

2004

Assessing the identity of Black Indians in Louisiana: a quantitative and qualitative analysis

Francis J. Powell

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, renfran@centurytel.net

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Powell, Francis J., "Assessing the identity of Black Indians in Louisiana: a quantitative and qualitative analysis" (2004). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 2943.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/2943

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

ASSESSING THE IDENTITY OF BLACK INDIANS IN LOUISIANA:
A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
Doctor of Philosophy

In

The School of Social Work

By
Francis J. Powell
B.S.W., Jackson State University, 1977
M.S.W., Grambling State University, 1996
May 2004

©Copyright 2004
Francis J. Powell
All Rights Reserved

For the memory of my mother,
Arlean Wheaton Powell

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother and father, Arlean Wheaton Powell and Francis J. Powell, Jr. and to my maternal grandparents, Rev. Hercules Wheaton and Frances Millsaps Wheaton. Their compassionate and gentle guidance was always there for me. I will miss them for the rest of my life.

I am truly blessed and thankful to have a caring, committed circle of friends. They have given me invaluable suggestions, comments, and criticisms. They possess great wisdom and insight. It would have been impossible for me to complete this endeavor without their assistance and support.

Throughout this process I have had the unflagging support of my professional colleagues at Northwestern State University. I owe special thanks to Dr. Wade Tyler and Dr. Randy Haley, whose analytic insight and intellectual honesty in countless conversations helped propel me throughout this writing process. I want to thank Dr. Hiram F. Gregory for his generous assistance in lending his wisdom and expert information on the historical Indian tribes of Louisiana. I am, however, especially indebted to Ms. Claudia Triche, who has, throughout, gracefully balanced being my boss, mentor, role model, and friend. Words are insufficient to express my admiration for them or my appreciation for their unfailing encouragement and wise counsel.

I owe deep gratitude to Dr. Ann McAllister and Dr. Gary Mayfield of the Division of Human Behavior department at Louisiana College for their consultation and the use of books, materials, and equipment.

I would not have made it through this process if it had not been for the tutelage of my friend Ruth Weinzettle, who started this journey with me in 2000. For the long rides

and the many classes, you patiently tolerated my many misunderstanding and unselfishly allowed me to learn from you. You have become my lifelong friend and knowing you has enriched my life.

I am extremely thankful to Dr. Kenneth Millar and Dr. Kathleen Perkins without whose help I would have never come to Louisiana State University. I would also like to thank Dr. William G. Archambeault for planting the idea for this dissertation.

I am especially thankful to my dissertation committee for their involvement, time commitment, and support. My chair, Dr. Brij Mohan, is a remarkable, compassionate and courageous man who is a prolific writer and a gifted scholar. Dr. Michael Burnett, from the Vocational Education department, agreed to step in when it seemed as if my committee was completely unraveling. His statistical consultation and directions were invaluable. Dr. Rebecca Chaisson graciously remained by my side throughout this process and directed my efforts in carrying out the qualitative research of this study. Dr. Lilly Allen kindly agreed to join my committee late in the process and provided immeasurable directions for this study. Also, to Dr. Tom Durant from the Sociology department and Dr. Gaines Foster from the History department for their involvement, time commitment and support.

I want to give thanks to my wife Rena who has helped me through every step of this work. Your patience and support amazes me. You are my light and the positive motivating force within my life. I also want to thank God who has always been the head of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
ABSTRACT		ix
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Mixture of African and Native Americans.....	2
	Historical Indian Tribes in Louisiana	8
	Purpose of the Study	11
	Importance of the Study	13
	Operational Definition of Key Concepts	14
	Legal Definitions and Racially Mixed People	15
2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
	Empowerment Approach Theory	18
	African American Perspective	20
	The Black Experience	21
	Church and Family	23
	Racial Identity Theories.....	24
	Native Americans	25
	Precontact	26
	Postcontact	26
	Cultural Beliefs	28
	Indian Identity	30
	Who is an Indian?	33
	Historiography of Southern Race Relations	35
	Theoretical Perspectives on Biracial Individuals	40
	Theoretical Perspectives on Ethnicity and Culture	42
	Measuring Ethnic Identity	44
	Life Satisfaction and Subjective Well-Being	45
	Well-Being and Social Support among African Americans	45
	Well-Being and Social Support among Native Americans	46
	Social Support Theory	47
	Literature Review Summary.....	49
3	METHODOLOGY	53
	Conceptual Framework	53
	Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods	54
	Research Design	55
	Population and Samples	57
	Instrumentation	59
	Data Collection Procedure	62

	Data Analysis	63
	Research Hypothesis	64
	Definition of Key Concepts	66
	Protection of Human Subjects	67
	Purpose of the Research Study	68
	Major Research Questions	68
	Qualitative Research Process	69
	Research Design	69
	Instrument	70
	Data Collection	71
4	DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE SAMPLE ...	72
	Sample Characteristics	72
	Univariate Analysis	74
	Objective One	74
	Recognition	74
	Gender	74
	Income	74
	Age	75
	Education	75
	Objective Two	76
	MEIM (Ethnic Identity and Affirmation, Belonging, Commitment – African American)	77
	MEIM (Ethnic Identity and Affirmation, Belonging, Commitment – Indian)	80
	Well-Being (Life Satisfaction and Social Status)	82
	Social Support	83
	Emotional Support (family)	85
	Socializing (family)	86
	Practical Assistance (family)	87
	Financial Assistance (family)	89
	Advice/Guidance (family)	90
	Emotional Support (friends)	92
	Socializing (friends)	93
	Practical Assistance (friends)	94
	Financial Assistance (friends)	95
	Advice/Guidance (friends)	96
	Bivariate Analysis	98
	Objective Three	98
5	DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE SAMPLES ..	107
	Sample Characteristics	107
	Dual Cultural Identity	111
	Racial Dissonance	112
	Racism	114
	Marginalization	116

	Future Generation and Fusion of African and Indian Culture ..	117
	Chapter Summary	121
6	QUANITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS	123
	Demographic Variables	123
	Ethnic Identity	125
	Well-Being (Life Satisfaction and Social Status)	128
	Qualitative Findings	131
	Implication of Social Work Practice	134
	Implication of Social Work Education	139
	Limitation of the Study	143
	Direction for Future Research	144
	REFERENCES	147
	APPENDIX	166
	A. MANDATORY CRITERIA FOR FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	166
	B. RESEARCH STUDY PROJECT INSTRUMENTS	170
	C. QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	182
	Qualitative Interview Guide	183
	VITA	184

ABSTRACT

This study shows the existence of Black Indians in Louisiana and investigates whether differences exist between Black Indians who are members of officially recognized tribes and those who do not have any type of recognition. This study examined if a relationship exist between tribal recognition and ethnic identity, subjective well-being, and social support. A cross-sectional survey design was used. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain qualitative data. The sample consisted of 60 participants. 30 were from recognized tribal groups and 30 were from non-recognized tribal communities. The study specifically examined variables related to the perceptions of Black Indians in Louisiana to see if this group perceives themselves to be Black, Indian, or both. The independent variable included demographic characteristics and tribal designation. The dependent variables were ethnic identity, subjective well-being and social support. Results showed that Black Indians in recognized groups had higher levels of Native American identity when compared to their levels of African American identity ($p < .01$). There were no significant differences in the levels of Native American identity when compared with the African American identity among the non-recognized samples ($p < .342$). Differences did emerge with respect to income, age, and tribal designation. Results indicated that those Black Indians in recognized tribes were significantly more likely to be younger with higher annual incomes than those Black Indians in non-recognized groups ($p < .01$). There were no significant differences between the two groups for the variables social support and subjective well-being. Findings imply that “race”, as a social construct, is designed by arbitrary categories that are inconsistent with ethnic heritage or cultural identity development.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are large numbers of African Americans with Native American ancestry, yet much of United States history fails to mention the existence of these people. Though often unmentioned outside of family circles, some 95 percent of African Americans are now estimated to have at least one Indian ancestor (Grenier, 1997). There also appears to be a positive bias among African Americans toward a willingness to claim a Native American heritage (see May, 1994; Forbes, 1993; Katz, 1986). It is seldom the case, among African Americans, to admit to any shared European ancestry.

Much has been written about the historical and social relations existing between Europeans and native peoples of the Americas. Likewise, the relationships between Europeans and Africans have been explored, but relations between Native Americans and Africans have been sadly neglected. Although most of the two million people claiming Indian ancestry in the United States are of racially mixed backgrounds, many are still amazed to find that many African Americans are of Indian heritage. Jack D. Forbes (1993) mentions that Josephine Baker, Paul Robinson, Lena Horn, Tina Turner, Frederick Douglass, Jessie Jackson, and Martin Luther King Jr. shared this biological legacy.

Of the percentage of Africans Americans who claim at least one Native American branch on their family tree, few can prove this connection with legal records. Their knowledge of their ancestry has been acquired from an oral tradition common in Black families and Black communities.

This research explores the perceptions of Black Indians¹ in Louisiana to see if this population perceives themselves to be Black, Indian, or both. This study involves a survey research design using several components. The primary component was to gather data from existing tribal rolls that have federal and/or state official recognition to determine whether any members are enrolled that meet the Black Indian criterion. Also, various non-recognized Indian communities contacts were made to determine how many individuals and families met this criterion as well. Particular attention was given to the cultural identity of those members who report having both an African and Native American heritage. Information was gathered on the cultural identity of these members as well as their sense of subjective “well-being” and social support systems.

Mixture of African and Native Americans

In attempts to understand Black African– Native American mixture and to probe the question of what extent African Americans throughout the Americas are part American Indian, it is necessary to clarify some racial or ethnic terms as they were used historically in this country and Europe. There is hardly a single racial term that has clear and consistent meaning. For example, the term “Indian” has been applied to many people including the Indians of South Asia as well as all groups found in the “West” Indies (the Americas) and the “East” Indies (Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, etc.). The term “Negro” has been applied to Black Africans, Indians of India, Native Americans, Japanese, and slaves of whatever ancestry (Forbes, 1993). “Black” has been used for all the above and for non-whites in general (Forbes, 1993). In Britain today, the term ‘black’ is applied

¹ For a definition of “Black Indian”, see the “Operational Definition of key Concepts” section in this chapter.

not only to Africans or West Indians (of whatever shade or mixture), but also to people from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and even Latin Americans (Forbes, 1993).

American Indian people, whether of unmixed ancestry or mixed with other ancestry, were at times affected by the tendency to create a purely white– black social system, especially when living away from a reservation or the tribal homeland (Forbes, 1993). In the British slave colonies of North America along the Atlantic coast, many persons of American Indian ancestry were at times classified as blacks, negroes, mulattoes, or people of color, and these terms were, of course, used for people of African ancestry (Forbes, 1993).

The concept of Negro, when analyzed in terms of its historical development, shows that the late medieval period in Italy and the Iberian peninsula saw people being variously classified as albo, alvi, blanco, branco, (white), nero, nigri, negro, negre, preto (black), and also of intermediate colors: lauro, loro, llor, berretini, rufo, pardo, olivastre (Forbes, 1993). The term Negro was not used for a race, for a single stock of people' or to point to ancestry or ethnicity. It was usually a simple description for a perceived color or appearance.

In 1854, the California State Supreme Court sought to bar all non-Caucasians from equal citizenship and civil rights. The court stated:

The word “Black” may include all Negroes, but the term “Negro” does not include all Black persons...We are of the opinion that the words “White”, “Negro”, “Mulatto”, and “Black person”, whenever they occur in our constitution...must be taken in their generic sense...that the words “Black person”, in the 14th section must be taken as contra distinguished from White, and necessarily includes all races other than the Caucasian (The People v. Hall, Oct. 1, 1854, as cited in Forbes, 1993, p.65).

Few racial terms have been of greater importance in the Americas than that of mulatto (Forbes, 1993). The common interpretation (which basically boils down to

“mulish” or “young mule”) is a nasty one: disparaging, and dehumanizing. This idea of the mule asserts that the name mulatto comes from mule, an animal derived from two others of different species (Forbes, 1993). Zambaigos/sambo is a term referring to a class of mulattos who were half American Indian and half African (Forbes, 1993).

One of the important contributing factors to the widespread mixture of American Indians and Africans was the imbalance of sex ratios among various groups (along with population demographics). Most authorities are in agreement that the Black African slave sex ratio was highly imbalanced in favor of males. Aguirre Beltran (as cited in Forbes, 1993), notes that:

The imbalance of sex and age were important factors that conditioned African influence on regional cultures. The Negro could not reconstruct his own family structure in America and Mexico and turned to interbreeding with the Indian to balance the disequilibrium of the sexes. Perhaps there were as many as three times as many men as women among the negroes brought to the Indies; the ratio may have been even more unequal...Logically their partners were usually Indian women. In fact, it seems as if many Indian women preferred them to their own husbands (p. 182).

Freedom was another compelling motive for Native American– African mixture. This motive caused many Africans to flee their slave captures to enter Indian Territory, but it also may have caused many males to have children by free Native American women so that the said children would be free. The child of a Native woman and a Black African slave was a free person after 1542-50, whereas the child of a Spaniard and a Black African slave women was still a slave (Forbes, 1993).

There were several roads of contact in American history that lead to the connections that created the African American with American Indian ties or the American Indian with African ancestry. Africans and Native Americans shared the common experience of enslavement. In addition to working together in the fields, they lived together in communal living quarters, produced collective recipes for food and

herbal remedies, shared myths and legends, and ultimately became lovers. The intermarriage of Africans and Native Americans was facilitated by the disproportionality of African male slaves to females and the decimation of Native American males by disease, enslavement, and prolonged wars (Wright, 1981). As Native American societies in the Southeast were primarily matrilineal, African males who married Native American women often became members of the wife's clan and citizens of the respective nation (Wright, 1981).

From the middle part of the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth century, Africans had been fleeing slavery along the same routes that Native Americans had used (Mulroy, 1993). The Muskogeans and especially their relatives, the Seminoles of Southern Florida, accepted these African runaways and incorporated them into their nations because the Africans were well skilled in languages, agriculture, technical skills, and warfare (Mulroy, 1993). Just as the "underground railroad" provided freedom in the North in later years, this other "underground railroad" ran south to freedom on the border (Mulroy, 1993). It is believed that Harriet Tubman was a Black Indian because of how well she knew the terrain to which she led runaway slaves through the underground railroad to the North.

Among the Muskogeans and the Seminoles, the Africans were granted much greater freedom, even though they were referred to as "slaves." Many Muskogean and Seminole referred to their African brethren as their "slaves" to protect them from white slaveholders who sought their return. There was some social status acquired by owning slaves. The Muskogean and Seminole had little need for slave labor because they did not adopt plantation style agriculture, as did the northern nations of the Five Civilized Tribes

(Mulroy, 1993). Africans, among the Muskogee, could own property, travel freely from town to town, and marry into the family of their owners. Often, the children of a Muskogee's African slave were free, and African Muskogees became traditional leaders among several local indigenous communities (Martin, 1991).

The Africans were more than just laborers and technicians for the Muskogee and Seminole; they became their diplomats, their warriors, and their religious leaders (Martin, 1991). They were also religious leaders within the communities of the Cherokee, Choctaw, and Chickasaws (Martin, 1991).

Jack Forbes examines the American Indian contribution to the black population and the African contribution to the Indian population. He mentioned the term *Mestee* as a generic term for mixed race people in the Lower South. It is sometimes spelled *mustee*, which Forbes attributes to its being made to agree with mulatto. In Louisiana, Mestee was used for a person who was less than one-eighth African who could pass for white (Nassau, 1994). In the Upper South mulatto was used rather indiscriminately for mixed race people, including black-Indian and even white-Indian, as well as the usual black-white mixes, and mestee was sometimes used for one who passed for white (Nassau, 1994).

Mestee groups all predate the Civil War. Since the Civil War, there has been no real distinction between black and part black, and the rule²-that part black- is black, has prevented the formation of any new groups. However, there are nearly 200 such groups in the broadest definition (Nassau, 1994). Before the Civil War, free mulattos were accorded an intermediate position between black and white in many locations. In

² The one drop rule designates that any person with an African ancestry or having one drop of black blood as being black.

Charleston and New Orleans, a Colored community with some wealth developed, which emulated white society and even held black slaves (Nassau, 1994).

After the Civil War, the term Colored was gradually extended to all blacks as a “courtesy” (Nassau, 1994). Residual Indian groups formed other Mestee communities by absorbing Blacks but lost their Indian language (Nassau, 1994). Since all the Indian groups of the South and Border regions are part black, once they lost their language, it was easy for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to say they were not real Indians and that they were blacks pretending to be Indians (Nassau, 1994). Some groups, notably the Melungeons and Brass Ankles, have absorbed so many whites since their formation that now most can easily pass for white (Nassau, 1994). Other groups have so much black mixture that most people consider them to be black, such as the Moors and Nanticokes of Delaware and Maryland (Nassau, 1994). Groups such as the Freedmen of Virginia, the colored Creoles (Redbones) of Louisiana and Mississippi, and the Creoles and Cajans of Alabama and Florida, admit that they are part-black but still keep themselves apart from other blacks and preserve a separate culture (Nassau, 1994).

G. Reginald Daniel (1992) in his book *Racially Mixed People in America* treats Mestees as part of the light-skinned blacks who have passed or have attempted to pass for white or Indian in order to escape the lower status accorded blacks. He notes that blacks have resented Mestees denying their black ancestry. Jack Forbes (1994) considers them as a black-Indian mix, a bridge between the two groups, but not to the whites.

Mestees tend to be more Indian culturally than racially as a result of black and white being introduced slowly into groups originally Indian (Nassau, 1994). In Virginia, they can be distinguished at a distance from blacks by their habit of walking silently in

single file, while neighboring blacks walk in clusters talking as they go (Nassau, 1994). Most Mestees do not have much interest in organized religion, which tends to play a central role in most black communities. They are not known for an interest in music, and their music tends to be that of the surrounding white community, not the black. Many Mestees are racist, having learned that one of the best ways not to be treated as black by whites, is to join them in their anti-black attitudes (Nassau, 1994).

Historical Indian Tribes in Louisiana

Louisiana has a significant Native American population—one of the largest within the eastern United States. In many instances, these populations do not fit the stereotypical images of what some people think of as Indians. Although Louisiana has had its share of discriminatory laws and practices and racial and ethnic abuses (especially with African Americans) it has fostered, more than most southern states, a milieu in which ethnically diverse groups could survive. Louisiana has more cultural and ethnic diversity than perhaps any other state. In addition to the French Catholics in the south and Protestants in the north, there are the Germans, Irish, Spanish, Cubans, Mexicans, Italians, Czechs, Hungarians, Croatians, Guatemalans, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, Laotians, Thais, Vietnamese (largest population of Vietnamese in the United States), Africans (and African Americans), Haitians, Jews, Greeks, Romani (Gypsies), and Native Americans³ (Marler, 1997).

Louisiana has the third largest Native American population in the eastern United States (Kniffen, Gregory, Stokes, 1987). Many of these Indian groups are culturally and

³ In this dissertation, I use the terms Indian, American Indian, Native American, and Indigenous people interchangeably.

racially mixed. In addition to their native languages, many speak French, Spanish, and English.

At the time of this study, there are four federally recognized tribes in Louisiana: the Coushatta Tribe, Tunica-Biloxi Tribe, Chitimacha Tribe, and the Jena Band of Choctaws. There are five state recognized tribes: the Clifton Choctaw Tribe, the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb, the Four-Wind Cherokee Tribe, the United Houma Nation, and the Caddo Adais Tribe. The Avoyles-Taensa and the Talimali Band of Apalache of Louisiana are currently applying for recognition.

The Clifton Choctaw tribe is a group living in a closed community in Rapides Parish. They are Choctaw, Chatot, Creole and African (Marler, 1997). The tribe failed to receive federal recognition as an Indian tribe but has received state recognition. One theory is that this group may have originally come to Louisiana from North Carolina where they were members of the Lumbee Indian tribe (as cited in Marler, 1997). However, this has not been documented.

The Ebarb Choctaw-Apache Tribe is a state recognized tribe that has lived in Sabine Parish since the 1700s (Gregory, 1987). They are of Choctaw and Lipan Apache heritage (Gregory, 1987). It maintains a tribal office in Zwolle, Louisiana, and a pow-wow ground at Ebarb, Louisiana. Primarily English speaking, elders are equally at ease in Spanish and sprinkle in words from Nahuatl, Choctaw, and Coahuitecan. The tribe retains traditional crafts such as white oak basketry and food ways such as tamales, chardizos, and salsas, as well as pan-tribal arts and crafts (Gregory, 1987).

The Houma, the largest tribe in Louisiana, which numbers about ten-thousand, live in Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes (United Houma Nation, 1992). Like the Red

Bones, they were suspected of absorbing Blacks and once were rigidly segregated by the local white power structure (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987).

The Chitimacha, a small tribe of about 300 members located at Charenton, in St. Mary Parish, is world renowned for its river cane basketry. By the third decade of the eighteenth century, they had been decimated and driven from their villages near Bayou Lafourche (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). Many of the survivors were sold into slavery (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). The Chitimacha are unique among the Indian tribes of Louisiana. From the first decade of the twentieth century until 1973, they were Louisiana's only reservation Indians and the only group to receive full federal benefits (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). Among tribes in Louisiana, they are the best situated financially and the best educated (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987).

According to Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes (1987), the offspring of Indians and non-Indians formed separate mestizo communities which developed their own identities outside of specific tribal groups. However, Indian identities persisted, and traditional culture was frequently maintained. At least three well-documented communities with Indian identities exist in Louisiana. These are the Clifton Choctaw community, the various Houma groups, and the Choctaw-Apache community at Ebarb (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). These mixed-blood communities have retained some native language, food habits, crafts, and elements of religious and political organizations (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). Although observably different from the more purely Indian groups, these communities also demonstrate that they differ equally from their non-Indian neighbors (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987).

Don C. Marler (1997), in his writings of the *Louisiana Redbones*, gives an explanation of the Redbone arrival in Louisiana. According to Marler, the Louisiana Territory was owned at sometime by England, France and Spain until it was purchased by the United States in 1803. Louisiana became a state in 1812. Ancestors of the people we now know to be Redbones came to the area when it was still a territory. They first came to the south (Lafayette area) and then moved to the west and central parts of the state. A Redbone is a person of mixed racial heritage who is a member of a group that defines its relationship to the dominant culture in a certain way. The racial mix may be any combination of two or more of the following: Native American, European Caucasian, Asians (i.e., English, French, Irish, Welsh), or Portuguese, Spanish, Moor, Turk, and any of the various Negroid sub-groups (Marler, 1997). Physical characteristics are varied but typically include a dark skin, often with a copper hue, high cheekbones, dark eyes, dark straight hair, and no single body type (Marler, 1997). Less often they are of lighter skin, blue eyes, and blond hair. In those people with some Negroid genetics, Negroid features may be evident, such as darker skin, curly hair, wide nose, and thick lips (Marler, 1997).

Purpose of the Study

Very little is known about the existence and conditions of Black Indians in Louisiana. Consequently, much ground work needs to be done to study this population. The broad purpose of this empirical study is to show the existence of Black Indians in Louisiana, those who have official tribal recognition as well as those without formal recognition. This study investigated whether differences exist between those individuals who identify themselves as Black Indians and are members of an officially recognized

tribe and those who identify as Black Indians but do not have any type of official recognition.

In this dissertation, Black Indians in three parishes in Louisiana and one county in Mississippi were studied using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Four outcome measures for these comparison groups were studied: cultural identity, social support, social status, and feelings of subjective well-being. To accomplish this goal, individuals who met the Black Indian criterion were identified through existing federal and state recognized tribal rolls in order to construct a data base of names and addresses (that were protected by Institutional Review Board [IRB] procedures) of those who were willing to participate in this study. Secondly, Black Indian communities were identified in terms of their locations and various demographic statistics. Finally, instruments and indexes were developed and modified for testing the data retrieved and analyzing the results.

In summary, this study explores three major research questions using quantitative data:

1. Does a relationship exist between cultural identity and tribal roll recognition?
2. Does a relationship exist between subjective well-being and tribal roll recognition?
3. Does a relationship exist between social support and tribal roll recognition?

A fourth question is examined through the use of qualitative data.

4. How is cultural retention maintained among non-recognized Black Indians?

Importance of the Study

The ancestry of Americans today, whether “black” or “Indian” in appearance, is frequently quite complex. Often, many people have been forced by racism into arbitrary categories that tend to render their ethnic heritage incomplete. The principal task of this exploratory research is to replace one-dimensional images of Africans in America with more accurate delineations by showing the existence of Black Indians in Louisiana and assessing their needs and cultural identities. This dissertation explores the perceptions of Black Indians in Louisiana to see if this group perceives themselves to be Black, Indian or both.

It is important to note the historical factors that created this dual identity group. Equally important are the present day factors that continue to have an impact on this group. The results of this dissertation increase the knowledge about Black Indians and 1) their cultural identity as it relates to African and Native, 2) their social support systems from family and friends, 3) their perception of their social status in their community as well as their country, and 4) their subjective well-being and life satisfaction.

By exploring these relationships through both quantitative statistical analysis and in-depth qualitative interviews, this research provides a more comprehensive description and analysis of the experiences of this population.

Operational Definitions of Key Concepts

Some ambiguity has surrounded the definition of race and ethnic cultural groups, especially since general semantical relationship of meanings has far reaching implications in treatment, research, funding, and public policy. The concept of race, as used by the United States Census Bureau, reflects self-identification by people according to the “race” or “races” with which they most closely identify. These categories are socio-political constructs and should not be interpreted as being scientific or anthropological in nature (U.S. Census, 2000).

The racial classification used by the census bureau defines Black, or African American, as a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicate their race as “Black, African American, or Negro,” or provide written entries such as African American, Afro American, Kenyan, Nigerian, or Haitian (U.S. Census, 2000).

American Indian is defined as a person having origins in any of the original people of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment (U.S. Census, 2000). Black Indian will be defined as a person who identifies as having both an Indian and African ancestry and may or may not have official recognition on tribal rolls or tribal affiliation. It includes people who indicate their ancestral connection is at least two generations old. It should be noted that there exist no universally accepted rule for establishing a person’s identity as an Indian. The Bureau of the Census counts anyone an Indian who declares to be such.

A federally recognized tribe is defined as only those tribes who maintain a legal relationship with the U.S. government through binding treaties, acts of Congress, and

executive orders (see appendix A). A tribe becomes recognized by the state of Louisiana at the discretion of the state legislators.⁴ There is no official criterion to follow for state recognition. Non-recognition (by conventional wisdom) implies that no legal relationship exists with the U.S. government. An Indian tribe was originally a body of people bound together by blood ties who were socially, politically, and religiously organized, who lived together in a defined territory, and who spoke a common language or dialect. To be considered a tribe, official recognition must be given by the U.S. government.

Legal Definitions and Racially Mixed People

The history and legality of race in America is an odd one. No idea has done more, or, has had more lasting damage than the “*one drop rule*,” according to which if you have any admixture of black ancestry, you are black, period. This idea imparted an artificial clarity to the idea of race and became the basis of the laws, conventions and etiquette of slavery, then of segregation and subsequently of today’s identity politics, in which one’s identity is a function of one’s race.

Karen I. Blu (1980) in her writing on *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian* wrote:

For Whites, blood is a substance that can be either racially pure or racially polluted. Black blood pollutes White blood absolutely, so that, in the logical extreme, one drop of Black blood makes an otherwise White man black...White ideas about ‘Indian blood’ are less formalized and clear-cut...It may take only one drop of Black blood to make a person a Negro, but it takes a lot of Indian blood to make a person a “real” Indian (p.196).

Louis Owens (1992), in a book dedicated for mixed bloods entitled *Other Destinies: Understanding the American Indian Novel*, wrote:

⁴ According to Pat Arnould, Deputy Director of the Louisiana Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs.

The fact that so many people throughout the world have a strangely concrete sense of what a “real” Indian should be adds still greater stress to the puzzle; woe to him or her who identifies as Indian or mixed-blood but does not bear a recognizable “Indian” name or physiognomy or life-style (p.23).

When the sequencing of the human genome was complete in 2000, it was heralded as evidence that “race” was a cultural/social construction with little bases in science. The sequencing apparently shows that approximately 99.9% of the human genome is the same in everybody and that there is greater genetic variation within each “race” than there is between “races” (Wade, 2002). Many scientists and academics believe that this new information challenges the legitimacy of racial categorizations and shows that race is a meaningless notion. In 1997 the American Anthropological Association, which has published an official statement on race, urged the government to cease using racial categories.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research that is specifically related to the experiences of Black Indians as an ethnic group is limited. In order to conceptualize their cultural development, feelings of social support, and subjective well-being, it is necessary to extrapolate from the bodies of literature for research available on the development of cultural identification among African Americans, Native Americans, and bi-racial individuals. A comprehensive review of the literature using Web SPIRS, ERIC, and other Anthropological, Psychological, Sociological, Human Ecology, and Social Work indexes and databases, did not reveal any scholarly work done on cultural identification among Black Indians as a group. However, largely separate literature is available on theories of well-being and social support. Although there is evidence in the literature that examines outcomes (i.e., self-esteem) for other minority groups, there is no evidence in the literature of this being done on Black Indians. This study attempts to do so.

This literature review begins with a discussion of the use of empowerment approach theory from a strengths perspective as the general theoretical framework for this study. Exhaustive work on ethnic sensitive social work practice make knowledge of culture and race critical to empowerment practice (for general discussion, see Devore & Schlesinger, 1991; Lum, 1986; Davis, 1986; and Chau, 1990). The review then explores literature related to cultural development from an African American perspective including: the Black experience, church and family, and racial identity theories. It is important that theoretical perspectives of ethnic cultural identity be explored because racism and oppression can result in altered states of identity, self-concepts, and values

due to the fact that racial assignments reflect social assumptions and group labeling rather than genetic composition (Cyrus, 1980). Ethnic or cultural identity is a social and political construct which groups use to define themselves. Davis (1991) defines it as “that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group” (p. 110).

Next, I turn to the literature concerning the Native American perspective to review the following: pre-contact, post-contact, cultural beliefs, and Indian identity. This literature review concludes with a comprehensive discussion on available research on the theoretical perspective on southern race relations, bi-racial individuals, ethnicity and culture, and measuring ethnic identity.

Empowerment Approach Theory

This dissertation will use the empowerment approach theory as the interpretive framework for understanding research related to the cultural experiences of Black Indians in Louisiana. Both African Americans and Native Americans share remarkably similar histories of powerlessness as marginalized groups, as well as social, political, and economic injustices perpetrated on them by a predominately white society. Their powerlessness is based on factors which include economic insecurity, absence of experience in the political arena, lack of access to information, and physical and emotional stress (Cox, 1989). The actual and perceived ability to use available resources contributes to a sense of power that is directly connected to self-esteem (Parson, 1989).

Society often “blames the victim” for power deficits even as power is withheld and abused by the dominant group (Ryan, 1971). Unfair social stratification and unfair distribution of goods and services are the most difficult issues facing the world today.

The empowerment approach makes connections between social and economic justice and individual pain and suffering. Utilizing empowerment theory as a unifying framework presents an integrative, holistic approach to meeting the needs of members of oppressed groups (Lee, 1994). Webster's definition of empower is "to give power or authority to; to give ability to, enable, permit (p. 373)," which implies that power can be given to another. However, Parson (1989) considers empowerment as a process that resides in the person, not the helper.

Empowerment is a term that employs a host of basic assumptions and views on matters involving the person in the environment (see Lee, 1994, for an overview of "empowerment approaches"). This study will not discuss all of these assumptions, except to demonstrate how this theory relates to racial identity and the right for self-determination among Black Indians and empowerment as it relates to subjective well-being and social support for this group.

Both African Americans and Native Americans are historically oppressed groups. Because of systemic influences (i.e., institutional racism) both groups generally lag behind other groups on virtually every statistical demographic in this country. Historically, imposed government control stringently limited African American and Indian freedom of movement and self-determination. African Americans were subjected to Black Codes and Jim Crow laws long after legalized slavery ended. Indians had their territory invaded, and for over 400 years, they were systematically deprived of their land and freedom and eventually forced to settle on reservations. Alcoholism, child neglect, diabetes, incest, spiritual loss, suicide, and unemployment are but a few of the problems facing American Indians (Williams & Ellison, 1996).

Hopelessness can lead to the destruction of self and others, despair, apathy, internalized rage, and false beliefs about the worth of the self (Harris, 1993). Therefore, strong support networks and good human relatedness and connections are essential to developing a positive sense of identity and self-direction. Empowerment practice is gaining in momentum as the oppression of groups, especially those who are poor, escalates in an intransigent political climate.

African American Perspective

A plethora of literature has documented the existence of an African American¹ culture. Wilson (1986, p. 39) states, “in spite of much individual variation, Blacks in America tend to share or at least be influenced by valuing an extended family, shared language patterns, and the shared experience of societal discrimination.”

Sociologists, educators, psychologists, psychiatrists, and anthropologists have provided a number of elaborate theories, paradigms, studies, epistemologies, and perspectives for assigning causation to the behavior of African Americans and other cultural and ethnic groups (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Jensen, 1969; Moynihan, 1965; Murray, 1984; Shockley, 1971). Available evidence catalogued in the literature indicates that in historical accounts, and in theoretical formulations, many investigators consider race as well as the nature, structure, and dynamics of African Americans historical condition, as the chief determinants in the analysis of behavior (Billingsley, 1968; Herskovits, 1968). But as a whole, most behavioral theories and paradigms have been specifically developed with no regard for the historic reality of African American people, nor for the lingering vestiges of African culture which equipped them with certain cultural mechanisms, coping, and adaptive strengths (Billingsley, 1968; Hill, 1972, 1998;

¹ The term “African-American will be used interchangeably with the term “Black.”

Martin & Martin, 1978; McAdoo, 1981; Staples, 1971). This void exists despite the urging of scholars that the past history of African Americans must be considered in the helping process (Blassingame, 1972; Brisbane, 1992; Dodson, 1981; Frazier, 1969; Glaser & Moynihan, 1963; Haley, 1976; Quarles, 1964; Scanzoni, 1971).

The Black Experience

Scholarly writings prior to the 1960s portrayed Blacks as having negative self-images, low self-esteem, and more generalized feelings of inadequacy and worthlessness. Several studies maintained that Black children could not develop a positive identity because of negative role models and the effects of racial oppression (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Asher, 1969; Ausubel, 1959; Brody, 1963; Clark & Clark, 1947). Researchers argued that Black children's self-esteem suffered because of the negative images and behaviors others expressed toward them (Ladner, 1977). However, the "Black Power" movement of the 1960s and 1970s, with its emphasis on Black consciousness and pride, resulted in the literature reflecting the changing conceptions of Black identity (Bowles, 1993).

Helms (1995), with her Black (or People-of-Color) racial identity model, built upon the Nigrescence theory of Cross (1971), which concerned the changing of the "Negro" identity to a new "Black" identity. Helms (1995) posited five statuses of racial identity for African Americans. The first is *Preencounter* (or *Conformity*) which is characterized by an external self-definition, a devaluing of one's own racial group, and an allegiance to White standards of merit. Second, *Encounter* (or *Dissonance*) attitudes are characterized by confusion and ambivalence regarding commitment to one's racial group. Persons with at this stage may be ambivalent about life decisions and exercise repression

of anxiety provoking race information. The *Immersion/emersion* status is characterized by an idealization of one's own racial group and a denigration of all that is associated with the White majority culture. This status is related to a hypervigilance toward racial stimuli and dichotomous thinking. The *Internalization* status is aligned with a positive commitment to one's own racial group, coupled with a capacity to respond objectively to members of the dominant White culture. Persons with high level of Internalization attitudes are believed to exercise flexible and analytic thinking. Finally, the *Integrative Awareness* status is characterized by a capacity to value one's multiple and collective identities, as well as an ability to empathize with social justice issues generally. For detailed descriptions of the stages or statuses of racial identity, see Carter (1995, 1997), Cross (1971, 1991, 1995), Helms (1990, 1995, 1996), Helms and Cook (1999), and Ponterotto and Pedersen (1993).

Chestang (1972) notes that the term "Black experience" presents conceptual and semantic ambiguity, but in brief it connotes dreams deferred and frustrated aspirations of a people oppressed by a society. It expresses a celebrating of the triumph of persons over a social order that would degrade them, and it finds its basic strength in the extended Black family and in the Black church (Billingsley, 1997). See (1998) observes that the Black experience is a dynamic spiritual phenomenon with invisible potency that triggers action and electrifies Blacks when they congregate for a common purpose. Young (1974) advances the notion that the Black experience has physiological warning systems that surface through rhythmic patterns, eye-to-eye contact, the shrug of a shoulder, the nod of a head, and the wrenching of hands when danger is approaching. Alexander (1979) asserts in essence that the Black experience is joy, pain, oppression, frustration and

transformation; it is being from a country but not of it; it is having hope when all seems hopeless and finding a reason not to give up.

In recent decades, a number of studies have focused on the resiliency (or successful coping strategies) of African Americans (Furstenberg et al., 1987; Winfield, 1991; Benson & Donahue, 1989; Benson & Roehlkepartain, 1993; Zill & Nord, 1994; Powell, 1996). It has been only during the past decade that this research on resilience has begun to be applied systematically to individuals and families who were racially or ethnically disadvantaged (Winfield, 1991; Nettles & Pleck, 1994; Logan, 1996). Rutter (1987) characterizes resilience as protective mechanisms or processes rather than as protective factors and does not consider these traits as permanent attributes of individuals, but as positive or healthy responses to stressful circumstances.

Church and Family

Much scholarship reaffirms the fact that the Black family, the Black church and the Black school were among the strongest institutions to emerge from two hundred and fifty years of slavery (Berlin & Rowland, 1997; Billingsley & Caldwell, 1991; Foner & Mahoney, 1995). The church and the family are the oldest, strongest, and most highly valued institutions in the African American experience. The Black church, beyond its religious function, has a historical role as lyceum, conservatory, forum, social service center, political academy, and financial institution (Lincoln, 1989). In addition, the support African American families provide for family members has been well documented (Billingsley, 1968; English, 1984; Hill, 1971; McAdoo, 1981).

Racial Identity Theories

Racial identity theory and its empirical literature are useful to our conceptualization of differential status identity, helping us to examine ways in which individuals perceive themselves as different from the dominant group. A premise of racial/ethnic identity theories is that race as a construct in the development of identity is more salient for those who identify themselves as African Americans or as another racial/ethnic group than for those who identify themselves as white (Fouad & Brown, 2000). However, the salience of race varies depending on how different one is (or is perceived to be) and with the importance of race to that difference (Fouad & Brown, 2000).

This was examined in three qualitative studies. Cunningham (1997) found that light-skinned African American, as opposed to dark-skinned African Americans were concerned about being accepted by both European and African Americans. Jones (1997) discovered that women who felt different in visible and invisible ways incorporated those differences into their self-identity. Race mattered most explicitly for the Black women in her sample and much less so for the White women.

Racial identity theories also hypothesize that individuals who have internalized racial attitudes are more collectivistic (i.e., oriented toward the group) than individualistic (oriented toward self)(Cross, 1971). Several studies support the hypothesized psychological health of the internalization stage and found that African Americans with internalized attitudes to have a better sense of hope and subjective well-being (Fouad & Brown, 2000; Oyserman, Grant, & Ager, 1995; Jackson & Neville, 1998). Males with higher internalized attitudes were found to have a high student involvement in university

activities compared with males in other identity stages (Taylor & Howard-Hamilton, 1995).

In a study that used the African Self Consciousness Scale (Baldwin & Bell, 1985), a high African consciousness and low stress cluster had the highest self esteem and perceived anger control (Chambers et al., 1998).

Native Americans

With more than five hundred and fifty federally recognized tribes (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999) speaking more than two hundred languages (Fleming, 1992), Native Americans represent the most ethnically diverse cultural group in the United States. Although many tribes share similar values and beliefs, their cultural practices, traditions, and social organization vary and are influenced not only by geographic locations but also by historical traumas experienced by individual tribal groups (Cameron, & Turtle-Song, 2003).

Their survival in the face of decimating diseases and destructive U.S. policies speaks to the resilience of indigenous people (Weaver, 1999). However, American Indians are greatly overrepresented in the child welfare system (Hogan & Siu, 1988; MacEachron, Gustavsson, Cross, & Lewis, 1996; Mannes, 1995; Wares, Wedel, Rosenthal, & Dobrec, 1994; Weaver & White, 1999), suffer disproportionately from a variety of health problems (May, 1988; Parker, 1994; Stillman, 1992; Wuest, 1991), and are among the poorest people in the United States (Little Eagle, 1993; Stillman, 1992; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993).

Precontact

When Europeans arrived in the Americas, they encountered a thriving, self-governing people living in harmony with nature. To an especially holistic and reverent people, natural phenomena were inseparable from the supernatural, and most Native Americans believed in a special kinship between themselves and the plants, animals, and inanimate objects that inhabited their world (Cameron & Turtle-Song, 2003).

Although there are enormous discrepancies among scholars, it is estimated that before the first contacts with Europeans, there were between ten and fifteen million indigenous people living in what is now the United States (Waldman & Braun, 1985). At their lowest point, between 1890 and 1910, approximately 250,000 to 300,000 Native American people had survived European contact (Thornton, 1987). Using the conservative number of ten million at the time of first contact, this represents a loss of 97 to 97.5 percent of the entire indigenous population in the United States in 400 years (Thornton, 1987).

Postcontact

The history of Native Americans after the arrival of the Europeans is a history of warfare and dispossession. The 400-year war between Native Americans and white settlers spanned from colonial times through the nineteenth century (Waldman & Braun, 1985; Pevar, 1992).

Past governmental policies regarding Native Americans have led to mistrust of many government services. According to Pevar (1992), “there has never been a consistent federal Indian policy” (p. 2). There have been six distinct policies, five of which have exacted a devastating toll on Native Americans, contributing to social,

political, physical, and mental health problems that indigenous people confront today (see Deloria & Lytle, 1983; Deloria, 1997; Pevar, 1992; Waldman & Braun, 1985; Canby, 1998).

The first policy was annihilation. In addition to raiding parties being acceptable practices, whites purposely exposed indigenous people to infectious diseases for which they had no natural immunity (Waldman & Braun, 1985). Between infectious diseases and the unbridled slaughter of Native American people, European contact had shattering effects not only on indigenous population but also on their faith and religion (Waldman & Braun, 1985).

The second policy was the forced removal of tribes from their ancestral homelands by the signing of the Indian Removal Act by Andrew Jackson (Pevar, 1992). Several thousand Native Americans died during this forced relocation (Thornton, 1987; Pevar, 1992).

The Treaty of Payne's Landing was passed in 1832. This treaty targeted the Seminoles who had given refuge to escaped slaves and required all Seminoles with African American ancestry to be treated as runaway slaves and returned to their masters (Canby, 1998). This meant the disintegration of many Seminole families (Canby, 1998).

Between 1887 and 1934, the third policy of assimilation was initiated. This process required Native Americans to integrate into white society by breaking up tribal governments and abolishing reservations (Canby, 1998). To accomplish this, Congress passed the Dawes Act in 1887, also known as the General Allotment Act. By the time the Allotment Act was abolished, almost two thirds of Native American lands had been lost (Canby, 1998).

According to Adams (1997), it was the boarding schools that had the most devastating effects and where the last Native American war was fought. During the 1930s to 1940s, most of the Native American children attending school would do so in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) or mission school systems (Cooper, 1999). Throughout these times, many Indian children endured humiliating punishments, along with physical, sexual, and emotional abuse (Brookings Institute, 1971; Horejsi, Craig, & Pablo, 1992). According to McGoldrick, Giordiano, & Pearce (1996), the “boarding school system was one of the most ruthless and inhumane methods of assimilation available to the U.S. government” (p. 50).

Near the end of World War II, Congress began to withdraw federal support and abdicate responsibility for Native American affairs (Hamley, 1994). One policy of this era was an attempt by the U.S. government to extinguish Native spiritual practices. A governmental prohibition on participation in traditional spiritual ceremonies continued until the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978. Despite the prohibitions and the christianizing efforts by various churches, indigenous culture and spirituality have survived and are widely practiced (Bryde, 1971).

Cultural Beliefs

Values can exert powerful influences on behaviors and beliefs about what constitutes appropriate, positive, and prosocial behavior in others (Coggins, 1991; Tropman, 1989). Most American Indian cultures have a high degree of integration of religious and health beliefs (Coggins, 1990); healing cannot be separated from culture or religion (Locust, 1988). Basic to the concept of the treatment of disease among many

Indians tribes is the idea that humans are made up of body, mind, and spirit (Coggins, 1991; Locust, 1988).

There is a growing literature that places Indians on a cultural continuum emphasizing four styles of living: traditional, marginal, middle class, and pan-Indian (French & Hornbuckle, 1980; Miller, 1982; Red Horse, Lewis, Feit, & Decker, 1978). Each of these styles contributes to a sense of family.

Traditionalists live in accordance with culturally prescribed customs (French & Hornbuckle, 1980; Locust, 1988; Red Horse et al., 1978). A spirit of cooperation with each other and the environment is central to their thinking. The marginal class (French & Hornbuckle, 1980) of Indians, caught between traditional roots and white society, is at risk for sociocultural stress because they are not fully accepted in either culture. Middle class Indians are more likely to subscribe to Western society's way of life (William & Ellison, 1996).

Pan-Indians struggle to re-establish lost traditions in a way that encompasses tribal variation (Hall, 1986; Red Horse et al., 1978). Pan-Indianism represents a reformation of tradition. Belief systems are enlarged to include the mixing of several traditional forms while avoiding activities of the dominant society (French & Hornbuckle, 1980; Hall, 1986). Pan-Indianism is characteristic of multi-tribe groups who are more likely to accept traditional rituals that have been practiced by members of other tribes (Hall, 1986). Pan-Indian families are the least likely to use Western health and mental health agencies (Red Horse, et al., 1978).

Indian Identity

Tremendous variations exist in how Indian people identify themselves (Green, 1995; Red Horse, 1978; Weaver, 1996, 2001). Some American Indians identify themselves according to their particular nation rather than as members of a broad category such as Native American or American Indian (Weaver, 1998). Others take considerable satisfaction in their role in a multicultural society (Weaver, 1998, 2001). Some identify many issues that they hold in common with other people of color but others reject all commonalities (Weaver, 1998).

Not all Indian people are equally connected to their heritage (Weaver, 1998; Porter, 1983; Oetting & Beauvais, 1991). Those who are not seen as having easily identifiable native characteristics or phenotypical features often have been assumed not to be Indian, yet this is not necessarily an accurate reflection of cultural identity (Porter, 1983; Weaver, 1998). In addition, it is possible for people to identify with more than one culture (Oetting & Beauvais, 1991; Weaver, 1996). A strong identification with one culture does not necessarily limit identification with another culture (Weaver, 1998). Identification with a cultural group has been found to have positive implications for well-being (Weaver, 1998).

The work of Haynes (1997) and Mihesuah (1998), both native researchers, explore and explain Native identity through a constructivist view. Haynes' (1997) study of ethnicity issues in a mixed-blood², Oklahoma Cherokee community, found that individuals' identities are affected by historical issues, constructs of assimilation, and

² The term "mixed-blood" did not originate within the Native population but is of European origin (Writer, 2001). The federal government has utilized it to classify Indian people in regard to wardship, policies, treaty obligations and services (Writer, 2001). It also reflects a non-Native view of Indianness based on the biological makeup of individuals (Writer, 2001).

factors such as gender, socio-economic status, blood quantum, skin color, and the time period in which one is raised. As opposed to the linear stage structure of Cross' (1971) Negro-to-Black Conversion Experience Model and Sue and Sue's (1990) Cultural Identity Model, Haynes' Cherokee Identity Sphere model rejects the stage sequence and is instead circular in nature, reflecting the Native worldview. Mihesuah (1998) presents a model of Indian Life Stages, which takes into account issues of socialization, physical appearance, blood and cultural heritage, social and political conditions, and prejudice and discrimination. Both models may assist individuals in understanding the diversity of Native people.

Haynes (1997), Red Horse (1997), Krouse (1999), and Pewewardy (1998) assert that most non-Indians define Indians on the basis of individual biological or genetic makeup (blood quantum³/blood descendancy) and physical attributes (skin color/physical features). In contrast, most Indian people define themselves on the basis of relationship to their specific tribal group, through which (extended) family one belongs to (relatives/family), and where one is from (community/location).

Dukes and Martinez (1997), in a study on ethnic identity among adolescents, reported that Whites and Native Americans had lower ethnic identity, and Blacks and Hispanics had higher ethnic identity. They continued to state that the greater the ethnic identity, the higher the self-esteem, purpose in life, and self-confidence. This is an

³ It is important to note that Native American groups did not initiate the blood quantum concept but rather the federal government imposed the concept upon them. Over the years of having to operate within the blood quantum context, some Native American individuals and tribal groups do adhere to the concept and consequently utilize blood quantum as an important element in defining who is or is not Indian or a tribal member. Others operate within traditional tribal community definitions or more contemporary mediated definitions (see Taylor, 1983, p. 10).

important finding in that it demonstrates how cultural identity is connected to subjective well-being.

Weaver and Brave-Heart (1999) explore factors which shape cultural identity for Native people and the implication of Native cultural identity for social work practice. The authors discuss theoretical perspectives on culture and report the findings of two studies that examine different factors that impact identity. They report that individuals may identify with more than one culture for a variety of reasons. A person of mixed heritage might identify with two or more cultures to which various members of his or her family belongs. They argue that, typically, cultural identification has been measured by variables such as language spoken in the home, geographical location, and close personal associates. While these measures give some indication of cultural identity, they are far from definitive. In particular, language spoken may not be an adequate measure of Native cultural identification.

Native nations have their own criteria for determining who is an Indian. Weaver and Brave-Heart (1999) state that some Native nations are matrilineal, others are patrilineal, and others trace descent through either parent. In some nations blood quantum or degree of biological Native heritage is considered in determining membership. Some Native people belong to nations whose existence is not recognized by the federal government. This lack of outside recognition or acknowledgment may have implications for an individual's sense of self.

Peroff & Wildcat (2002) describe Indian identity as being on a continuum from "Spatially" defined Indianness to "Aspatially" defined Indianness. Their study draws on the complexity theory and Deloria's (1973) concept of spatial thinking in understanding

Indian identity. At one end of the Indian identity continuum is the “spatially” defined Indian identity. This identity is fundamentally shaped and grounded in specific, geographically identifiable places. Peroff & Wildcat (2002) contend that an Indian tribe shares an internal frame of reference that helps adapt and maintain a spatially defined Indian identity. Shared mental images, memories, customs, and habits link the tribe together (Peroff & Wildcat, 2002). When shared experiences are associated with a specific place (i.e., a reservation, ancestral homeland, or sacred site), helps a tribe preserve unique ways members interact with each other (Peroff & Wildcat, 2002). Their identity is maintained in how they live their lives. An Indian is not what you are, but rather who you are.

By contrast, an “Aspatially” Indian identity is essentially disconnected from a geographically identifiable place and is developed primarily from stereotypes and metaphors formed in the dominated society (Peroff & Wildcat, 2002). A crucial point is that aspatial Indian identity is a creation of the diverse body of metaphors generated by formal institutions (i.e., mass media). Aspatial Indianness is more a product of the way members of the dominate society perceive Indians than it is an expression of the way Indians do, in fact, live in American society (Peroff & Wildcat, 2002).

Who is an Indian?

No single definition of “Indian” exists—socially, administratively, legislatively or judicially. According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), no single Federal or tribal criterion establishes a person’s identity as an Indian. Government agencies use differing criteria to determine who is an Indian eligible to participate in their programs. Tribes

also have varying eligibility criteria for membership. To determine what the criteria might be for agencies or Tribes, one must contact them directly.

To be eligible for BIA services, a person must (1) be a member of a Tribe recognized by the Federal Government, (2) have one-half or more Indian blood of tribes indigenous to the United States, or (3) must, for some purpose, be one-fourth or more Indian ancestry (Pevar, 1992).

Although there is no universally accepted definition of the term “Indian,” there is one ethnological definition, and there are many legal definitions. Many federal laws use the word “Indian” without defining it (Pevar, 1992). This allows federal agencies to decide who is an Indian under those laws. Some agencies have been accused of defining Indian too narrowly, thereby depriving people of benefits that Congress intended them to receive (Pevar, 1992). When Congress has not defined the term, courts have used a two-part test to determine who is an Indian. First, the person must have some Indian blood, that is, some identifiable Indian ancestry (Pevar, 1992). Second, the Indian community must recognize this person as an Indian (Pevar, 1992). The Census Bureau takes a simple approach to these problems and lists every person as an Indian who claims to be one.

The American Indian identity is a complex matter. As with many contemporary ethnic identities, genetics, in the form of ancestry and blood quantum, plays an important role in identity construction (Tallbear, 2000). While many Indian tribes require that potential members show a particular blood quantum before they are accorded tribal membership, few tribes currently use genetic tests to determine eligibility (Tallbear, 2000). There are no reports of American Indian tribes requiring or relying on DNA testing for membership, but the Western Mohegan, an officially unrecognized tribe of the

upper Hudson, has reportedly tested the DNA of its members in an effort to prove they possess American Indian blood (Tallbear, 2000).

In February 2000, legislation was introduced into the Vermont Legislature that proposed that the State's Commissioner of Health establish standards and procedures for DNA testing to determine the identity of an individual as a Native American (Tallbear, 2000). It was intended that the results of such testing would be conclusive proof of Native American ancestry. The bill failed to become law.

Some in American Indian circles approaches genetic testing with a certain amount of skepticism and resistance. Tallbear considers this reluctance to be in part based on "an increasingly widespread belief among Indian people that to entertain ideas about benefits of science and technology is to be anti-traditional" (p.98). She also believes that tribes fear that scientific establishments cannot be trusted with their genetic resources.

Historiography of Southern Race Relations

The early encounter of Native Americans and African Americans in the South has been dealt with by historians, but with varying conclusions pertaining to the two groups' attitudes toward each other. Overall, historians have treated Native Americans and African Americans with emphasis on their relations to whites and not on their mutual relations with each other. Most Southern historians have stressed hostility between Blacks and Indians but have made few attempts to explain this supposed animosity. Those who did, (e.g. William S. Willis and William G. McLoughlin), declared white Europeans and Americans guilty of employing a "divide and rule" strategy against Native Americans and African Americans.

Whites attitudes towards African Americans were uniformly negative. Attitudes toward Indians were less uniform and opportunistically depended on military, political, and economic circumstances. The main goals were to eliminate Native American presence and gain a land base for white Americans. As the white dominant minority was afraid of African slave uprisings and of Native Americans' retaliations for injustices suffered, whites attempted to keep the two groups separate and sowed distrust among them in order to prevent concerted actions against whites.

Whites tried to create fear and suspicion between African Americans and Native Americans. They did this by raising rumors that Blacks were responsible for introducing diseases into Indian areas. Whites also used armed African Americans in attacks on Indian villages, as during South Carolina's invasion of Cherokee country in 1715 (May, 1994). Conversely, whites paid Indians well for bringing in fugitive slaves. In Augusta, Georgia, 1763, the price for one returned slave was one musket and three blankets (May, 1994). At that time, it took thirty-five deerskins to get a musket and three blankets (May, 1994). Slave catching allowed individual Indians to pay off some of their usually considerable debt to the white trader (May, 1994). Indians participated in putting down eighteenth century slave uprisings (for instance, the Stono Uprising in South Carolina, 1739) (as cited by May, 1994).

Stories of Indian cruelty toward Black slaves were widespread throughout the South. The practice of scalping and torture became aspects of widely spread stereotypes of Native Americans in slave quarters (May, 1994). In fact, whites paid Indians an equal amount for a dead runaway's scalp as for a returned slave (May, 1994). Enslaved African Americans knew that Indians could capture and sell them to whites for enormous

profits. White expansion into Indian country led to frequent slave stealing on the part of Indians, who would sell the slaves to a different colony, sometimes stealing them again and selling them back to the original owner (May, 1994). In addition, the African American so called “buffalo soldier” on the Plains engaged in the implementation of white American genocidal policies against Native Americans.

William G. McLoughlin’s article *Red Indians, Black Slavery, and White Racism* stated that Indians who were friendly to Blacks at one point in their history often later became hostile toward them. McLoughlin’s proposition that Native American “learned” racism against African Americans from whites contained the same underlying theme as Willis’ (1963) “divide and rule” argument.

In opposition to the argument presented above, some historians have claimed that African American and Native American populations were natural allies in the struggle against white oppression. This school of thought pointed out that Black-Indian alliances have been overlooked in American historiography.

William Loren Katz’s book *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage* (1986) is a case in point. His purpose was to establish Black and Indian participation in “democratic movements before the American Revolution” in search of “liberty, justice, or a better life” (p.6).

Peter Wood’s *Black Majority: Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through Stono Rebellion* (1974) pointed out the many levels of interethnic relations. Wood used historical, geographical, anthropological, and demographic records. He acknowledged Native American-African American relations, which were “crucial to the retention of

black labor” (p.23), as local tribes could assist runaway Blacks or capture and return them, depending on a variety of factors.

Wood’s study showed that several thousand Indian slaves shared tasks and quarters with African slaves in colonial South Carolina. By 1710, Indians still outnumbered African Americans in South Carolina. Despite the absence of complete interracial harmony, Wood did not lose sight of similarities of Indian and African tribal cultures, such as familiarity with subtropical climate, attention to nature, basket weaving, gourd birdhouses, and Indian and African stories, all of which lent themselves to a “fusion of Negro and Indian skills” (p.53).

This discussion of the historiography of ethnic or race relations shows that it has strongly been influenced by white attitudes toward Native Americans and African Americans. The fact that there is a positive bias toward Native American ancestry has been an underreported phenomenon among African Americans, but less so among Euro-Americans. G. Reginald Daniel (1992) explained this discrepancy in term of historical rights and privileges. Native American ancestry has never carried the stigma that has been consistently attached to African decent. In this century, varying amounts of Native American ancestry could qualify someone for federal assistance, voting rights, and land claims—unavailable for African Americans. Furthermore, the historical distance to their complete military subjugation made possible “the romanticization of Native Americans, affording many Whites [sic] the luxury of viewing any aboriginal ancestry of their own as a source of pride” (Daniel, 1992, p.100).

More precisely, European American attitudes towards Native Americans often times have been indistinct. When Native Americans ceased being a military threat to

European Americans, they were attributed romantic features like bravery, virtue, and nobility. The image of African American in (European American) popular culture has served a different purpose and found different expressions. Unlike Native Americans, African Americans were not viewed as being noblemen, but inferior in all aspects because of “scientifically” proven racial characteristics. Depending on the extent of this supposed “docility,” African Americans were seen as a threat to “white womanhood” (another popular social construct).

Black and Indian experience at the hands of whites have been scarring and harmful. Since most people of color in the United States have been “part-white” because of concubinage, intermarriage, and rape, issues of identity have arisen, which have not always been resolvable for all individuals or groups.

How did “popular culture” or negative stereotypes affect people of obviously “mixed” biological and/or cultural Native descent? In some instances bi- and tri-racial ancestry has led to “identity problems” with white, Black, and/or Native American neighbors (Greenbaum, 1991). When ascription and self-identification did not agree, which usually happened in case of the presence of African American ancestry, the “mixed” groups and individuals in question suffered federal non-recognition as Native American tribes, local discrimination, and attempts by whites and Blacks to subsume them under the larger, supposedly more homogenous label of “African American” (Greenbaum, 1991). Being labeled “African American,” however, meant “mixed” groups had no recourse through the Bureau of Indian Affairs (i.e. the federal government) to mediate in land claims (Greenbaum, 1991).

The concepts of race, ethnicity, ascription and self-identification have always been very political. Local whites who themselves perhaps were remotely part-Indian resisted the recognition of tri-racial tribes because the label “(part-Black) Indian” would then negatively impact part-Indian whites, who had borne it with some romanticized pride (Greenbaum, 1991). At the same time, the “one drop rule,” (i.e. the concept that any degree of African ancestry precluded anyone from any other ethnic category) has remained very strong to this day (Greenbaum, 1991).

Theoretical Perspectives on Biracial Individuals

Maria Root (1990) looks into the socially repressive status placed on biracial individuals and describes a model for identity resolution for these individuals. She proceeds in her study with the assumption that the United States is divided into white and non-white and that the vision of the melting pot does not include Africans, Asians, Hispanics, or American Indians. A second assumption is that being white is considered superior to non-whites, which results in attempts to prevent racial mixing. The third assumption that she makes is that the hierarchy of racial groups is based on their likeness to the white middle class social structure and social values. All of these dynamics have resulted in any person with ethnic features or traceable non-white blood to be considered non-white.

Mixed children begin to be aware of their “otherness” at around the age of three, when they start noticing differences in racial appearances (Root, 1990). The role of the family is vital in helping to teach the children and teenagers about their heritages and the values of both races. When these racial issues are not discussed, it causes biracial children to have more difficulty dealing with their racial heritage. It is also important for

the children to see members of the extended family treating their parents with respect. If one parent is seen as lesser by the other side of the family, then the child may start to see their own features related to that parent as inferior.

It is often thought that biracial individuals were at an advantage because they had a choice (Root, 1990), but if they chose to identify as the race that they are not perceived as, they must struggle to exercise that choice. Root (1990) discusses various models for different stages of development for biracial individuals. The first model is based on accepting the identity that society assigns. The second model is to identify with both racial groups. The last two models are identifying with a single racial group (chosen by the individual) and identification as a new racial group. “Marginality is a state created by society and not inherent in one’s racial heritage. As long as the biracial person bases self-acceptance on complete social acceptance by any racial group, they will be marginal” (p. 204). The objective then is to open the door to allowing biracial individuals the freedom to chose their own identity and offer the option of a new race, that of biracial.

There are important issues and concerns for those directly involved in biracial cultural development. Kerwin, Ponterotto, Jackson, & Harris (1993), interviewed nine children of biracial background (ranging between the ages of 5-16 years) using a qualitative investigation method. They found that the themes that arose from their interviews with the children often depended on the developmental age of the child. Major themes that arose from doing interviews included racial/ethnic labels, self-description, and racial awareness. When asked what they were, the younger children responded according to their religious background, whereas the older children responded

with racial labels. The younger children also used actual colors to describe themselves, such as “tan” or “brown”, as opposed to racial labels like “Black,” “White,” or “Mixed.” When asked about social pressure to choose one racial identity, the older children all recalled instances where they felt forced to choose or had no choice and were only allowed to be black. When asked to describe themselves, the children all included skin color in their description of what they looked like. Although all the children were aware of racial differences, there was a trend for greater awareness the older the child was.

Theoretical Perspectives on Ethnicity and Culture

Some scholars have advocated the use of “ethnicity” or “culture” instead of race to connote the broader cultural context in which we develop and learn. This would still be a simplistic practice of racial or cultural group classification. According to Fouad & Brown (2000), “Ethnicity” refers to the ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving shared among people in close proximity who have had similar life circumstances over generations. Culture is an analogous but broader term than ethnicity in that it may not be tied to geography; it refers to the systems of meanings, behaviors, and relationships acquired or learned from experiences in the environment that determine personal and social behavior, as well as relations to material and nonmaterial things (Fouad & Brown, 2000).

Stephan and Stephan (1990) found three characteristics of ethnic identity in their empirical review. First, ethnic identity is subjective. The formation of ethnic identity does not occur simply on physical criteria or by knowing which culture one was born into. It is true that individuals do claim ethnic identity to a group they feel they belong to; however, this group can be incongruent with physical traits and cultural membership.

This is particularly important for biracial youth as they often do not have the physical characteristics associated with particular ethnic groups, thereby making how they identify with an ethnic group often subjective. Second, ethnic identity is a “joint process,” one by which both the individual and the involved group decide on the ethnicity. If one chooses to be Caucasian, yet this is inconsistent with the way the group thinks a Caucasian should look; the member does not have the choice to belong to that group. Third, ethnic identity is not stable; it is fluid and changes with time. It is common for individuals to change identities over time as life events occur. For example, when in the presence of other Jews at work, a person may feel Jewish; however, when that same person attends a meeting after work with no Jews in attendance, that same person may feel Caucasian or may in fact feel both. It should be noted that this is much simpler among the various “white” ethnic groups than it would be for those belonging to the various different “racial” groups.

Davis (1991) divided the dimensions of ethnic identity into a subjective and an objective domain. This provides clarity on how to study ethnic identity. The objective dimension of ethnic identity involves speaking an ethnic language, practicing ethnic traditions, participating in ethnic personal networks, and participating in formal ethnic organizations. These behaviors can be observed by outsiders and are one way to measure the strength of ethnic identity. The subjective dimension of ethnic identity is not readily observed, but is measured through interviews and self-reports of the sense of ethnic identity that is felt. The subjective dimension refers to emotions, feelings, and attitudes.

Measuring Ethnic Identity

Numerous scales have been constructed to measure ethnic identity development. Most are specific to one ethnic group. For example, Parham and Helms (1991) developed the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) to measure the attitudes of African Americans toward their own group and toward the dominant culture.

Other measures of ethnic identity, such as the Black Consciousness Survey (Huston, 1984), Black Identity Questionnaire (Paul & Fischer, 1980), and Ethnic Identification Inventory (Rosenthal & Cichello, 1986), assess the nature and strength of the individual's acceptance of, and commitment to, his or her ethnicity.

Weaver (2001) asserts that there is no consensus about what cultural identity among Native Americans is; however, there is no shortage of attempts of how to measure it. Identity is expressed as a measurable or quantifiable entity more for Native Americans than for any other group (Weaver, 2001). The federal government and most tribes use some form of blood quantum measurement (Peroff, 1997; Weaver, 2001). However, Native Americans have a 75 percent rate of intermarriages, which is the highest rate of any ethnic group, and their course of absorption into the larger U.S. society seems irreversible (Weaver, 2001). Most attempts at measuring Native American ethnic identity are of questionable adequacy and accuracy (Weaver, 2001).

It has been a concern that ethnic identity measures might not allow for the integration of several group identities as a positive and healthy development process or that multiracial individuals might have less clear ethnic identity due to having more than one racial heritage (Poston, 1990). The increasing recognition of those issues has led to the development of models aimed specifically at multiracial individuals. Phinney and

Alipuria (1990) developed a measure of ethnic identity designed specifically for use with people of diverse ethnic backgrounds. The measure was based on elements of ethnic identity that are common across groups so that scores could be compared regardless of race or ethnicity.

Life Satisfaction and Subjective Well-Being

Well-being is a complex construct that concerns optimal experience and functioning (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Current research on well-being has been derived from two general perspectives: the hedonic approach, which focuses on happiness and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance, and the eudaimonic approach, which focuses on meaning and self-realization and defines well-being in terms of the degree to which a person is fully functioning. Kahneman, et al (1999) defined hedonic psychology as the study of “what makes experiences and life pleasant and unpleasant” (p. ix). The term eudaimonic is valuable because it refers to well-being as distinct from happiness, per se (Waterman, 1993).

Christopher (1999) argued that definitions of well-being are inherently culturally rooted, and further, that there can be no such thing as a value-free assessment of well-being. According to Christopher, all understanding of well-being is essentially moral vision, based on individuals’ judgments about what it means to be well.

Well-Being and Social Support Among African Americans

As suggested earlier, religious institutions play important social and political roles in the African American community (see Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990) and contribute to the health and well-being among African Americans (see Ellison, 1994; Koenig, 1994; Levin, 1994). Religious practices, rituals, and beliefs provide specific coping resources

for African Americans (Ellison, 1992). Several analyses of data from national surveys of the general population concluded religious involvement generally bears a stronger positive relationship with life satisfaction and other aspect of subjective well-being for African Americans than for whites of similar backgrounds (St. George & McNamara, 1984; Thomas & Holmes, 1992; Heisel & Faulkner, 1982; Coke, 1992).

A sizeable body of research demonstrates that religious institutions enhance the social resources of African Americans. Analyses of data indicate that church members are important providers of informal social support, especially for the elderly; the services, companionship, and prayers offered by church members frequently complement the support provided by family members and other associates (Taylor & Chatters, 1986, 1988; Hatch, 1991). Several studies of Black elders identify participation in church based support networks as a key predictor of various aspects of well-being (Ortega, Crutchfield, & Rushing, 1983; Walls & Zarit, 1991). In addition to promoting informal supportive exchanges, African American religious congregations also sponsor a host of formal programs for the poor, infirmed, and others with special needs (Caldwell, Greene, & Billingsley, 1992).

Well-Being and Social Support among Native Americans

Similar to African Americans, religion and family have important roles in the subjective well-being and social support for Native Americans. The central unit of Indian society is the family (Light & Martin, 1996). However, Indian families have often been criticized, and negative findings regarding their lifestyle appear frequently in the literature (see Ing, 1992; Cummings, 1989; LaFromboise, Choney, James, & Running Wolf, 1995).

One study by Lewis (1981) identified three strengths of American Indian families: (a) the helping systems that operate within the family, (b) the courage and optimism obtained from spiritual life, and (c) the respect for each other and personal relationships which form the basis for later learning. Lewis (1981) concluded that these strengths helped Indian families face poverty and inadequate living conditions. It is encouraging to note that over three-fourths of Indian households have the husband, wife, and children in the home (American Indian Policy Review Commission, 1976; Red Horse, 1981).

The Indian families do not have the rigid structure of relationship found in Western white culture (Light & Martin, 1996). Instead, Indians relate to people outside the immediate family in supportive and caring ways (Levine & Laurie, 1974). Often this relation/connection to people outside the immediate family begins early in life when second sets of parents are selected for newborn babies (Sandoz, 1961). Therefore, the “total” family involved in child rearing and support includes unrelated members of the Indian community (Ryan, 1981). This community support and protection can be viewed as responsibility for other’s actions. Thus, individual behavior is being monitored by the sense of responsibility for other Indian family members (Manson, 1979). This approach to the family with Native American is akin to the African philosophy of “it takes a village to raise a child.”

Social Support Theory

Social support theory is based on the concept that social ties improve health and well-being (Kaplan, et al. 1977; McColl & Skinner, 1988; Wood & Turner, 1985). Its functions include providing a sense of belonging, opportunities for nurturance,

reassurance of worth, assistance with acquiring needed goods and services, guidance and advice in uncertain or adverse circumstances, and access to new and diverse information (Barrera & Ainley, 1983; House, 1981; Tolsdorf, 1976).

It is generally agreed upon that social support is provided in the context of “social support systems” or “social networks,” which are usually defined as those people (family members, friends, co-workers and so on) to which an individual is linked by emotional bonds and/or behavioral interactions (Gottlieb, 1983; Saulnier, 1982). Researchers now point to the salience of multiple dimensions of social support, such as the structure of the social support network and the sources of support (e.g., spouse, friends, and relatives) (Kaplan, Cassel & Gore, 1977).

Caplan (1974) defined social support as attachments that promote mastery, offer guidance, and provide identity-validating feedback about behavior. He also postulated that social support was any input provided by individuals or groups that moves the recipient closer to his/her goals. In an attempt to integrate the conceptualization of social support, House (1981) identified four interdependent types of socially supportive behaviours: emotional support (e.g., empathy, caring, trust), instrumental support (e.g., sharing tasks, loaning money), informational support (e.g., teaching skills, providing information to assist in problem solution), and appraisal support (e.g., providing feedback on personal performance). Barrera & Ainley (1983) identified six functions attributed to social support in the literature: directive guidance (e.g., providing information, instruction and advice), intimate interaction (e.g., expressing intimacy, esteem, physical affection and trust), positive social interaction (e.g., discussing interests, involving in recreational activities, joking), material aid (e.g., loaning money), behavioral assistance

(e.g., sharing of tasks) and feedback. Likewise, Tolsdorf (1976) visualized social support as the product of all social bonds that provided an individual with (1) goods and services, such as financial aid or help with housework, (2) information and guidance, such as suggestions about where and whom to consult for help, and (3) psychosocial backing, such as encouragement, emotional comfort, and intimacy.

Literature Review Summary

However we look at it—the multiverse that surrounds us, there is no such thing as only, no such thing as one. That we think otherwise is testimony to the depth of our patriarchalization. Snowflakes, leaves, humans, plants, raindrops, stars, molecules, microscopic entities all come in communities. The singular cannot really exist (Kilpatrick, p. 394).

We have observed that African American and Indian relationships have been universal in the Americas. They have covered every conceivable realm of relations known to humanity. A recollection of the institution of slavery brings to mind the arrival of Africans to the Americas, which gave rise to African – Indian contact, although some of the literature suggests that contact happened before African slaves were brought to America.

The results of these contacts are varied. Physically, to some Indians it has meant an almost absorption by Africans; to others it has meant a large infusion of African blood. To the African in America, it has meant an infusion of Indian blood. There are Indians who have a great mix of African American ancestry but are Indian in their cultural ways and are legally regarded as Indians. In other instances, there are large numbers of African Americans who have an Indian ancestry but accept the status of Black because of the fact that this is their dominant culture. Yet, even in these instances, many of these African Americans often take delight in telling about their Indian strain. Indeed, many

Blacks say they are mixed with some Indian group even when it is evident to anthropologists that they are not.

In the realm of social anthropology, the results of African American and Indian relationships are especially significant. Africans in America passed many of their cultural traits to Indians. In many instances, Africans learned much from Indians as well. Native Americans played important roles in the development of the African Churches. Their similar views with regards to family, religion, music, rhythm, and dance are but a few examples. Their sense of community, their reverent and holistic regard for nature, as well as their view of the natural and supernatural serve as other examples.

The present day attitude of Indians towards African Americans is quite different from what it was during the early history of the United States. The bifurcation of racism is largely responsible for the present day relationship between Indians and Blacks. The case of the Seminole Indians in Florida and Oklahoma is but one example. The causes for present day relationship between Indians and Blacks are often complex. However, the strategies used in creating this separation of family and friends among Blacks and Indians are the same ones used as far back as pre-civil war times. Black buffalo soldiers and Indian slave catchers were historical strategies used to separate Blacks and Indians. Contemporary issues involve things like Indian identity and being required to legally prove ancestral connections by blood quantum levels.

During the civil rights era, self-identification began to carry a more political meaning for African Americans that did not promote harmony between Blacks and Indians. In the late 60s, Black power advocates stressed roots, ethnicity, and transforming Blacks from a racial category to an ethnic one that was dedicated to political

action. The Civil Rights movement created tension between Blacks and Indians, which changed the contemporary relationships between these two groups. In the 1960s and 70s, the primary focus in the Black community was identifying with Blackness. If you were to include some additional ethnicity, you would be at risk for exposure to problems within this community. It was during this time that a Black conscience movement took root (i.e., the Black Panther party, the philosophies of activists like Malcolm X and Angela Davis). Claiming an Indian ancestry was not advantageous because the movement for civil rights was for “African Americans.” Brown vs. The Board of Education, The Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Voting Rights Act of 1965, and Affirmative Action were policies aimed at the civil rights of Blacks.

Today, because of a more tolerant view of mixed people, many Blacks feel more freedom to once again identify with their Native heritage. However, the political advantage today seems to favor the Indian. Now it is the Indian who promote more focus on being “pure blood” and stress political policies that favors them only. The tides have turned, so to speak. As mentioned earlier, there are examples of where tribes are removing “mixed-bloods from their rolls.

The literature tell us that the centuries which followed Columbus’ incursion into the Caribbean saw a radical decline in the population of the Americas. Subsequently, the population began to recover but with an important difference. That is, in many areas the ensuing population had seemed to be African, mixed, or European in appearance, rather than Native American. In short, persons may “look” African but have Native American ancestry or “look” indigenous American but have African ancestry, and not only may

individuals lean in one direction or the other, but the population of entire regions may seem to fall into one category or another.

The final area of concern raised in this literature review is the complexity of ethnic/cultural identity and its development. The ancestry of modern day Americans, whether of “Black” or “Indian” appearance, is often quite complex indeed. Race, as a social construct, is generally designed by arbitrary categories that are inconsistent with ethnic heritage. It should be one of the principal tasks of scholarship to replace one-dimensional images of persons other than white with more accurate delineations.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the conceptual framework used in this study is outlined, including the strategy for combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. Issues common to both methods (i.e., population samples and human subject protection) are also discussed. The quantitative methodology of the study is organized in the following sections: (1) research design, (2) population and samples, (3) instrumentation, (4) data collection procedures, and (5) data analysis. Next, I discuss research hypothesis, major research questions, protection of human subjects, and the qualitative methods used in the study.

Conceptual Framework

This dissertation is an empirical analysis that investigates the cultural identity, social support, and subjective well-being of Black Indians in Louisiana. This study evaluated the cultural identity of a sample that identified as being of both African and Native American heritage. For the purpose of this dissertation, cultural identity, social support, and well-being are viewed as outcome measures.

A quantitative survey design with an informal semi-structured interview schedule was the chief method used to obtain exploratory descriptive-analytic data. Survey research is an excellent available method used for collecting data to describe the characteristics of large populations (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

In the quantitative analysis, the null hypothesis is that no relationship exists between cultural identity, social support, subjective well-being, and tribal roll recognition. Tested against this hypothesis are three possible results. First, the sample subject ethnic identity test score, as measured by the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

(MEIM), will be higher for Black Indians (as defined in this study) enrolled in officially recognized tribes than those Black Indians who are not in any officially recognized tribal group. Second, Black Indians in official recognized groups will have higher scores on well-being and social support, as measured by the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status and Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), than those Black Indians not on any officially recognized rolls. Third, Black Indians on officially recognized tribal rolls would have higher socio-economic levels than Black Indians without official recognition.

This study also used a qualitative method of research analysis. Personal interviews with respondents who met the Black Indian criterion were conducted to understand their experiences. In the interviews, domains were investigated to determine if reoccurring themes are present to help evaluate their available social support systems and their perceived sense of subjective well-being. Also crucial to this section of the study (particularly as it relates to sample members who are not part of officially recognized tribal groups) is what behaviors are observed that describe and/or explain their methods for Indian cultural identity retention.

Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Both quantitative and qualitative items are used in this study. Integrating these two research methods offers a balanced approach to knowledge building in which the strength of one approach compensates for the weakness of the other (Reid, 1994; Padgett, 1998). For example, quantitative methods emphasize the production of precise and generalizable statistical findings and are generally more appropriate to nomothetic aims (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). To verify whether a cause produces an effect, quantitative methods are likely to be used. Researchers who interpret descriptive statistics often find

that some of those statistics imply the need for a qualitative inquiry to understand their meanings better. Qualitative research methods attempt to tap the deeper meanings of particular human experiences and are intended to generate theoretically richer observations that are not easily reduced to numbers (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). The aim is to discover the subjects' experiences and how they make sense of those experiences.

In one study, Rank (1992) used qualitative methods to explain quantitative data that indicated that women on welfare have low fertility rates. Along similar lines, Burnette (1994) used a multivariate frequency table to portray her sample of elderly people. Her narrative further described her sample in terms of means and proportions for various demographic characteristics.

The purpose in using a mixed methodology in this dissertation is to expand the scope of the quantitative research and to discover experiences and new perspectives related to cultural identity and social well-being in Black Indians. Both methods are used in tandem and seek information in the same domains. The findings from each process are used to inform the other of any reoccurring themes which may result from this study.

Research Design

The design of this study was a written self report cross-sectional survey design using non-random opportunistic samples. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with some participants to obtain qualitative data. This research is exploratory and descriptive in nature.

Although self-reports can be vulnerable to various measurement errors, survey research is still particularly useful when describing characteristics of a large population (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). In addition to making large samples feasible, another strength

of survey research is that the finding may be more generalizable than the findings of experiments (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). This advantage in external validity is offset by the limited internal validity of surveys, particularly cross-sectional surveys (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). Survey research is generally weak in validity and strong on reliability. It is repeatedly critiqued as superficial (Piper, 1994; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Padgett, 1998), artificial, and sometimes not capable of flexibility (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

The most common use of convenience samples is in situations in which a sample is recruited for and is well suited to one purpose (Kazdin, 1998). However, the use of a population that is selected because it is convenient raises concerns and may have implications for generalizing results. Another area for concern, that encompasses generalizability consideration, is subject selection biases. The possibilities for inadvertent sampling bias are endless and not always obvious (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). Considerable effort was made in this study to use available techniques to avoid bias. Although cross-sectional designs are commonly used in descriptive and exploratory research to establish correlations between variables, it cannot determine causation because time order is not taken into account (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

To address the drawbacks associated with this research design, some strategies are employed. Previous research done with Native Americans and African Americans suggest that they are likely to have feelings of distrust toward outsiders. Therefore, great care was made to establish a positive rapport with at least one person from the officially recognized groups and the non-recognized groups by demonstrating that this study was not political in any way and did not offer reward or punishment for agreeing to participate (or not to participate). Its only goal was to increase (or add to) the existing

body of literature on Black Indians in Louisiana. The researcher's strategy was that once rapport was established with an individual person, this person in turn would aid to reduce any anxiety or distrust held by other tribal or community members.

In an attempt to aid the rapport process, it was believed that face-to-face data collection would be more effective in obtaining results from study subjects than either telephone or mail surveys. Telephone and mail surveys offer higher degrees of anonymity for the respondents; however, personal contacts by individuals with good communication skills can increase the willingness of study samples to talk about personal and sensitive subjects matters (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). For complex surveys with persons who have limited literacy levels, personal interviews are the best technique for obtaining data (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). Also, interviewers who share similar demographic characteristics with the respondents are more likely to prevail over socio-cultural barriers between interviewer and study subject (Orbe & Harris, 2001).

Population and Samples

The target population for this study was defined as Black Indians in Louisiana who report having both an African American and Native American ancestral heritage. The accessible population was defined as those Black Indians who are members of officially recognized tribal rolls and those who are not officially recognized.

In order to establish the frame of the accessible population, the researcher first contacted the Bureau of Indian affairs in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to determine if that office had any information regarding this population. At the time of this study, the Bureau of Indian affairs had no information on this population or any information as to the existence of this population. Next, contact was made with the nine (four federal and

five state) recognized tribes in Louisiana by telephone and follow up letter asking if they had tribal members that met the Black Indian criterion. Only the Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Marksville Louisiana reported having Black Indians on their tribal rolls. This tribe has a total enrollment of approximately 300 members. According to anthropological data, Black Indians comprise approximately 20% of their tribal members. Those Black Indians who are under age 18 are not included in this study. Thus, a sample of 30 tribal members was asked to participate in this study.

Thirdly, Black churches in close proximity to the location of these recognized tribes were contacted by use of phone directories to determine if there were communities in these areas who had residents that met the Black Indian criterion. Two communities were found using this strategy: the Bob Town community in Dulack, Louisiana, which is in close proximity to the Houma Nation, and the Avoyel-Taensa, which is in close proximity to the Tunica-Biloxi tribe. These communities were contacted to determine if any members would be willing to participate in this study.

The Bob Town community is a very closed community where poverty and illiteracy are high. Fifteen participants agreed to participate in this study and were included in the non-recognized sub-group. The Avoyel Taensa tribe of Louisiana is presently petitioning for official recognition. They are presently experiencing difficulties proving their genealogy as Indians. Historically, according to anthropological data, this tribe consisted of Indians, slaves, and free people of color (Kniffen, Gregory, & Stokes, 1987). It is uncertain as to the total membership of this tribe. Estimates have put their numbers at approximately 500 members. Only about 200 members are currently residing in the state. Those members meeting the Black Indian criterion comprise approximately

20% of this tribe. Twenty members of the Avoyel-Taensa tribe agreed to participate in this study. These participants fall within the non-recognized group. Again, those members who were under age 18 are not included in this study.

In order to be eligible for participation, respondents had to meet the following criteria: (1) they had to be of adult age, that was, 18 years of age or older, (2) they had to identify themselves as “Black Indians” meaning that they had both an African and Native American ancestral heritage going back at least two generations, and (3) they had to be either on officially recognized tribal roll, or in communities or tribes that had no official recognition.

Because this study is comparing two groups (recognized Black Indians with Black Indians without recognition), particular care was given to the sample size of the non-recognized comparison group. Although the non-recognized group completed thirty-five questionnaires, five of these questionnaires had to be discarded because of incompleteness.

Instrumentation

The survey instruments for this study are found in Appendix B. These instruments were selected after extensive review of the literature related to cultural identity, subjective well-being, and social support.

Measurement of cultural identity uses the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure designed by Joan Phinney (1992). This 14-item instrument is designed to measure ethnic identity as a general phenomenon that can be compared and contrasted across diverse groups of individuals. Three subscales are included in the measure: (a) affirmation and belonging (e.g., pride and attachment to group), (b) ethnic identity achievement (e.g.,

search and commitment), and (c) ethnic behavior and practices (e.g., participates in activities). This instrument has subsequently been used in dozens of studies and has consistently shown good reliability, typically with alphas above .80 across a wide range of ethnic groups and ages.

The Social Support Behaviors (SS-B) Scale (Vaux, 1981) will be used to measure social support among Black Indians used in this study. The SS-B is a forty-five-item Likert-type scale designed to tap five modes of support: emotional support, socializing, practical assistance, financial assistance, and advice/guidance. The scale focuses on available supportive behavior and asks subjects to indicate separately how likely both a family member and friend would be to perform the specific behavior. An emotional support item is presented by the example “help me decide what to do.” Socializing is characterized by “called to see just how I was doing.” An item measuring practical assistance reads, “Showed me how to do something I didn’t know how to do.” Financial assistance is characterized by an item such as “paid for my lunch when I was broke.” An advice/assistance item example is “helped me think about a problem.” The SS-B scale is easily scored. The scale ranges from 1 (“no one would do this”) to 5 (“most family members/friends would certainly do this”). All items are stated in the same direction, thus no scores need to be recoded. A classification of items by the author, and a panel of judges who review the completeness and appropriateness of the instrument, established content validity. Revisions were made based on the judges’ comments and suggestions.

The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (last revised September, 2000) was used to determine the sense of social status across socioeconomic status indicators. Although social status is not necessarily a variable used in this study, its measurement is

done as a correlate with life satisfaction. In an easy pictorial format, this instrument presents a “social ladder” and asks individuals to place an “X” on the rung on which they feel they stand. There are two versions of the ladder, one linked to traditional socio-economic status indicators (SES ladder) and the second linked to standing in one’s community (community ladder). The difference between these two ladders may be of interest in poorer communities in which individuals may not be high on the SES ladder in terms of income, occupation, or education, but may have high standing within social groups such as religious or local community. This instrument will serve as a two-way data confirmation by contrasting income range, employed versus unemployed, and economic success. Literature states that this is a better assessment of economic success than reporting income levels alone.

Finally, the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), (1985), authored by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin, was used to assess subjective life satisfaction. It is a 5-item questionnaire that refers to the cognitive-judgmental aspects of general life satisfaction. Thus, in contrast to a measures that applies some external standard, the SWLS reveals the individual’s own judgment of his or her quality of life. The instrument is very short and unidimensional with good validity and reliability.

The independent variables for this study will be the designation of the tribes used in the study. This designation will have two levels; yes- officially recognized by federal/state government, and no- not officially recognized by any tribal organizations. Demographics on employment, education, income, gender, age, and religion will be also used as independent variables. The dependent variables in this study will be success

outcomes as measured by reported life satisfaction, social support systems, and native cultural retention.

Data Collection Procedure

Four instruments were used for data collection between July and August 2003 (see Appendix B). The researcher, in collecting the data, followed the following procedures.

The collection of data for this study was done two ways. Because of tribal protocols and policies, a tribal council member was used to collect data from respondents in the recognized group. Thirty-five separate packages, which included an introductory letter, an informed consent, and copies of the instruments, was given to the tribal member to disseminate to those participating in the study. Prior to disseminating these packages, the nature of the study and all materials used in the study was thoroughly explained to the tribal council member. The researcher made contact, either in person or by phone, each day with the tribal council member to check the progress of the data collection and to see if any questions needed to be answered.

With the non-recognized, the data collecting packages (which also included introductory letter, informed consent, and copies of instruments) were given to the participants in the study by the researcher along with two master's level licensed social workers, both of whom were females. One of the social workers was a resident of Houma, Louisiana, and served as a liaison with the residents of the community to which the respondents in the study lived.

Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures are described for each research objective. In all cases, the alpha level of statistical significance was set a priori at .05. Statistical analysis procedures involved calculations using SPSS Data Analysis Systems. Coding, data entry, and data analysis were completed by the researcher.

Objective one was to describe Black Indians on selected demographic variables. These characteristics included the following: recognition, gender, age, income, and educational level. Variables that were measured as categorical, that is, nominal or ordinal scales of measurement, were summarized using frequencies and percentages. Gender and tribal recognition was measured on a nominal scale and educational level was measured on an ordinal scale. Variables measured on a continuous scale of measurement (i.e., interval scale of measurement) were summarized using means and standard deviations. These variables included age and household income.

Objective two was to describe Black Indians on levels of Native identity and African American identity, as measured by the MEIM, well-being (life satisfaction and social status) as measured by the SWLS and the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status, and social support as measured by the SS-B scale.

Native identity and African identity was measured using the MEIM. The sub-scales, which were included as part of the MEIM, was measured on four point Likert-type scales. These scales were treated as interval data for analysis purposes. Therefore, both item means and standard deviations, as well as sub-scale means and standard deviations, were reported as summary data analyses.

Life Satisfaction was measured using the SWLS scale. The measurement used a seven point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The summated scores were treated as interval data; therefore, they were summarized as means and standard deviations. Social Status was measured using the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status and was also treated as interval data for statistical purposes. Therefore, means and standard deviations were reported. Social support, which was measured using the SS-B scale, was also treated as interval data.

Objective three was to compare recognized Black Indians with non-recognized Black Indians on the following variables: (1) ethnic identity, (2) Life Satisfaction, (3) Social Status, and (4) Social Support from family and friends. There were separate measurements for each of these variables. Independent t tests and chi-squares statistical procedures were used to compare these two groups on each of the measures.

Research Hypotheses

The literature search conducted at the beginning of this study suggests the following research hypotheses. Though specific and focused, they are somewhat exploratory in nature, as the literature did not capitulate strong, consistent evidence to hypothesize in which direction differences might occur.

Hypothesis 1: The ethnic identity (Native) score as measured by MEIM will be higher for Black Indians enrolled in officially recognized tribes than those Black Indians who are not in any officially recognized tribal group.

Cultural identity and cultural retention is hypothesized to be higher among members of officially recognized Indian tribal groups. This hypothesis is supported in the literature using the “spatially” defined Indian identity. This definition purposes that

Indians who remain on reservations, and have tribal connections are said to have a stronger Indian identity. Their identity comes from not only how they identify themselves, but also in how, and the way, they live their lives. Those living away from reservations, or who are not among recognized tribal groups, are said to have an “aspatial” defined Indian identity. The “aspatial” identity is defined mostly by metaphors and stereotypes about Indian culture.

Hypothesis 2: Black Indians in officially recognized tribal groups will have higher scores on Life satisfaction, as measured by the Satisfaction with Life Scale, than those Black Indians not on any officially recognized rolls.

Previous research indicates that well-being is a complex construct. It cannot be concluded, with any meaningful degree of certainty, that hedonic or eudaimonic well-being correlates with tribal affiliation.

Hypothesis 3: Black Indians in officially recognized tribal groups will have higher scores on Social Status, as measured by the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status, than those Black Indians not on any officially recognized rolls.

Hypothesis 4: Black Indians in officially recognized tribal groups will have higher scores of Social Support as measured by the SS-B scale. Social support theory is based on the concept that social ties improve health and well-being thereby fostering meaningful self-realization. Although the literature reports support systems for both African Americans and Indians, this hypothesis evaluates the indirect effects of tribal recognition on subjective well-being by serving as a support systems for its enrolled members.

Definition of Key Concepts

The following are definitions of concepts relevant to the research project.

Tribe: a society, or division of a society, whose members have ancestry, customs, beliefs, and leadership in common. To be considered a tribe, official recognition must be given by the U.S. government or the state.

Federally recognized tribe: is defined as only those tribes who maintain a legal relationship with the U.S. government through binding treaties, acts of Congress, and executive orders.

State recognized tribe: is defined as those tribes whose legal relationship is with the state only and has no legal relationship with the federal government. There is no official criterion to follow, and fewer benefits are given to its tribal members.

Non-recognition: no legal relationship exists with either the U.S. government or the state of Louisiana.

African American: is defined as a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicate their race as “Black, African American, or Negro.”

American Indian: is defined as a person having origins in any of the original people of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintain tribal affiliations or community attachment. It includes people who are also called “Native Americans, First Nations People, Indians, or Indigenous Peoples.”

Black Indian: is defined as a person who identifies, by legal documents or by self reports, as having both an Indian and African ancestry, and may or may not have official tribal recognition, or have tribal affiliation.

Protection of Human Subjects

This dissertation was approved by the Principal Investigator for this study, Dr. Brij Mohan, School of Social Work, Louisiana State University. (All documents related to human subjects protection is located in Appendix D.) Protection of human subjects in the pilot study was given by the institutional review board at Louisiana State University at the outset of the study in 2001. Louisiana State University gave human subject approval to the research in April 2003.

Confidentiality of the participants for this study is ensured by keeping all materials relevant to the research project in an office, which is accessible to the project director (author of the dissertation), project staff, and the principal investigator. Identifying client information is kept in locked files. Potential participants for the study were informed of the nature of the research study and assured that no information regarding their identity would be released. All participants were free to withdraw from the research study at any time, and their participation or non-participation carried no rewards or punishment.

Informed consent was obtained for all participants in the qualitative interviews (see Appendix D). Interviewees were told that participation was voluntary, and the interview could be stopped at any time. Interviewees were audiotaped and given a separate consent, which indicated their willingness to be taped, to have the tape transcribed, and to have excerpts of the transcripts used in the written presentation.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this research study is to determine whether differences exist between those black Indians who are members of an officially recognize tribe and those who do not have official recognition. The tasks for this study will include:

1. Describe Black Indians on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Recognized
 - b. Non-recognition
 - c. Gender
 - d. Income
 - e. Age
 - f. Education
2. Describe Black Indians on level of:
 - a. Ethnic identity (Indian and Black) as measured by the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)
 - b. Well being (Life satisfaction, social status) as measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) and the Macarthur Scale of Subjective Social Status
 - c. Social support as measured by the Social Support Behaviors (SS-B) Scale.
3. Compare Black Indians who belong to recognized and non-recognized groups on the following variables:
 - a. Ethnic Identity
 - b. Life Satisfaction
 - c. Social Status
 - d. Social Support

Major Research Questions

The primary research questions to be answered herein are: (1) How are Black Indians fairing in Louisiana, (2) Do they differ based on tribal membership, (3) How do officially recognized (i.e., federal and/or state) tribal Black Indians differ from those Black Indians who are not officially recognized on the following variables: a) income, b) level of educational attainment, and (4) how do these two groups differ on the retention of Native cultural identification (i.e., language, customs, and traditions).

Other possible research questions derived by this study include: (a) Are these non-recognized communities African American communities or Indian communities? (b) Are they African-Indian communities? (c) How do these communities' members see themselves (as Black or as Indian, both, either, or neither)? (d) What are the needs of these people? And, (e) is there a desire on their part to re-establish their Indian culture?

These questions will be applied using an exploratory descriptive-analytic data of non-random convenience samples. The only risk to subjects is the inadvertent release of personal information from either questionnaire. However, no subject names or other identifying information will be used on these documents. Subject participation will be voluntary and failure to participate carries no penalty of any kind.

Qualitative Research Process

Research Design

The aim of Qualitative research is to discover the subjects' experiences and how they make sense of those experiences (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). It probes attitudes as well and attempts to understand the wealth and intricacies related to a phenomenon. A unique strength of this research method is that it allows the researcher to explore what the study subjects perceive as important components of their experiences. Authors often define qualitative inquiry by comparing it to quantitative inquiry (e.g., Creswell, 1994). Ragin (1987) mentioned that quantitative researchers work with few variables and many cases, while qualitative researchers rely on few cases and many variables. Qualitative researchers typically rely on four methods for gathering information: (a) participation in the setting, (b) direct observation, (c) in-depth interviewing, and (d) analyzing documents and material culture (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

Previous qualitative research informed by the narratives of African Americans and Indians illustrates the diversity of experiences among these historically oppressed groups. The qualitative research method is also useful to this study being that African Americans rely heavily on the oral tradition in passing family history from one generation to the next.

In this study, engagement will be accomplished through in-depth interviews. Data will be collected through the use of audiotapes and notes taken during the interviews. It is anticipated that the interviews will be approximately one hour in length.

Rubin & Babbie (2001) report that the generalizability of qualitative research can be affected in three ways: (1) the personal nature of the observation and measurement made by the researcher can produce results that may not necessarily be made by another researcher, (2) the comprehensive understanding of the findings is less generalizable than results of rigorous sampling and standardized measures, and (3) there is a high potential for biased sampling. Therefore, any described conclusions based on qualitative data should be reported as suggestive rather than definitive (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

Instrument

The interview will use open-ended questions, which will focus on three general themes. Questions about cultural identity will be asked first, as these are thought to be less distressing to the interviewees. Next, each respondent will be asked to describe what it is like having both an African and Native American heritage and to tell of any difficulties experienced. They will be asked how they see themselves primarily. They will also be asked if they have had anyone not believe that they were of Native American ancestry, and if so, how they responded. Finally, they will be asked how their Native

American heritage has been passed down to following generations. The interview ends with discussions of their perceived strengths, unmet needs, and suggestions they have regarding improving social support and the well-being of Black Indians in Louisiana. Qualitative research emphasizes that the data collection should be continually refined based on information assembled from interviewees (Padgett, 1988; Patton, 1990).

Data Collection

The collection of data for this study will be done primarily by the researcher. However, when assistance is needed, it will be given by a licensed certified social worker trained and experienced in interviewing techniques, communications skills, the importance of confidentiality, informed consent, and safety issues.

Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected simultaneously and occurred from May through August 2003. Data collection for the qualitative interviews was performed by the researcher (author of the dissertation), Rena D. Powell, MSW (an experienced psychiatric social worker that has experience in data collection), and Gisele Randall, MSW (social worker for Terrebonne Parish school district). Because of the nature of this study, it is important for the interviewing team to consist of both a male and female. The average length of the data collection ranged from 90 minutes to two hours.

Research respondents were contacted first by phone in order to describe the study and set up a scheduled meeting time and place. The data collection/interviews took place in the subject sample's home and at other pre-arranged interview sites, such as tribal offices.

CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE SAMPLE

In this chapter, a description of the quantitative sample, including a listing of variables for the study, frequency distributions, preliminary analysis of differences between recognized and non-recognized tribal members are reported.

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 lists the variables used in the descriptive analyses of the quantitative data. The first four variables represent the independent variables to be analyzed using independent t-tests and Chi-square analysis. Employment and income also serve as independent variables in the analysis of subjective social status.

Table 1.

Description of Variables and Coding Used in Analysis

Variable	Description	Coding (Range)
Tribe Status	Officially recognized by Federal/State government	1= Recognized 2= Non-recognition
Gender	Sex of respondent	1 = Male 2 = Female
Education	Years of schooling reported by respondent	Number (1 – 20+)
Age	Respondent's age	Number (19 – 74)
Indian Identity	Responses to 15 items scale measuring Native ethnic identity	Score on scale(14-48)
African American identity	Responses to 15 items scale measuring African American identity	Score on scale(14-48)

Table 1, continued

Variable	Description	Coding (range)
Life Satisfaction	Responses to 5 items scale measuring respondent's report of satisfaction with their lives	Scores (5 – 35)
Subjective Social Status	Responses to item measuring self report on where respondent feel they stand in their community and in the United States	Scores (0 – 11)
Social Support System	Responses to 45 item measuring support from family and/or friends in areas of “emotional support”, “socializing”, “practical assistance”, “financial assistance”, “advice/guidance”	Scores (45 – 225)
Employment	Which best describes your main daily activities and/or responsibilities	1 = Working full time 2 = Working part-time 3 = Unemployed or off 4 = Looking for work 5 = Keeping house or raising children full-time 6 = Retired
Employment (continued)	With regard to current or recent job activity	1=Officials/Managers 2 = Professionals 3 = Technicians 4 = Sales Workers 5 = Office/Clerical 6 = Craft (Skilled) 7 = Operative (Semi-Skilled) 8 = Laborers (Unskilled) 9 = Service Worker
Income	Total combined family income	1 = < \$5,000 2 = \$5,000 - \$11,999 3 = \$12,000 - \$15,999

Table 1, continued

Variable	Description	Coding (range)
		4 =\$16,000 -\$24,999
		5 =\$25,000 -\$34,999
		6 =\$35,000 -\$49,999
		7 =\$50,000 -\$74,999
		8 =\$75,000 -\$99,999
		9 =\$100,000 +
		10 = don't know
		11 = no response

Univariate Analysis

Objective One:

The first objective of this study is to describe Black Indians on the following demographic characteristics; (a) recognition, (b) gender, (c) income, (d) age, and (e) education.

Recognition: 30 (50%) of the respondents who participated in this study were from officially recognized federal/state tribal rolls, and 30 (50%) were from tribes and/or communities that had no official recognition.

Gender: Of the 60 respondents used in this study, 32 (53.3%) were males and 28 (46.7%) were females.

Income: Respondents were asked to report their total annual household income before taxes. The income of respondents ranged from those with under \$5,000 in annual income to those with \$100,000 or greater. Nineteen (31.7%) of the respondents reported annual incomes of less than \$25,000, nineteen (31.7%) reported incomes between \$25,000 and \$50,000, and thirteen (21.6%) reported incomes of \$50,000 or above. A summary of the income levels of the respondents is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Reported Annual Household Income of Study Samples

Income Level	n	%	Cumulative	
			n	%
Under \$5,000	2	3.3	2	3.3
\$5,000 - \$11,999	3	5.0	5	8.3
\$12,000 - \$15,999	7	11.7	12	20.0
\$16,000 - \$24,999	7	11.7	19	31.7
\$25,000 - \$34,999	6	10.0	25	41.7
\$35,000 - \$49,999	4	6.7	29	48.3
\$50,000 - \$74,999	9	15.0	38	63.3
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2	3.3	40	66.7
\$100,000 or above	2	3.3	42	70.0
don't know	8	13.3	50	83.3
no response	10	16.7	60	100
Total	60	100		

Age: Respondents' ages were recorded in actual years. The age range of the 60 participants was from age 19 to age 74 with the mean age being 40.53 (SD = 14.96).

When the age data was summarized, participants in this study were predominantly between the ages of 19 and 35 (n = 28 or 46.7%).

Education: The educational level of the participants ranged from those with less than a high school diploma to those with postgraduate degrees. The largest group represented was those with high school diplomas (n = 27), representing close to half (45%) of the sample. The second largest group was those respondents with less than a

high school diploma ($n = 15$), representing one-fourth (25%) of the sample. A summary of the educational level of the respondents in the study is presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Education Level of Respondents

Education Level	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	Cumulative	
			<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
High School or GED	27	45.0	27	45.0
Associate degree-- junior college	4	6.7	31	51.7
Bachelor's degree	6	10.0	37	61.7
Masters degree	6	10.0	43	71.7
Professional (MD,JD,DDS,etc)	1	1.7	44	73.3
Other (specify) ¹	1	1.7	45	75.0
< High School diploma	15	25.0	60	100.0
Total	60	100.0		

Objective Two:

The second objective was to describe Black Indians on levels of ethnic identity, well-being (life satisfaction, social status), and social support (family and friends).

Ethnic identity was measured using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure ([MEIM] consisting of 12 items). This instrument measures “ethnic identity (consisting of 5 items); and “affirmation, belonging and commitment to one’s ethnic group” (consisting of 7 items). Each of the two sub-scales used a four-point Likert-type response

¹ Business School degree

scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” This instrument was used to measure both the Indian identity as well as the African American identity for the respondents. The participants were selected randomly as to which identity was measured first (Native or African American). Twenty-nine (48.3%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “African American” identity first. Thirty-one (51.7%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “Native” identity first. The scoring range for the African American identity was 17.0 to 48.0 with a mean score of 37.78 ($SD = 7.02$). The scoring range for the Native identity was likewise 17.0 to 48.0 but with a mean score of 40.03 ($SD = 6.83$). To facilitate reporting of these findings, a scale was established by the researcher to guide the interpretation of the responses to the individual items. This scale is intended to coincide with the response categories provided to the respondents and include the following categories: $< 1.51 =$ Strongly Disagree; 1.51 to $2.50 =$ Disagree; 2.51 to $3.50 =$ Agree; $> 3.50 =$ Strongly Agree. Each of the two sub-scales are presented separately in the following sections.

MEIM (Ethnic Identity and Affirmation, Belonging, Commitment—African American)

The participants responded to 5 items in the MEIM scale that measured “ethnic identity.” Of the 5 items for ethnic identity (African American), the items with which the respondents most strongly agreed included: “I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs” ($M = 3.15$), “I am active in organization or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group” ($M = 3.13$), and “Spent time finding out history, traditions, and customs” ($M = 2.78$). The mean response to each of these three items was classified in the “Agree” response category by the

interpretive scale established by the researcher indicating that the respondents “Agree” that these actions would be considered measures of ethnic identity searches. The item that respondents least agreed with was: “I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership” ($\underline{M} = 2.70$). This item, although classified in the “agree” category, had the lowest mean score (see Table 4).

Of the 7 items measuring “affirmation, belonging, and commitment” in the scale, the items with which the respondents most strongly agreed included: “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me” ($\underline{M} = 3.40$), “I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to” ($\underline{M} = 3.40$), and “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” ($\underline{M} = 3.36$). The item that respondent least agreed with was “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group” ($\underline{M} = 3.20$). This item also falls within the range of the “agree” category, however, it has the lowest mean score for this section of the scale. The minimum score was 9.0 with a maximum score of 28.0 ($\underline{M} = 23.30$) (see Table 5).

Table 4.

MEIM (Ethnic Identity – African American)

Item	\underline{M}^2	\underline{SD}	Response ³ Category
I participate in cultural practices of my group, i.e.: music, food, customs	3.15	.860	A
Active in organizations that include members of my ethnic group	3.13	.769	A
Spent time finding out history, traditions, and customs	2.78	.825	A

² Mean values based on response scale 4 = Strongly agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

³ Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SD-Strongly disagree = <1.51, D-Disagree = 1.51 to 2.50, A-Agree = 2.51 to 3.50, SA-Strongly agree = >3.50.

Table 4, continued.

Item	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Response Category
I talk to other people to learn more about my ethnic background	2.71	.903	A
Think about how life is affected by my ethnic membership	2.70	.869	A

Table 5.

MEIM (Affirmation, belonging, and commitment – African American)

Item	<u>M</u> ⁴	<u>SD</u>	Response ⁵ Category
I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me	3.40	.616	A
I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to	3.40	.668	A
I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group	3.36	.581	A
I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background	3.33	.628	A
I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group	3.30	.645	A
I understand what my ethnic group membership means to me	3.30	.743	A
I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group	3.20	.754	A
Total mean score	23.30	4.04	

⁴ Mean values based on response scale 4 = Strongly agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

⁵ Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SD-Strongly disagree = <1.51, D-Disagree = 1.51 to 2.50, A-Agree = 2.51 to 3.50, SA-Strongly agree = >3.50.

MEIM (Ethnic Identity and Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment—Indian)

The participants in the study responded to the 5-item MEIM measure for “ethnic identity” (Indian). The items with which the respondents most strongly agreed included: “I participate in cultural practices of my group, such as music, food, and customs” (\underline{M} = 3.30), “I talk to other people to learn more about my ethnic group” (\underline{M} = 3.16), and “Spent time finding out history, traditions, customs” (\underline{M} = 3.13). These items were in the “Agree” response category. The item that the respondents least agreed with was “Think about how life is affected by my ethnic membership” (\underline{M} = 2.81). This item falls within the range of the “Agree” category, however, it has the lowest mean score for this section of the identity measure (see Table 6).

Table 6.

MEIM (Ethnic identity—Indian)

Item	\underline{M} ⁶	\underline{SD}	Response ⁷ Category
I participate in cultural practices of my group (music, food, customs)	3.30	.849	A
I talk to other people to learn more about my ethnic group	3.16	.866	A
Spent time finding out history traditions, customs	3.13	.812	A
Active in organization that include members of my ethnic group	2.93	.989	A
Think about how life is affected by my ethnic membership	2.81	.982	A

⁶ Mean values based on response scale 4 = Strongly agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

⁷ Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SD-Strongly disagree = <1.51, D-Disagree = 1.51 to 2.50, A-Agree = 2.51 to 3.50, SA-Strongly agree = >3.50.

For the 7 items measuring “affirmation, belonging, & commitment” (Indian), the items respondents most strongly agreed with included: “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” ($\underline{M} = 3.70$), “Happy about belonging to my ethnic group” ($\underline{M} = 3.60$), and “I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background” ($\underline{M} = 3.58$). These responses fall within the “Strongly agree” categorical range. The item that respondent least agreed with was “Clear sense of ethnic background and what it means to me” ($\underline{M} = 3.35$). This item falls within the “Agree” category range, but has the lowest mean score for the section of the sub-scale (see Table 7).

Table 7.

MEIM (Affirmation, belonging, and commitment – Indian)

Item	\underline{M}^8	\underline{SD}	Response ⁹ Category
I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group	3.70	.561	SA
I am happy about belonging to my ethnic group	3.60	.693	SA
I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background	3.58	.590	SA
I understand what my ethnic group membership means to me	3.51	.770	SA
I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group	3.51	.676	SA
I have a strong sense about belonging to my ethnic group	3.41	.849	A
I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me	3.35	.708	A
Total mean score	24.68	4.06	

⁸Mean values based on response scale 4 = Strongly agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

⁹Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SD-Strongly disagree = <1.51, D-Disagree = 1.51 to 2.50, A-Agree = 2.51 to 3.50, SA-Strongly agree = >3.50.

Well-Being (Life Satisfaction and Social Status)

Well-being for the participants in this study was measured using the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) and the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status. The scoring range for the SWLS is 5 to 35. The respondents in this study had a scoring range from 7 to 35 with a mean score of 26.81 (SD = 5.91). This instrument scale used a seven-point Likert-type response scale ranging from “Disagree Strongly” to “Agree Strongly.” For interpretive purposes, the researcher established the following response guide: <1.51 = Disagree Strongly; 1.51 to 2.50 = Disagree; 2.51 to 3.50 = Slightly Disagree; 3.51 to 4.50 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 4.51 to 5.50 = Slightly Agree; 5.51 to 6.50 = Agree; and, > 6.50 = Agree Strongly. Of the 5 satisfaction with life items, the item which the respondents most strongly agreed with was: “I am satisfied with my life” (M = 5.76). This mean score falls within the “Agree” categorical range. The item least agreed with by the respondents was: “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing” (M = 4.83). This item received a rating in the “Slightly Agree” category (see Table 9).

The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status instrument, which measured the social status of the participants in the study, asked respondents to place an “X” on a picture of a ladder where they felt they stood in their community and in the United States of America. The bottom represented a score of 0, and the top represented a score of 11. The respondents in the study had a scoring range of 1 to 11 with a mean score of 6.91 (SD = 2.09) for the community ladder. For the “United States” ladder, the scoring range was 1 to 11 with a mean score of 6.20 (SD = 2.05).

Table 9.

Satisfaction With Life Scale

Item	<u>M</u> ¹⁰	<u>SD</u>	Response ¹¹ Category
I am satisfied with my life	5.76	1.19	A
My life is close to my ideal	5.67	1.32	A
The conditions of my life are excellent	5.33	1.45	SA
So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life	5.23	1.61	SA
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	4.83	1.68	SA

Social Support

Social support was measured in two parts (support from family and support from friends), and used the Social Support Behaviors (SS-B) Scale. This instrument has a scoring range of 45 to 225. The respondents in the study had a scoring range of 68 to 225 with a mean score of 176.85 (SD = 48.82) for family support. For support from friends, the scoring range was 45 to 225 with a mean score of 169.05 (SD = 50.85). In the current study, five dimensions of social support from family and friends are measured using the SS-B scale: Emotional Support (consisting of 11 items); Socializing (comprised of 7 items); Practical Assistance (consisting of 8 items); Financial Assistance (encompassing 7 items); and Advice/Guidance (consisting of 12 items). Each dimension total sub-scale

¹⁰ Mean values based on the response scale 1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, 7 = agree strongly

¹¹ Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: DS- Disagree Strongly = <1.51, D-Disagree = 1.51 to 2.50, SD-Slightly Disagree = 2.51 to 3.50, NA/D-Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3.51 to 4.50, SA-Slightly Agree = 4.51 to 5.50, A-Agree = 5.51 to 6.50, and AS-Agree Strongly = >6.50

mean scores are presented in Table 10. Each of the sub- scales used a Likert-type scale ranging from “No one would do this” to “Most would certainly do this.” For interpretive purposes, the following categorical scale was established by the researcher: <1.51 = no one would do this; 1.51 to 2.50 = someone might do this; 2.51 to 3.50 = some would probably do this; 3.51 to 4.50 = some would certainly do this; and > 4.50 = most would certainly do this. Each of the ten sub-scales (five for family and five for friends) are presented separately in the following sections.

Table 10.

Total sub-scale score for SS-B scale dimensions

<u>Item</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Emotional Support (family)	39.78	10.47
Socializing (family)	28.26	7.36
Practical Assistance (family)	31.00	9.42
Financial Assistance (family)	25.75	9.28
Advice/Guidance (family)	48.01	12.84
Emotional Support (friends)	41.54	12.34
Socializing (friends)	27.43	7.65
Practical Assistance (friends)	29.36	9.81
Financial Assistance (friends)	24.36	9.10
Advice/Guidance (friends)	46.36	13.35

Emotional Support (family)

Study participants responded to the 11 items that were included as the Emotional Support (family) scale. Of these 11 items, the respondents felt most certain about the following: “Would listen if I needed to talk about my feelings” ($M = 4.11$), “Would give me a hug or show me I was cared about” ($M = 4.19$), and “Would show affection for me” ($M = 4.05$). The mean response to each of these three items was classified in the “Some would certainly do this” categorical range of the interpretive scale indicating that the respondents had at least one family member was providing this kind of “emotional support.” The item that the respondents least concurred with was “Would not pass judgment on me” ($M = 3.70$). This item also falls within the “Some would certainly do this” categorical range, however, it has the lowest mean score for this section of the sub-scale. Overall, all eight items for this sub-scale came within the same categorical rating (see Table 11).

Table 11.

Emotional Support (Family)

Item	M^{12}	SD	Response ¹³ Category
Would give me a hug or show me I was cared about	4.19	1.11	SC
Would listen if I need to talk about feelings	4.11	1.07	SC
Would show affection for me	4.05	1.11	SC

¹² Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

¹³ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 11, continued.

Item	<u>M</u> ¹⁴	<u>SD</u>	Response ¹⁵ Category
Would give encouragement to do something difficult	4.03	1.05	SC
Would stick by me in a crunch	4.01	1.18	SC
Would comfort me if I was upset	4.01	1.08	SC
Would help me think about a problem	4.00	1.16	SC
Would show that they understood what I wanted to do	3.98	1.15	SC
Would be sympathetic if I was upset	3.96	1.22	SC
Would suggest doing something to take mind off my problems	3.83	1.12	SC
Would not pass judgment on me	3.70	1.33	SC
Total mean score	39.78	10.47	

Socializing (family)

The second sub-scale of the SS-B scale measured “socializing” as an item of support. On the 7 items for this sub-scale, the participants in the study most strongly concurred with the following: “Would have a good time with me” (M = 4.13), and “Would chat with me” (M = 4.08). Both these items fall within the “Some would certainly do this” categorical range (see Table 12). The item respondents least concurred with was “Would go to a movie or concert with me” (M = 3.85). This item had the lowest mean score but still is within the “some would certainly do this” categorical range.

¹⁴ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

¹⁵ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 12.

Socializing (Family)

Item	<u>M</u> ¹⁶	<u>SD</u>	Response ¹⁷ Category
Would have a good time with me	4.13	1.04	SC
Would chat with me	4.08	1.06	SC
Would call me to see how I was doing	4.06	1.11	SC
Would have lunch or dinner with me	4.05	1.18	SC
Would joke or do something to cheer me up	4.05	1.18	SC
Would visit me or invite me over	4.03	1.14	SC
Would go to a movie or concert with me	3.85	1.28	SC
Total mean score	28.27	7.36	

Practical Assistance (family)

The third sub-scale for the SS-B scale measured “practical assistance” as social support and consisted of 8 items. The items that the participants in the study most strongly concurred with were: “Would give me a ride if I needed one” (M = 4.10) and “Would help with a move or chore” (M = 4.01). The item with the lowest certainty by

¹⁶ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

¹⁷ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

respondents was “Would loan tools, equipment, appliances if I needed them” ($M = 3.68$).

All items for this sub-scale were within the categorical response range of “some would certainly do this (see Table 13).

Table 13.

Practical Assistance (family)

Item	M^{18}	SD	Response ¹⁹ Category
Would give me a ride if I needed one	4.10	1.05	SC
Would help with a move or chore	4.01	1.18	SC
Would look after my belongings (house, pet, etc.) for a while	3.88	1.41	SC
Would talk to other people to arrange something for me	3.86	1.21	SC
Would loan me a car if I needed one	3.83	1.24	SC
Would bring me presents of things I needed	3.81	1.33	SC
Would offer me a place to stay for a while	3.80	1.37	SC
Would loan tools, equipment, appliances if I needed them	3.68	1.43	SC
Total mean score	31.00	9.42	

¹⁸ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

¹⁹ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Financial Assistance (family)

The fourth sub-scale of the SS-B scale measures financial assistance as a support system and consists of 7 items. The items with the highest mean scores were: “Would pay for lunch if I was broke” (\underline{M} = 3.90) and “Would buy me a drink if I was short of money” (\underline{M} = 3.83). Both these items are within the categorical response range of “some would certainly do this.” The lowest mean score for this section is item “Would loan money and want to forget about it” (\underline{M} = 3.46). This item is in the categorical response range “some would probably do this” (see Table 14).

Table 14.

Financial Assistance (family)

<u>Item</u>	<u>M</u> ²⁰	<u>SD</u>	<u>Response</u> ²¹ <u>Category</u>
Would pay for lunch if I was broke	3.90	1.27	SC
Would buy me a drink if I was short of money	3.83	1.36	SC
Would buy me clothes if I was short money	3.73	1.43	SC
Would help me with some necessary purchase	3.71	1.39	SC
Would loan money for a indefinite amount of time	3.61	1.37	SC
Would loan a large amount of money (one month's rent)	3.48	1.54	SP

²⁰ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

²¹ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 14, continued.

Item	<u>M</u> ²²	<u>SD</u>	Response ²³ Category
Would loan money and want to “forget about it”	3.46	1.46	SP
Total mean score	25.75	9.28	

Advice/Guidance (family)

The fifth sub-scale of the SS-B scale measures supportive behaviors through advice/guidance assistance. This area of the scale consisted of 12 items. The respondents felt most certain with the following items: “Would show me how to do something I didn’t know how” (M = 4.06), “Would suggest how I can find more about a situation” (M = 4.05), and “Would suggest a way I might do something” (M = 4.05). Each of these items are within the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range. The item least certain with was “Would help me figured out what I wanted to do” (M = 3.93) (see Table 15). This item is also within the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range.

²² Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

²³ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 15.

Advice/Guidance (family)

Item	<u>M</u> ²⁴	<u>SD</u>	Response ²⁵ Category
Would show me how to do something I didn't know how	4.06	1.08	SC
Would suggest how I can find more about a situation	4.05	1.09	SC
Would suggest a way I might do something	4.05	1.03	SC
Would tell me what to do	4.03	1.11	SC
Would give advice about what to do	4.03	1.07	SC
Would tell me about available choices and options	4.01	1.18	SC
Would help me figure out what was going on	4.01	1.14	SC
Would tell me the best way to get something done	3.96	1.34	SC
Would tell me who to talk to for help	3.96	1.17	SC
Would give reason why I should/not do something	3.95	1.24	SC
Would help me figure out what I wanted to do	3.93	1.11	SC
Would help me decide what to do	3.93	1.13	SC
Total mean score	48.01	12.84	

²⁴ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

²⁵ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

The participants in the study responded to the SS-B scale that measured support behaviors from “friends” next. This section of the instrument is identical to the support questions items for the “family” section, but asked the respondents to indicate the likelihood of a friend performing this behavior.

Emotional Support (friends)

The items that respondents felt most certain with for this section were: “Would listen if I need to talk about feelings” ($M = 3.98$), “Would help me think about a problem” ($M = 3.95$), and “Would give encouragement to do something difficult” ($M = 3.91$). Each of these items are within the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range (see Table 16). The item respondent least concurred with was; “Would not pass judgment on me” ($M = 3.56$). This item is in the same categorical response range as the other three items, however, it has the lowest mean score.

Table 16.

Emotional Support (friends)

Item	M^{26}	SD	Response ²⁷ Category
Would listen if I need to talk about feelings	3.98	1.15	SC
Would help me think about a problem	3.95	1.25	SC
Would give encouragement to do something difficult	3.91	1.16	SC
Would be sympathetic if I was upset	3.78	1.36	SC

²⁶ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

²⁷ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 16 (continued)

Item	<u>M</u> ²⁸	<u>SD</u>	Response ²⁹ Category
Would give me a hug or showed me	3.78	1.31	SC
Would show that they understood what I wanted to do	3.76	1.25	SC
Would show affection for me	3.75	1.32	SC
Would comfort me if I was upset	3.73	1.17	SC
Would stick by me in a crunch	3.68	1.32	SC
Would suggest doing something to take my mind off my problems	3.60	1.15	SC
Would not pass judgment on me	3.56	1.28	SC
Total mean score	41.51	12.34	

Socializing (friends)

For this sub-scale, the items with which respondents felt most certain with were: “Would chat with me” (M = 4.03), and “Would have a good time with me” (M = 4.00). Both items were in the “some would certainly do this” response range. The least certain item for the respondents was “Would visit me, or invite me over” (M = 3.83). This item was also in the “some would certainly do this” response range (see Table 17).

²⁸ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

²⁹ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 17.

Socializing (Friends)

Item	<u>M</u> ³⁰	<u>SD</u>	Response ³¹ Category
Would chat with me	4.03	1.16	SC
Would have a good time with me	4.00	1.16	SC
Would joke or do something to cheer me up	3.93	1.16	SC
Would have lunch or dinner with me	3.90	1.17	SC
Would go to a movie or concert with me	3.88	1.20	SC
Would call me to see how I was doing	3.85	1.24	SC
Would visit me or invite me over	3.83	1.18	SC
Total mean score	27.43	7.68	

Practical Assistance (Friends)

For this SS-B subscale, respondents in the study felt most certain with the following items: “Would give me a ride if I needed one” (M = 3.93), and “Would help with a move or chore” (M = 3.76). Both items are within the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range. The item with the lowest response was “Would loan me a car if I needed one” (M = 3.48). This item is within the “some would probably do this” categorical range (see Table 18).

³⁰ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this.

³¹ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 18.

Practical Assistance (friends)

Item	<u>M</u> ³²	<u>SD</u>	Response ³³ Category
Would give me a ride if I needed one	3.93	1.14	SC
Would help with a move or chore	3.76	1.24	SC
Would loan me tools, equipment or appliances if I needed them	3.70	1.41	SC
Would bring me presents of things I needed	3.66	1.40	SC
Would talk to other people to arrange something for me	3.66	1.36	SC
Would look after my belongings (house, pet, etc.) for a while	3.61	1.30	SC
Would offer me a place to stay for a while	3.53	1.44	SC
Would loan me a car if I needed one	3.48	1.42	SP
Total mean score	29.36	9.81	

Financial Assistance (friends)

The items the participants most strongly concurred with for this sub-scale were: “Would pay for lunch if I was broke” ($\bar{M} = 3.83$), and “Would buy me a drink if I was short of money” ($\bar{M} = 3.83$). Both items are in the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range. (see Table19). The item with the least participants’

³² Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this

³³ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

concurrence was “Would loan me a large amount of money (one month’s rent) (\underline{M} = 3.10). This item is in the “some would probably do this” response range.

Table 19

Financial Assistance (friends)

Item	\underline{M} ³⁴	\underline{SD}	Response ³⁵ Category
Would pay for lunch if I was broke	3.83	1.27	SC
Would buy me a drink if I was short of money	3.83	1.27	SC
Would help me with some necessary purchase	3.60	1.34	SC
Would loan me money for an indefinite amount of time	3.43	1.44	SP
Would buy me clothes if I was short of money	3.31	1.52	SP
Would loan me money and forget about it	3.25	1.52	SP
Would loan me a large amount of money (one month’s rent)	3.10	1.59	SP
Total mean score	24.36	9.10	

Advice/Guidance (friends)

For this sub-scale measure, the respondents felt most certain with these items: “Would help figure out what I wanted to do” (\underline{M} = 3.95), “Would give me advice about what to do” (\underline{M} = 3.91), and “Would suggest a way I might do something” (\underline{M} = 3.91).

³⁴ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this

³⁵ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Each of these items are in the “some would certainly do this” response range (see Table 20). The lowest response rate for this sub-scale measure is item “Would suggest how I can find more about a situation” ($M = 3.78$). This item is also within the “some would certainly do this” categorical response range.

Table 20.

Advice/Guidance (friends)

Item	M ³⁶	SD	Response ³⁷ Category
Would help me figure out what I wanted to do	3.95	1.15	SC
Would suggest a way I might do something	3.91	1.19	SC
Would give me advice about what to do	3.91	1.12	SC
Would help me figure out what was going on	3.90	1.16	SC
Would tell me what to do	3.88	1.23	SC
Would show me how to do something I don't know how to do	3.86	1.25	SC
Would tell me the best way to get something done	3.86	1.22	SC
Would help me decide what to do	3.85	1.23	SC
Would tell me who to talk to for help	3.85	1.19	SC

³⁶ Mean values based on the response scale: 1 = no one would do this, 2 = someone might do this, 3 = some would probably do this, 4 = some would certainly do this, 5 = most would certainly do this

³⁷ <1.51 = N-no one would do this, 1.51 to 2.50 = S-someone might do this, 2.51 to 3.50 = SP-some would probably do this, 3.51 to 4.50 = SC-some would certainly do this, and >4.50 = MC-most would certainly do this.

Table 20 (continued)

Item	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Response Category
Would give reason why I should/not do something	3.80	1.25	SC
Would suggest how I can find more about a situation	3.78	1.24	SC
Would tell me about available choices and options	3.78	1.23	SC
Total mean score	46.36	13.35	

Bivariate Analysis

Objective Three:

The third objective of the study is to compare samples in recognized tribes with those samples that have no official recognition on the following variables: (1) ethnic identity, (2) life satisfaction, (3) social support, and (4) social status.

Ethnic identity was measured in two ways. First, ethnic identity was measured using the responses by the participants to selected numbered items on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). As stated in the previous section, this instrument was used to measure both the Indian identity as well as the African American identity for the respondents. The participants were selected randomly as to which identity was measured first (Native or African American). Twenty-nine (48.3%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “African American”

identity first. Thirty-one (51.7%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “Native” identity first.

Two of the demographic characteristics in Hypothesis 1 (ethnic identity and type recognition status) were measured as interval data. Therefore, *t* tests were used to determine if differences existed in the levels of native ethnic identity, and African American ethnic identity, between tribes with official recognition and those with non-recognized status. Table 21 provides a summary of the findings as well as means and standard deviations scores.

Table 21

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Native Ethnic Identity and African American Identity (N = 60)

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Native Identity	16.30 (3.79)	14.40 (2.45)	2.30	58	.043
Black Identity	13.33 (3.74)	15.63 (2.49)	-2.79	58	.007

The independent *t* test procedure was used to test the hypothesis that ethnic identity (Native score) as measured by MEIM will be higher for Black Indians enrolled in officially recognized tribes than those Black Indians who are not in any officially recognized group. Results of the comparison of the mean scores between the two groups proved significant. Recognized tribal members had a mean score of 16.30 (SD = 3.79) (*t*= 2.30, *p* .043). Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted. Black Indians in official recognized tribes have higher ethnic identity (Native scores), as measured by the MEIM, than Black Indians without recognition.

The result of the comparison of the mean scores for the Black Identity measure also proved significant. Here, test results show that Black Indians in recognized tribes had a mean score of 13.33 (SD = 3.74) compared to non-recognized respondents' mean score of 15.63 (SD = 15.63) ($t = -2.79$, $p = .007$). The mean score indicate that Black Indians in recognized groups have lower identification with an African American identity than Black Indians in non-recognized groups. This finding is supported in the literature by using the theory of “spatially” defined Indian identity (see Peroff & Wildcat, 2002).

The second coding of the MEIM measures affirmation, belonging, and commitment to the respondent's respective ethnic group (see Table 22). The preferred scoring for this subscale is to use the mean of the item scores. Davis (1991) provides clarity in how to study ethnic identity by providing dimensions into subjective and objective domains. The objective dimensions (i.e., language, traditions, customs) can be observed by outsiders and are one way to measure the strength of ethnic identity. However, the subjective dimensions (i.e., emotions, feelings, and attitudes) are not readily observed and must be measured through interviews and self-reports. The qualitative data used in this dissertation will further explore the subjective sense of ethnic identity that is felt by the respondents in this study.

The t test finds no significant difference in affirmation, belonging, and commitment to ethnic group among Black Indians in recognized tribes when compared to those Black Indians with no official recognition. The test did, however, show that Black Indians from non-recognized group had higher mean score when measured for Native affirmation than did Black Indians in recognized tribes for Black affirmation.

Table 22.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on affirmation, belonging, & commitment to ethnic group (N = 60)

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Native Affirmation	25.50 (4.68)	23.86 (3.20)	1.58	58	.720
Black Affirmation	21.80 (4.49)	24.80 (2.90)	-3.07	58	.359

To summarize information regarding life satisfaction comparisons between recognized and non-recognized Black Indians, the mean scores of the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) were computed using an independent t test (see Table 23). The t test revealed no significant differences in life satisfaction between non-recognized Black Indians and Black Indians with official recognition.

Table 23.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Life Satisfaction (N = 60)

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Satisfaction with Life	26.73 (6.51)	26.90 (5.35)	-.108	58	.189

The mean scores on social status comparison between recognized and non-recognized Black Indians are summarized in table 24.

The t test used for this analysis indicates that there are no significant differences in social status among Black Indians in recognized groups and non-recognized groups in terms of how they view their position in their country (United States of America).

However their view on their position in their respective communities is somewhat different between the two groups. Perhaps this is reflective of the hierarchal structures of tribal communities for recognized Indian tribes.

Table 24.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Subjective Social Status (N = 60)

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Where you stand in your community	6.60 (2.38)	7.23 (1.73)	-1.17	58	.083
Where you stand In United States	6.16 (2.21)	6.23 (1.92)	-.124	58	.652

Income was also included in the social status variable and measured as categorical data (see Table 25). A chi-square test of independence was used to test whether the variable income and recognition were independent of each other. Eight (13.3%) of the participants in the study reported that they did not know their annual income. Ten (16.7%) of the participants chose the “no response” item. Forty-two (70%) of the participants reported their annual income. Income was given two categories, those participants making <\$16,000 (as this figure is generally considered the poverty threshold cutoff range), and those participants making >\$16,000.

The obtained $X^2 (1, n = 42) = 7.46, p = .006$, was significant, indicating that a relationship did exist between the two variables. The nature of the relationship is that a higher proportion of Black Indians in non-recognized groups had incomes below \$16,000

than did those Black Indians in recognized tribes. In addition, a significant higher number of Black Indians in officially recognized tribes had incomes above \$16,000 than did Black Indians in non-recognized groups.

Table 25.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Income

Item	Income		Total n
	\$15,999.00	\$16,000.00 +	
	n %	n %	
Recognized	2 16.7%	19 63.3%	21
Non-recognition	10 83.3%	11 36.7%	21
Total	12 100.0	30 100.0	42

Note. $X^2(1, n = 42) = 7.46, p = .006$

Social support was measured as interval data using the Social Support Behaviors (SS-B) Scale. The independent samples t test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in levels of social support (family and friends) between recognized Black Indians and non-recognized Black Indians on the following dimensions: emotional support, socializing, practical assistance, financial assistance, and advice/guidance.

Result of the comparisons showed that there were no significant differences (at $p = .05$) among recognized Black Indians and non-recognized Black Indians by the category of emotional support from family (see table 26). Recognized samples had a mean score 40.23 ($SD = 9.69$) while non-recognized samples had mean score of 39.33 ($SD = 11.35$ ($t = .330, p = .222$)). In the dimension of Socializing, the t test finds no

significant differences between the two comparison groups. Recognized participants had a mean score of 28.70 (SD = 6.78) and non-recognized samples had a mean score of 27.83 (SD = 8.00) ($t = .452, p = .270$). For “practical assistance”, result of the comparisons of the mean scores finds no differences for this sub-scale of the measure. The mean score for recognized participants was 30.96 (SD = 9.22) and non-recognized participants had a mean score of 31.03 (SD = 9.77) ($t = -.027, p = .682$). The mean score for “financial assistance” for the recognized samples was 25.56 (SD = 9.29) and 25.93 (SD = 9.43) for the non-recognized samples ($t = -.152, p = .833$). For “advice/guidance”, the results of the t test find no significant difference. Recognized samples had a mean score of 46.63 (SD = 12.12) while non-recognized samples had a mean score of 47.40 (SD = 13.70) ($t = .369, p = .365$). A summary of the mean scores for social support (family) is listed in Table 26. The independent t test procedure used to test the hypothesis that social support would be higher for the recognized samples than non-recognized samples revealed no differences between groups for any of the sub-scales on support from family. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 26.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Emotional Support, Socializing, Practical Assistance, Financial Assistance, & Advice/Guidance (family)
N = 60

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Emotional Support	40.23 (9.69)	39.33 (11.35)	.330	58	.222
Socializing	28.70 (6.78)	27.83 (8.00)	.452	58	.270
Practical Assistance	30.96 (9.22)	31.03 (9.77)	-.027	58	.682

Table 26, continued.

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Financial Assistance	25.56 (9.29)	25.93 (9.43)	-.152	58	.833
Advice/Guidance	48.63 (12.12)	47.40 (13.70)	.369	58	.365

The independent samples *t* test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in levels of social support (friends) between recognized Black Indians and non-recognized Black Indians on the following dimensions: emotional support, socializing, practical assistance, financial assistance, and advice/guidance. Result of the comparison showed that there were no significant differences (at $p = .05$) among recognized Black Indians and non-recognized Black Indians by the sub-scale category for social support by friends in: emotional support, socializing, practical assistance, financial assistance, and advice/ guidance. A summary of mean scores, standard deviations, and significance levels are presented in Table 27.

Table 27.

Comparison of Recognized and Non-recognized Black Indians on Emotional Support, Socializing, Practical Assistance, Financial Assistance, & Advice/Guidance (friends)
N = 60

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Emotional Support	41.73 (12.81)	41.30 (12.06)	.135	58	.822
Socializing	27.80 (7.94)	27.06 (7.52)	.367	58	.975
Practical Assistance	29.46 (10.06)	29.26 (9.73)	.078	58	.781

Table 27, continued.

Item	Recognition Status		t	df	p
	Recognized Mean (SD)	Non-recognized Mean (SD)			
Financial Assistance	24.56 (9.23)	24.16 (9.12)	.169	58	.958
Advice/Guidance	46.73 (13.73)	46.00 (13.19)	.211	58	.856

The independent t test procedure used to test the hypothesis that social support would be higher for the recognized samples than non-recognized samples revealed no differences between groups for any of the sub-scales on support from friends. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

In summary, t tests and chi-squares performed indicate that Black Indians from recognized tribes and non-recognized groups differ significantly on the variables ethnic identity and income. There are no significant difference among these comparison groups in life satisfaction, social status, and social support.

CHAPTER 5

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE SAMPLES

In this chapter, synopses of the characteristics of the qualitative samples on key variables are provided. Next, themes, which emerge from the qualitative data related to the respondents' cultural identification as Black Indians, are discussed. The concepts of race and ethnicity, ascription and self-identification have, and, continue to be, political.

This qualitative section utilizes a narrative analysis (Walcott, 1994) to examine the meaning of the life experiences for the participants in this study. Narrative analysis seeks to describe the meaning of experiences for individuals, frequently those who are socially marginalized or oppressed, as they construct stories (narratives) about their lives (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The focus on narrative research is consistent with empowerment theoretical perspective used in this dissertation and make use of the oral storytelling tradition common in both African American and Native American cultures. Narratives from the respondents about their cultural identification expand our understanding of the experiences of Black Indians in Louisiana, contextualize the quantitative findings, and offer a more personal view of this mixed ethnic group.

Sample Characteristics

Six participants consented to in-depth interviews to describe activities, events, and actions, which explained how they perceived Indian cultural retention. Table 1 summarizes some of the key demographics characteristics of the interviewees for comparison with the quantitative sample. Three of the participants are members from officially recognized tribes and three are from non-recognized groups. Two of the recognized members were from the Tunica Biloxi tribe in Marksville, Louisiana. The

third recognized member was from the Houma Nation in Houma, Louisiana. For the non-recognized participants in the qualitative sample, one was from Dulack, Louisiana, which is in close proximity to the Houma Nation. The second non-recognized sample was from the Avoyles Tensa tribe in Simmsport, Louisiana, which is in close proximity to the Tunica's. The final qualitative non-recognized sample was from Adams County in Natchez Mississippi. All but one of the respondents have finished high school or obtained a GED. The average age of the interviewees is 40 years. The average number of children is 2.16 with an average age of 15 years. All but two of the interviewees were employed. Three of the interviewees; Wade, Vivian, and Jerome, are members of recognized tribal groups. Cookie, Roxi Ann, and Lester are members of non-recognized tribes and communities.

A brief synopsis of the life situation for each of the respondents interviewed is given next, in the order in which the interviews were completed. The names have been changed to protect their confidentiality.

Cookie is a 39-year-old divorced grandmother who describes herself as having African American, Choctaw, and Cree ancestral heritage but has no official tribal recognition. Living with Cookie is her 15-year-old son and her 9-year-old grandson. She also has a 24-year old daughter (the grand child's mother) who does not live with her. Cookie has been divorced from her husband for 10 years and admits to having "very little" contact with him. Cookie is a college graduate and is employed as a Licensed Practical Nurse. She has worked as a nurse for close to fifteen years. She expresses a desire to become a Registered Nurse. Cookie was the only participant in the qualitative study that was from Adam County in Natchez Mississippi. There is only one recognized

Indian tribe in Mississippi, which is the Mississippi Band Of Choctaws in Philadelphia, Mississippi. Philadelphia, Mississippi, is approximately five hours from Natchez Mississippi. Although there are no recognized tribes in close proximity to Cookie's residence, there are Pow-Wows held at the Grand Village of the Natchez Indians. Cookie attends every Pow-Wow that is held there.

Lester is a 65-year-old retired laborer. He describes himself as being from "Avoyel" and "Ofo" peoples and having an African American and Choctaw ancestral heritage. He is not a member of any recognized tribal group. He has been married for 41 years and has two adult children ages 40 and 35 years of age. Lester and his wife own their home and live in the Simmsport, Louisiana, area. Lester did not complete high school, but takes pride in the fact that he and his wife put both of their children through college. At the time of this study, Lester and several other tribal members were seeking official recognition for their tribe. So far, these efforts have been unsuccessful. The interview with Lester occurred at their tribal office in Marksville, Louisiana.

Wade is a member of a federally recognized tribe. He is 42 years old and is of African American and Choctaw ancestral heritage. Wade is married and he and his wife have two children ages 13 and 12. He is a college graduate with a postgraduate degree and work in the health care profession as a Social Worker. Wade is also a council member for his respective tribe. He and his family live in the Marksville Louisiana area. He had lived in this area his entire life. Wade, his wife, and both children are all official member of this recognized tribe.

Vivian is a 47 year old single mother with one daughter age 21. She admits to an African American and Choctaw ancestral heritage. She is a member of an officially

recognized tribal community. Both Vivian and her daughter live together in the southern part of the state near Dulack, Louisiana. At the time of this interview, Vivian's daughter (who is also single) was expecting her first child. Vivian attended college, but did not graduate. She reports that she often regrets not having graduated. On several occasions she wanted to go back but says that "one year turned into the next...and I never went back." She is employed with a local fishery company as a clerical worker.

Roxi Ann is a 30-year-old single (never married) parent with 5 children. Her children are ages fourteen, ten, six, five, and three. At the time of this interview, she was pregnant with her sixth child. Roxi Ann says that this is her "last time" getting pregnant. She is unemployed and is a TANF recipient. She is of African American and Choctaw heritage but is not a member of an officially recognized tribe. Roxi Ann completed high school with a GED, but did not go to college. She and her five children live in a two-bedroom house that she rents near Dulack, Louisiana. She stated that she had been in a long term relationship with the father of her first two children but that he had been killed in a drug related incident. The father of her third and fourth child is serving a prison sentence at Angola. She has minimal contact with her present boyfriend, who is the father of her youngest child and the child she is carrying. He pays no child support.

Jerome is 21 years old. He has an African American and Choctaw ancestral heritage and is a member of an officially recognized tribe. He is single and has no children. Jerome is a high school graduate and was the only interviewee who was presently attending a state college. He states that he would like to go to law school and become a lawyer. Jerome says he is very interested in legal matters regarding Native Americans. He continues to live at home with his parents in the Marksville, Louisiana

area and is employed as a gaming technician with a tribal casino. Jerome has a fiancé and plans to marry after he completes college.

Table 1.

Synopsis of Characteristics of Qualitative Interviewees*

Interviewees	Age	Sex	Recognition	Marital Status	# of children	Education level
Cookie	39	F	No	Divorced	3	16 yrs
Lester	65	M	No	Married	2	10 yrs
Wade	42	M	Yes	Married	2	18 yrs
Vivian	47	F	Yes	Single	1	16 yrs
Roxi Ann	30	F	No	Single	5	12 yrs
Jerome	21	M	Yes	Single	0	14 yrs

* Names changed to protect confidentiality

Dual Cultural Identity

It is important to note that ethnic identification may occur in many ways. It is multidimensional in that one group member may be active within the objective domains of ethnic identity (i.e., language, traditions, ethnic personal networks, etc.) but may not subjectively (i.e., emotions, feelings, and attitudes) feel a part of that group (Davis, 1991). Or, one group member may not outwardly function within any of the formal organizations of an ethnic group; yet have a strong sense of subjective belonging.

Therefore, in this section, I discuss three key findings from a preliminary analysis of the narratives: racial dissonance, racism and marginalization.

Racial Dissonance

Scholars generally recognize that ethnic identity is a “joint process,” one by which the individual and the involved group decide (Stephan & Stephan, 1990; Fouad & Brown, 2000). If one chooses to be “white,” yet this is inconsistent with the way the group (or society as a whole) thinks a “white” should look; the member does not have a choice to belong to that group. If a person identifies as being Indian, but does not look phenotypically to be the way that other Indians, or society itself, think an Indian should look, then that person is often not assumed to be Indian.

Respondents were first asked to describe some of the experiences they had growing up with a dual ethnicity. The qualitative analysis of the narratives by the respondents in the study shows “disbelief” of their identity, and, difficulties in defining their racial reference group, to be a reoccurring theme:

Cookie: Growing up, I felt I didn’t belong. Either I was too dark, or not dark enough. I was called “Red” all the time. But, for the most part, I had a happy childhood. My grandmother made it known that it was not the color of your skin that matter...it was what it was that was in your heart...and that made it a whole lot easier to deal with it. But I knew that something was missing.

Lester: When I was growing up, it wasn’t safe to be Indian. It was better to be thought of as Black or Negro. So, my mother always told us to never talk about who we were or what we were. She was afraid. She thought that we would get hurt or be killed. So, we just never talked about it much...especially away from home. But we knew who we were. We knew who our peoples were.

Wade: The kids around the neighborhood where I use to live as a child use to think I was Hispanic. Because I looked different. I went to an all Black school until the tenth grade. Other students would call me “Cocheez” or “Jesus”[pronounced-*hey-sues*]. I guess it was a bad thing at that time to be Native American. Most of the time you were just classified as Black, and that’s the way you went. But, I always knew I was part Indian...and I was proud of that.

Roxi Ann: Growing up, there was a lot of prejudice...I guess...in school...and, other places you go. And, while growing up...I had all these freckles on my face. People would ask... 'what are you?'...And, I would say that I was Indian, or Native American. Most would say to me 'you don't look like a Indian'...and stuff like that.

Jerome: My mom is, well it's kind of confusing. My dad is African American, Black, whatever, and he has Native American in him. My great grandma was half, so, I just recently found out all of this. When I was growing up I didn't really consider Native American a part of my races. And my mom was adopted, so she has White on her birth certificate, but she is actually like $\frac{3}{4}$ Native American, which I did not know she was that much. And she is Danish and so, it's kind of confusing (laugh). So I'm more Native American than I thought I was.

Racial dissonance can be characterized by confusion and ambivalence regarding commitment to one's racial group (Helms, 1995). According to Helms, persons with levels of dissonance may be ambivalent about life decisions, and may exercise repression of anxiety provoking race information.

It is often the case that these participants in the qualitative study faced opposition regarding their choice to assert their dual racial heritage. Most of the respondents also illustrated that they had, for a variety of reasons, experienced some form of "disbelief" by others to their claims to be Native American, or their ancestral heritage. According to Helms (1990), one of the milestones of the civil rights movement was the self-empowerment of minority groups to name themselves. All of the respondents said that they had some difficulties ascribing with an Indian identity while growing up. Issues related to identity and ascription will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

Cookie: From time to time I dress in hair ornaments and hair wraps, and of course my jewelry...accessorized in Native attire. And, this guy asked me was I native...well he used the name Indian...well of course, there is no such thing as 'Indian'...we are identified as 'natives' or 'native people' or 'native Americans'...and, I said, yes, I'm of Choctaw ancestry. He said...I've never seen a Black Indian! I said that before air conditioning and such...when people were outside most of the time, most native peoples were dark complexioned...also, I like most people...native people come in a variety of shades.

Wade: A lot of people feel that there is no such thing as a Black Indian...except for this tribe. When you look at any one of those tribal members...they are going to look either white or black. But, people are sometimes still looking for 'tee-pees'...still looking for the 'war-paint'. That's their idea of what an Indian is supposed to look like. But it is not that way.

Roxi Ann: Well...I hear all sorts of things sometimes. I hear things like you're trying not to be Black by saying that you are an Indian...you know you are Black. You don't even look like an Indian. Then I say...what does an Indian look like?

Vivian: It boils down to the color of your skin. Blacks were on the 'Trail of Tears'. But you don't read that in any history books. Its as if everyone thinks that Africans have been isolated from all other gene pools since coming to North America. I frequently hear white people say that... 'oh, my grandmother was part Cherokee'...or 'my grandfather was part Apache.' No one questions that. And, I'm not saying that they are not telling the truth. They probably are. But if a person say that I'm Choctaw...or, part Choctaw...and their skin it too dark...then, the common assumption is that you are simply Black and nothing else.

These stories typify a commonality shared by most of the respondents when asked about their responses when people say that there is no such thing as a Black Indian. In fact, all six respondents reported this shared experience. Lester and Jerome's comments are included in the following section because of the racism theme associated with their narratives.

Racism

Research indicates that individuals with dual ethnicity sometime experience anxiety regarding their dual racial heritage. For many people of color, racism may be a far more visible, virulent, and frequent experience than sexism or heterosexism (Comas-Diaz & Green, 1994; Kanuha, 1990). Tensions may rise with one or more racial group based on ambiguous affiliations. Many may experience oppression as people of color and by people of color (Root, 1992). Lester and Jerome's narrative exemplifies these finding:

Jerome: Sometimes you feel prejudice. And, sometimes I feel it no matter where I go. I think the prejudice happens because of my skin color. You know, I have a reddish yellowish thing going on here. But, really, I don't have time for that type of bull-shit. Sometimes, I feel it more when I'm around Black people. I don't ever remember being called a racial slur by a white person. That kind of stuff comes from niggers (laugh).

Lester: People seem to have a hard time thinking of Indians as being Black...are thinking that some Blacks are really Indians. I think that most people see Black...and that's all they see...Black...and nothing else. When I was a small boy...I still remember seeing white men coming into Black neighborhoods at night to sleep up with Black women. Some of those women had babies by those white men. Guess what? None of those babies were ever considered part white. They all were Black. That's what people see and think...especially white people. And that's the way they think about black people. They can believe that some white people have Indian in them...but that refuse to see it if its Black. You know, and I'm convinced that is why our petition for recognition was denied. When those legislators looked out and saw all those Black faces looking back at them, they just didn't believe we were Indians. Or, refuse to accept the fact that we are.

Lester described how his tribe was petitioning for recognition and the difficulties they were having with the legislators as well as with other recognized Indian tribes. He went on to describe a incident that happen while his tribe was talking with legislators at the capitol building in Baton Rouge. He told how many of the legislators pounded on their desk in the stereotypical war drum beat and did the Tommy-Hawk chop.

Perhaps the most striking commonality among the six respondents in the qualitative analysis is that they reported that most of the prejudicial treatment they received occurred with African Americans.

Roxi Ann: I went to a Black school. And I would get talked about every day...especially by the Black girls...and many days would have to fight. I didn't like to fight...but I would. Girls would say that I though I was 'all that' because my hair looked a certain way. They would get mad every time a boy would talk to me. It didn't matter if he was their boyfriend or not...they would just get mad and want to fight. I guess they consider me to not be like them.

Wade: I grew up being Black...basically. I got called a lot of names by the kids in my neighborhood and school... 'Geronimo'... 'Tonto' ... 'Kemosabee'... 'red nigger' ...'yellow nigger' ...stuff like that. This went on for a long time.

Cookie: I was not born in Louisiana. I was born in Indiana. Growing up, I went to a school that was mostly white. My experiences there were okay...especially with my teachers...who were white. When we move to Louisiana when I was 13, I went to a Black school...for the first time in my life. I had more trouble at this school than I ever had while living in Indiana. For the most part...I simply wasn't accepted by most of my classmates. Of course, I had a few friends...but certainly not many.

Marginalization

Often, people with dual ethnicities have a sense of feeling connected to both their cultures but also not be a full member of either (Root, 1992). This status between two cultures can produce feelings of marginality. Two of the respondents for the qualitative interviews, Cookie and Wade, reported strong feelings of marginality.

Cookie: When I was growing up...it was troublesome for me to be labeled and categorized as 'Black.' I had always been close to both my parents, so to deny the existence of one side my heritage by putting on a piece of paper saying I was 'Black' seemed wrong. This seemed incomplete. To me, I was not only Black, I was both Black and Indian.

Wade: When my father married my mother he was kicked out of the tribe. He left for a long time. So, I grew up Black. When this tribe was trying to get recognized...my father was one of only a few members that could read and write. So, the tribe asked him for his help. Previous to that time...I was always known to be an African American. I was always told that we have Native blood, and we grew up with that...because my father is a member of this tribe. So, when we became recognized...all of his children were put on the roll. So, now I guess I'm Native.

These two narratives suggest that when one has more than one ethnic culture with which to identify, things may be confusing. In the 1920s, Parks (In Phinney and Alipuria 1996) coined the term "marginal man" which he stated was a person at the edge of two cultures who therefore had a better understanding of both cultures. However, Stonequist (1937), who was a student of Parks, saw the "marginal man" as caught between two cultures and never fully fitting in either one. Stonequist's theory was the most widely accepted. However, since the 1980s there has been considerable research disputing his idea of the "marginal man."

Future Generations and Fusion of African and Indian Culture

All of the qualitative interviewees shared a commonality about their dual ethnicity and the ways they have been able to express it. They all shared similar strategy in the way they would pass their Native heritage to future generations. At the time of the interview, each of the participants reported that they had participated in, or observed, a Native cultural practice where their entire family attended (i.e., Pow Wows). All shared similar stories regarding herbal medicines, food preparations, and a limited knowledge of some Native language (generally consisting of only a few words). In Vivian's narrative, she describes a home remedy used by her Choctaw grandmother to treat wasp stings, and, sprained sore muscles.

Vivian: I remember that when we were children playing, and if we were to get stung by a bee or wasp...my grandmother would put wet chewing tobacco or wet dipping snuff...

FP¹: Dipping snuff? Do you mean like Tops or Garrett's tobacco dipping snuff?

Vivian: Yes. That kind of snuff. My grandmother and grandfather use to dip a lot of stuff and chew a lot of tobacco.

FP: So did my grandparents.

Vivian: Anyway, if we were to get stung...she would put this dipping stuff on the bite. And, it worked. It would dry the sting up and take the soreness out.

The narratives about putting tobacco juice on wasps' stings were described by the other participants as well. It is uncertain whether this is an African custom or an Indian custom. Often time the acculturation between African and Indian went both ways. The shared customs and traditions were not just Indian to African, but also African to Indian.

Lester and Cookie shared other stories. Lester was the oldest participant in the qualitative interviews, and Jerome was the youngest participant. However, both shared

¹ FP = Francis Powell

stories about their Native cultural customs and traditions. This indicates that some cultural traditions, customs, and practices are being passed from one generation to the next.

Lester: When we were young and when we got sick, my mother would use a lot of home remedies to give to us children. She did this primarily because we were poor. But I remember her using different plants, barks, and roots as medicine. Her parents passed down this information to her, and she passed it on to her children. She gave us mayapples...or horse apples...as we use to call them, whenever we had a stomachache.

Cookie: I remember as a little girl my Aunts and Uncles talking about different type of medicines they would use for different types of illness or injuries. They would talk about this thing that they called 'horn water' which was a concoction of different roots and barks and stuff. I don't remember what all was in it...but it could be both ingested or applied externally...depending on they type of aliment. I remember that they would drive sometimes for miles looking for the ingredients to use for this 'horn water.' Or, to buy 'horn water' from people who already had some made.

FP: Do you remember what the ingredients were that was in it?

Cookie: No, I do not. And, I can't find anybody that do...because I would like to know. I have vivid memories of it, but never saw it made. I do remember that whatever you dropped it on would turn brown...no matter what the color was before...if the horn water touched it, it would turn brown.

Jerome, the youngest participant of the qualitative interviewees, shares in his narrative stories of home remedies passed down to him by his fore-parents.

Jerome: I remember hearing stories about how aloe-Vera plants were used when someone would get burned. Also, I've always heard that they use to blow smoke in people ears that had an earache and this would help stop the ache.

All of the participants in the qualitative study shared similar stories about their parents, grandparents, or other relatives making quilts or weaving baskets. Wade, Vivian, and Cookie all talked about how quilts were made in their families. Lester told of how his mother made pine straw baskets that she would sometimes sell. He also told of her carving gourds. Lester said the she used gourds for many things like cups, bowls,

birdhouses, and rattles for babies. Roxi Ann talked about seeing her grandmother cook bread and apple turnover on top of the stove instead of baking them.

Another striking commonality among the interviewees was whom they had as their friends. Five of the six participants said that their friends were either African Americans or White. Based on the interviews that were completed, it is possible to speculate about the reason for their selection of friends. Wade, who is a recognized tribal member, noted that in his opinion “Indian were hard to get along with and they are jealous.” Other speculation maybe due to feelings of resentment by non-recognized participants at being shunned from recognized rolls. Without further information, no clear explanation can be given as a reason. Only Lester said that he had friends who were Black, White, and Indian.

All of the participants in the qualitative study stated that they described their ethnicity as being Native American and African American on the last U.S. Census report. However, this had not always been the case. Prior to the Census 2000, most of the participants reported their ethnicity as being African American.

Each of the interviewees were asked if there were any specific needs which related to their Native American heritage that were not being met. The participants from the recognized group stated that their individual needs were being met, however that felt that the needs of Native Americans as a people were not being met.

Wade: As an individual, all of my needs are being met...as a tribe; I would like to see the tribe paid back for the land that was taken from them...and we are working hard for that to happen. Also, for my fellow Native American brothers and sisters to gain respect for themselves. A lot of them...when they leave the reservation, they go back to being a ‘Black’ person or a ‘white’ person.

Vivian: Education...as far as Native American awareness. Just like we have in our schools...African American history...there is not enough Native American history in our

schools. There are still so many stereotypes about Native Americans. The correct history of our people need to be told.

Today, because status as a member of a federally recognized tribe provides monetary as well psychological benefits, membership has been quantified and officialized. Those who have official recognition as tribal members are eligible for federal and/or state services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Lester and Roxi Ann's narratives illustrates this point:

Lester: We need programs from the BIA to help our children with education and medical attention. We get no support from the Bureau of Indian Affairs...and that is because we have no recognition. Without recognition, we get no services from the BIA. Our children need services just like those children in that tribe up the highway.

FP: Are you referring to the Tunica Biloxi tribe?

Lester: Yes, I am.

Roxi Ann: If I were a member of a tribe...things would be easier. It wouldn't be such a struggle with money problems. Most Natives who are in recognized tribes...and have a casino...get some kind of help from the tribe. As far as my heritage, I don't need any help with that because I know who I am. It's in my heart...and the heart knows what it is.

Many recognized tribes rely on funding for educational, social, and public works services from the federal and state government. To receive federal and state services, applicants must be card-carrying tribe members. The general theme of the participants from the recognized group, in response to needs being met, centered on needs for the entire tribe or for the Native American people in general. Whereas, for the non-recognized participants, the theme were more centered on personal needs and services not provided for them from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is cover with more detail in Chapter 6.

Chapter Summary

The stories told by the interviewees in this study illustrate several key issues. First, all the interviewees in this study demonstrated that they've experienced difficulty with acceptance from both African and Native cultural groups. There were indications that there were difficulties in knowing where to fit (culturally speaking). All the respondents reported in their narrative this reoccurring theme: Cookie—"I felt I didn't belong"...Wade—"I looked different"...Lester—"It was safer to be thought of as Black." It is clear from these excerpts that these interviewees had experienced situations and circumstances that made them feel culturally marginalized. All six respondents also described situation where they felt they were treated with prejudiced from both Native and African American groups.

Secondly, there were social pressures as to what an Indian should look like in terms of physical appearance. Five out of the six respondents in the qualitative study experienced situations where their ethnic heritage was challenged because of how they looked phenotypically. There has consistently been two primary strategies implemented over the course of history in order to keep the "races" separated from each other...the creation of a negative mythology about people of color and their ancestors, using biological, sociocultural and sociopolitical arguments; and the denial of the existence of mixed race individuals altogether, especially if that mixture involves African ancestry (e.g., the "one drop" rule). Also, there were failures, in many instances, to receive any official acknowledgement of having this dual ethnicity. Of the six respondents, three had official recognition as belonging to a recognized tribe. Of those three individuals, only

one, Jerome, was recognized as a Black Indian as a child. Wade and Vivian were labeled Black or African American as children.

Finally, despite the barriers of resistance, the respondents displayed high degrees of cultural pride as it relates to their dual ethnicity. Roxi Ann noted that she was an “Indian in my heart.” Although five of the six respondents were first introduced to an African American culture primarily, they all knew of their Native ancestry. Also, all six respondents stayed connected to their Native American heritage through customs, traditions, and practice.

It is important to note that there is no universal definition of what an Indian is. The US Census Bureau counts any one an Indian who says they are. There are scores of full-blooded Indians who are not members of recognized tribes. Also, there are score of “mixed-blood” Indians who are on the tribal rolls of federal and state recognized tribes. The men and women in this qualitative sample have been able to successfully be “Indians in their hearts.” From a strengths perspective, and a empowering perspective, their dual ethnicity has survived and they take pride in living it.

CHAPTER 6

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to show the existence of Black Indians in Louisiana and to investigate whether differences exist between those Black Indians who are members of officially recognized tribes and those who do not have official recognition on levels of: cultural identity, social support, social status, and feeling of subjective well-being. This study specifically examined variables related to the perceptions of Black Indians in Louisiana to see if this group perceives themselves to be Black, Indian or both. These findings of this study are especially important in that they may provide a more comprehensive description and analysis of the experiences of this population.

The independent variables in this study were categorized into two empirically and conceptually based variable groupings: demographic characteristics and tribal designation. Black Indians in this study were described according to these two variable groupings.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings, conclusions, implications, and limitations of this research.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables explored in this study included: (a) tribal designation either as recognized or non-recognized, (b) gender, (c) income, (d) age, and (e) educational level. The demographic data showed that half of the study participants were from officially recognized tribes (n= 30, 50%) and the other from non-recognized tribal groups (n=30, 50%). The gender of the participants was split proportionally (n = 32

males or 53.3%, and $n = 28$ females or 46.7%). The age range of the sixty participants was from age nineteen to age seventy-four with the mean age being 40.53 ($SD = 14.96$). The largest number of the participants were those with high school diplomas ($n = 27$), representing nearly one-half (45%) of the sample. Nineteen (31.7%) of the participants reported annual incomes of less than \$25,000, nineteen (31.7%) reported annual incomes between \$25,000 and \$50,000, and thirteen (21.6%) reported annual income of \$50,000 or above. The general profile of the participant in this study is a 40 year-old male, who hold less than a college degree, and has less than \$50,000 in annual income.

In addition to descriptive analyses, demographic variables were further examined to determine if associations existed between demographic variables and the tribal designation of the samples in the study. Differences did emerge with respect to income, age, and tribal designation. A chi-square test of independence was used to test whether the variable income and recognition were independent of each other in this study. The obtained ($X^2_{(1, n = 42)} = 7.46, p = < .01$), was significant, indicating that a relationship did exist between the two variables. For example, with reported income, 3.3% ($n = 2$) of the recognized samples fell below the poverty threshold of an annual income of \$16,000. 33.3% ($n = 10$) of the non-recognized samples reported annual incomes below \$16,000. Some recognized tribes own gambling casinos. For those who do, each tribal member get a share of the casino's profits, even the children in the tribe. The income from these profits can be substantial.

Age, although not significantly different at the .05 alpha level, did have a significance level of .056. The mean age for the recognized samples was 35.86 ($SD = 12.68$). The mean age for the non-recognized samples was 45.20 ($SD = 15.79$).

Ethnic Identity

The second objective in the study was to describe Black Indians on levels of Native American identity and African American identity. The participants were selected randomly as to which identity was measured first (Native or African American). Twenty-nine (48.3%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “African American” identity first. Thirty-one (51.7%) of the respondents were randomly selected to be given the instrument measuring their “Native” identity first. The scoring range for the African American identity was 17.0 to 48.0 with a mean score of 37.78 ($SD = 7.02$). The scoring range for the Native identity was likewise 17.0 to 48.0 but with a mean score of 40.03 ($SD = 6.83$).

Of the five items for ethnic identity (African American), the items with which the participants most strongly agreed were: (a) “I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special foods, music, or customs” ($M = 3.15$); (b) “I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly member of my own ethnic group” ($M = 3.13$); and (c) “In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group” ($M = 2.71$). Of the seven items measuring “affirmation, belonging, and commitment” (African American), the items participants most strongly agreed with were: (a) “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me” ($M = 3.40$); (b) “I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to” ($M = 3.40$); and (c) “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” ($M = 3.36$).

For the five items measuring ethnic identity (Indian), the items participants most strongly agreed with were: (a) “I participate in cultural practices of my group, such as music, food, and customs” ($M = 3.30$); (b) “I talk to other people to learn more about my

ethnic group” ($M = 3.16$); and (c) “Spent time finding out history, traditions, customs” ($M = 3.13$). The items measuring “affirmation, belonging, and commitment” (Indian) participants most strongly agreed with were: (a) “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” ($M = 3.70$); (b) “Happy about belonging to my ethnic group” ($M = 3.60$); and (c) “I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background” ($M = 3.58$).

The item measuring ethnic identity, “I participate in cultural practices of my group, such as music, food, and customs”, was the strongest response for both the African American and Native American identity measures for the participants. Likewise, the items measuring affirmation, belonging, and commitment, “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” and “I am happy about belonging to my ethnic group” was strongest in both African American and Indian identity measures. This, perhaps, is an indication of the participants’ ability to identify with, and be actively part of, both an African American and Native American culture.

When ethnic identity for both African American and Native American scores were measured from within the non-recognized and recognized group, the findings were statistically significant. The results showed that the recognized group had mean scores for their Native identity of 41.80 ($SD = 8.10$) and a mean African American identity score of 35.13 ($SD = 7.83$) ($t = -5.11, p < .01$). This finding reveal that recognized Black Indians in this research study had significantly higher levels of Native American identity when compared to their levels of African American identity. The non-recognized samples had mean scores for their Native identity of 38.26 ($SD = 4.77$) and a mean African American score of 40.43 ($SD = 4.95$) ($t = 1.90, p = .342$). These scores revealed that there were no significant differences in the levels of Native American identity when

compared with the African American identity among the non-recognized samples. Results of the comparison of the mean scores between the two groups also proved significant. Recognized tribal members had a mean score of 16.30 (SD = 3.79) compared with the non-recognized mean score of 14.40 (SD = 2.45) ($t = 2.30, p < .05$) for Native identity. The result of the comparison of the mean scores for Black identity also proved statistically significant. Test results show that the recognized samples had a mean score of 13.33 (SD = 3.74) compared with the non-recognized mean score of 15.63 (SD = 2.49) ($t = -2.79, p < .01$). These findings reveals the Black Indians in recognized tribes have higher levels of Native identity and lower level of African American identity than do those Black Indians in non-recognized tribal communities. In addition, the Black Indians in recognized tribes consider themselves to be more Indian than Black. Also, as a result of this research study finding, Black Indians in non-recognized communities consider themselves to be both Native and African American. Therefore, the findings in this study support the hypothesis that Black Indians in recognized tribes will have higher levels of Native identity, and see themselves to be more Indian, than Black Indians in non-recognized tribes. Since Black Indians are considered, at best, to be mixed Indians, it is speculative to assume that the reason why recognized Black Indians have higher levels of Indian identity is associated with the benefits recognition provides for tribal members (i.e., health care services, educational services, and other social services). It cannot be known whether these types of services offer incentives to identifying more as an Indian than would be if these services were not provided unless other research is done. However, the literature does support the theory that those Indians who live on reservations, and who continuously have life experiences immersed in Indian culture,

have higher ethnic Identity than those Indians who live off reservations, especially when compared to those Indians living in urban areas (see Peroff & Wildcat, 2002).

Well-Being (Life Satisfaction and Social Status)

Life satisfaction is one factor in the more general construct of subjective well-being. In the hypothesized relationship between life satisfaction and tribal designation, tribal recognition seemed to not have an influence. The hypothesis that Black Indians who were members of recognized tribes would have higher levels of life satisfaction than those members in non-recognized groups was rejected. The findings for this objective revealed that, as an overall group, the participants in this study were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their life. The assumption behind self-reports of subjective well-being is that the respondent is in a privileged position to report his or her experience of well-being (Diener, 1984). Of the five life satisfaction items used in the study, the item, which the participants most strongly agreed with, was “I am satisfied with my life” ($M = 5.76$). When the recognized participants were compared with the non-recognized participants in the study, tests found no significant differences between the two groups in life satisfaction ($t_{(108)} = .58, p = .189$). This point is especially interesting in light of the fact that several Black Indians in the non-recognized tribes were actively seeking official recognition at the time of this study. Their experiences included many situations of frustration and perceived discrimination, which would seem to reduce life satisfaction, yet there were no differences when compared to members in officially recognized tribes. Research literature suggests that there are several cultural traditions and customs that might influence life satisfaction despite trying external life situations (Light & Martin, 1996; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990; Ellison, 1994; Koenig, 1994; Lewis, 1994; St. George &

McNamara, 1984; Thomas & Holmes, 1992; Heisel & Faulkner, 1982; Coke, 1992). The central unit of both African American and Indian society is the family and religious practices. The reliance on church and family to provide comfort in times of trouble can have meaningful influences on life satisfaction. Several researchers (e.g., Campbell et al. 1976; George 1981) have noted that perceptions of satisfaction are based on cognitive assessments of life situations rather than affective ones.

Social status among the participants in this study showed a scoring range of 1 to 11 with a mean score of 6.91 (SD = 2.09) for the community ladder. For the “United States” ladder, the scoring range was 1 to 11 with a mean score of 6.20 (SD = 2.05). Higher scores indicate that participants in the study had perceptions of higher social status. When the recognized group was compared with the non-recognized participants, the test used in the analysis revealed no significant difference in social status among Black Indians in recognized groups and non-recognized groups in how they saw their position in the United States ($t_{-,124} = 58, p .652$). Perhaps this is reflective of the fact that both African Americans and Indians are historically oppressed and marginalized groups in America and have consistently struggled for social justice. Their view on their position in their respective communities differs between the two groups ($t_{-1.17} = 58, p .083$). This would not prove statistically significant at the .05 p level, but would demonstrate significance at the .10 p level. This difference revealed that Black Indians in non-recognized groups had higher level of perceived social status, with a mean score of 7.23 (SD = 1.73), than did the recognized group with a mean score of 6.60 (SD = 2.38). Perhaps this difference is representative of the hierarchical social structure found in officially recognized tribes (i.e., tribal chiefs, tribal counsels, etc.) as well as present day

relationships between African American and Native Americans. Findings support the conclusion that the group of Black Indians who do not have official tribal recognition, and thus who have a stronger African American identity, see themselves as having higher social status than recognized Black Indians who are more likely to have a stronger Indian identity. This is compatible with previous findings that Indians have lower self-esteem when compared to other groups often resulting from the historical traumas that Native Americans have endured in this country (see Hogan & Siu, 1988; MacEachron, Gustavsson, Cross, & Lewis, 1996; Mannes, 1995; Wares, Wedel, Rosenthal, & Dobrec, 1994; Weaver & White, 1999; May, 1988; Parker, 1994; Stillman, 1992; Wuest, 1991; Little Eagle, 1993; Stillman, 1992; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993). This finding in the study rejects the hypothesis that Black Indians in recognized tribes will have higher levels of social status than Black Indians in non-recognized groups.

The test procedure used in the study to test the hypothesis that social support would be higher for the recognized participants than for the non-recognized participants revealed no differences between the two groups for any of the sub scales for support from family or support from friends. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Both the recognized and non-recognized had higher mean scores for family support than support from friends. This finding is compatible with the research in the literature in the fact that both African Americans and Native Americans rely on the family for support. Often, for minorities, the family is a critical part of the nurturing environment. Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman (1997) discusses the family and the larger community. The family represents the “nurturing environment” and the larger community is the “sustaining environment.” They contend that the nurturing environment provide features such as belonging from

family and friends. The sustaining environment contains social systems that provide for survival needs (i.e., employment, education, health care, etc.). A minority group may have a strong nurturing environment in family, friends, and even a neighborhood that provide them with emotional strength. However, the larger sustaining environment may not be supportive or consistent because of prejudice, discrimination, and less than equal treatment (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 1997).

Qualitative Findings

This qualitative component of the study, using a narrative research approach, explored the subjective experiences of growing up with a dual ethnicity. The purpose of the study was to examine identity formation in Black Indians from the point of view of the individual and to understand what factors affected the process for each individual. The stories the six participants told about their racial identity was analyzed in two ways: to identify dominant themes across narratives and to assess the coherence of each individual's narrative as an indication of self-cohesion. Three dominant themes were identified from the narratives. Each of them was dynamic and represented a range of responses by the participants. The first theme described the attempts at blending their dual heritage and the racial dissonance that was generally felt. The second theme described how the participants dealt internally with experiences of difference from others and overt discrimination. The third theme described the diversity in the lives of the participants, who learn to navigate two cultures and the marginalization that they sometimes experienced.

Qualitative analysis can provide information that complements the quantitative findings by expanding our understanding of the relationship between certain variables

and outcomes. Statistical analysis of the quantitative data revealed that tribal designation has a relationship with the level of Native American identity. However, the participants in this study, who agreed to qualitative interviews, shared similar life experiences regardless of tribal designation. Many of these experiences centered on the challenges of having a dual ethnicity and the marginalization and racism that often accompany it. Often, this marginalization and perceived racism came from both the dominant and other minority groups. This finding is consistent with research literature on the formulation of bi-racial identity (see Root, 1992; Davis, 1991; Phinney & Alipuria, 1996). A majority of the participants in this qualitative study, regardless of tribal designation, reported that they felt marginalized in expressing their Native American heritage. Many reported that they were forced into a single racial category that was usually African American. This finding is also consistent with the literature research. Many African Americans fear that persons who want to affirm their European, Native American, or Asian roots want to deny their African ancestry (Bates, 1993: 38-39). There is also a fear by many African Americans that whites, who support a movement of multiracial identity, want to divide the Black community, reduce African Americans numbers, and undermine affirmative action and other civil rights remedies (Daniel, 1992). Also, as a point of interest, is the contention of the “one-drop” rule that marginalize African Americans into a single racial category and restrict their ability to self-identify. Native Americans with some African ancestry generally try to avoid the one-drop rule, usually by staying on a reservation (Bennett, 1962). Those who leave the reservation are often treated as Blacks. This one-drop rule affects African Americans perhaps more than any other racial group and this rule is unique to the United States, reflecting our history of slavery and segregation

(Williamson, 1980). This sentiment was reflected in some of the narratives given by the participants:

Cookie: When I was growing up...it was troublesome for me to be labeled and categorized as 'Black.' I had always been close to both my parents, so to deny the existence of one side my heritage by putting on a piece of paper saying I was 'Black' seemed wrong. This seemed incomplete. To me, I was not only Black, I was both Black and Indian.

Vivian: It boils down to the color of your skin. Blacks were on the 'Trail of Tears'. But you don't read that in any history books. It's as if everyone thinks that Africans have been isolated from all other gene pools since coming to North America. I frequently hear white people say that... 'oh, my grandmother was part Cherokee'...or 'my grandfather was part Apache.' No one questions that. And, I'm not saying that they are not telling the truth. They probably are. But if a person say that I'm Choctaw...or, part Choctaw...and their skin it too dark...then, the common assumption is that you are simply Black and nothing else.

The ambiguity of the racial identity of African American leads to everyday strains and embarrassments, traumatic experiences, and sometimes to deep dilemmas of identity (Russell, et.al, 1992).

This study showed that the participants, regardless of tribal designation, shared a strong connection with Native American customs, traditions, and practices. This finding in the study is consistent with Davis' (1990) objective dimension of ethnic identity. The participants reported participating in both Native American and African American ethnic networks and formal organizations. In addition, subjective dimension of Native identity was revealed. This was demonstrated by their acknowledgment of emotions, feelings, and attitudes in association with their dual ethnicity despite the hardships that sometimes were endured.

There was a shared commitment by the participants in the qualitative study, regardless of tribal designation, aimed at passing Native traditions and customs to the next generation. This was done primarily through observing and participating in Native

cultural practices with all family members. In addition, all of the participants pass on folklore to their children that were passed to them by their elders. All shared stories of home remedies, food preparations, knowledge of herbal medicine, and a few words from Native languages.

The Bureau of Indians Affairs (BIA) was on particular concern for some of the non-recognized samples in the qualitative study. The BIA promotes agricultural and economic development for recognized tribes. It also provides for health care services, social services, and education. These are considered to be highly valuable services that are very beneficial to recognized tribes. The BIA is not obligated to provide any of these services for non-recognized tribal groups. Petitioning for official recognition is often a highly political and controversial matter. State recognition of tribes is left to the discretion of the state legislature. Vying for federal recognition is very difficult as well. Many participants in the non-recognized sample indicated that their tribal members, and their children, needed the services offered by the BIA. However, because of their non-recognized status, they are not eligible for those services.

This study found that although the participants were from both recognized and non-recognized tribes, they all shared similar life experiences in having a dual ethnicity label. Analysis of coherence of each story revealed that

Implications for Social Work Practice

Earlier in this paper it was proposed that variables associated with tribal designation derive from many aspects of the person-environment experience, including the research participants' tribal group membership, levels of Native American identity, subjective well-being, social status, and social support. The results of this study support

the existence of links between demographic characteristics, income, tribal designation, and levels of Native American identity compared with levels of African American identity. The findings in this research study is consistent with the strengths perspective and identity formation theories which underlie social work thought and practice and have particular relevance for social workers in settings which provide services to minority clients with a dual ethnicity.

Social work practice maybe vulnerable to certain fallacies when it comes to assessments, interventions, and evaluations of services with minority clients. For example, the use of racial categories is highly variable and arbitrary, reflecting historical precedent, law, politics, ancestry, emotions, racial physiognomy, and socioeconomic status (Beutler, et al., 1996; Zuckerman, 1990). Many in the general public appear to believe the U.S. citizens primarily comprise five racial groups (sometimes referred to as Whites, Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, and Asians). However, none of these attempts at labeling or categorizing racial groups have any clear and consistent meaning, and in general, fail to even consider those who have dual ethnicity. Our social systems created these artificial categories to separate and deny opportunity and to limit by saying ‘we know what you are like, so we don’t have to look at individuality.’ We limit in our educational systems, health care systems, judicial systems, and virtually every institutional system in our society. This labeling and categorizing of groups have profound impact on our sense of national identity and purpose, and on our views of who should be included and who excluded from living among us as equals. The role of social workers is to break down binary thinking that leads us to force clients into single categories that engulf them in an ethnic role (Fong, Spickard & Ewalt, 1995). The

findings in this research study, as well as other studies, about ethnicity provide important information for social work practice by revealing that cultural background influences the way clients identify problems, and how they seek and accept help for those problems. In dealing with authorities and other societal systems, minorities are often forced to see themselves in one category because this is often how our society sees them. However, the findings in this research study demonstrated that they see themselves in multiple categories. Although all groups of color have experienced some form of cultural oppression from the dominant group, this study revealed that they can sometimes experience cultural oppression from within their own minority group by being stigmatized for their desire to claim a dual heritage. This information could prove important in the assessments by social workers of multi-ethnic clients' identity formation.

It is clear that our society is multicultural. The way a person may look phenotypically may not say anything about his or her ethnicity or cultural heritage. It may tell us nothing about this person's relationships, practices, beliefs, values, and experiences in the social environment. This research study disproves several hypotheses, or assumptions, about how a historically oppressed, and often marginalized, group might function in their social environment, or how they might feel about themselves, their position in their society, and the depth of their support systems. Often, we make assumptions, because of group assignment, that are erroneous. When you act upon these faulty assumptions of minorities in social work practice, you will lose the client's trust and confidence. You could cause damage to the client either by commission or omission, and the client may stop trying to work through their situation to gain strength and not turn to anyone else for help. Therefore, it is crucial that social workers have an appreciation

for, and are competent in, cultural diversity. Without it, we increase the likelihood of committing social faux pas and violating cultural norms and/or taboos. We are called to be culturally competent by our professional code of ethics. We should also be called to it by our desire to be effective in our practice with minority clients. As social workers, it is essential that we understand that “effective multicultural practice requires the simultaneously simple and complex activity of putting the client—with all that implies about the particular aspects of the client’s life experience and meaning system—at the center of the helping process (Greene, 1994, p. 17).

An essential ingredient in effective social work practice is to understand the racial and ethnic characteristics of clients (Jacobs & Bowles, 1988). However, it is not enough to have an intellectual understanding of particular characteristics of clients, but the ability to acknowledge their different perceptions and experiences must be incorporated into practice applications. This information must be translated into appropriate and culturally congruent interventions and practice roles (Henderson, 1994).

We make assumptions about groups in terms of their life satisfaction, sense of support, and subjective well-being that are often not true. Those assumptions might arise from a deficit approach to viewing minority populations. Social work practitioners must shift from pathology focused practice to an empowerment based practice when working with historically and contemporarily oppressed groups (Saleeby, 1992). The findings in this dissertation suggest viewing minority groups from the strength perspective approach. Several scholars have presented the process of empowerment as an approach that social workers can engage clients to reduce the powerlessness that has been created by negative valuations based on membership in a specific ethnic or racial group (see Solomon, 1976;

Boyd-Franklin, 1989; Pinderhughes, 1995; Lee, 1994). This dissertation supports this theoretical premise. For example, regardless of income, social status, or tribal designation, the majority of the participants in this research study felt they had support systems firmly in place. From a strength perspective approach, social worker practice would focus on the strengths the clients manifests in his or her life. This is in stark contrast to focusing on problems, pathologies, and deficits in the client and his or her environment. When we as social workers choose to focus on strength, we are in essence taking exception to any role of victim the client may have played until that time; we are attempting to halt the process of victimization. If we over look the strengths of clients in our practice, we are tacitly colluding in that process of victimization.

Practice evaluations with diverse client systems need to determine effective treatment and service delivery models. Assessments with minority populations should involve a “case to cause” perspective. It should involve, both from a historical and contemporary perspective, the world views and life experiences the client brings with them to the evaluation process. If a client is feeling marginalized or discriminated against, as the participants in this research study revealed that they occasionally did, then it is vital for the practitioner to investigate the institutional systems that produce the marginalization of vulnerable groups and advocate changing those systems. Practice should also include models that focus on families, groups, and social justice must incorporate the relevance of ethnicity and recognize the role of power and conflict in relation to ethnicity issues.

In the plan change process, assessment of minority client’s problems should not include assumptions about how race interact with the client’s life experiences. Instead,

race should be explored by social work practitioners by examining the political and economic impact of oppression on client systems. Interventions should involve incorporating all the strengths that the clients bring to the therapeutic process. Policies, practice, program development and implementation, and resource allocation must be evaluated by social work practitioners in terms of their impact on oppression of marginalized and vulnerable groups.

Implications for Social Work Education

In social work education, accreditation standards have mandated supportive content of racial and ethnic groups. Undergraduate and master's level programs have been required to include content on ethnic and racial minorities for the past twenty years (Harrison, Thyer, & Wodarski, 1996). It is incumbent upon social work educators to provide students with the skills needed to interact with individuals from backgrounds different from their own, to show students how they can become, in a sense, anthropologists who learn about the culture of each client they meet (Thornton & Garrett, 1995). All components of social work education should prepare students for the realities of multicultural and multiracial societies. It is clear that social work education should provide innovative means for students to gain experience in working with clients of other cultures and backgrounds. Having students use ethnographic research techniques with classmates and other interviewees in courses on social work practice and human behavior in the social environment helps students gain the knowledge, values, and skills needed for practice with diverse groups. The major strength that will come from this is that it will provide opportunities for students to incorporate knowledge and skills relevant to social work practice through experiential learning.

There have been inroads made in the inclusion of content on minorities into the curricula. The difficulty has been more with the application of this knowledge in the classroom, field instructions, supervision, and agency-based practice (Marshack, Hendricks, & Gladstein, (1994). However, issues pertaining to multiracial and multiethnic groups have not been seriously attempted in social work curricula. In a broader sense, curricula need to incorporate knowledge about identity formation in multi-racial individuals and skills related to assessments and interventions of problems situations they may experience. Specifically, as it relates to Black Indians, the social work curriculum should provide current research information regarding procedures, protocols, and policies associated with tribal designation and the difficulties in having to meet legal requirements necessary to document ancestral heritage and how this lack of designation impacts services delivery programs for this population.

Social work education at the undergraduate level prepares students for generalist practice with micro, mezzo, and macro systems. It prepares graduate social work students for advance and/or specialized practice which are also grounded in the person-environment perspective. In teaching assessment of multi-cultural issues, student should be exposed to a curriculum that is specific to the indigenous tribe for their state. The diversity of Native people and cultural values of Native people, although helpful as an introductory source, are presently too general. More emphasis on cultural specific curricula items is needed. For example, the rituals of encounters, in terms of gift giving, which is important in Native culture, should be emphasized. The curricula on the demographics of Native people should not only focus heavily on pathological areas (i.e., rates of substance abuse, poverty levels, illiteracy rates, etc.) but should give more

emphasis on the strengths of this group (i.e., increase in population rates, the resiliency of this group, etc.).

Students also have to be made aware of issues of oppression and how this is interwoven in a client's worldview and life experiences. This is especially relevant to vulnerable populations like African Americans and Native Americans. The social work curriculum must cover the pain and suffering of Native Americans that result from policy (i.e., boarding schools) and the impact of these policies on Native identity and family life (i.e., the loss of language, the loss of spiritual practices, sexual abuse issues, and other stress related issues). Also, issues related to Indian women should be included in the curriculum. For example, the dominant traditional roles of Indian women in matrilineal cultural societies. Students also need to be taught of other issues pertaining to Indian women. For example, their rape and assault rates as well as their intimate partner violence rates, are substantially high when compared with African American and Hispanic women.

The social work curricula should also include infusions of tribal sovereignty rights and sovereignty issues. Particularly since this relates to legal restitutions and definitions of who is and who is not an Indian. Also of importance is the portrayal of Native Americans in the media which depict stereotypical images. Oppressed minorities often exclaim their resentment about their inability to control their images in the media (see, e.g., Wilson, 1987; Hacker, 1992; Jhally & Lewis, 1992). More positive and appropriate images are necessary. Student should be exposed to films that would help them develop higher levels of analysis pertaining to cultural images of Indians. Films such as "Whale Rider", "Rabbit Proof Fence", and "Where the Spirit Lives" are good

films that would help students develop better and more accurate images of Native American culture.

Research is another area of importance for social work education. Research done on minorities by the dominant group has a history of being harmful. The Tuskegee study serves as but one example. In this study, African American men were deliberately infected with syphilis to study the effects of this disease when left untreated. Because of this, many minority groups distrust researcher who would study them. Therefore, the research curriculum in social work education should include issues pertaining specifically to research done with minority groups. For example, research done with Native American should consider Native protocol and should include Native's input on how the study is being conducted. Also, the research should have value for, and contribute to, the Native community.

Finally, the social work curricula should strengthen its emphasis on knowledge building for student in multicultural issues. Students should be challenged to look within themselves and ask themselves what their cultural assumptions are and how these assumptions affect their worldviews and behavior. Field placement should be an avenue for exposure to different fields of practices serving multicultural clients. The curricula should continually instill in students the values of promoting social and economic justice by advocating for vulnerable groups. It should be the value base of the profession, instilling the knowledge and skill necessary for students to analyze social policy in order to understand their effects on minority clients, and to advocate for policy changes when necessary.

Limitations of the Study

This research has some limitations. First, the study relies exclusively on self-report scales, which is vulnerable to various measurement errors. Secondly, the quantitative study is based on a limited sample size. Therefore, the sampling used in this study is not an all-encompassing comprehensive assemblage of the total possible population of Black Indians. This research was limited by the availability of samples who were: (a) met the Black criterion, (b) willing to participate in the study, and (c) met the age requirements for the study. While this sample size represents the universe of Black Indians in the state of Louisiana, a sample of sixty maybe considered small and not have the same generalizability for research studies done with a larger number of participants. Although the numbers of African Americans who admit to a Native American ancestry are substantial, those meeting the Black Indian criterion used in this study were limited. According to Rubin & Babbie (2001) the sample size used in this study is large enough to detect medium to large effect sizes. However, the possibility of making a Type II error for a small effect size of .10 or less is above the suggested 20 percent level. The possibility exists, therefore, that variables that were found to be non-significant in the analysis might, in fact, be statistically related to the dependent variables in the study, but this was not found because of the small sample size.

The issue of self-definition is of paramount concern. Historical and present day problems make it difficult for Black families to research their Native genealogy. A bipolar racial system that was designed primarily to maintain the purity of the white race presents challenges for doing this type of research. One historical problem is the historical practice of “pencil genocide” that was done with many birth records for Black

Indians, which makes verification of blood quantum difficult for them. Also at issue are tribal rights of sovereignty and their right to determine who are (and who are not) their members. All of these factors had an effect on the sample size of this study.

Limitations also exist for the qualitative research. First, the qualitative study was based solely on the experiences of those Black Indians willing to submit to an in-depth interview. The participants were selected more for their willingness to be interviewed than from randomization. If the qualitative participants had been selected truly by random, their stories of life experiences may not have necessarily been as similar and different themes may have surfaced. Because the qualitative analysis was based on a one time in-depth interview, it does not have the ability to judge changes over time.

Another important factor of this research is the geographical area where this study was done, which is the South. The South is distinct due to its economic, political, and social themes. Gastil (1975) stated that race consciousness was one of the most pervasive social themes that gave the South continuity and unity in the Southern heritage. Therefore, the influence of inherent racism presents challenges to this study as well.

An additional limitation includes the selectivity of the sample. The participants in this study are from Louisiana, which is primarily rural; therefore it is not known whether the findings would have generalizability in populations from larger metropolitan areas.

Directions for Future Research

The present study, serving as the first to specifically address issues pertaining to the ethnic identity formation among Black Indians in Louisiana, makes a valuable contribution to the literature by providing information about the variables associated with tribal designation, ethnic identity, subjective well-being, and social support for this

population. As the research information on this issue is limited, additional research needs to be completed to identify other variables of consideration and to assess whether the current research findings are consistently present.

The findings of this study speak to the complexity of ethnic and cultural identity, and provide direction for future research. It does not provide a definitive answer as to how identity is formulated among individual with a dual ethnic culture, nor does it answers the reasons why one may lean stronger towards one culture over the next. Rather, it suggests that the relationship between these two experiences is complex and multi-faceted, requiring multiple methods of assessment.

Additional retrospective qualitative research is needed to explore how the process of becoming an official recognized Indian impact ethnic identity among Black Indians. It would be extremely helpful to examine patterns of behavior before becoming officially recognized then compared with patterns of behaviors after recognition was granted. For example, what were there reference group before and after recognition? What were the roles of dating, partnering, and spouse selection? Obtaining this information would require more time ordering method of qualitative data collection employed within a longitudinal panel design. Data collection strategies such as life history calendars, which plot out several concurrent events over time, may be effective in providing a rich level of data needed to answer these questions. This richness and depth of detail would be important for clinicians working with multicultural clients.

Additional research is also needed which would study a much larger sample of Black Indians, which could be compared by geographical regions. Data collection from recognized and non-recognized tribes and communities from the south east region of the

country could be compared with recognized and non-recognized tribes and communities from the south west in order to see if the findings would be consistent with the finding of this present study. A larger sample of Black Indians would provide a much deeper exploration of the interaction effects between the independent variables that were examined in this study.

Finally, this present study may have been better served if done solely qualitatively. In qualitative research, Black Indians could provide a wealth of information about the influences that impact their identity formation. Kazdin (1998) suggest that qualitative research can “elaborate causal relations and path during the course of their development” (p.260), providing a deeper understanding that is sometimes lacking in quantitative research. Since a large percentage of the American Indian population are considered to be mixed-bloods, quantitative research could provide information that would help us determine if identity formation occurs similarly among all Indian mixed groups, or if there are differences which may be associated with the type of group mixture involved. In other words, would levels of identity between groups with African and Indian ancestry be similar when compared to groups with Indian and Asian ancestry? Qualitative research could provide additional information in the development of these identities.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D.W. (1997). Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Asher, S. (1969). Racial preference and social comparison processes. *Journal of Sociology* 25, 157-166.
- Ausubel, D. (1959). Ego development among segregated negro children. *Mental Hygiene*, 42, 362-369.
- Alexander, G. (1979). *The black experience*. Unpublished document. Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Baldwin, J. (1991, October). *An afrocentric perspective on health and social behavior of African american males. Presented at the national conference on health and social behavior of Africa american males*. Institute for urban affairs and research. Washington, DC
- Baldwin, J. & Bell, Y.R. (1985). The african self-consciousness scale: an afrocentric personality questionnaire. *Western journal of black studies*, 9, pp. 61 - 68.
- Ball, B. (1984). *The Mulungeons: Notes on the Origin of a Race*. Overmountain Press. 1984.
- Barrera, T., & Ainley, R.M. (1983). Defining health and well-being for the future of counseling psychology. *Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 743 – 750.
- Bates, K.G. (1993). "Color Complexity." *Emerge Magazine*. June: 38-39.
- Bennett, L. (1962). *Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America, 1619-1962*. Chicago: Johnson Publishing.
- Benson, P. & Donahue, M. (1989). "Ten Year Trends in At-Risk Behaviors." *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 4, (April): 125-139.
- Benson, P. & Roehlkepartain, E.C. (1993). Youth in Single-Parent Families: Risk and Resiliency. *Search Institute Background Paper*, July.
- Berlin, I., & Rowland, L.S. (1997). *Families and freedom: A documentary history of African-American kinship in the Civil War era*. New York: The New Press.
- Betancourt, H., & Lopez, S.R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity and race in american psychology. *American Psychologist*, 28, 629-637.

- Beutler, L.E., Brown, M.T., Crothers, L., Booker, K., & Seabrook, M.K. (1996). The dilemma of factitious demographic distinctions in psychological research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 892-902.
- Billingsley, A. (1968). *Black families in white America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Billingsley, A. (1997). *One more river to cross: The Black church as an agent of social reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Billingsley, A., & Caldwell, C. (1991). The church, the family, and the school in the African-American Community. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60 (3): 427-440.
- Blassingame, J. (1972). *The slave community in the antebellum south*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blu, K.I. (1980). *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bowles, D. (1993). Development of an ethnic self-concept among blacks. In C. Jacobs and D. Bowles (Eds.). *Ethnicity and race: Critical concepts in social work*. Maryland: NASW.
- Boyd-Franklin, N. (1989). *Black families in therapy*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brisbane, F.L. (1992). *Working with African Americans*. Illinois, HRDI International Press.
- Brody, E. (1963). Color and identity—conflict in young boys. *Archival General Psychology*, 10, 909-925.
- Brookings Institute. (1971). *The problem of Indian administration*. Institute for Government Research. New York: Johnson Reprint.
- Brown, M.T., & Pinterits, J. (1998). Basic issues in the career counseling of African Americans. In W.B. Walsh, S.H. Osipow, R.P. Bingham, M.T. Brown, & C.M. Ward (Eds.), *Career counseling for African Americans*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brown, S.D., Ryan, N.E., & McPartland, E.B. (1996, October). Why are so many people happy and what do we do for those who aren't? A reaction to Lightsey (1996). *The Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 751 – 757.
- Bryde, J.F. (1971). *Indian students and guidance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Burnette, D. (1994). Managing chronic illness alone in late life: Sisyphus at Work. In C. Reissman (ed.), *Qualitative Studies in Social Work Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Caldwell, C.H., Green, A.D., & Billingsley, A. (1992). The black church as a family support system: Instrumental and expressive functions. *National Journal of Sociology*, 6, 21-40.
- Cambell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rogers, L. (1976). *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cameron, S.C., & Turtle-Song, I. (2003). Native American mental health: An examination of resiliency in the face of overwhelming odds. In F.D. Harper & J. McFadden (Eds.), *Culture and Counseling: New Approaches*, Pearson Education Inc.
- Canby, W.C. (1998). *American Indian law in a nutshell* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Group.
- Cantor, N., & Sanderson, C.A. (1999). Life task participation and well-being: The importance of taking part in daily life. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. New York: Russell-Sage.
- Carter, R.T. (1995). *The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racially inclusive model*. New York: Wiley Press.
- Carter, R.T. (1997). Is white a race? Expressions of white racial identity. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L.C. Powell, & L.M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 198-209). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., Menozzi, P., & Piazza, A. (1994). *The history and geography of human genes*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chambers, J.W., Jr., Kambon, K., Birdsong, B.D., Brown, J., Dixon, P., & Robbins-Brinson, L. (1998). Afrocentric cultural identity and the stress experience of african american college students. *Journal of black psychology*, 24, pp. 368 - 396.
- Chau, K. (ed.) (1990). *Ethnicity and Biculturalism: Emerging Perspective of Social Group Work*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Chestang, L. (1972). Character development in a hostile environment. *Social Work* 17, 100-105.

- Chestang, L. (1976). *Environmental Influences on Social Functioning: The Black Experience*. Washington, DC
- Chow, E. N. (1996). Introduction: Transforming knowledgement: Race, class and gender. In E.N. Chow, D. Wilkinson, & M. B. Zinn (Eds.), *Race, class and gender: Common bonds, different voices* (pp. xix - 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, K. & Clark, M. (1947). Racial identification and preference in negro children. In T. Newcomb and E. Hartley (Eds.). *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt Press.
- Coggins, K. (1991). *Cultural considerations in social program planning among American Indians*. Unpublished manuscript, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Coggins, K. (1990). *Alternative pathways to healing: The recovery medicine wheel*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications.
- Coke, M.M. (1992). Correlates of life satisfaction among elderly African Americans. *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, 47, 316-320.
- Comas-Diaz, L., & Greene, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Cooper, M.L. (1999). *Indian school: Teaching the White man's way*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cox, E.O. (1989). *Empowerment of the Low Income Elderly Through Group Work*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Cross, W.E., Jr. (1971). The negro to black conversion experience. *Black world*. 20, pp. 13 - 27.
- Cross, W.E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cross, W.E. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, J.L. (1997). Colored existence: racial identity formation in light-skinned blacks. *Smith College studies in social work*, 67, pp. 375 - 400.

- Daniel, G. Reginald (1992). *Racially Mixed People in America*. Sage Publication, Newbury Park, California.
- Davis, J. (1991). Strategies for coping with cultural diversity. *Counseling Psychologist*, 23, 722- 740.
- Davis, L.E. (1986). *Ethnicity in Social Group Work Practice*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Deloria, V. (1985). *American Indian policy in the 20th century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Deloria, V. (1997). *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*. Fulcrum Publishing, Golden Colorado.
- Deloria, V. (1973). God is Red. New York: Grosset. In N.C. Peroff and D.R. Wildcat (Eds.), Who is an American Indian? *The Social Science Journal*, 39 (3), 349 – 361.
- Deloria, V., & Lytle, C.M. (1983). *American Indians, American Justice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Devore, W., & Schlesinger, E. (1991). *Ethnic Sensitive Social Work Practice*. (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Diener, E. (1996). Traits can be powerful, but are not enough: Lessons from subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30, 389 – 399.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542 – 575.
- Diener, E., & Lucas, R.E. (1999). Personality and subjective well-being. *Psychology Bulletin*, 95, 213 – 229.
- Dodson, J. (1981). Conceptualization of black families. In H. McAdoo (ed.). *Black Families*. 19-36.
- Dukes, R.L., & Martinez, R.O. (1997). The effects of ethnic identity, ethnicity, and gender on adolescent well-being. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 26(5), 503-516.
- Ellison, C.G. (1994). Religion, the life stress paradigm, and the study of depression. In J.S. Levin (ed.), *Religion in Aging and Health: Theoretical foundation and methodological frontiers*, (pp. 78-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellison, C.G. (1992). Are religious people nice people? Evidence from the national survey of black Americans. *Social Forces*, 71, 1027-1055.

- Emmons, R.A. (1996). Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1058 – 1068.
- English, R. (1984, Nov.). *The challenge for mental health: Minorities and their worldviews*. Paper presented at the second annual Robert L. Sutherland lecture, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.
- Fleming, C.M. (1992). American Indians and Alaskan Natives: Changing Societies Past and Present. In M.A. Orlandi, R. Weston, & L.G. Epstein (Eds.), *Cultural competence for evaluators: A guide for alcohol and other drug abuse prevention practitioners working with ethnic/racial communities. (OSAP cultural competence series 1* (pp. 147-171). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Foner, E. & Mahoney, O. (1995). *America's reconstruction: People and politics after the Civil War*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Fong, R., Spickard, P.R., & Ewalt, P.L. (1995). A multiracial reality: Issues for social work. *Social Work* 40 (6), 725-728.
- Forbes, Jack D. (1993). *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black People*. Illinois Press University of Illinois.
- Fouad, N.A., & Brown, M.T. (2000). Role of race and social class in development: implication for counseling psychology. *Counseling Psychology* (3rd ed.), John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Frazier, E.F. (1969). *The negro family in the United States*. (rev. ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- French, L., & Hornbuckle, J. (1980). Alcoholism among Native Americans: An analysis. *Social Work*, 25, 275-280.
- Furstenberg, F., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Morgan, S.P. (1987). *Adolescent mothers in later life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- George, L.K. (1992). *Social Factors and the onset and outcomes of depression*. In *Aging, health behaviors, and health outcomes*, edited by K. Warner Schaie, J.S. House, and D.G. Blazer, 137-159. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Glazer, N. & Moynihan, D.P. (1963). *Beyond the melting pot. The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, M.I.T Press.

- Gottlieb, W. (1983). Sex difference in social support and positive well-being: A consideration of emotional styles and marital status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 329 – 264.
- Gregory, H.F. (1987). Pieces and Patches—A Whole from Many Parts. *Splittin' on the Grain, Louisiana Folklife*, 8(1), 9 –11.
- Green, J.W. (1995). *Cultural awareness in the human services*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Greenbaum, S. (1991). What's in a Label? Identity Problems of Southern Indian Tribes. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 19 (2), Summer 1991, 107 – 126.
- Greene, R.R. (Ed.). (1994). *Human behavior theory: A diversity framework*. New York: Aldine DeGruyter Publisher.
- Grenier, Richard (1997). Black Indians: an American Legacy. *The Washington Times*. February 27, 1997. Washington, DC.
- Hacker, A. (1992). *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. New York: Scribner.
- Haley, A. (1976). *Roots: The Saga of an American family*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, R.L. (1986). Alcohol treatment in American Indian populations: An indigenous treatment modality compared with traditional approaches. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 472, 168-178.
- Hamley, J.L. (1994). *Cultural genocide in the classroom: A history of the federal boarding school movement in American Indian education, 1875-1920*. A dissertation. Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Harlow, R.E., & Cantor, N. (1996). Still participating after all these years: A study of life task participation in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1235 – 1249.
- Harris, F.E. (1993). *Ministry for Social Crisis: Theology and Praxis in the Black Church Tradition*. Macon GA: Mercer University Press.
- Harrison, D.F., Thyer, B.A., Wodarski, J.S. (1996). *Cultural Diversity and Social Work Practice (2nd Ed.)*. Charles C. Thomas Publisher, LTD, Springfield, Il.
- Hatch, L.R. (1991). Informal support patterns of older African American and white women. *Research on Aging*, 13, 144-170.

- Haynes, J. (1997). *An oral history of the social construction of Cherokee identity*. A dissertation. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Heisel, M.A., & Faulkner, A.O. (1982). Religiosity in an older black population. *The Gerontologist*, 22, 354-358.
- Helms, J.E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J.E. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity and other “racial” constructs. In E.J. Trickett, R.J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 285-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Helms, J.E. (1995). An update of Helm’s white and people of color model racial identity models. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J.E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G.R. Sodowsky & J.C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Helms, J.E. & Cook, D.A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Henderson, G. (1994). *Social Work interventions: Helping people of color*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publisher.
- Herrnstein, R.J. & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Herskovits, M. (1968). *The myth of the Negro past*. Boston, MA: Bacon Hill Press.
- Hill, R. (1972). *Strengths of black families*. New York: Emerson Hall.
- Hill, R. (1998). Enhancing the resilience of African American families. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 1 (2/3).
- Hogan, P.T., & Siu, S. (1988). Minority children and the child welfare system. *Journal of Social Work*, 33, 493-498.
- Horejsi, C., Craig, B.H., & Pablo, J. (1992). Reactions by Native American parents to child protections agencies: Cultural and community factors. *Child Welfare*, 71, 329-342.
- Huston, L.N. (1984). Black consciousness and self-esteem. *The Journal of Black Psychology*, II, 1 – 7.

- Ing, N.R. (1992). The effects of residential schools on Native child-rearing practices. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 18, 65-118.
- Ingham, J. M. (1996). *Psychological anthropology reconsidered*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, C.C., & Neville, H.A. (1998). Influence of racial identity attitudes on African American college students' vocational identity and hope. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 53, pp. 97 - 113.
- Jacobs, C., & Bowles, D. (1988). *Ethnicity and race: Critical concepts in social work*. Silver Spring, MD: *National Association of Social Workers*.
- Jensen, A.R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 1-123.
- Jhally, S., & Lewis, J. (1992). *Enlighten Racism: The Cosby Show, Audience, and the Myth of the American Dream*. Boulder, CO: Westview Publisher.
- Jones, S.R. (1997). Voices of identity and difference: a qualitative exploration of the multiple dimensions of identity development in women college students. *Journal of college student developments*, 38, pp. 376 - 386.
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (1999). *Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kanuha, V. (1990). Compounding the triple jeopardy: Battering in lesbian or color relationships. *Women and Therapy*, 9 (1/2), 169-184.
- Kaplan, R.M., Sieber, W.J., & Ganiats, T.G. (1977). The Quality of Well-Being Scale: Comparison of the interviewer-administered version with a self-administered questionnaire. *Psychology and Health*, 12, 783 – 791.
- Kardiner, A. & Ovesey, L. (1951). *The mark of oppression*. Cleveland, OH: World Press.
- Katz, William L. (1986). *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage*. New York: Atheneum.
- Kazdin, A.E. (1998). *Research design in clinical psychology (3rd ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon. Needham Heights, MA.
- Kerwin, C., Ponterotto, J.C., Jackson, B.L., & Harris, A. (1993). Racial identity in biracial children: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40, 221 – 231.

- Kilpatrick, A. (1995). A note on Cherokee theological concepts. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 19 (June 1995): 394 – 400.
- Kniffen, F.B., Gregory, H.F., & Stokes, G.A. (1987). *The Historical Indian Tribes of Louisiana: From 1542 to the Present*. Louisiana State University Press. Baton Rouge.
- Koenig, H.G. (1994). *Aging and God: Spiritual pathways to mental health in midlife and later years*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Krouse, S.A. (1999). Kinship and identity: Mixed bloods in urban Indian communities. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 23(2), 73-89.
- Ladner, J. (1977). *Mixed families: adapting across racial boundaries*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- LaFromboise, T.D., Choney, S.B., James, A., & Running Wolf, P.R. (1995). American Indian women psychology. In H. Landrine (Ed.), *Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 197-349). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lang, B. (1997). Metaphysical racism. In N. Zack (Ed.), *Race/sex: Their sameness, difference and interplay* (pp. 17-28). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lee, Judith A.B. (1994). *The Empowerment Approach to Social Work Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levin, J.S. (1994). Religion and health. *African American Research Perspectives*, 1, 15-21.
- Lincoln, C.E. (1989). *The Black church in the African-American experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lincoln, C.E., & Mamiya, L.H. (1990). *The Black Church in the African-American experience*. NC: Duke University Press.
- Lindhorst, T. (2001). *The effect of domestic violence on welfare use, employment and mental health: A quantitative and qualitative analysis*. A dissertation. Louisiana State University Libraries.
- Little Eagle, A. (1993). Ten years later: Shannon still poorest county in the nation. *Indian Country Today*, p.A5.
- Littlefield, Daniel L. (1980). *The Cherokee Freedmen: From Emancipation to American Citizenship*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Locust, C. (1988). Wounding the spirit: Discrimination and traditional American Indian belief systems. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 315-330.
- Logan, S.L. (1996). *The Black Family*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lum, D. (1986). *Social Work Practice and People of Color*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Lykken, D., & Tellegen, A. (1996). Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science*, 7, 186 – 189.
- MacEachron, A.E., Gustavsson, N.S., Cross, S., & Lewis, A. (1996). The effectiveness of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978. *Social Service Review*, 70, 451-463.
- Mannes, M. (1995). Factors and events leading to the passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act. *Child Welfare*, 74, 264-282.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). A collective fear of the collectives: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 568 – 579.
- Marler, D.C. (1997). *The Louisiana Redbones*. Presented at the first union, a meeting of Melungeons, at Clinch Valley College in Wise, Va. July 1997.
- Marshack, E., Hendricks, O., & Gladstein, M. (1994). The commonality of difference: Teaching about diversity in field instruction. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 3 (1), 77-89.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research (3rd ed.)*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Martin, E. & Martin, J. (1978). *The black extended family*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Martin, Joel (1991). *Sacred Revolt: The Muskogeans Struggle for a New World*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.
- May, P.A. (1988). The health status of Indian children: Problems and prevention in early life. In S.P. Manson & N.G. Dinges (Eds.), Behavioral health issues among American Indians and Alaska Natives: Explorations on the frontiers of the bio-behavioral sciences. *Journal of the National Center Monograph Series*, 1(1), 244-289.
- Mays, Katja (1996). *African American and Native Americans in the Creek and Cherokee Nations, 1830's to 1920's*. Symposium on Indians in the Old South. Athens, GA: Southern Anthropological Society, University of Georgia Press.

- McAdoo, H.P. (Ed.) (1981). *Black Families*. Beverly Hill: Sage Publications.
- McCull, S., & Skinner, S.L. (1988). *Social support and health*. New York: Academic Press.
- McGoldrick, M., Giordano, J., & Pearce, J. (1996). *Ethnicity and family therapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- McLoughlin, William G. (1974). "Red Indians, Black Slavery, and White Racism:" *American Quarterly*, 26 (1974), 367 – 385.
- Mihesuah, D.A. (1998). American Indian identities: Issues of individual choices and development. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22(2), 193-226.
- Miller, N.B. (1982). Social work services to urban Indians. In J.W. Green (Ed.), *Cultural awareness in the human services* (pp. 157-183). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Moynihan, D.P. (1965). *The Negro family: The case for national concern*. New York: Bantam.
- Mulroy, K. (1993). *Freedom on the Border*. Lubbock Texas: Texas Tech University Press, 1993. 7
- Murray, C. (1984). *Losing ground: American social policy: 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Nassau, Mike (1994). *Mulungeons and Other Mustee Groups*. Presentation to an anthropology course, "The African Diaspora". University of Florida.
- Nettles, S. & Pleck, J. (1994). Risk, Resilience, and Development. In *Stress, Risk, and Resilience in children and adolescents*, ed. R. J. Haggerty et al., New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oetting, E.R., & Beauvais, F. (1991). Orthogonal cultural identification theory: The cultural identification of minority adolescents. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 25(5A & 6A), 655-685.
- O'Neil, Theresa D. (1996). *Disciplined Hearts: history, identity, and depression in an American Indian Community*. University of California Press. Los Angeles California.
- Orbe, M.P., & Harris, T.M. (2001). *Interracial communication: Theory into practice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

- Ortega, S.T., Crutchfield, R.D., & Rushing, W.A. (1983). Race differences in elderly personal well-being. *Research on Aging*, 5, 101-118.
- Owens, L. (1992). *Other Destinies: Understanding the American Indian Novel*. University of Oklahoma Press. 1992.
- Oyserman, D., Gant, L., & Ager, J. (1995). A socially contextualized model of african american identity: possible selves and school persistence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69, pp. 1216-1232.
- Padgett, D.K. (1998). *Qualitative Methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Parham, T.A., & Helms, J.E. (1991). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 250 – 257.
- Parker, J.G. (1994). The lived experience of Native Americans with diabetes within a transcultural nursing perspective. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 6(1), 5-11.
- Parson, R.J. (1989). Empowerment: Purpose and Practice Principles in Social Work. *Social Work With Groups* 14(2): 7-21.
- Paul, M.J. & Fischer, J.L. (1980). Correlates of self-concept among Black early adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 9, 163 – 173.
- Peroff, N.C. (1997). Indian Identity. *The Social Science Journal*, 34(4), 485-494.
- Peroff, N.C. & Wildcat, D.R. (2002). Who is an American Indian? *The Social Science Journal*, 39(3), 349- 361.
- Pevar, S.L. (1992). *The rights of Indians and tribes: The basic ACLU guide to Indian tribal rights*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Pewewardy, C. (1998, June). Will the “real” Indians please stand up. *Multicultural Review*, 7(2), 36-42.
- Phinney, J. (1992). The Multigroup ethnic identity measure: A scale for use with adolescents and young adults from diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156 – 176.
- Phinney, J.S., & Alipuria, L.L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence*, 13, 171 – 183.
- Pinderhughes, E. (1995). Empowering diverse population: Family practice in the twenty-first century. *Families in Society*, 76, 131-140.

- Poe, Richard (1999). Black Spark White Fire. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 1999. 3 (2), 23-35.
- Ponterotto, J.G., & Pedersen, P.B. (1993). *Preventing prejudice: A guide for counselors and educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Porter, F.W. (1983). *Nonrecognized American Indian Tribes: An historical and legal perspective*. Chicago: Newbury Library.
- Porter, Kenneth W. (1996). *The Black Seminoles*. University Press of Florida. Gainesville, FL.
- Poston, W.S.C., (1990). The biracial identity development model: A needed addition. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 152 – 155.
- Powell, Francis J. (1996). *Racial differences in mental health diagnoses for Black males in central Louisiana*. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Grambling State University School of Social Work, Grambling, Louisiana.
- Quarles, B. (1964). *The negro in the making of America*. New York. Collier Books.
- Ragin, C.C. (1987). *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and Quantitative strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rank, M. (1992). *The Blending of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Understanding Childbearing Among Welfare Recipients*. In A. Rubin & E. Babbie, *Research Methods for Social Work* 4th edition, Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Red Horse, J.G. (1997). *Racial identity development and Native Americans*. Paper presented at the 10th Annual National Conference on Race & Ethnicity in American Higher Education, Orlando, FL.
- Red Horse, J.G., Lewis, R., Feit, M., & Decker, J. (1978). Family behavior of urban American Indians. *Social Casework*, 59, 67-72.
- Robbins, S.B., & Kliwer, W.L. (2000). *Advances in Theory and Research on Subjective Well-Being*. Counseling Psychology (3rd ed). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Root, M.P.P. (1990). Resolving the “other” status: Identity development of biracial individuals. *Women and Therapy*, 9, 185 – 205.

- Rosenthal, D., & Cichello, A. (1986). The meeting of two cultures: Ethnic identity and psychosocial adjustment of Italian-Australian adolescents. *Journal of Psychology*, 21, 487 – 501.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research Methods for Social Work (4th ed.)*. Brooks / Cole Publishing.
- Russell, K., Wilson, M., & Hall, R. (1992). *The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color among African Americans*. Harcourt Brace. Orlando, Florida.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial Resilience and Protective Mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57 (July): 316-331.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141 – 166.
- Ryan, R.M., & Frederick, C.M. (1997). On energy, personality and health: Subjective well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 65, 529 – 565.
- Ryan, William (1971). *Blaming the Victims*. New York: Vintage.
- Ryff, C.D., & Keyes, C.L.M. (1995). The structure of psychological well being revisited. *Journal of Psychology*, 69, 719 – 727.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychology Inquiry*, 9, 1 – 28.
- Saleebey, D. (1992). *The strengths perspective in social work practice*. New York: Longman Publisher.
- Saulnier, M.F. (1982). Psychological resources matter, no matter how you say it or frame it. *Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 736 – 742.
- Scanzoni, R. (1971). *The black family in modern society*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schiele, J.H. (1993). Cultural oppression, African Americans, and social work practice. *Black Caucus*, 2, 20-34.
- See, L.A. (1998). Diversity in the workplace: Issues and concerns of Africans and Asians. In A. Daly (Ed.), *Diversity in the Workplace*. Washington, DC. NASW Publication.
- Shockley, W. (1971). Models, mathematics, and the moral obligation to diagnose the origin of Negro I.Q. deficits. *Review of Educational Research*, 41, 369-377.

- Solomon, B.(1976). *Black empowerment: Social work in oppressed communities*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Staples, R. (1971). *The black family: Essays and studies*. California: Wadsworth Press.
- Stephan, F. and Stephan, A. (1990). Interracial and intraracial quasi-counseling interactions when counselors avoid discussing race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 484-491.
- St. George, A., & McNamara, P.H. (1984). Religion, race, and psychological well-being. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 23, 351-363.
- Stillman, P. (1992). Racism, poverty contributes to high cancer death rates. *Lakota Times*, September 23.
- Stonequist, E.V. (1937). *The Marginal Man: A study in personality and culture*. New York: Scribners.
- Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different (2nd ed.)*. new York: Wiley.
- Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H.C. (1998). The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 482 – 493.
- Tallbear, K. (2000). *Genetic, culture, and identity in Indian country*. Paper presented at the seventh international congress on ethno biology, Athens, Georgia, Oct. 23 – 27, 2000. <http://www.iiirm.org/publications/genetics/ISEPaper.pdf>.
- Tashankkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, C.M., & Howard-Hamilton, M.F. (1995). Student involvement and racial identity attitudes among African American males. *Journal of college student development*, 36, pp. 330 - 336.
- Taylor, T.W. (1983). *American Indian policy*. Mt. Airy, MD: Lomond.
- Thomas, M.E., & Holmes, B.J. (1992). Determinants of satisfaction for blacks and whites. *Sociological Quarterly*, 33, 459-472.
- Thornton, R. (1987). *American Indian holocaust and survival: A population history since 1492*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.
- Thornton, S., & Garrett, K.J. (1995). Ethnography as a bridge to multicultural practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 31, 67-74.

- Tolsdorf, S.E. (1976). Illusion and social support: A social psychological perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 193 – 210.
- Triandis, H.C. (1989). Self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 269 – 289.
- Tropman, J.E. (1989). *American values and social welfare: Cultural contradictions in the welfare state*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993). *We the ...first Americans*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1999). *Statistical abstract of the United States: The national data book*. Washington, DC.
- U.S. Census Bureau, (2000). Census of populations, PL 94 - 171.
- Wade, N. (2000). For Genome Mappers, the Tricky Terrain of Race requires some careful Navigation. *The New York Times*, July 20, 2000.
<http://college3.nytimes.com/guests/articles/2000/07/20/857931.xml>.
- Walcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. In Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions by John W. Creswell. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Waldman, C., & Braun, M. (1985). *Atlas of the North American Indian*. New York: Fact on File.
- Walls, C.T., & Zarit, S.H. (1991). Informal support from black churches and the well-being of elderly blacks. *The Gerontologist*, 31, 490-495.
- Wares, D.M., Wedel, K.R., Rosenthal, J.A., & Dobrec, A. (1994). Indian child welfare: A multicultural challenge. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 3(3), 1-15.
- Waterman, A.S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64, 678 – 691.
- Weaver, H.N. (2001). Indigenous identity: What is it, and who really has it? *American Indian Quarterly*, 25(2), 240-255.
- Weaver, H.N. (1999). Indigenous People and the Social Work Profession: Defining culturally competent services. *Journal of Social Work*, 44 (3), 217-225.

- Weaver, Hilary N. and Brave-Heart, Maria Yellow Horse (1999). Examining Two Facets of American Indian Identity: Exposure to other cultures and the influence of historical trauma. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* (The Haworth Press, Inc.) vol 2, no. ½, 1999, pp. 19-33.
- Weaver, H.N., & White, B.J. (1999). Protecting the future of indigenous children and nations: An examination of the Indian Child Welfare Act. *Journal of Health and Social Policy*.
- Weaver, H.N. (1998). Indigenous people in a multicultural society: Unique issues for human services. *Social Work*, 43, (3), 203-211.
- Weaver, H.N. (1996). Social work with American Indian youth using the Orthogonal Model of Cultural Identification. *Families in Society*, 77, 98-107.
- Welburn, Ron (1998). *A Most Secret Identity: Native American Assimilation and Resistance in African America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Williams, C., & Ellison, A. (1996). Personal reflections on permanency planning and cultural competency. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 5(1/2), 9-18.
- Williamson, J. (1980). *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States*. New York: Free Press
- Willis, William S. (1963). Divide and Rule: Red, White, and Black in the Southeast. *Journal of Negro History*, 48 (July 1963), 157 – 176.
- Wilson, W. (1967). Correlates of avowed happiness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67, 294-306.
- Wilson, W.J. (1986). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Knopf.
- Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Winfield, L.F., ed. (1991). “Resilience, Schooling, and Development in African-American Youth.” *Education and Urban Society*. 24 (1), November (Special Issue).
- Wood, P. (1974). *Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through Stono Rebellion*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Wood, R.L., & Turner, R.C. (1985). Convoys over the life course: Attachment, roles, and social support. In P.B. Baltes & O.C. Brim (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

- Wright, J. L. (1981). *The Only Land They Know: The tragic story of the Indian of the Old South*. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Writer, J.H. (2001). Identifying the identified: The need for critical exploration of Native American identity within educational context. *Critical Themes in Teacher Education*, 22(3), 308-322.
- Wuest, J. (1991). Harmonizing: A North American Indian approach to management of middle ear disease with transcultural nursing implications. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 3(1), 5-14.
- Young, A.A. (1997). Rationalizing race in thinking about the future: the case of low-income black men. *Smith College studies in social work*, 67, pp. 432 - 455.
- Young, V.H. (1974). A black American socialization pattern. *American Ethnologist*, 1, 405-412.
- Zack, N. (1997). Race and philosophic meaning. In N. Zack (Ed.), *Race/sex: Their sameness, difference and interplay* (pp. 29-44). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Zastrow, C., & Kirst-Ashman, K. (1997). *Understanding Human Behavior and the Social Environment*. 4th Ed. Nelson-Hall Publishers. Chicago, Illinois.
- Zill, N. & Nord, C. (1994). *Running in Place*. Washington, DC: Child Trends, Inc.
- Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory of racial difference: Scientific, social, and ethical issues. *American Psychologist*, 45, 1297-1303.

APPENDIX A: MANDATORY CRITERIA FOR FEDERAL
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

(A) The petitioner has been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis since 1900. Evidence that the group's character as an Indian entity has from time to time been denied shall not be considered to be conclusive evidence that this criterion has not been met. Evidence to be relied upon in determining a group's Indian identity may include one or a combination of the following, as well as other evidence of identification by other than the petitioner itself or its members.

- (1) Identification as an Indian entity by Federal authorities.
- (2) Relationships with State governments based on identification of the group as Indian.
- (3) Dealings with a county, parish, or other local government in a relationship based on the group's Indian identity.
- (4) Identification as an Indian entity by anthropologists, historians, and/or other scholars.
- (5) Identification as an Indian entity in newspapers and books.
- (6) Identification as an Indian entity in relationships with Indian tribes or with national, regional, or state Indian organizations.

(B) A predominant portion of the petitioning group comprises a distinct community and has existed as a community from historical times until the present.

(1) This criterion may be demonstrated by some combination of the following evidence and/or other evidence that the petitioner meets the definition of community set forth in § 83.1:

- i. Significant rates of marriage within the group, and/or, as may be culturally required, patterned out-marriages with other Indian populations.
- ii. Significant social relationships connecting individual members.
- iii. Significant rates of informal social interaction which exist broadly among the members of a group.
- iv. A significant degree of shared or cooperative labor or other economic activity among the membership.
- v. Evidence of strong patterns of discrimination or other social distinctions by non-members.
- vi. Shared sacred or secular ritual activity encompassing most of the group.
- vii. Cultural patterns shared among a significant portion of the group that are different from those of the non-Indian populations with whom it interacts. These patterns must function as more than a symbolic identification of the group as Indian. They may include, but are not limited to, language, kinship organization, or religious beliefs and practices.
- viii. The persistence of a named, collective Indian identity continuously over a period of more than 50 years, notwithstanding changes in name.
- ix. A demonstration of historical political influence under the criterion in § 83.7(c) shall be evidence for demonstrating historical community.

(2) A petitioner shall be considered to have provided sufficient evidence of community at a given point in time if evidence is provided to demonstrate any one of the following:

- i. More than 50 percent of the members reside in a geographical area exclusively or almost exclusively composed of members of the group, and the balance of the group maintains consistent interaction with some members of the community;
- ii. At least 50 percent of the marriages in the group are between members of the group;
- iii. At least 50 percent of the group members maintain distinct cultural patterns such as, but not limited to, language, kinship organization, or religious beliefs and practices;
- iv. There are distinct community social institutions encompassing most of the members, such as kinship organizations, formal or informal economic cooperation, or religious organizations; or
- v. The group has met the criterion in § 83.7(c) using evidence described in §83.7(c)(2).

(C) The petitioner has maintained political influence or authority over its members as an autonomous entity from historical times until the present.

(1) This criterion may be demonstrated by some combination of the evidence listed below and/or by other evidence that the petitioner meets the definition of political influence or authority in § 83.1.

- i. The group is able to mobilize significant numbers of members and significant resources from its members for group purposes.
- ii. Most of the membership considers issues acted upon or actions taken by group leaders or governing bodies to be of importance.
- iii. There is widespread knowledge, communication and involvement in political processes by most of the group's members.
- iv. The group meets the criterion in § 83;.7(b) at more than a minimal level.
- v. There are internal conflicts which show controversy over valued group goals, properties, policies, processes and/or decisions.

(2) A petitioning group shall be considered to have provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate the exercise of political influence or authority at a given point in time by demonstrating that group leaders and/or other mechanisms exist or existed which:

- i. Allocate group resources such as land, residence rights and the like on a consistent basis.
- ii. Settle disputes between members or subgroups by mediation or other means on a regular basis;
- iii. Exert strong influence on the behavior of individual members, such as the establishment or maintenance of norms and the enforcement of sanctions to direct or control behavior;
- iv. Organize or influence economic subsistence activities among the members, including shared or cooperative labor.

(3) A group that has met the requirements in paragraph 83.7(b)(2) at a given point in time shall be considered to have provided sufficient evidence to meet this criterion at that point in time.

(D) A copy of the group's present governing document including its membership criteria. In the absence of a written document, the petitioner must provide a statement describing in full its membership criteria and current governing procedures.

(E) The petitioner's membership consists of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.

(1) Evidence acceptable to the Secretary which can be used for this purpose includes but is not limited to:

- i. Rolls prepared by the Secretary on a descendency basis for purposes of distributing claims money, providing allotments, or other purposes;
- ii. State, Federal, or other official records or evidence identifying present members or ancestors of present members as being descendants of a historical tribe or tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.
- iii. Church, school, and other similar enrollment records identifying present members or ancestors of present members as being descendants of a historical tribe or tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.
- iv. Affidavits of recognition by tribal elders, leaders, or the tribal governing body identifying present members or ancestors of present members as being descendants of a historical tribe or tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.

- v. Other records or evidence identifying present members or ancestors of present members as being descendants of a historical tribe or tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.

(2) The petitioner must provide an official membership list, separately certified by the group's governing body, of all known current members of the group. This list must include each member's full name (including maiden name), date of birth, and current residential address. The petitioner must also provide a copy of each available former list of members based on the group's own defined criteria, as well as a statement describing the circumstances surrounding the preparation of the current list and, insofar as possible, the circumstances surrounding the preparation of former lists.

(F) The membership of the petitioning group is composed principally of persons who are not members of any acknowledged North American Indian tribe. However, under certain conditions a petitioning group may be acknowledged even if its membership is composed principally of persons whose names have appeared on rolls of, or who have been otherwise associated with, an acknowledged Indian tribe. The conditions are that the group must establish that it has functioned throughout history until the present as a separate and autonomous Indian tribal entity, that its members do not maintain a bilateral political relationship with the acknowledged tribe, and that its members have provided written confirmation of their membership in the petitioning group.

(G) Neither the petitioner nor its members are the subject of congressional legislation that has expressly terminated or forbidden the Federal relationship.

APPENDIX B: RESEARCH STUDY PROJECT INSTRUMENTS

THE MULTIGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE (MEIM)

The MEIM was originally published in the following article:

Phinney, J. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with adolescents and adults from diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156 – 176.

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be _____

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

- 1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
- 2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
- 3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.
- 4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
- 5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
- 6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
- 7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
- 8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
- 9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.

10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.

11- I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group.

12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

13- My ethnicity is

- (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
- (2) Black or African American
- (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
- (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
- (5) American Indian/Native American
- (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
- (7) Other (write in): _____

14- My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)

15- My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE (SWLS)

Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71 – 75.

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding. The 7-point scale is as follows:

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = slightly disagree

4 = neither agree nor disagree

5 = slightly agree

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

_____ 1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

_____ 2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

_____ 3. I am satisfied with my life.

_____ 4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

_____ 5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

THE MACARTHUR SCALE OF SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL STATUS

Question 1.

Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in their communities.

People define community in different ways; please define it in whatever way is most meaningful to you. At the **top** of the ladder are the people who have the highest standing in their community. At the **bottom** are the people who have the lowest standing in their community.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?

Please place a large "X" on the rung where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in your community.



Question 2.

Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States.

At the **top** of the ladder are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the **bottom** are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?

Please place a large “X” on the rung where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States.



Question 3. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school you have completed? (Check one.)

Elementary School	High School	College	Graduate School
01____	09____	13____	17____
02____	10____	14____	18____
03____	11____	15____	19____
04____	12____	16____	20+____
05____			
06____			
07____			
08____			

Question 4. What is the highest degree you earned?

- ____ High school diploma or equivalency (GED)
- ____ Associate degree (junior college)
- ____ Bachelor's degree
- ____ Master's degree
- ____ Doctorate
- ____ Professional (MD, JD, DDS, etc.)
- ____ Other specify
- ____ None of the above (less than high school)

Question 5. Which of the following best describes your current main daily activities and/or responsibilities?

- ____ Working full time
- ____ Working part-time
- ____ Unemployed or laid off
- ____ Looking for work
- ____ Keeping house or raising children full-time
- ____ Retired

Question 6. With regard to your current or most recent job activity:

a. In what kind of business or industry do (did) you work?

(For example: hospital, newspaper publishing, mail order house, auto engine manufacturing, breakfast cereal manufacturing.)

b. What kind of work do (did) you do? (Job Title)

(For example: registered nurse, personnel manager, supervisor of order department, gasoline engine assembler, grinder operator.)

c. How much did you earn, before taxes and other deductions, during the past 12 months?

- Less than \$5,000
- \$5,000 through \$11,999
- \$12,000 through \$15,999
- \$16,000 through \$24,999
- \$25,000 through \$34,999
- \$35,000 through \$49,999
- \$50,000 through \$74,999
- \$75,000 through \$99,999
- \$100,000 and greater
- Don't know
- No response

Question 7. How many people are currently living in your household, including yourself?

- Number of people
- Of these people, how many are children?
- Of these people, how many are adults?
- Of the adults, how many bring income into the household?

Question 8. Is the home where you live:

- Owned or being bought by you (or someone in the household)?
- Rented for money?
- Occupied without payment of money or rent?
- Other (specify) _____

[Some might try to get a "market value" estimate of the value of owned homes and an estimate of how much principal was outstanding on the mortgage.]

Question 9. Which of these categories best describes your total combined family income for the past 12 months? This should include income (before taxes) from all sources, wages, rent from properties, social security, disability and/or veteran's benefits, unemployment benefits, workman's compensation, help from relatives (including child payments and alimony), and so on.

- Less than \$5,000
- \$5,000 through \$11,999
- \$12,000 through \$15,999
- \$16,000 through \$24,999
- \$25,000 through \$34,999
- \$35,000 through \$49,999
- \$50,000 through \$74,999
- \$75,000 through \$99,999
- \$100,000 and greater
- Don't know
- No response

Question 10. If you lost all your current source(s) of household income (your paycheck, public assistance, or other forms of income), how long could you continue to live at your current address and standard of living?

- _____ Less than 1 month
- _____ 1 to 2 months
- _____ 3 to 6 months
- _____ 7 to 12 months
- _____ More than 1 year

Question 11. Suppose you needed money quickly, and you cashed in all of your (and your spouse's) checking and savings accounts, and any stocks and bonds. If you added up what you would get, about how much would this amount to?

- _____ Less than \$500
- _____ \$500 to \$4,999
- _____ \$5,000 to \$9,999
- _____ \$10,000 to \$19,999
- _____ \$20,000 to \$49,999
- _____ \$50,000 to \$99,999
- _____ \$100,000 to \$199,999
- _____ \$200,000 to \$499,999
- _____ \$500,000 and greater
- _____ Don't know
- _____ No response

If you now subtracted out any debt that you have (credit card debt, unpaid loans including car loans, home mortgage), about how much would you have left?

- _____ Less than \$500
- _____ \$500 to \$4,999
- _____ \$5,000 to \$9,999
- _____ \$10,000 to \$19,999
- _____ \$20,000 to \$49,999
- _____ \$50,000 to \$99,999
- _____ \$100,000 to \$199,999
- _____ \$200,000 to \$499,999
- _____ \$500,000 and greater
- _____ Don't know
- _____ No response

SOCIAL SUPPORT BEHAVIORS (SS-B) SCALE

People help each other in a lot of ways. Suppose you had some kind of problem (were upset about something, needed help with a practical problem, were broke, or needed advice or guidance), how likely would (a) member of your family, and (b) your friends be to help you out in each of the specific ways listed below. We realize you may rarely need this kind of help, but if you did, would family and friends help in the ways indicated? Try to base your answer on your past experience with these people. Use the scale below, and circle one number under family, and one under friends, in each row.

1. no one would do this
2. someone might do this
3. some family member/friend would probably do this
4. some family member/friend would certainly do this
5. most family members/friends would certainly do this

	(a) Family	(b) Friends
1. Would suggest doing something, just to take my mind off my problems.....	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Would visit me, or invite me over	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Would comfort me if I was upset	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Would give me a ride if I needed one	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Would have lunch or dinner with me	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Would look after my belongings (house, pets etc.) for a while	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Would loan me a car if I needed one	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Would joke around or suggest doing something to cheer me up	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Would go to a movie or concert with me	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Would suggest how I could find out more about a situation	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. Would help me with a move or a big chore	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. Would listen if I needed to talk about my feelings	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. Would have a good time with me	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
14. Would pay for lunch if I was broke	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

		(a) Family					(b) Friends				
15.	Would suggest a way I might do something	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Would give me encouragement to do something difficult	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Would give me advice about what to do	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Would chat with me	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Would help me figure out what I wanted to do .	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Would show me that they understood what I wanted to do	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Would buy me a drink if I was short of money	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Would help me to decide what to do	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Would give me a hug or otherwise show me I was cared about	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Would call me just to see how I was doing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Would help me figure out what was going on	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Would help me with some necessary purchase	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Would not pass judgment on me	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Would tell me who to talk to for help	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Would loan me money for an indefinite amount of time	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Would be sympathetic if I was upset	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Would stick by me in a crunch	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Would buy me clothes if I was short of money	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Would tell me about the available choices and options	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Would loan me tools, equipment or appliances if I needed them	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Would give me reasons why I should or should not do something	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

		(a) Family		(b) Friends
36.	Would show affection for me	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
37.	Would show me how to do something I didn't know how to do	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
38.	Would bring me little presents of things I needed	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
39.	Would tell me the best way to get something done	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
40.	Would talk to other people to arrange something for me	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
41.	Would loan me money and want to "forget about it"	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
42.	Would tell me what to do	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
43.	Would offer me a place to stay for a while	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
44.	Would help me think about a problem	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
45.	Would loan me a fairly large sum of money (say the equivalent of a month's rent or mortgage)	1	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C: QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Qualitative Interview Guide

1. What was it like growing up with both an African and Native American cultural identity?
2. Were there any difficulties?
3. What do you say when people say that there is no such thing as a Black Indian?
4. How have you managed to keep your Native American heritage?
5. How will you pass it on to future generations?
6. How did you learn about your dual heritage?
7. Who are your friends? Are they Black or Indian?
8. How would you describe your ethnicity in the U.S. Census?
9. Are there any specific needs that relates to your Native American heritage that are not being met?

VITA

Francis Joseph Powell was born in Louisville, Mississippi. He graduated from Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi, with a Bachelor of Social Work degree in 1977. For the next twelve years he worked as a school social worker at the Mississippi School for the Deaf and later became the school's Dean of Students. Mr. Powell moved to Pineville, Louisiana, in 1993 where he worked for the Department of Health and Hospitals as a substance abuse counselor for two years. He completed his Master of Social Work degree from Grambling State University in 1996. In 1996, Mr. Powell began working at Winn Correctional Facility in Winnfield, Louisiana, as Mental Health Director. In 1998, he began teaching in the Department of Social Work at Northwestern State University. He teaches courses in cultural diversity, policy analysis, and social work as a profession. He is a strong advocate for social and economic justice for vulnerable populations. Mr. Powell came to Louisiana State University in 2000 to obtain his doctorate and will be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree in social work at the May 2004 commencement. He currently lives in Pineville, Louisiana, with his wife Rena and their miniature schnauzer, Malcolm.