

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

English, Pedagogy, and Ideology: A Case Study of the Hampton Institute, 1878-1900

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8410d7cd>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 24(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Spack, Ruth

**Publication Date**

2000

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# English, Pedagogy, and Ideology: A Case Study of the Hampton Institute, 1878–1900

**RUTH SPACK**

---

---

In the late nineteenth century, when the US government embarked on an educational program to teach English to American Indian students, there were few if any trained teachers of English as a second language in public schools in the United States. Immigrant groups that wielded some political power, such as German speakers, created their own schools, which were staffed with teachers who spoke the students' languages. In contrast, poor immigrant children, if they attended school at all, were typically drilled in English by the same teachers in the same material as English-speaking children, even though they could not understand the teachers' instructions.<sup>1</sup> Given that teaching English and teaching through English were necessarily trial-and-error processes, the issue of language and language instruction pervaded the annual reports of the commissioner of Indian affairs at the turn of the century. While there is a growing body of literature on American Indian education in the late nineteenth century, including historical overviews and studies of particular schools,<sup>2</sup> as well as the occasional study dealing with the US government's language policy at the turn of the twentieth century,<sup>3</sup> no detailed investigation exists of the methods teachers actually employed in order to teach English to American Indian students when this first nationwide English-as-a-second-language program was instituted. This study is a contribution to that history.

To learn how English was taught at the time the US government was increasing its involvement in American Indian education, this article examines the second-language program developed at the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia beginning in 1878. Hampton was not representative of all off-reservation boarding schools. Founded as a school for freed

---

Ruth Spack is associate professor of English at Bentley College in Waltham, Massachusetts. This article is excerpted from a book manuscript titled *America's Second Tongue: The Ownership of English and American Indian Education, 1860s–1900*.

slaves and focusing on the African American population, it was not designed exclusively for American Indian students. Furthermore, unlike the government boarding schools, it had access to private financial resources and, as a contract school, was relatively free of Indian Office control. Despite these factors, this investigation focuses on Hampton for several reasons, the most obvious being that it was the first eastern boarding school to accept large groups of reservation Indians in the late nineteenth century. More importantly, of all the school principals, all of whom were required to submit annual reports to the commissioner of Indian affairs, Hampton's Samuel Armstrong provided the most detailed accounts of instruction. Combined with vivid descriptions of actual classrooms, as detailed in Hampton's newspaper, *Southern Workman*, the school left an extensive record of the earliest English-language teaching at a boarding school. In addition, the Hampton materials reveal the complexity of the learning process for American Indian students. Other school principals either put a falsely positive spin on their English-teaching efforts or, if they mentioned language instruction at all, focused solely on the negative. Perhaps most significant is Hampton's commitment to put into practice what it considered to be the best educational philosophy of the time. The school made a concerted effort to create a program in which the English language became a "flexible instrument," to borrow Armstrong's term.<sup>4</sup>

The learning process at Hampton was to some extent a two-way street. Education transformed both students and teachers. As teacher Elaine Goodale (Eastman) expressed it, "[m]uch hung on our sympathy, ingenuity, and quick appreciation of the struggle to relearn, in maturity, such fundamental tools as a new language, new conventions, new social attitudes. It was a struggle of the will and the emotions, no less than of the intellect, in which both teacher and pupils engaged as pioneers."<sup>5</sup> As they sought to help students learn English, Hampton teachers (1) reexamined their practices in light of students' experiences; (2) experimented with pedagogical approaches; and (3) tested new theories, some of which would become tenets of second-language acquisition theory in the late twentieth century.<sup>6</sup> In the process, they replaced many conventional methodologies with more productive strategies for working with second-language learners.

Yet the Hampton case is also a story of failure. Hampton typically pointed to its graduates, particularly to those who entered the professions, as proof of the efficacy and value of its approach to education. However, reports gathered in *Twenty-Two Years' Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute* revealed that only thirty-one students had earned a graduation diploma from Hampton by 1892.<sup>7</sup> Donal Lindsey's analysis of later accounts shows that of the total of 1,230 Indians educated at Hampton from 1878 to 1912 only 158 graduated. A relative few of those attained degrees in higher education and even fewer went on to professional careers. Their achievement in this regard paled in comparison to the accomplishments of African American alumni. Those Indians who had obtained jobs were typically farmers or domestic workers. Furthermore, even if they were living in poverty, Hampton students were assessed as successful simply by virtue of their Christian marriage, European-style dress, and/or abstinence from alcohol. Lindsey's discovery of numerous

empty student files in the school's archival records suggests that many students did not, in fact, make any gains at Hampton.<sup>8</sup>

The reason that so many Hampton students failed to thrive is related to factors that plagued all off-reservation boarding schools, including homesickness, overwork, and susceptibility to disease. But these difficulties were in turn linked to the larger problem of cultural and linguistic displacement that resulted from the colonial context in which American Indian education was situated. Virtually every school established by Anglo Americans in the United States from the seventeenth century on was designed to Christianize and civilize the Natives in order to raise them above what was perceived to be a debased state. English thus signified much more than an additional language. The US government's demand for English language teaching was less a statement of the importance of educating second-language learners than an instrument of cultural and political domination. As early as 1868, President Ulysses S. Grant's Peace Commission recommended that compulsory schools be established in which American Indian languages would be "blotted out" and replaced with English. Underlying that recommendation was the belief that a uniform language could fuse the multitude of American Indian nations into a controllable entity—"one homogeneous mass". For the next ten years, the government began to place its own English-only schools on Indian reservations. By 1881, the commissioner of Indian affairs was calling for enforced English-language learning. With the exception of a brief period between 1894 and 1898 during which Superintendent of Indian Schools William Hailmann promoted bilingualism, the Indian Office insisted that all instruction be in English. In order for their schools to function within this colonial framework, European American in power had to situate themselves in a superior position, linguistically and culturally. In the words of Commissioner of Indian Affairs J. D. C. Atkins, English was viewed as "the language of the greatest, most powerful, and enterprising nationalities beneath the sun."<sup>9</sup>

The idea that the English language sustained and transmitted a superior culture informed Hampton's educational philosophy. The Hampton staff assumed that American Indian students were in need of conversion to the European American way of life. Teachers pressured students to adopt Christian mores and, when students did so, Samuel Armstrong would say with pride that they had been "converted from their own way; they have morally come to the right-about, faced the other way."<sup>10</sup> The language the teachers used to discuss students' progress often reflected deeply ingrained stereotypes of American Indian peoples. As Robert Berkhofer illustrates in *The White Man's Indian*, European Americans typically viewed Indians either as noble—dignified, brave, and hospitable—or as savage—wild, sexualized, and pagan.<sup>11</sup> Whichever stereotype was applied at any given juncture, European American characteristically measured American Indian cultures against their own, a process that almost always resulted in the identification of what was lacking in Indian ways of knowing rather than the recognition of positive attributes of Indian culture.

Nevertheless, to see education at Hampton solely as a tool of cultural and linguistic imperialism would be to deny the fact that the teachers strove to create a supportive teaching environment. At the very least, the atmosphere at

Hampton was riddled with contradictions and inconsistencies. On the one hand, the teachers were motivated by a desire to teach well and improve students' lives, and they were willing to challenge the status quo vis-à-vis pedagogical methodology. On the other hand, the teachers were a product of their virulently ethnocentric times. Their pedagogy inevitably reflected these conflicting views. As Michael Young argues, curriculum is not simply a set of courses but a social construct that reflects the ideological framework of those who have the power to administer educational programs.<sup>12</sup> This investigation thus goes beyond mere description of the course of study at Hampton to examine the ways in which knowledge was conveyed about—and through—language. The study seeks to determine not only how Hampton teachers developed effective teaching strategies, but also the extent to which their teaching strategies were shaped by the government's English-only mandate and by the associate discourses of colonialism that permeated European American culture.

#### THE EVOLUTION OF HAMPTON'S INDIAN PROGRAM

The story of Hampton's Indian program begins in a prison camp in St. Augustine, Florida. In April 1875, following months of hostilities that led to surrender in Indian Territory, Army Lieutenant Richard Henry Pratt escorted seventy-two Plains leaders and warriors to Fort Marion and remained to supervise their military confinement. The prisoners ranged in age from nineteen to at least fifty years. None of them could understand or speak English. Pratt's admiration of the prisoners' dignified comportment en route made him sympathetic to their situation. Desirous of facilitating understanding between them and the surrounding European American community, he declared English speech a priority and soon persuaded several local women to teach the prisoners. For almost three years, the prisoners received daily instruction. According to Pratt's memoirs, the effort was a great success: "Most of the young men learned to write fairly intelligent letters...and the English language became the common tongue among them."<sup>13</sup>

Pratt's goals for his students were limited, however. He expressed satisfaction with a student who "learned to express himself a little in English," but reacted negatively when the civilizing process worked too well. When Howling Wolf returned from Boston after five months of medical treatment, for example, his awakened sense of self-dignity and consequent resistance incurred Pratt's wrath. According to Pratt, Howling Wolf "had taken on altogether too much Boston for his resources and future good. He became insubordinate and insurrectionary, and I was forced to discipline him."<sup>14</sup>

After demonstrating that his English language program aimed to produce docile subjects, not independent thinkers, Pratt was able to raise enough funds through private sources to provide another three years of education for those who wished to continue schooling after their prison terms ended.<sup>15</sup> General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, head of the Hampton Institute, agreed to accept the Indians as students, for he saw a link between their needs and those of the freed slaves who comprised the student body. In April 1878, Pratt

brought fifteen (and later two more) of the young men to be educated at Hampton. With the new students on display at a welcoming assembly, Pratt had to provide an honest assessment of their linguistic accomplishments. As reported in the school newspaper, *Southern Workman*, Pratt claimed that some of the men could read the Bible, sing hymns, recite passages of scripture, and repeat what they had learned. However, he acknowledged, “[i]t may be, as some would say, that these are parrot-like speeches.” The “parrot-like speeches” were soon in evidence when two of the new students came forward to speak. After almost three years of almost daily English-language education, the two young men struggled to express themselves:

“I go school—way off. I come a school—three days, way off—sea. I go school here—I like here. Come last night, half-past one. Came not here—other house. I went school—Miss Mather....” [Matches, Cheyenne]

“I to-night came. Because my head don’t know. St. Augustine, one year—say don’t know—A, B, C, I can’t talk—A, B, C, D, two years. Good womans—Miss Mather—Miss Perrit—Mrs. Gibbs, good....” [Su-Cam, Kiowa]<sup>16</sup>

The Indian students clearly needed a more effective English-language program.

From the beginning, the Indian students at Hampton had the advantage of being taught by a group of teachers who were well versed in a progressive student-focused approach to education. Several of the teachers had attended the training school in Quincy, Massachusetts superintended by Colonel Francis Parker, a well-known educational philosopher. Parker’s program placed the child and the child’s natural environment—rather than the subject matter or the teacher—at the center of instruction. He advocated and put into practice a democratic approach to education, in direct contrast to schools that employed an impracticable system of reward and punishment to force students to learn. Disdainful of school curricula that separated language skills from content learning, Parker encouraged teachers to plan lessons that built on students’ background knowledge in order to create curiosity about new subject matter. He envisioned classrooms as active places, for he believed that children were “more interested in seeing how a thing is done, *after they have tried to do it themselves*, than before.” Parker did not present a lock-step approach, but rather taught teachers to observe the development of the child, and then urged these pedagogues to devise their own methods accordingly.<sup>17</sup> Parker’s philosophy fit well with the situation the Hampton teachers faced when the American Indian students first arrived. Having no experience teaching English as a second language, they were in a position to create an entirely new program adapted to the students’ varied needs.

According to Helen Ludlow, a Hampton teacher, the St. Augustine students began instruction immediately, four days a week, with two days devoted to manual labor and one to church. The Hampton teachers soon discovered that although these students were able to write and understand the language,

they could not speak English well. Six weeks later, while visiting the school, Pratt declared that his St. Augustine proteges had made discernible improvements, particularly in the clarity of their speech. Furthermore, everyone agreed that they were quick and motivated learners, leading Armstrong to believe that his school had found a productive way to educate American Indians. The government agreed to fund the program, providing a stipend for each enrolled pupil, and sent Pratt to the Dakota Territory to recruit new students. Pratt returned on November 5 with forty-nine students, including nine girls, ranging in age from ten to twenty-five. Despite the fact that an interpreter remained at the school to help with the students' transition, Armstrong had an enormous task ahead of him. One-third to one-half of the prospective students had never been to school; most of those who had been to school had been taught primarily in the Dakota language; only a few could speak or understand some English; and only two could speak English well.<sup>18</sup>

Fortunately for Armstrong, African American students played a significant role in the Indian students' second-language acquisition. The first party of Dakota students at Hampton petitioned within a month of their arrival for permission to room with African American students, in order to make more rapid progress in English. "House father" Booker T. Washington reported that African American students willingly roomed with the newcomers and became valued mentors. For example, during the summer of 1878, African American students took turns helping teacher James Robbins, himself a Hampton graduate, during language lessons. One African American student who participated during the evening study hour observed that the Indian students "seemed eager to learn, and made rapid progress. After you told them anything once, they scarcely ever forgot it." While in charge of the Indian girls during the summer vacation of 1879, Amelia Perry, a Hampton graduate, took advantage of the opportunity to teach them English, using the dormitory rooms as the source of language. The language-learning was reciprocal: Perry later reported that she had learned many of the students' words and expressions and could understand much of what they were saying in their own language.<sup>19</sup>

In addition to the person-to-person contact in study halls and dormitories, students had other opportunities to interact and socialize with English speakers. In his monthly report, Washington told of American Indian students who had joined the debating club or paid a social call with an African American friend. In the summer of 1879, the school instituted an annual "outing system" when twelve boys were sent to farms in western Massachusetts, the expressed goal being to "separate them and give them a chance to learn to speak English," as they had "complained of 'too much Indian talk'" at the school. Female students, too, went north during the summer to perform domestic work in private homes. When they returned, these "Massachusetts girls," with their stylish new appearance and improved English, became models for other students.<sup>20</sup>

Despite the obvious language-learning value of these out-of-classroom interactions, Armstrong found it necessary in early 1879 to create an exclusively Indian department to meet the students' unique language needs. Students who knew enough English were able to participate in regular class-

es. Throughout the years, Hampton divided and re-divided students in an attempt to create some unity within classes and students were promoted as they progressed. As was true throughout the Indian school system, students entered school not only at different times of the year, but also with different levels of linguistic proficiency, a difference stemming partly from the variety of ages at which they were first exposed to English and partly from the length and depth of their previous study. Students' own literacy and oral proficiencies varied as well. For example, some students could read and write more fluently than they could speak and vice versa. The aim of academic education for all the students was the acquisition of English—spoken, read, and written—not only in the language class, but also in their other courses of study, which in the first year included arithmetic, geography, and vocal music.<sup>21</sup>

In principle, the teaching at Hampton took place only in English. But, initially at least, adhering to the government's English-only decree proved impossible. In order for any learning to take place, teachers took advantage of students who had previously studied English. One of the first was an eighteen-year-old who interpreted for the Dakota when they first arrived, delaying his own coursework to help the boys who knew no English. Teacher Laura Tileston described a reading class in which a lesson was "put into Indian by the smallest member of the class, a bright little half-breed." Harriet Holbrook described a similar situation in her arithmetic classroom when a young man had the benefit of translation: "As light dawned upon his beclouded mind, he exclaimed, 'No wonder the colored boys learn faster than we; they understand what the teacher says to them.'" During the summer, some advanced American Indian students had the opportunity to teach beginners. Interpretation—as a last resort—became an essential strategy, as student-teacher Zallie Rulo reported: "To be sure, I did not teach Indian, nor did I talk Indian to them, but only when it was very necessary to do so."<sup>22</sup>

Students' use of English outside of the classroom fluctuated at best. In the early years, at least, students who knew sign language used that method to communicate with one another: they often captured the sun's rays in mirrors, threw the light a short distance to attract the attention of the person they wanted to talk to, and then proceeded to communicate with their hands. In 1885, the rules at Hampton allowed students to use their own languages before breakfast and after supper during the week and all day on Sunday. Students received no "severe" punishment if they broke these rules. Instead, Hampton encouraged voluntary English speaking through a system of rewards. As time went on, according to teacher Laura Tileston, students were more supportive of one another's efforts: "One of the boys said, 'These new Indians learn English very fast.... [W]e teacher these boys and help them all times, and that makes encourage.'" In 1888, after the Indian Office had turned up the heat on the English-only rule, Armstrong felt under pressure to comply, declaring that English speaking "is the law of the school, and at roll-call every night each reports on his or her adherence to it."<sup>23</sup>

By the 1890s, more students were entering Hampton with a stronger English background than had been the case in the earlier years. In 1898, Principal H. B. Frissell explained that the recruitment process had become



more selective, with education at Hampton being “held out as a reward of merit to the members of the Western schools.” Hampton chose only students who had been satisfactorily educated in government and missionary schools; no students came directly “from the blanket.” At the end of the century, Hampton eliminated the Indian department and placed all American Indian students in regular classes with African American students.<sup>24</sup>

### FROM BODIES TO OBJECTS TO SPOKEN WORDS

In the late nineteenth century, teaching language typically meant teaching grammar, and teaching grammar typically meant following a procedure of definition, example, and application. For example, a student would first learn the definition of a noun, then note examples of nouns, and then apply that knowledge in exercises requiring the selection of nouns from among other words. In spite of research studies that demonstrated the ineffectiveness of this method, it continued to hold a place in the schools because of educators’ unswerving faith that grammar could train students to express themselves precisely.<sup>25</sup> The teachers at Hampton discovered immediately that this method had no value in the second language learning of American Indian students. Hampton thus deferred conventional grammar teaching for the first two or three years of a student’s education.

At first, teachers used no textbooks. According to James Robbins, “the best teachers for the Indians are walking blackboards, and...those mysterious things called books ought not to be put in their hands for months to come.” Cora Folsom, inviting readers to experience vicariously the inside of her classroom, explained what it meant to teach without texts, especially when no common language existed between teacher and students: “By a series of home-made signs, which they are quick to interpret, they are made to understand that they are to repeat your greeting, and you are rewarded with a gruff or timid ‘Good monink,’ and thus another gate is opened to the ‘white man’s road.’” Instead of books, bodies became useful resources for learning. Students were taught to match action to word, for example by following directions to “stand up,” “sit down,” “walk softly,” “speak louder,” or “march out.” If the action suited the word particularly well, Josephine Richards reported, “some of the tall braves [would] go through the exercises of pulling hand or sleeve, bending wrists and arms, shaking right hand or left with great gusto.”<sup>26</sup>

Next, students were exposed to a variety of objects—including pictures and toys—that were brought into the classroom. In using this method of second-language instruction, Hampton teachers were sometimes guided by manuals designed for teaching modern languages that comprised “Worman’s Modern Language Series.”<sup>27</sup> This series was based on the “natural method” derived from the ideas of Swiss reformer Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, whose work exerted a strong influence on progressive American schools in the late nineteenth century. Pestalozzi started with the experiences and observations of children and proceeded by means of carefully orchestrated oral instruction to systematic and organized knowledge.<sup>28</sup> Proponents of the Pestalozzian method, also known in the United States as “object teaching,” sought to

replace the rote and passive learning that characterized nineteenth-century American classrooms.<sup>29</sup> Worman's approach in his French and German books aimed to foster speaking ability in a second language instead of using the method of grammar drills commonly employed for language teaching in the schools. Using pictorial illustrations for the names of objects, his books attempted to show teachers an immersion approach for teaching a second language without the help of the first. In this monolingual approach, teachers presented the new language in a particular order. A teacher, for example, would begin with the name of a thing, such as *boy*, and would lead up to actions or positions of objects: *The boy is under the table*.<sup>30</sup>

Although in theory Pestalozzian-based lessons enabled classrooms to flow naturally according to the students' cognitive development, the lessons in many US classrooms often became little more than rote learning, adding little to students' knowledge and understanding.<sup>31</sup> Given that in its object teaching in the first years Hampton relied partly on Isaac Lewis Peet's *Language Lessons [for] Deaf Mutes and Foreigners*, the tedium that often accompanied object teaching may well have been the case in some of the Hampton classrooms.<sup>32</sup> Peet described an approach that was numbing at best, with the teacher presenting twelve objects at a time, writing their names on the blackboard, touching an object, requiring a student to pronounce its name, pointing to the name, repeating the exercise until the student understood that the written word represented the thing, then pointing to the name and requiring the student to touch the corresponding object, and so on. Peet claimed that this monolingual method for second-language students was preferable to their learning from a bilingual instructor, for it enabled the child "to think at once, without any process of translation, in the new language upon which he is fixing his mind."<sup>33</sup>

Despite the drawbacks of object teaching, it led to some productive teaching approaches. By using materials based on principles of the oral Pestalozzian method, such as "Guyot's Geographical Series," the teachers at Hampton were able to integrate oral language lessons into a content-based course, discovering through practice what late twentieth-century second-language researchers would deem an invaluable approach to language acquisition.<sup>34</sup> In one class, for example, the teacher used Guyot's method of locating things in the room and the school grounds and then had students make picture maps of their own surroundings. They then brought objects into the classroom, one teacher beginning with a watch for the purpose of studying time. Once students learned that lesson, which took two months, they were shown a globe and taught the seasons, climates, and motion of the earth. After lessons on the zones, which used pictures of life in Alaska, the United States, and South America, students made a hemisphere, complete with lines for the equator and tropics, and placed in each zone pictures of the houses, animals, and vegetation that they thought would be found there.<sup>35</sup> Given the special linguistic circumstances of the Hampton classroom, the Pestalozzian method proved invaluable, inasmuch as it called for dealing first with observation and direct participation rather than definitions and abstract rules.

It is interesting to note that some of the seemingly conventional methods followed in the public schools had actually been pedagogical innovations in

their time. For example, recitations, in which the teacher asked a question and the students responded with predetermined answers, had been introduced into nineteenth-century schools as a reform designed to improve instruction by reducing teachers' lecture time and increasing students' speaking time.<sup>36</sup> At Hampton, these recitations were sometimes referred to as "conversing in English," but a transcription of a classroom observation reveals that that did not necessarily signify authentic communication: "Good morning. What a pleasant day it is. Yes; it is very pleasant. Are you glad? Yes; I am very glad." But even these dubious innovations were transformed by the second-language nature of the project and by the Hampton teachers' openness to developing new methodologies. For example, the teachers studied the differences between English and the students' own languages, at least in terms of phonology and prosody. They discovered that certain sounds were extremely difficult for students to articulate and that the lack of the rising inflection at the end of a question in Dakota presented a stumbling block. Helen Ludlow noted that "[t]he Indian gutturals do not open the mouth and give the free play of muscle that clear cut English requires." To solve this problem, teachers drilled students constantly in phonetics and worked on their enunciation. They noticed that students were more comfortable expressing exclamations or questions when they performed aloud in concert and could support one another in their efforts, and so they provided more opportunities for group recitations. These interactions with students helped to counteract some of the stereotypes teachers held of Indians. In the words of Josephine Richards, "however little they can say in English, [they] have very speaking faces, remarkably free from the stolidity generally considered a characteristic of their race."<sup>37</sup>

The traditional technique of memorization, too, took on a new life in the context of second-language acquisition. When Indian students memorized complex texts such as poems, a common practice in the public schools, the results were problematic, for the students often did not understand what they were saying. A case in point was the following verse:

Yield not to temptation, for yielding is sin;  
Each victory will help you some other to win;  
Fight manfully onward, dark passions subdue,  
Look ever to Jesus, He'll carry you through.

The teacher who assigned this passage maintained that she had carefully explained the meaning of the words, but "notwithstanding it all, the verse was misapplied," as she soon discovered when a female student proudly told her, "one Indian girl she get mad with me, I no like, she big temptation; I no yield to temptation; I fight her, I was victory!" Teachers eventually found short dialogues that students memorized and repeated daily to be more "useful in giving confidence in speaking, by familiarizing the pupils with common expressions." They also discovered that when the texts to be memorized grew out of students' direct participation, the students were more likely to comprehend. After her students had drawn, molded, and talked about the subject of a geog-

raphy lesson, for example, Laura Tileston gave them definitions to memorize: words first and then sentences. Students would commit these definitions to memory and at first recite them aloud in concert. Tileston found that with this method students' interest soon became "strong enough to overcome their natural distrust of trying to speak English" and they became "anxious to 'say it alone, that good way.'" Though "hardly the method we would take for white children," Tileston's experience suggested to her that this was "what the Indian needs most."<sup>38</sup>

Colonel Francis Parker's student-centered approach was evident in the choice of stimuli for the "talking class." One teacher, for example, brought in pictures that related to the students' former life, in one case a depiction of a man on horseback hunting buffalo. Through these pictures and through objects, students were taught to make sentences and put them together. Observing that geography and natural history classes were particularly effective in prompting students to talk, the teachers brought live animals, stuffed specimens, globes, and sand tables (to mold divisions of land and water) into the classroom. Classes often took walks during school hours to learn the names associated with the natural environment. Teachers relied on role playing to promote spoken English, especially to help guarantee achievement of meaning. For example, after Laura Tileston realized that students had many single words in their vocabulary whose precise use they were unsure of (*where* and *when*, for example) she created sets of playing cards, half of which had questions such as "Where are you?" or "What are you doing?" and half of which had answers such as "Here I am" or "I am sewing." Students broke into two groups to ask and answer one another. Or sometimes teachers devised a more elaborate scenario, with one student playing the doctor and others coming to complain of illness, request medication, or get a written excuse from work.<sup>39</sup>

In addition to classroom activities, the staff offered opportunities for speaking in the evenings. Students met together to play games that were conducted by teachers, such as "Clap in and clap out," "Go bang," and "Simon says." They also practiced oral language in song. One of the Hampton Student Singers transcribed several Dakota love songs and then taught Indian students to sing "simple exercises by note in time and tune." Many American Indian students also learned by ear the hymns and plantation melodies sung by their African American schoolmates and sang them while they worked. In 1884, the school formed a debating society, which presented recitations and poetry readings in addition to debates on student-selected topics, such as "Shall the white man be allowed on the Indian Reservation?" and "Ought Indians to be permitted to vote?"<sup>40</sup>

Despite their efforts to foster speaking, however, the teachers found it very difficult to induce American Indian students to converse in English, even when the students understood what they heard. Although some students spoke readily, the majority did not.<sup>41</sup> Teachers noted that even advanced students were more willing to produce words in written compositions than to say them orally. At a farewell event for departing students, for example, one girl said, "If I had had time to write I would have spoken. I had many words to say."

Some younger students spoke English only outside of class and only to their white dolls, perhaps because the dolls could not criticize them, as Helen Ludlow suggested. Repeatedly, teachers referred to their pupils as “bashful” or “shy,” and they had difficulty accepting the silence, especially that of the older students:

They are all eager to learn, but being ready to *learn* does not always mean ready to *use* a word, and it is not unusual to “Stand awhile on one foot and then awhile on t’other,” while the noble Red man calmly makes up his mind about answering your “How do you do?” and there is no need to try to keep cool, for a chill of uncertainty creeps up and down your back bone as you consider that he may decide not to say it at all.

Even in the more advanced classes, teachers had to fight the temptation to talk rather than have students do so, especially as the students were “excellent listeners.” Tileston explained that often teachers were doing most of the talking in order to satisfy the students’ requests: “[O]ne boy from Arizona was interested to hear of his own country, but when I asked him to tell me, said, ‘not now; I like you talk now; sometime you not talk, I tell you.’”<sup>42</sup>

After reading teachers’ reports, Armstrong occasionally implied that the blame for not speaking English lay with the students. On one occasion, for example, he said that “[a]s a rule, they [the students] understand ordinary conversation, and many can write a grammatical letter, but these very ones are most reluctant to display their knowledge of English, except to their teacher, and do themselves injustice when addressed by strangers.” Armstrong recognized early on, however, that the reluctance to speak did not correlate with students’ intelligence and abilities: “Their minds are keen and clear, and they show in the study hour a capacity for independent and continuous mental work.” After more than ten years of involvement with American Indian education, Armstrong came to a greater understanding of the inner workings of the mind of a student who was in the process of acquiring a second language, noting that “he must carry on two trains of thought at once; he must not only recall facts, but think of the English words in which to clothe them.” Armstrong understood how excruciatingly slow the process of second language acquisition could be and that some learners acquired a second language more easily than others. He also recognized that silence was often linked to students’ desire not to embarrass themselves in using a second language and that their silent period might mean that they were absorbing language that they were not yet ready to display.<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, this intellectual growth in relation to language acquisition was often undermined by a colonial ideology.

Although many of the strategies and classroom activities designed to promote spoken English were innovative and beneficial, predictably the Hampton teachers’ monolingualism and cultural outlook caused them to miss fertile opportunities to foster second-language acquisition. Alternatives to the Indian Office’s monolingual, monocultural approach to second-language learning regularly appeared at Hampton but were largely ignored or misunderstood. Through their own experience, for instance, some Hampton teachers

became aware of the advantages of bilingualism and bilingual approaches to instruction in speaking and listening. Language teacher Cora Folsom for one noted that if students were already literate in their own language, it was a great help; and if a teacher was able to translate an English word, it was of even greater assistance. Yet, according to Donal Lindsey, Folsom was the only teacher who attempted to learn an American Indian language while at Hampton.<sup>44</sup> All the teachers understood that their mandate was to eradicate tribal cultures, and they believed in that goal. At the same time, the teachers' experiences made them aware of the fact that students' cultural backgrounds could be useful resources for learning to speak English. As a result of her classroom experience, for example, geography teacher Laura Tileston began to theorize about the link between students' interest in their past experiences and their willingness to speak: "Mountains, rivers, hills, lakes, and all physical features are their dearly loved friends, and they often come out of their shells, and tell of scouting parties among the mountains or hunting on the prairies."<sup>45</sup> Despite these discoveries, the teaching of the spoken language at Hampton remained resolutely monolingual and Eurocentric.

#### FOSTERING AND MANIPULATING ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LITERACY

As early as June 1879, the St. Augustine students expressed impatience with the lack of books. One student complained that he would be the object of ridicule if he returned home without knowing how to read, and the teachers became aware that the "Floridas" needed "a more nourishing mental diet." In 1880, Washington reported that Native students longed to attend study hour and to have "a pile of books," just as the African American students did, but that they had not yet been "permitted" to do so. Postponing book-based teaching made sense in light of students' language differences, but the record shows that there was a hidden agenda. The focus on object learning in place of reading was linked to Armstrong's tendency to infantilize the students, for he subscribed to the colonial view that "[t]he Indian is a child." He explained that, "[k]nowing the reaction sure to follow gratifying a childish desire for school books, we kept them back, to their discontent, gradually allowing their use in class hours thus gradually increasing their eagerness to know more."<sup>46</sup>

Once schoolbooks were introduced into the curriculum, however, new problems arose. Repeatedly, teachers decried the lack of texts adapted to their particular student population. The standard readers used throughout the history of the Hampton Indian program assumed a knowledge of language that many American Indian students simply did not possess. For example, the authors of a text used at Hampton, *Appleton's Second Reader*, stated that "[t]he longer words to be met with in this Reader belong to the common vocabulary, and the child should learn to recognize them in print as he does in speech."<sup>47</sup> Teachers were concerned not only about level of lexical or linguistic difficulty, but also about appropriateness of content. The problem was acute with students who were already adults. Ludlow noted the absurdity of having grown men cite lines from a text designed for elementary school students: "We smile to hear the braves taming their tongues to tell us how the

naughty boy pulled the poor cat's tail, but the only doors into the royal domain of the English language seem to be measured for children at present, and so the six foot pilgrims must stoop."<sup>48</sup>

As was true throughout the existence of the Indian department, ill-conceived or inappropriate methodologies were regularly offset by the Hampton teachers' desire to help students learn. Because the primary reading books were ill-suited to these adult learners, teachers initially distributed instead a series of leaflets, the contents of which included short historical anecdotes, facts of science, and simple Bible teachings. However, the teachers acknowledged that the pamphlets lacked the "charm" of books. The students' "worship of books" manifested itself when Helen Ludlow gave them a geography text after they had been taught orally from maps for several months. Ludlow found their gratitude "really touching." With the more advanced students, the *Southern Workman* itself served as a reading text. Ludlow made a point of stating that these students read the items related to American Indians with great pleasure and relatively little help. Washington noted that students had a "special fondness" for newspapers in their own languages, which were provided in the reading room.<sup>49</sup> Again, the staff at Hampton had hints of the value of students' own cultures and languages in their learning process, but most of the school records show that these hints were largely ignored.

Having committed to a monolingual approach to language teaching and having no special training in English-as-a-second-language methodology, teachers were often stymied by the challenge of teaching students to read. They had little trouble explaining the meaning of words representing physical phenomena, for they could bring objects into the class, draw them on the blackboard, or make gestures until the students understood. But the most basic words defied definition, as Harriet Holbrook reported: "What that word *had* mean? I not know,' said a tall Omaha. *Which* proves another stumbling-block. Alas, that English should be such an unexplainable language!" History teacher Josephine Richards' anecdote reveals that true understanding could elude a student even when the context of the reading was familiar: "Not long ago, reference was made in a book to a league formed by Indian tribes against the United States government, and when the definition of league was called for, the answer came very promptly, 'three miles,' that meaning of the word having just been acquired in their Reading class."<sup>50</sup>

Over time and with experience, teachers developed different methods to teach and promote the acquisition of reading skills. In some classes, for example, students read aloud in concert, then took turns reading individually and taking correction from the whole class. Teachers supplemented reading lessons by asking students to draw the action depicted in the texts. Students also acted out scenes from the books. As the years progressed, teachers began to discover that the right content could foster greater reading skills, even in the lower division. As Cora Folsom theorized, "[t]o read well with an Indian means that he must be *interested*, and to be interested he must have something to think about and study over out of school." Subjects related to plants and animals were particularly appealing to students. They also enjoyed numerous children's magazines, such as those used at the Quincy schools, which the

teachers brought to class. After the passage of the Dawes Act in 1887, advanced students in the “civilization class” read about current events in daily newspapers to prepare them for the “new rights and duties of citizenship.”<sup>51</sup>

Teaching writing at Hampton initially meant teaching penmanship, in large part because students could do it well. The former prisoners from St. Augustine, for example, had drawn in ledger books while incarcerated, a process that presumably contributed to the development of their literacy, for they had also learned to write “handsomely” before they came to Hampton, as Helen Ludlow noted.<sup>52</sup> At Hampton, the teachers used the Spencerian method of handwriting instruction, the most popular writing system in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Spencerian copy-books included charts that indicated specific heights, lengths, and slants, as well as guidelines on which students could correctly copy and combine letters.<sup>53</sup> By April 1879, the St. Augustine students had filled three copy-books and shown great improvement.

Teachers drew on Colonel Francis Parker’s philosophy as they approached the non-technical aspects of writing. They designed purposeful lessons to develop thought and expression and to deepen students’ enthusiasm for their work. Letter writing not only helped students practice what they had learned, but also kept them in touch with their family and friends at home and would prove useful to them after they returned to their reservations. Students also wrote letters to people outside their inner circle. For example, after studying ants in an advanced science course, the class wrote letters to the donors of the microscopes to share what they had learned.<sup>54</sup> Students who received aid from private sources were required to write “scholarship letters” to their patrons to express gratitude and report on their progress.

Teachers regularly published students’ letters in *Southern Workman* and excerpts often appeared in Armstrong’s annual reports to the commissioner of Indian affairs. In order to certify the letters’ authenticity, students’ second-language errors were not edited out, as the following example shows:

I will trying to talk English and try to be good man, I know some of the white mans way, and I want to know some more so when I get my home I will try to teach my people thats way I want to do.... [T]he Indian people some are good those remember the Church but some are bad those did not remember the Church and did not like to go to school and did not like to be try good man and not work.

Despite its apparent authenticity, this letter did not necessarily represent the student’s own sentiments. This student’s views—typical of those published in the school newspaper—are remarkably similar to those expressed by Samuel Armstrong: “Put yourself in the place of these young Indians when they shall go to their homes. The grace of God only can save them. Without careful Christian culture our work will come to naught.”<sup>55</sup>

The stated objective in reprinting student writing in the *Southern Workman* was to give students pride in their work and to help them understand the purpose of writing. While these writing projects undoubtedly were beneficial to students, they also served as propaganda tools for the Hampton



Institute. One purpose of publishing student texts was to establish the legitimacy of Hampton's work in order to justify its federal funding and to increase philanthropic donations. In the words of teacher Elaine Goodale (Eastman): "Public support was slow to develop and imperatively needed. It was our part to stage a popular demonstration of the red man's innate capacity."<sup>56</sup> Before they reached publication, the letters home were subject to spin control. When reformer Alice Fletcher visited Hampton, for example, she advised students to send only positive messages about life at school: "Don't spend your time saying to your parents 'I want to see you.'...Try to make little pictures in your letters of your happy, busy life here." Armstrong noted that "some misstatements ha[d] been made and mischief done," undoubtedly because some students had written home to complain about the school experience and their parents had become upset. Despite the occasional setbacks, Armstrong promoted the weekly correspondence. From his public relations perspective, children's letters gave parents confidence that the school was indeed teaching English, and thus it facilitated the recruitment process.<sup>57</sup>

#### LANGUAGE, RACE, AND CULTURE

Armstrong understood the unsettling effect of formal education on people who were pre-literate, noting that "[t]raining the head and the heart creates a wholesome discontent."<sup>58</sup> But his solution for addressing that discontent did not aim to provide most students with opportunities to achieve at high levels in society or even to achieve equality. Literacy education at Hampton was central to its mission but was not its central mission. Armstrong focused instead on "training the hand": making laborers of the majority of students so that they could join a workforce that served the European American population. Students spent at least half their day performing manual labor tasks. This insistence on vocational training as a goal of education was already an institutionalized goal in American education for freed slaves, the very population for whom Hampton was created, as well as for other minority populations.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, this development coincided with a prevalent belief that ethnic difference was immutable. In major periodicals published from the middle of the nineteenth century until its close, as Reginald Horsman has shown, the American public was informed repeatedly that mental and physical differences between the races could be proved scientifically.<sup>60</sup> Those who subscribed to this view did not necessarily think that all traits were transmitted genetically, which would mean that change could take place only at a natural evolutionary pace. References to heredity instead usually denoted cultural transmission, which allowed for more rapid acculturation through education. Still, as Alexandra Harmon has argued, underlying this belief was a sense that racial identity was inherited, more a matter of ancestry than culture.<sup>61</sup> In the minds of many educational reformers of the time, including Samuel Armstrong, language-learning ability was linked to racial identity: "our northern Indians are slow in gaining facility in conversation...partly because of the[ir] race characteristics."<sup>62</sup>

Racial attitudes did not necessarily categorize American Indian students as inferior in every situation. Comparisons with African Americans were

inevitable at Hampton, and American Indian students fared well in these contrasts when the focus was on English speaking. According to Helen Ludlow, the Indian students had an advantage over African American students with a corresponding knowledge of English because African Americans had “race peculiarities” that the American Indians did not share. One peculiarity, she claimed, was a “musical ear” that led African American students to (mis)interpret words by their sound or to select melodious words that made little sense in context. Ludlow’s linguistic theory was also governed by assumptions about class. She asserted that American Indian students had a “sharper habit of thought” than African American students, which she believed was “in great part the result of careful English training from the first, with nothing to unlearn; as one of any race learns a foreign language from regular instructors more correctly than the lower classes of its natives speak it.”<sup>63</sup>

Despite its elevation of American Indians above African Americans in regard to this one linguistic category, the Hampton Institute’s racialized outlook situated the English language in a superior position to American Indian languages according to the colonial discourses of the day. The rhetoric of Commissioner of Indian Affairs J. D. C. Atkins, for example, reflected the late nineteenth-century United States yearning to establish linguistic domination worldwide: “True Americans all feel that the Constitution, laws, and institutions of the United States...are superior to those of any other country; and they should understand that by *the spread of the English language* will these laws and institutions be more firmly established and widely disseminated.”<sup>64</sup> This imperialist attitude surfaced at Hampton even in a project as apparently innocent as a grammar game, as Helen Ludlow’s report reveals:

To the active imagination of my Indian pupils the English verb will ever hereafter appear, I suppose, under a somewhat military aspect. Its “principal parts” we know as “chiefs”; the different modes, as so many reservations, in which each chief has a certain number of bands (tenses) that follow him. These bands are numbered as companies, doing valiant service in support of the King’s English—or the President’s American. For many weeks company drill progressed with unflagging interest and patience.<sup>65</sup>

In her grammar lesson, Helen Ludlow figuratively enlisted American Indian leaders in defense of the federal government’s nationalistic agenda. Her mention of the “King’s English” in the same breath as the “President’s American” linked the two great imperial powers of the time: Great Britain and the United States of America. Grammar was thus placed in the service of the growing US empire. Ludlow’s linking of grammar-learning to a military endeavor established a connection between the two predominant approaches to the assimilation of American Indian peoples: education and armed conflict. Standardized English grammar ultimately had to be taught because it would help to produce a new crop of learners whose use of language would obliterate their old identity and reflect their new social status as standardized Americans.

Time and again the Hampton teachers imposed their own social values and asserted the superiority of their own culture and language on Native

Americans. The schoolbooks used at Hampton, for example William Swinton's *Introductory Geography*, reflected this ideology of European American dominance:

There are differences among men far greater than differences in complexion and features. We ask which kinds of people are the best educated, and are the most skilled in finding out and doing things which are useful for all the world? Which are making the most progress? And, when we find a people very much noted for all these, we say that they are a highly *civilized* people.

When we find people who are not so enlightened, but who still are not savages, and seem to be on the way to become civilized people, we call them *semi-civilized*, which means half-civilized.

The races who, in their way of living, are the least civilized,—who have no written language, and only the rudest arts,—are called *savage* races.<sup>66</sup>

Teachers at Hampton did not challenge the racial theory represented in their textbooks. Rather, they reinforced Swinton's racial paradigm in the classroom through recitation lessons, the purpose of which, according to Swinton's preface, was to "emphasize and fasten." A sample recitation at Hampton—written in teacher question-class response format—was reprinted in *Southern Workman*:

9. To what race do we all belong?
9. The human race
10. How many classes belong to this race?
10. There are five large classes belonging to the human race.
11. Which are the first?
11. The white people are the strongest.
12. Which are next?
12. The Mongolians or yellows.
13. The next?
13. The Ethiopians or blacks.
14. Next?
14. The Americans or reds.<sup>67</sup>

Having internalized lessons that placed them at the bottom of a human scale, students then reproduced what they learned in classroom compositions that were later published in *Southern Workman*:

The white people they are civilized; they have everything, and go to school, too. They learn how to read and write so they can read newspaper.

The yellow people they half civilized, some of them know to read and write, and some know how to take care of themself.

The red people they big savages; they don't know anything.<sup>68</sup>

The teacher who published this student essay reported that nearly all the students in this geography class received an "Excellent" mark. When students

expressed criticism of their own cultural practices, it was considered a positive sign that they were becoming civilized, as history teacher Josephine Richards' comment indicates: "It was pleasant to note *the growth of modern thought* in the history class one day, when, after studying an illustration of 'ye ancient times' among Indians, where the chief was taking his ease at the door of his lodge while his wife toiled at the fire, the boy who had been reading remarked, 'Give him zero.'" The students internalized the school's demoralizing views on civilization in many other spheres as well, including the debating society:

I teach scholar this sentence: "My friends I want to learn how to talk English and I want you all to help me," which he and I went to his room after supper and have him stand against his room door and first make his bow and then say it.... And when the time I called on him to recite his piece, he bravely got up and said: "My-Friends: —I—want—to—learn—to—talk—English—and—I—want—you—all—to—help—me," without stammering at all which made me think that we could be raised from that degradation.<sup>69</sup>

## CONCLUSION

It would be easy to explain away the Hampton teachers' attitudes toward American Indian cultures by stating that the teachers were so much a product of their own hegemonic culture that they could not step outside its bounds to analyze their lessons from another cultural perspective. But the situation was much more complex than that, for some teachers did in fact look at their pedagogy from the students' perspective. They were not unaware of the troubling implications of their work. When she considered American history lessons from the viewpoint of Indian students, for example, Josephine Richards noted that, "[i]t becomes a matter of speculation how the graphic descriptions of the Aborigines, with scalping knife and tomahawk (so entertaining to a white child), will strike their descendants." Cora Folsom expressed ambivalence about the school's cooperation with the duplicitous US government: "the teacher has...the sins of her fathers to answer for before her class. She wants to encourage her pupils to be *civilized* like the white man, to embrace his religion, and follow his example, and yet has to put into his hands a history of broken promises and of a civilization as far from Christianity as the Indian himself is."<sup>70</sup>

Despite these concerns, the Hampton teachers' good intentions and innovative teaching strategies were not always sufficient to counteract the negative effect of their own unexamined prejudices. Although in the process of reflecting on their pedagogy these teachers transformed their understanding of language methodology, they never dislodged their prior assumption that English was a superior language. Although they respected the intelligence of American Indian students and claimed these students exhibited advantages over the African American students, they continued to make racial and class judgments that relegated American Indians to a lower evolutionary scale than Europeans. Although their own experiences often refuted the existing negative representations of American Indians, they continued to perpetuate dam-

aging cultural stereotypes. Finally, although they viewed themselves as separate from the colonizing authorities that created the Indian schools, they participated in a form of cultural genocide in their efforts to persuade students to replace their Indian ways of life with European American Christian culture. This ideology continued to inform the work of their classrooms, weakening the link between students and their home languages and identities. This consequently undermined many students' sense of self-worth.

Furthermore, the Hampton teachers did not recognize—or at least did not acknowledge in the school records examined in this study—the underlying student resistance to the misrepresentations of American Indians that were disseminated in the school. Teachers repeatedly commented that the students seemed to take the European American version of history “calmly,” and that students even smiled at “any allusion to the ‘savages.’” But the Hampton records suggest that students were not always passive participants in the acculturation process, as the following excerpt from Zallie Rulo's graduation speech reveals:

During last year in Dakota, there was one white man killed by the Indians. How many Indians do you suppose were killed by the white men? There were six Indians killed by the white men. Of which savage out West do you think you would be most afraid, the red savage or the white savage?<sup>71</sup>

The discourse used to discuss students who did not meet Hampton's criteria for success reveals the extent to which prevailing attitudes toward racial and cultural determinism shaped the teachers' conceptual framework. Brief biographical accounts of “returned Indian students” filled more than 150 pages of *Twenty-Two Years' Work* in 1893. Included in those accounts is a paragraph about Zallie Rulo. The teacher who wrote the biography stated that despite the fact that Rulo had left Hampton with “advantages,” she “drifted about from place to place, doing well at times but on the whole...made a bad record.” The teacher attributed these failings to Rulo's “heredity and early associations.”<sup>72</sup> This reliance on heredity to explain student failure effectively absolved Hampton of responsibility. Rulo's subversive commentary at her graduation and Hampton's subsequent disparaging remarks about her demonstrate that, far from being an innocuous or neutral vehicle for communication, the English language was a site of struggle over meaning and representation. Given the unequal power relationships in the school and in the world beyond, even students who had mastered the language were not guaranteed access to the benefits of European American society. The language, and all that it signified, more typically mastered them.

## NOTES

1. Selma Berrol, “Public Schools and Immigrants: The New York Experience,” *American Education and the Immigrant, 1840-1940*, ed. Bernard J. Weiss (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), 32-33.

2. Robert A. Trennert, Jr., *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891–1935* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder, *A History of Indian Education* (Billings: Eastern Montana College, 1989); David H. DeJong, *Promises of the Past: A History of Indian Education in the United States* (Golden, CO: North American Press, 1993); Devon A. Mihesuah, *Cultivating the Rosebuds: The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1851–1909* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); Michael C. Coleman, *American Indian Children at School, 1850–1930* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1993); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994); Donal F. Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877–1923* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995); David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875–1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996); Clyde Ellis, *To Change Them Forever: Indian Education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893–1920* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996).

3. Arnold H. Leibowitz, *Educational Policy and Political Acceptance: The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools* (Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, 1971), ED047321: 63–80; James Park, “Historical Foundations of Language Policy: The Nez Percé Case,” in *Language Renewal Among American Indian Tribes: Issues Problems, and Prospects*, eds. Robert St. Clair and William Leap (Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982), 49–67.

4. S(amuel) C. Armstrong, “Hampton, VA., September 1, 1886,” *Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (1886), 242. References to annual reports of the commissioner of Indian affairs are hereafter cited as *RCIA*.

5. Kay Graber, ed., *Sister to the Sioux: The Memoirs of Elaine Goodale Eastman, 1885–1891* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 19.

6. For current theory and practice related to second-language acquisition, see Stephen Krashen, *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition* (New York: Pergamon, 1982); Suzanne F. Peregoy and Owen F. Boyle, *Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for K–12 Teachers*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1997). For the application of these principles to the teaching of American Indian students today, see Jon Reyhner, ed., *Teaching American Indian Students* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).

7. Cora M. Folsom, “Record of Returned Indian Students,” *Twenty-Two Years’ Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute*, ed. Helen W. Ludlow (Hampton: Normal School Press, 1893), 325–493. For a breakdown and analysis of the statistics in Folsom’s report, see Wilbert H. Ahern, “‘The Returned Indians’: Hampton Institute and Its Indian Alumni, 1879–1893,” *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 10 (1983): 101–124.

8. Ahern, “‘Returned Indians,’” 108–110; Lindsey, *Hampton Institute*, 213, 217.

9. Report to the president by the Indian Peace Commission, 7 January 1868, *RCIA* (1869), 504; Hiram Price, *RCIA* (1881), 27; J. D. C. Atkins, *RCIA* (1886), 99.

10. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1887), 344; Armstrong, *The Indian Question* (Hampton, VA: Normal School Steam Press, 1883), 22.

11. Robert Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage, 1978), 28, 16.

12. Michael F. D. Young, “An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge,” *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, ed. Michael F. D. Young (London: Collier, 1971), 19–46.

13. Richard Henry Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867–1904*, ed. Robert Utley (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), 97, 121.
14. Richard Henry Pratt, "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections* (1892): 45–46.
15. Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 55.
16. "An Indian Raid on Hampton Institute," *Southern Workman* (May 1878): 36.
17. Jack K. Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 129–130; Lelia E. Partridge, *The "Quincy Methods" Illustrated: Pen Photographs from the Quincy Schools* (New York: Kellogg, 1885), xii–xiii, 86.
18. "Report of the Principal," *Southern Workman* (June 1878): 44; "Anniversary Day at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (June 1878): 46; Ezra A. Hayt, *RCIA* (1878), 473; Richard Henry Pratt, "Official Report," *Southern Workman* (Dec. 1878): 90.
19. Helen W. Ludlow, ed., *Ten Years' Work for Indians at the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute at Hampton, Virginia* (Hampton: Norman School Press, 1893), 13; B(ooker) T. W(ashington), "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Oct. 1880): 103; "Scholarship Letters," *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44; J(ames) C. R(obbins), "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Sept. 1879): 93; Helen Ludlow, "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Feb. 1880): 19. For an analysis of the good and bad relations between African American and American Indian students at Hampton, see Lindsey, *Hampton Institute*.
20. Washington, "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Oct. 1880): 103; "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Aug. 1879): 85; Washington, "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Jan. 1881): 7. It was also financially advantageous for Armstrong to send the children away during the summer months (Lindsey, *Hampton Institute*, 37).
21. Mary Lou Hultgren and Paulette Fairbanks Molin, *To Lead and to Serve: American Indian Education at Hampton Institute* (Virginia Beach: Virginia Federation for the Humanities, 1989), 21–22; Ludlow, "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44.
22. "Scholarship Letters," *Southern Workman* (Mar. 1879): 29; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1883), 226; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1885), 466; "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Jan. 1885): 8.
23. "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Mar. 1879): 31; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1885), 465; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1888), 281.
24. H. B. Frissell, "Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Thirtieth Annual Report of the Principal for the School and Fiscal Year Ending June 30th, 1898," *Southern Workman* (May 1898): 92; Hultgren and Molin, *To Lead and to Serve*, 50.
25. George C. Carpenter, Franklin T. Baker, and Fred N. Scott, *The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School* (1903; New York: Longmans, 1927), 199, 145.
26. James Robbins, "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Jan. 1879): 7; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1884), 241; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1883), 228.
27. The Worman series is mentioned in Armstrong, *RCIA* (1882), 241. One book in the series was James H. Worman, *First French Book after the Natural or Pestalozzian Method: For Schools and Home Instruction* (New York: American, 1881).
28. Robert B. Downs, *Heinrich Pestalozzi: Father of Modern Pedagogy* (Boston: Twayne, 1975), 132.

29. Larry Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1880–1990*, 2nd ed. (New York: Teachers College, 1993), 39.
30. “Indian Report of Miss H. W. Ludlow. ‘The Talking Class,’” *Southern Workman* (June 1882): 68.
31. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 39.
32. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1882), 241. The full title of Peet’s book is *Language Lessons: Designed to Introduce Young Learners, Deaf Mutes and Foreigners to a Correct Understanding and Use of the English Language on the Principle of Object Teaching* (New York: Baker, 1875).
33. Peet, *Language Lessons*, vii.
34. The Guyot series is mentioned in Armstrong, *RCIA* (1882), 242. One book in the series is *Elementary Geography for Primary Classes* (New York: Scribner’s, 1879). For current theory on content-based language learning, see Patricia A. Richard-Amato and Marguerite Ann Snow, *The Multicultural Classroom: Readings for Content-Area Teachers* (New York: Longman, 1992).
35. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1882), 242.
36. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 30.
37. Robbins, “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (May 1880): 55; Ludlow, “Incidents,” *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1883), 228.
38. Robbins, “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (Mar. 1880): 31; Ludlow, “The Talking Class,” 68; “Indian Report of Miss Laura E. Tileston. Geography,” *Southern Workman* (June 1882): 68.
39. Robbins, “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1880): 43; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1882), 241; *RCIA* (1883), 227; *RCIA* (1885), 465.
40. Washington, “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (Sept. 1880): 93; Ludlow, “Indian Education at Hampton and Carlisle,” *Harpers Magazine* (Apr. 1881): 664–65; J. E., “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (Jan. 1884): 7.
41. Teachers singled out Dakota students for their “excessive reserve.” *RCIA* (1882), 245; *RCIA* (1883), 227.
42. “Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton,” *Southern Workman* (Nov. 1881): 111; Ludlow, “Indian Education,” 664; Tileston, “Report on English,” *Southern Workman* (June 1885): 70; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1883), 227; “Indian Report of Miss Laura,” 68.
43. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1880), 305; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1881), 253; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1890), 315. For current theory on the role of a “silent period” in second-language acquisition, see Krashen, “Theory Versus Practice in Language Teaching,” *Innovative Approaches to Language Teaching*, ed. Robert Blair (Cambridge: Newbury, 1982), 25–26.
44. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1884), 241; Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute*, 252. Elaine Goodale learned Dakota after she left Hampton to teach in Dakota Territory. Graber, *Sister to the Sioux*, 35.
45. “Indian Report of Miss Laura,” 68.
46. Ludlow, “The Charm of a Book,” *Southern Workman* (June 1879): 67; Armstrong, *The Indian Question*, 8; Armstrong, “Indian Education in the East: An Address,” *Southern Workman* (Nov. 1880): 114.
47. William T. Harris, Andrew J. Rickoff, and Mark Bailey, “From the Authors to the Teacher,” *Appleton’s School Readers: The Second Reader* (1877, 1878; New York: American, 1902), 2.
48. Ludlow, “Incidents,” *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44.



49. Ludlow, "The Charm," 67; Ludlow, "Incidents," *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44; Washington, "Incidents," (Oct. 1880): 103.
50. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1885), 467; "Indian Report of Miss Josephine Richards. History," *Southern Workman* (June 1882): 68.
51. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1883), 226; *Ibid.*, 225; Ludlow, "Indian Education," 663; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1888), 282.
52. Ludlow, "Incidents," *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1879): 44.
53. John A. Nietz, *Old Textbooks: Spelling, Grammar, Reading, Arithmetic, Geography, American History, Civil Government, Physiology, Penmanship, Art, Music—As Taught in the Common Schools from Colonial Days to 1900* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961), 324.
54. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1892), 601.
55. "A Set of Scholarship Letters," *Southern Workman* (Feb. 1880): 17; Armstrong, "Indian Education in the East," *Southern Workman* (Nov. 1880): 114.
56. Graber, *Sister to the Sioux*, 20.
57. "Incidents of Indian Life at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (Aug. 1882): 85; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1880), 305.
58. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1892), 599.
59. Robert C. Morris, *Reading, Riting, and Reconstruction: The Education of Freedmen in the South, 1861–1870* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981) 157.
60. Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 140.
61. Alexandra Harmon, "When Is an Indian Not an Indian? The 'Friends of the Indian' and the Problems of Indian Identity," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 18 (1990): 107.
62. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1890), 315.
63. Ludlow, "Results of English Teaching at Hampton," *Southern Workman* (June 1882): 64.
64. J. D. C. Atkins, *RCIA* (1887), 19 (emphasis added).
65. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1884), 241–242.
66. William Swinton, *Introductory Geography in Readings and Recitations* (New York: Ivison, 1882), 19–20. For discussions of the treatment of American Indians in nineteenth-century schoolbooks, see Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 71–81; Laurence M. Hauptman, "Mythologizing Westward Expansion: Schoolbooks and the Image of the American Frontier before Turner," *Western Historical Quarterly* 8 (1977): 272–275; Laurence M. Hauptman, "Westward the Course of Empire: Geography Schoolbooks and Manifest Destiny, 1783–1893," *Historian* 40 (1978): 432–437.
67. "Our World: Work and Fun in the Geography Class," *Southern Workman* (Feb. 1885): 20. It should be noted that the fifth race is not identified in the article.
68. *Ibid.*, 20.
69. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1885), 464–465 (emphasis added); Joseph E. Estes, "Indian Debating Society," *Southern Workman* (Apr. 1884): 42.
70. "Indian Report of Miss Josephine Richards," 68; Armstrong, *RCIA* (1887) 352.
71. Armstrong, *RCIA* (1884) 243; Zallie Rulo, "The Indian Woman," *Southern Workman* (June 1885): 62.
72. Folsom, "Record," 376.