites, and review by key informants (Yin, pp. 33-34).

Dialogueic techniques facilitated by a cohort model and utilised during the participants’ professional development, were extended into the case study phase. For a period of approximately three months, case study researchers communicated on a weekly basis with their case participant to engage in dialogue on issues related to language and culture and the impact of inclusion on student academic performance. The dialogue centred on “etic issues brought in by the researcher” or on *emic issues* identified by the participant (Stake, 1995, p. 20). Under the mentorship of the researchers, all of whom have significant experience in the classroom, participants engaged in the procedures of “teacher research”—identifying questions about their own teaching and children’s learning they would like to research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Their explorations were recorded and documented in reflective journals, which served as one embedded unit of analysis for the instant case and across cases. This mentoring component directed the research toward the fifth research question:

5. Do the teachers perceive that students’ learning, academic achievement and social development are being enhanced by the inclusion of language and culture in their classrooms?
Findings

The findings are presented in three parts. First are those related to the participants themselves including demographic information, cultural and linguistic competencies, and attitudes toward the inclusion of Native language and culture in the education of Native students. The second section focuses on finding with regard to the Native teacher professional development programs, particularly the context, content, and processes that characterise the programs. The third section reports the findings of the case studies illustrating the issues the new teachers faced in the real world of the classroom.

Who Are The New Native Teachers?

Demographics. The new native teachers are a diverse group as revealed by the 243 (48.6% of the total) participants who responded to the Pre-Service Teacher Surveys in the first phase of the study when most were in the final semester of their professional programs. The respondents claimed over 100 various Tribal or Native affiliations. These are identified in Table 2 below in the words of the participants.
Table 2. Tribal Affiliations As Reported By the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Affiliation</th>
<th>Affiliation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yup'ik (2)</td>
<td>Athabascan/Koyukon and Gwich’in Athabascan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yup'ik/White</td>
<td>Inupiaq Eskimo, Golovin Native Corp., Bering Strait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inupiaq (2)</td>
<td>Fong du Lac Band-White Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athabascan</td>
<td>Athabascan, Anvik Tribal Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inupiaq/Caucasian</td>
<td>Yupik/Alaskan Bristol Bay Native Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native-Inupiat</td>
<td>Alaska Native, Sea Alaska Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit/Haida</td>
<td>½ Nooksack, ½ Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibwe</td>
<td>Ojibway/Odawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee (2)</td>
<td>Mississippi Band of Ojibwe/White Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lummi (4)</td>
<td>Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinomish (3)</td>
<td>Bay Mills Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lummi/Norwegian</td>
<td>Ojibwe-Nagah Chi Wanong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup</td>
<td>Turtle Mountain Chippewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville/Lummi</td>
<td>Passamaquoddy/Penobscot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>Confederated Salish &amp; Kootenai Tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakama</td>
<td>Lumbee (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakama/Puyallup</td>
<td>Waccamaw Siouxan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarora/Finnish</td>
<td>Tuscarora/Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo (2)</td>
<td>½ Irish/Penticton Band (Okanagan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muckleshoot</td>
<td>Muscogee Creek (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoopa/Yurok</td>
<td>Cherokee/Choctaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow (5)</td>
<td>Choctaw/Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee (11)</td>
<td>Cherokee/Comanche/Semino/Cherokee/California/English/Cherokee/Comanche/Semino/Cherokee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw (3)</td>
<td>Cherokee/Creek/Semino/Cherokee/Comanche/Ponca/Choctaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee/Creek</td>
<td>Comanche/Ponca/Choctaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux (3)</td>
<td>Eastern Band Cherokee/Western Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfeet (5)</td>
<td>Caucasian/Comanche/Semino/Cherokee/Comanche/Ponca/Choctaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>Kiowa/Lakota/Zuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salish</td>
<td>Delaware/Comanche/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni (2)</td>
<td>White Mountain Apache (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dine (33)</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham/Ft. Mojave/Laguna Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui (2)</td>
<td>Yaqui/Tohono O’odham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi (8)</td>
<td>Hopi/Navajo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi/Navajo</td>
<td>Gros Ventre (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quarter of the respondents are between the ages of 26 and 30; almost half (48%) reported being 31 years old or older; and of these, 21% were 40 and older. Typical of the elementary teacher certification field, a little over 80% are female (see Figures 1 and 2). As illustrated in tables 3 and 4, 68% of the respondents had one or more children, three fourths of which were age 14 or younger.
Table 3. Number of Children per Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Age Range of Respondents’ Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range of Respondents’ Children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than five</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and older</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, nearly half of the respondents had prior Instructional/Paraprofessional (T/I/P) experience ranging in duration from less than one to more than 15 years.

Table 5. Instructional/Paraprofessional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/I/P Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Total years of I/P Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 to 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 to 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 to 10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5 to 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language and Culture – Knowledge and Competencies. In addition to basic background characteristics, we were interested in learning more about the language and cultural capabilities of respondents. The Pre-Service Teacher Survey queries regarding their Native/tribal language abilities and their knowledge of their own as well as other tribal, languages and cultures produced the results illustrated in Figures 3 and 4 and Table 7.

As shown in Figure 3, a majority of the respondents (60 percent) understand their Native or tribal language. However, when we inquired further, it seems that fewer report understanding their Native language when spoken. About half or 46 percent speak their Native/tribal language and about the same number read in their Native/tribal language. A little over a third (35 percent) is able to write in their Native tribal language. In terms of use, about one-fourth (25.7 percent) of the respondents converse in the Native language on a daily basis while about half reportedly never converse in their Native tribal language (see Table 7).

![Figure 3. Native/tribal Language Ability of Respondents](n = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand Their Native/Tribal Language</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand Their Native/Tribal Language, When Spoken</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Their Native/Tribal Language</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Their Native/Tribal Language</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in Their Native/Tribal Language</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Native/Tribal Language Conversational Practises among Respondents
Overall, the respondents appear well-informed about their own and other tribal cultures. As shown in Figure 4, when asked how knowledgeable they were of their own tribal culture, over half (57.5 percent) of the respondents indicated they were somewhat/very to very knowledgeable; only about 11 percent said they were not very knowledgeable. Although less knowledgeable about other tribal cultures, 41 percent of respondents indicated they were somewhat knowledgeable and nearly a fifth (21 percent) said they were somewhat/very to very knowledgeable about other tribal cultures.

Understanding the Meaning of “Culture.” The pre-service teachers were asked to describe what was meant by “culture” when speaking of teaching or integrating culture in the classroom. The respondents’ answers are thoughtful and often complex, reflecting the diverse settings in which they live their lives but also evidencing many common elements. Some examples include:

- To me, culture is the system of beliefs, values, rituals and routines that a person is born and raised with. Culture is also bigger than one person or family. It is the collective beliefs and values of a given community.
- It is what one grows up with. Their customs, beliefs, language, arts and society.
- To me, culture means the traditions, customs, values, language and belief system that one grows up with.
- Culture involves all aspects of a person's life. Native culture includes history, geography, language, diet and religious activities.
- Culture is a term of identity. A way of life with values that pertain to creativity, social life, mentality and spirituality.
When all the elements or characteristics of culture cited by the participants were categorised, eight components emerged. Figure 5 depicts these common components and the frequency of their mention by the respondents.

Figure 5. Respondents Understanding of the Meaning of “Culture”

One hundred and sixteen respondents used terms associated with “relationships and a sense of belonging,” i.e. “Traditions, language, and daily habits performed by a group”; “traditions practised by a set of people in a given region”; “connection with family”; “beliefs and ideas shared by a people.”

Ninety six included the notion of “spirituality and values” in their definition of culture, i.e. “values and morals we are taught”; “learning the spiritual component”; values and beliefs of a people”; “spiritual beliefs and family values”; “traditional ceremonial knowledge”; “the social, emotional and spiritual aspects of life.”

Ninety four individuals spoke of “ways of knowing and living” as being defining elements of a culture, i.e. “the way that people are taught to live, think, and believe”; “the way a student understands the world”; “the total of all knowledge of a culture”; “how they practise their day to day living.”

Fifty-two respondents viewed “language” as a critical component of culture offering such statements as: “Language is important to understanding out culture”; “Culture is our language and that's what ties people together”; “Language cannot be separated from the culture.”

Forty-nine individuals saw one’s “history” as an element of culture. They referred to “our historical ways”; “our heritage and background in which we grow”; “one’s background or tribal ancestry”; “understanding where you come from, the history of your people.”
Forty-six viewed culture as essential to one’s “identity.” Some of their statements include: “Culture is not something that you are; it is ‘who’ you are.” “Culture is what defines a nation or peoples.” “It is part of a person’s self-identity.”

Thirty-two responses included references to those visible components that can be categorised as “material culture.” Typical items listed were: “foods we eat, music, dance, way we dress”; “music, lifestyles, and food”; “dress, language, and food.”

A sense of place was linked to culture by twenty-two of the respondents. Comments included: “Connection with Mother Earth”; “environment in which they live”; “where one originated”; “the land.”

Attitudes toward Native Language and Culture in Schooling. The participants’ attitudes toward the inclusion of language and culture in schooling are of particular interest to this study. The pre-service teachers were asked whether students’ Native/tribal language and culture should: (a) be taught in the school, but as a separate class; (b) be integrated into the classroom curriculum; or (c) not be taught in school. Their responses, shown in Figure 6, indicate that nearly 95 percent of the respondents felt Native/tribal language should be included in the schooling of Native children and only 5.2 percent felt Native languages should not be taught in school. Slightly more than 67 percent felt the primary means of inclusion should be to integrate Native/Tribal language into the classroom curriculum while 27.7 percent recommended that it be taught in school as a separate class.

Regarding culture, 96.1 percent felt Native/tribal culture should be included in the schooling of Native children and just 3.9 percent believe culture should not be taught in school. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents indicate the primary means of inclusion should be to integrate Native/Tribal culture into the classroom curriculum, while 18.1 percent recommend that it be taught in school as a separate class.

The respondents were then asked to rate the importance of teaching students’ Native/tribal language, culture, and Native studies in school. We compared this to their response regarding the importance of teaching English in school (see Figure 7).
Most respondents clearly felt that Native/tribal language, culture, and studies are important subjects to teach Native students; certainly on par with teaching English in school. A very small number of respondents did not feel that Native/tribal language, culture and studies are (very) important subject to teach in school (approximately 0.4 percent).

The Professional Development Programs

Context. Of the 28 programs included in the study, 12 are situated in colleges of education within state or private mainstream institutions and 16 are tribal college programs. At the time of the study, only one of the tribal colleges was accredited for a four-year bachelor’s degree. The remaining 15 had joined with neighbouring educational institutions to offer teacher preparation. Thirteen of the tribal college programs were carried out in partnerships with mainstream universities and two partnered with another tribal college that had a four year accredited program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream University (MU) (State or Private)</th>
<th>Tribal College (TC)</th>
<th>TC Partnered /MU</th>
<th>TC Partnered/TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington 2</td>
<td>South Dakota 1</td>
<td>Washington 1</td>
<td>South Dakota 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alaska 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hawaii 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-two of the programs shown on Table 8 are two-year “Professional Preparation” programs made possible by funding grants through the Office of Indian Education. Applicants entering the programs had already completed all general studies requirements and were ready to begin their professional studies toward a bachelor degree and elementary teacher certification.

Programs in the two states marked with asterisks do not match this profile. The four Alaska programs and one of the Hawaii programs are standard four-year teacher education programs. They were selected for inclusion in the Project because of their demonstrated commitment to educating Native teachers to meet the needs of the indigenous populations within their environs. To assure congruence across the study, only those cohorts who were in the final two years of their professional development in these programs were included.

The second Hawaiian program is a three-semester post-baccalaureate program situated within the College of Hawaiian Language. The program is delivered primarily through the medium of Hawaiian and is designed to prepare teachers for Hawaiian language medium schools, Hawaiian language and culture programs in English medium schools, and schools serving students with a strong Hawaiian cultural background.

A review of the mission statements or statements of purpose for the Native teacher preparation programs reveals many philosophical and ideological similarities. See Figure 8. All of the programs, regardless of their institutional context or funding sources, specifically articulate as their purpose the preparation of Native teachers to teach Native students.

The preservation or maintenance of indigenous cultures, languages, and values stands as an overarching goal for nine of the tribal college programs and three of those situated in major Universities.

Figure 8. Stated Purposes/Goals of the Programs

All of the programs, without exception, emphasise the preparation of culturally responsive educators as a desired outcome. The paths they took to this goal will be described in the next section.
Several programs move beyond cultural responsiveness to a vision of community-based educational reform, a transformational process in which the new teachers are key players. Mentioned in association with this goal is the preparation of teachers who will “return to their home communities,” to become involved in “resolution of educational challenges,” and to “support educational reform while bringing about systemic change.” This goal is explicitly articulated by three of the tribal colleges and two of the state university programs.

The number of Native instructors and faculty varies widely across the programs. As might be expected, programs delivered in tribal colleges generally have the highest percentages—30 to 50 percent—while most mainstream institutions reported significantly lower numbers; as low as “one” in three of the programs.

Content. The programs of study for all of the NTPPs evidence a focus on Native language and culture, Native studies, and diversity education. Table 9 presents an account of the number of tribal college and mainstream programs that required or offered an array of programs addressing this focus.

| Table 9. Diversity Education and Indigenous Education Requirements or Offerings |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|                                | Mainstream University NTPPs | Tribal College NTPPs |
|                                | Required by | Offered by | Required by | Offered by |
| Multicultural/ Diversity Education | 9           | 12        |              |           |
| ELL/Bilingual                   | 3           | 2         | (required for concentration in BLE) | 2          | (Required for AIS Minor) |
| Native Language                 | 1           | 4         | 2            | 5         | (Required for concentration or minor in AIS) |
| Native History                  | 2           | 1         | (Required for concentration in AIS) | 3          | (Required for endorsement or minor in AIS) |
| Indian/Native Education (Foundations/History) | 6           | 1         | 2            |          | (required for concentration or minor) |
| Native Paedagogy                | 3           |           |              | 1         |               |
| Other Native Studies            | 5           | 1         | 2 (Required for Endorsement or AIS minor) |           |               |

It should be noted that courses included on Table 9 are identified as being offered or required only for the professional programs of study. As indicated on the Pre-Service Teacher Surveys, many of the pre-service teachers, particularly those who completed their general studies in tribal college programs, had already taken a number of Native or tribally specific courses before entering the professional programs.
In addition to the above courses, the subject of native language and culture was addressed in a number of other ways. All of the programs utilised either summer workshops, monthly or bi-monthly meetings, weekend seminars, or community based research projects to focus on various aspects of language, culture, tribal histories, traditions, and government. These generally involved participation by elders or other experts from the communities served by the programs.

Many of the programs emphasised the integration of tribal/native culture, language, or values throughout the content areas. This was particularly evident in two of the university programs and four of the tribal college programs that prepared teachers to teach in the Native language medium or to earn concentrations or endorsements for teaching the language or culture. These six programs also enjoyed the highest percentages of Native faculty.

The pre-service teachers shared insights as to what was most important to them when, on the Pre-Service Teacher Survey, they were asked, “What more would you like to know about teaching Native students?” One hundred and sixty-two pre-service teachers responded to this question; sixty-six of the respondents expressed a desire for more knowledge in the area of Native language and culture. Examples of some of the responses are as follows:

- I would like to learn my language and be able to teach it.
- Language, where to go to look at some current web sites, and more culture awareness.
- With teaching students of the same tribe as my own I would say language, but with other tribal students I have to say just more knowledge of their culture.
- Become more thorough about cultures, lifestyles and languages.
- I would like to be able to learn more about teaching them their culture and helping them to do/understand it, but in order to do this I need to first understand it.
- I would like to find more ways of including native students and language into my classroom.
- Writing Navajo language.
- How to integrate culture related materials into everyday curriculum.
- How to get a curriculum on Native language and culture started in my classroom.

The next most frequently mentioned topic was “learning styles,” included in 13 responses, and “parent involvement,” which was mentioned eight times.

On the same survey, the future teachers were asked to rate their preparedness in a variety of content and subject matter. We looked at six areas of instruction in teacher preparation programs that could be loosely categorised as diversity related topic areas: English as a Second Language (ESL), Special Ed., Bilingual Ed., Multicultural Ed., Parent Community Involvement, and Co-operative Group Instruction.

Figure 9 suggests that respondents’ notions of how well they are being prepared to teach ESL, Special Education, and Bilingual Education are somewhat mixed. Of the three areas, 44 percent felt they were being somewhat/very well to very well prepared. This figure was closer to only 25 percent for ESL or Bilingual Education. Approximately one fourth of the respondents indicated they were not at all being prepared in ESL (26.9 percent) or Bilingual Education (23.7 percent).
In Figure 9a, we see that more respondents report feeling that they are being *somewhat/very well to very well* prepared in the areas of multicultural education (58 percent), Parent/Community Involvement (62 percent), and Co-operative Group Instruction (71 percent). A small percentage (between one percent and four percent) felt they were not at all being prepared to teach in these areas.

We examined nine areas of instruction in teacher preparation programs that might be characterised as standard: reading, writing, math, science, testing/assessment, technology, music, art, and social studies. Figure 9b illustrates that 76 percent felt that they were being *somewhat/very well to very well* prepared to teach in the areas of reading; in writing 74 percent; and in math 70 percent. A small percentage (between two and five percent) felt they were *not at all* prepared to teach in these areas.
In Figure 9b a similar percentage of respondents report feeling that they are being somewhat/very well to very well prepared to teach in the areas of science (62 percent), testing/assessment (71 percent), and technology (61 percent). A small percentage (between one and six percent) felt they were not at all being prepared in these areas.

In Figure 9d, a smaller percentage of respondents reported feeling that they are being somewhat/very well to very well prepared to teach in the areas of music (35 percent) and art (48 percent). However, social studies appear to enjoy the same degree of attention as other standard areas (65 percent of the respondents report being somewhat/very well to very well prepared to teach it). Music and art (similar to Native related areas, ESL, and Bilingual Ed) did not appear to receive equal attention in that 21 percent and 18 percent of the respondents felt they were not at all being prepared to teach these subject areas.

**Processes.** All of the programs utilised a combination of field based and classroom learning. Mentoring by instructors, community members, or classroom teachers was a strong component in 10 of the mainstream institution programs and in 12 of the tribal colleges. Distance learning was heavily utilised in nine of the tribal college programs and five of the mainstream university programs.

All of the programs followed a cohort model approach. Several of the programs also used linking seminars and/or journaling in combination with the field experiences. These two processes together enhanced professional dialogue and encouraged the development of reflective practise.
Case Studies – Theory into Practise
A total of eight cases studies were undertaken with participants in locations reflecting the range of cultural and geographic diversity represented by the NTPPs that were the focus of Phase One. On Pre-Service Teachers Surveys each of the participating novice teachers reported having a positive attitude toward the integration or inclusion of Native/tribal language and culture in schooling and felt that they were at least “somewhat prepared” to accomplish this. Diversity of school types and grade levels (depicted in Table 10.) was also considered in selecting participants.
To provide context for understanding the experiences of each of the new teachers within the cultural/linguistic settings of their first teaching positions, the following profiles are offered:

**Case 1.** The teacher attended an NTPP in a neighbouring large State University. She was formerly a teaching assistant at the school in which she is now teaching. While she is not from the Community, she is married to Community member. She is fluent in her own Native language (another Tribe) and is respectful of the Community’s culture and languages.

The community is comprised of two language and culture groups. The status of both languages is precarious. Most speakers are over 60. Controversy exists with regard to who should learn which language and which dialect or style. The Tribal Education Dept. and the Community School Board support inclusion of tribal languages, culture, and history. But no plan or curriculum has been developed. Language and culture class is conducted daily for all classes, except pre-kindergarten. A traditional garden at the school links learning to the students’ culture and history.

**Case 2.** The teacher graduated from a Tribal College NTPP and is a member of the community in which she is now teaching. She speaks the language and integrates it to some extent in her teaching but believes it should be taught by trained language specialists. “We live the culture within the classroom.”
Only a few elders still speak the community language. The culture committee and elders are helping the community work toward restoration. The language is written and high school students are required to take 2 years of language and culture. In elementary, there is only one 30-minute language class per week. The infusion of Native language and culture into the curriculum is supported by community leaders, parents, school board, and Native teachers.

**Case 3.** The teacher graduated from a large University. She is new to the community and does not share the language or culture of the students. She “chose” to “stretch herself” by teaching in a remote village far from family and urban amenities accustomed to. The cultural values and beliefs of the community are interwoven throughout the curriculum and she integrates “words” from their Native language as much as possible.

The Native language is spoken by nearly everyone over the age of 60 and is understood by most people in their 50s and 40s. School was established through a grass-roots effort and the environment is reflective of the local culture and values. The curriculum is linked to the Alaska Cultural Standards. There is a District level language and culture initiative and students all have language and culture instruction daily.

**Case 4.** The teacher attended a tribal college program. She is a community member, and, in fact, attended the school in which she now teaches. She was formerly an aide and a Head Start teacher at the school. She does not speak her Native language fluently, but understands it and believes that Native language and culture should be integrated into the curriculum.

The community is working toward restoration of language and culture. In the school, a curriculum to increase the use of the Native language and to integrate local knowledge and values has been developed by parents, teachers, and community members.

**Case 5.** The teacher is a graduate of a state university and was formerly a teacher aide at the school in which she now teaches. She is from a neighbouring community and shares the culture and language of her students. She speaks her language and is involved in cultural/traditional events and ceremonies in the community.

Within the community, the language has not been forgotten but “is largely in the custodial care of the elders.” It is being replaced by English for Council meetings but the Tribe is currently formulating a plan for preserving the language. There is division within the community as to whether language and culture have a place in the school. This conflict of opinion has impacted the school program. It was required that students have language/culture class once or twice a week, but it was left to the discretion of the teacher and teacher aides. Tribal council has now mandated that language and culture will be taught in the school.
Case 6. The teacher attended a Hawaiian medium professional development program in a public university. She has near-Native fluency in the heritage language; her Native language and cultural experiences were acquired through school rather than the home. She is young (no prior teaching or para-teaching experience) and is from a different community; but the language is the same as that of the students.

Language and culture revitalisation is an important issue in the community as it is throughout the state. Those involved in this movement can be seen a belonging to “a community” and the school is central to that. Families often live quite a distance from the school. The entire school is immersion with the language and culture serving as the vehicle for learning. It does not teach the language, but teaches through the language.

Case 7. The teacher attended a tribal college NTPP. He was formerly an aide in the school, which was a motivating factor for completing the certification program. He has had several language classes but is nowhere near fluency, however, he is known in the school as one who has contact with elders in the community and knows traditional culture.

The Community is comprised of two completely different languages – one a language isolate, the other is one dialect of several spoken in the region. Both languages are in danger, however, the isolate has the fewest speakers – most are over the age of 70. One tribal council governs both Tribes. A tribal resolution supporting language has been approved by council but it is not supported in actual practise. Local school districts have only recently, in the last 5 years, begun programs to incorporate culture and language into the curriculum. The tribal school appears to support language on paper but in practise is doing less than public schools at present. Language issues are delegated to the two culture committees.

Case 8. The teacher received her training and certification through a tribal college NTPP. She is a member of the tribe on whose reservation she now teaches and was formerly a teacher’s aide at the school. Raised on the reservation, she speaks the language fluently, and is literate in the tribal language. She has painful memories of her attendance at a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding school as a child. She is a fervent promoter of maintenance of her tribal language and culture.

The Community is made up mainly of one tribal group. The overwhelming majority (98%) of students belong to that one group. Tribal language is pervasive throughout the community, but mostly “older” people speaking it. Language and culture are considered core principles of students’ learning. There is one immersion class per grade level, kindergarten through the fifth grade. Kindergarten and first grade are taught completely in tribal language, with English being introduced in the second grade. Non-immersion students meet with the tribal language and culture teacher for one 30-minute class per week. Focus is on students understanding, simple word conversations and cultural awareness.
The issues with which the new teachers were grappling were revealed through structured interviews and in the pages of their reflective journals. Many spoke or wrote of their concerns related to the inclusion of Native language and culture in their teaching, a subject they were prompted to explore by the case researcher. But they also moved on to other topics, some unique to their teaching situation, others that are of common concern to most new teachers in most settings. These issues generally fell within five categories:

1. Teaching or integration of Native language and culture;
2. Parental communication and involvement;
3. Colleague relationships—jealousy and prejudice;
4. Classroom Management/Organisation and time management;
5. Accountability and Testing.

The categories become more meaningful when illuminated by the participants’ voices:

1. Many spoke of difficulties they faced in teaching or integrating Native language and culture. These difficulties generally emanated from three conditions:
   - Lack of Support—home or school.
   - Community Dissention or Lack of Support
   - Lack of Knowledge, Planning, Materials, or Training

The teachers spoke first about the lack of support:

*I am frustrated by the continued lack of time and administrative support for language and culture in the school.*

*I have heard from other teachers that the language should be taught at home and not at school. It seems like they don’t really mind as long as it does not interfere with their classroom and so forth. For instance, last year, one of the 1st grade teachers made a big stink about the immersion program. And this was because she was a regular classroom teacher. The problem was a student who went to kindergarten immersion and was put back into the regular classroom setting mid year of first grade. She kept saying “He does not know anything. He is so behind” and other remarks like that. So, in cases like that, I get the impression that they could care less about our program and what it offers to our children.*

*This is indeed one of the biggest barriers of our Immersion program. . . . the plain and simple fact that there really is no form of assessments.*

The subject of community dissention or lack of support served as a real impediment for many of the participants:

*Do I think language should be brought into the classroom? I think that we should try to. My problem with that is that people tend to mix our religion with that (teaching the Native language) in the classroom. We all have our own way we*
interpret our Tribal doings and when it is brought up in the classroom, it brings about a form of separation between people and even the students.

Coming away from the interview, I realise what an awesome responsibility we have to stem the tide of losing the language and culture of Native people. In what small way can I help? In my heart, I know the language and culture or (knowing and understanding) is good and important, but how to keep it? There is conflict about how this should be done.

Just this week, my co-teacher told another staff member that the dance the children were learning and practicing was not from their community. We discussed this later and what she told us was that (the birds) were sacred and as far as she knows, her people would not have a dance for them. Her grandfather used to go around and destroy traps put out by the “Americans.” The dance was an adaptation of the (one) brought in by (another Tribe). My co-teacher asked me “So, are you going to let the children do this dance?” This was disheartening. I have heard in the community complaints against a particular elder and how they do things or word pronunciation or spelling. Who/What should be adapted?

Language lessons need to be given to the parents to make this language movement work. Many of our students’ parents are young, who don't know the language themselves. When it is taught at school, it is not being reinforced at home.

For many a simple lack of knowledge or materials stood in the way of their ability to better integrate culture and (or) language and a lack of planning was seen as a very real lack of commitment on the part of the school administration.

Bringing in a new English reading program without considering that program's effects on immersion instruction!!!! They knew they were going to do this, so why not develop something that is equal for the immersion programs? They only had all of last year and the summer to do so. My school is sooo good at all this 'last minute stuff. That is one of the things that I CAN NOT STAND!!! Heck, we're only educating our children or future. They should be prepared for them, immersion or not. It is easier for the ones in charge to say oh yes, we're doing for the children. Yeah, right. It's the TEACHERS who are doing it for the children. Not for the state and the administration. And now, they want to test my kids in English because of the new programs. I don't think so! They might as well throw them into unfamiliar water without life coats and expect them to swim.

What would help me to be able to infuse culture more into my teaching would be time to plan and time to become more comfortable? The school board could help by offering more training. They offer all these trainings, but they are real hesitant . . . our principal has this thing about . . . you can’t go on any one day training. They want you to focus on longer trainings but there hardly any.
Monthly, we are to follow a list of topics relating to the culture developed by the culture program. I do cover some of the topics, but feel that I lack knowledge in some of the areas.

I still feel that I am lacking in teaching with the culture intertwined. I am not quite sure how to tackle this. Well, I know how to begin, but feel inadequate. When I learned about the history of my people across the nation, I was horrified and wondered why I hadn’t learned the truth long before I was in my twenties. I don’t see how I can teach that to first graders. I think that the history with the United States and Natives has to be known before one can understand why we are at this place today. Why we are on a reservation, why there is a need for our culture to survive. Maybe that is for the older grades and maybe my thinking is wrong. I look at the children and think about how hard it’s going to be for them in high school when it’s not going to be all Indians and people will be judging them for the colour of their skin and not for who they are. Then the inadequacy of my teaching really hits me! How do you tell children to embrace their culture and live it to its fullest, but on the other hand, some people aren’t going to like you for it?

. . . with the curriculum in place for first grade, it seems that there is little time left over to even take into consideration that the children are Native American. I think one of my needs is how to incorporate more of the culture into the classroom. My only excuse is time!

How do I want to approach incorporating language and culture in the classroom? I think it should be meaningful relevant and natural. Another aspect would be consistency—not hit or miss. It should be more than just vocabulary repeating names of things, like animals, colours, numbers, etc. This would be difficult since I do not know the language. I may have to start simple by having the students learn to count from 1-10, listen to traditional songs and perform/participate in traditional dances. The more I think about this, I get overwhelmed. Keeping it simple and finding resources—people, books.

Despite this lack of support, however, many persevered and prevailed:

I am a STRONG believer in our native language, culture and traditions. I am not ashamed to teach our children their language. It may be difficult due to little or no materials, however, one way or another, I WILL TEACH MY CHILDREN HOW TO SPEAK AND COMPREHEND OUR LANGUAGE. After all, we are nobody without it. My grandfather and mother’s teaching will not be forgotten.

I try to stand in two worlds, the Native world and the American world, and build a bridge between the two so that our children are fully capable of meeting the content performance standards in testing while also seeing the importance of their knowledge to their own culture and people.

If I see an opportunity to incorporate the language and culture, I do.
2. A second major area of concern for the new teachers was parental communication and involvement.

I still have butterflies when dealing with parents, so I have a ways to go.

I have learned that regardless of the classroom, children always bring their family with them, mentally if not physically and avoiding it or refusing to get to know the family is a refusal to accept the prevalent culture and the child. School is not only about academics.

When children come to me in class, I sometimes frown at having to deal with their parents because of a history of them not liking me. But, after my first year, I know that the parents are thankful that I am their child’s teacher. One of them told me that she was so happy to have an Indian from the community be their son’s teacher because I understood where he was coming from.

I am really conscious of not being a community member. I am always sensitive/respectful of this—not to overstep my boundaries—spoken and unspoken.

In working for schools, it seemed that the school culture and home and community cultures were separate. Parents express their separations with statements like “You are the teacher, why is my child not learning? That’s your job.”

I sometimes feel that my relationship with parents is strained. I feel that they really don’t express their feelings with me. Maybe this is natural. We may not have defined expectations for their child.

Native teachers have the tendency to take on extra burdens (that they may or may not be in a position to address) because of their close connection to the children and families, many of whom are relatives.

Right now we are working on encouraging more parental involvement. We don’t really have a plan, but everybody wants parent involvement to go up. Right now we only use our parents on field trips, raising money and PTO meetings.

My rewards include the relationships with the parents. If I have to call home about a student not doing her homework, they will say, “Thank you for letting us know.” They will tell me they will try and it will work for a while and then it’ll stop but during parent conferences they will tell me they are glad that I’m working with their student. I have had to tell some parents, no, for some change they wanted, but they didn’t get upset, they accepted it.
3. Relationships with colleagues were a source of stress and concern for many of the new teachers and often contained elements of jealousy and prejudice:

Many teachers do not trust each other, the administration or the community. They do not attend community events which is part of the problem. They leave after school. The administration has had so many changes. There is no consistency in expectations or support.

I was frustrated and slightly angry with the other first grade teachers for not offering assistance. I felt from day one that they were watching to see how I would do and almost sensed that they were waiting for failure and to be able to say, I knew she couldn’t do it. When I was hired on as a first grade teacher, there were others in the building that wanted my position and I didn’t get a kind reaction from two out of the three first grade teachers when I did get the job. One was to be my mentor on top of it all!

Once it was out that I would be in first grade, not one single first grade teacher came to me and said congratulations or if I needed any help to just ask.

I told another support staff that I was going to do this program and she said in a nice way that she would just love to be Indian, to be able to participate. During the program two other teachers that were non-Indian commented on how they wish it were as easy for them to attend college and have everything paid for.

Most of the time, comments were made in passing. I have had other teachers ask me where we were going to work and when we told them that we were written into the contract with the school and were going to be offered the first available work, most went silent. Another teacher named Ann made the comment that I should know that this isn’t a tribal school and public schools are different.

I had another incident where a volunteer at the school wanted to know how they could just hand out a teaching degree to someone in two years. I then fully informed this man of the prerequisites and schedule ahead of us. I was also more than willing to let him know that many of the girls already had degrees and only needed to be certified. Needless to say, I was angry with this man for his nonchalant comments and pure stupidity. It was hard to be nice during my explanation.

An incident that stands out in my mind has to do with the speech teacher at one of these meetings. We were talking about enforcing school policies, specifically the head lice policy. Some of our children seem to have a recurring problem with head lice and the problem is when a child is sent home, the problem isn’t taken care of and there is either a long absence or they come back to school worse off. We try to follow the policies, but in some circumstances, it’s best to allow the child to stay at school regardless of known problems with lice, so that they don’t miss out on learning due to absence. The speech teacher made the suggestion that upon orientation, that ALL families in the school be sent home with a bottle of “nit
shampoo” to be used and this was said in a very condescending way with a laugh at the end. There were some in agreement who also thought it was rather funny. I just looked at her and then said that “all” families in school do not have head lice problems. Our principal quickly changed the subject. After that, I was bothered by the statement and decided that if comments are going to be made as such, I wouldn’t hesitate to reply.

Another incident where another first grade teacher made a derogatory comment about the children was during lunch. My class was lining up and we were waiting in a group for some to finish dumping and we did a group hug. I am very tall so I leaned forward and grabbed as many as I could for the hug. The other teacher came towards me and said, “I wonder how many nits fell on you?” and laughed. I told her that I do not have a problem with head lice in my class—guess I’m lucky. This is a teacher that I have never seen hug her children. I made sure that my other family members would never be in her class as I find her very negative towards my people.

But some found that their commitment to their calling could provide support against difficulties with school staff:

If anything, some may not like me in the end, but I refuse to be treated any less than any other staff member. That seems to be the battle I have had to fight every now and then.

I feel that my job is to stand up for myself as a Native teacher and for the children. I think that my path has been leading back to my people and the training program has given me the opportunity to be a productive member.

4. Many of the novice teachers were overwhelmed by issues of simple classroom organisation and management of time as well as students:

Having a family with three kids, and trying to find extra time to finish up my lesson planning was hard on me. Being a Hopi, my weekends were spent at my village.

Another big challenge for me was personal management of time—not working too much—and yet working enough.

I never found time to order the things that could have made my job easier. . . . The beginning of the year has been so ***?*...! I have had little opportunity to concentrate on anything but classroom management.

I entered the classroom with little knowledge of how to manage a classroom full of kindergartners

We have one week before school starts to prepare but most of the time is spent in meetings. I feel that it was not enough time to go over our books. I knew that my testing would go down. I was scared about this since the beginning.
I’ve been so busy with school and trying to balance my life with (community). I don’t think this is going to work for me. This is too stressful for someone with a life like mine.

I am so burned out trying to stay late and get work done, then having to get home and get my family life together. Our weekends are hardly fee, with community things going on, which I love taking part of. But when you’re a teacher, you need some of that time for lesson planning.

I do know that teaching does come with its strings...It’s just that there are times my string feels longer, heavier, more rough than others.

But some found “guardian angels” who came to the rescue. These individuals received the highest and warmest praise:

I soon learned on the job that classroom management is the key to successfully teaching elementary students. I entered the classroom with little knowledge of how to manage a classroom full of kindergarteners. However, I learned quickly as I was forced to either sink or swim. I chose to swim, and classroom management became one of my big projects since it was an area that I needed to strengthen the most. By following the lead of my cooperating teacher, I learned how to be firm with the students while also using a gentle touch. In order to accomplish this, I first had to have my classroom management system in tact and as soon as I did, everything else fell into place.

This person was a life saver at the beginning of the school year, and still is. She is a wonderful person. She is the language and culture teacher. She helped by picking me up off the ground and lent a helping hand. Oh heck, I really don't think I would have gotten off my feet this year, if it weren't for her. She has helped me identify and set a schedule, what and when we would be teaching what, how we would adapt native phonics into Spalding. She laid stuff out for me and I picked it up and RAN with it. She helped teach the class when I felt overwhelmed and, believe me, I DID. She helped establish a routine...one that I still use to date. . . . Need I say more? This is the person who has unselfishly assisted me at my most vulnerable time when I did not know what to do! The first couple weeks of school was SCARY... I was lost and did not know what to do. I was frustrated and FREAKED OUT! With her help and advice...I made it.

5. The issues that received perhaps the most emotional coverage in the pages of the respondents journals was that of standardised testing

I was scared about this (standardised testing) since the beginning. They told me at the beginning of the year that no matter what I do with my fourth graders, when they test for the Stanford Nine, they’re going to do lousy for some reason. They said that fourth graders have a lull, or something, and that their grades are always low. So
my focus has been on testing. Do they know how to read the questions? I’m trying to figure out what’s wrong and I’m just kind of leaving certain things out, but trying to focus on this testing. My principal is a test man. He wants our students to do well on the tests. They prepare us by ordering Test Best. I didn’t start that until February, thinking that there wasn’t too much in there. I’ll know better to start earlier next time. I had quite a few low end students . . . They seemed to have trouble with comprehension. I had one student that I found out, at the end, that didn’t finish the last half of third grade. They let him enrol as a fourth grader . . . When I saw how my students did on their Stanford 9 tests, I felt awful. I first thought of how the parents were going to interpret this. I don’t know if the school got any calls. I was upset with not only myself but with the students. But I have to remember how test are biased toward our students. I found out I need to expose them to a lot of words. The research tells us that our students are visual learners. So I looked through catalogs for pictures that I could use to relate to words. The cost of what I wanted was almost 300 dollars.

When we have a pow-wow scheduled, I can actually say that I am always thinking about what lesson I will be behind—in due to the break in schedule—not the experience of the powwow and its meaning. Our school pushes testing so hard and focuses (so much) on raising scores that we are beginning to prepare in first grade for the testing in third grade.

As for the state standardised test, . . . I’m not sure how (the principal) wants me to do this. Do I translate the test orally in the (Native) language or what—or is that WRONG to do? I really don’t believe that these things were taken into consideration when the superintendent and (Principal) decided that first grade should be full immersion. Like I said, don’t get me wrong, I LOVE TEACHING OUR LANGUAGE TO OUR CHILDREN . . . However, how do the two (superintendent and principal) plan to back this up, and me for that matter, to the State of Arizona and the Board of Education? Yes, I need tests, and this is something that the program needs to take into consideration when preparing us for our profession. I believe that we have been taught well....very well. However, this is my weakness. Just a personal suggestion.

Sometimes the frustration is completely overwhelming. Sometimes, I tell myself that she (the principal) must have forgotten how it was to be a classroom teacher. But than again...President Bush doesn't know what it’s like either. His laws and mandates are making our school systems seem like boot camp, instead of a fun place to learn. He's cramming all these things down the States’ throats, and they're cramming it down the administrators...and finally, they are shoving it in from all sides down ours, regardless of the bad taste it leaves behind.
Discussion of the Findings

Taken as a group, the new teachers presented in this study are the ideal conduit to carry forward the promise of a new brand of education for American Indian, Native Alaska, and Native Hawaiian students—one branded by sovereignty and self-determination rather than assimilation and colonisation. They are a complex blend of idealism and wisdom, cultural/linguistic knowledge and the eagerness to expand their knowledge. Nearly half of them speak their Native tongue and most are knowledgeable about their culture. Perhaps most importantly, the vast majority view their language and culture as integral to the schooling of their youth.

The programs are as varied as the populations they serve; this is to be expected if they are preparing teachers to work with the many diverse cultures within their service areas. They all offer courses to prepare the future teachers for cultural diversity and many of the summer institutes and seminars are exemplary in exposing the pre-service teachers to community based knowledge and languages. Judging from the comments of the teachers, both from the survey and from the case studies, in many of the programs there is a need for more instruction in the areas of Native language, ESL, and bilingual methods. The other areas in which many of the participants felt deficient were: parent involvement, classroom management, speaking/teaching their Native language, and integrating culture into their curriculum. It is important to note here that four of the programs—three in tribal colleges and one in a major university—had high percentages of Native faculty (one reported 100 percent.) These programs specifically proposed to prepare teachers for immersion or bilingual classroom or to be able to teach their language and culture. On their surveys and in the course of the case studies, there was no evidence that the graduates of these four programs felt they were deficient in the areas around teaching their languages or integrating culture.

Preparation to teach and integrate the Native language commands the presence of Native faculty. At present availability is a problem, however, this may be changing, as within each cohort of new Native teachers there is evidence of a small percentage continuing on for higher degrees in education. There is much truth in the adage that “we teach as we were taught.” Experienced and well-trained Native faculty who embrace a more authentic, holistic approach to education can have a powerful affect on the training of teachers. One of the case study participants noted:

*It’s hard to change or be a different teacher the way they want us to because of a lot of the old teachers on the rez. I see that now because I just kind of went right into the path that they are in. That’s why I got interested again in reading my books over again, to refresh.*

In looking at the issues faced by the eight case study participants, other than those related to language and culture, many of them are similar to those encountered by new teachers everywhere. Many of the issues could be mitigated by more tightly woven support systems and mentoring. In their study of novice language teachers, Lally and Velera (2000) noted: “In all too many cases, the tremendous support surrounding the student
teacher throughout his or her practicum comes to a screeching halt as soon as the degree is conferred” (p. 106). This can generally be attributed to "Praxis shock," an unsettling response that occurs when their university preparation confronts K-12 classroom realities in their first teaching position (e.g., Veenman, 1984; Kelchtermans & Ballet 2001). Unfortunately, this often leads to high turnover and teachers leaving the field. In the field of Native education this is too high a price and every effort must be made by Programs to provide university/college support systems to bridge the gap between Programs and the classrooms and well prepared professional Native mentors to support the teachers in their new, challenging roles.

The need for strategies to increase parent involvement was made clear by the case study participants. The literature supports the importance of parental involvement in the academic progress of their children. It is believed to promote academic achievement as well as a reciprocal teaching and learning home environment among family members (Batchelder & Markel, 1997; Greymorning, 1999; Ward, 1998). For American Indian parents, however, there are many factors that hinder productive parental involvement (i.e., suspicion of public schooling, socio-economic barriers, unreceptive school personnel, etc). This is a topic that must be addressed more thoroughly and meaningfully in teacher preparation via both course work and field experience.

An exercise that had great value for the case study researchers and participants was the process of journaling. The new teachers are being asked to do things differently than they were taught. Effective change requires reflection and analysis. Journaling facilitated this for the case study participants. Many spoke about this effect in their journals:

The journaling experience has been and eye opener for me. I am not the type of person to keep a journal on a regular basis, which is why I found this part of the research project to be difficult. However, since I was able to reflect on various experiences in my journals, I was able to see possible solutions for myself before seeking the advice of others. Usually I would like to think that I can remember how each lesson went and what I can do to improve upon it, but I proved myself wrong a few times! By keeping a journal, I could write down exactly what I was thinking at that time and look back at it later and see it from a different perspective. As a professional resolution, I would like to continue keeping a journal since it can be very helpful to reflect on past experiences and how I reacted to them. I can also view these experiences from a different perspective at a later date and find other possible solutions.

A Research Based Model for Indigenous Teacher Education

When all of the data collected and words spoken in this study are integrated, there emerges some notion of just what a transformational indigenous teacher education model might look like. Because every effective program must meet the needs of a select population (sometimes many populations) each will in reality have variations responsive to the context. For purposes of constructing a model, we have chosen to depict features of one
that is exemplary of all the ideal conditions of paedagogy and curriculum to meet the needs of a community that embraces a decolonising vision of community based education. Some of the components of such a program would include:

1. Planning and designing of the program would begin with the community it will serve. Acting as the experts, community members would identify needs and oversee the curriculum for inclusion of the community’s values and culture.

2. All faculty members and instructors would be highly trained indigenous educators, committed to transformative schooling, and experienced in classroom teaching.

3. Native language and culture would be at the heart of the program, integrated throughout the courses and specifically attended to through classes to gain proficiency in the Native language and to learn methods for instructions—bilingual and ELL classes—and language planning.

4. A cohort model would be followed throughout professional development to facilitate reflective dialogue and provide peer support.

5. The faculty, in collaboration with community members and master teachers would serve as mentors in- and outside the classrooms, conducting seminars and engaging the participants in the use of reflective journals to link theory to practise.

6. Curriculum would be community based and integrated rather than segmented and compartmentalised.

This ideal world is not impossible to apprehend as shown by several of the programs in the study. Tribal colleges embody the transformation from mainstream to community-based education and this is reflected in many of their Native teacher preparation programs. Many of the programs in major universities, offered in partnerships with Tribes, are responsibly and respectfully tailored to meet the needs of the communities they serve. The real job for both is to prepare educators who are enlightened and empowered to become the change-agents. That can be a daunting task as most of the program students are themselves the products of mainstream systems of schooling.

Indigenous control of education has become policy over the past forty years. What that education looks like is still an issue. The problems in Native education that researchers are so fond of reciting were all produced systematically and historically produced by the mainstream assimilationist system. Analysing the machinations of colonialism is important and is proceeding today, but as Grande (2004) warns, “Unless educational reform happens concurrently, . . it can only serve as a deeply insufficient (if not negligent) Band-Aid over the incessant wounds of imperialism (p. 19).
This paper begins with the voice of one of the new Native teachers, informing us of the commitment felt by so many of this new vanguard in the education of Native youth. The last word is left to another:

As a native educator, I am the steersman on the canoe. I know the kind of journey that we are on and where our destination is. I am able to show the students how to reach our destination; however, it is the students who are paddling. To me, that is the best part about teaching. We are all paddling to reach the same destination; however, the paths that we take and the ways that we reach our destination are different. When I teach my students I have to trust their abilities so that we all arrive at the same point. In our language there are two meanings to the same word “año”. One meaning is to teach, and one is to learn. As a teacher, passing on my knowledge to my students is my main job, but I also learn a lot from my students as well. I have a responsibility to transfer my knowledge to the students, and the students, in turn, have a responsibility to seek out the knowledge from me. I am a native educator and there is an intention for what I do. The important thing is that I know what the intention of my job is and that is to lead the students on the right path for all our people.
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