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There is growing interest in the empirical psychological study of Native Americans. Nonetheless, currently there are few empirical investigations examining Native American identity from a racial perspective. One study, completed in 2011 by Gonzalez and Bennett, modified the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity to adapt to Native American individuals and used an Exploratory Factor Analysis that resulted in a four factor model of Native American identity called the Native Identity Scale (Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011). The purpose of this study was to examine the reliability of the Native Identity Scale when used with a sample from self-identified Native American adults in the southwest region of the United States. In addition, this study examined the influence of tribal language fluency on responses to items on the Native Identity Scale. Moreover, the study examined how the racial composition of the community individuals grew up in influenced their responses to items on the Native Identity Scale. Findings from the current study support the reliability of the Native Identity Scale when used with Native Americans from the Southwestern United State. The Exploratory Factor Analysis demonstrated some differences in items for the four subscales but the same factors (Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, Oppressed Minority) were found for the population studied and the initial Native American population from the midwest region of the United States. Data analysis demonstrated that the tribal language fluency of participants influenced how
participants responded to the humanist subscale. Overall, results of the study provided insight into salient facets of Native American identity.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the United States (U.S.), individuals are classified, defined, and grouped together based on race, for example White, African-American, Hispanic, Native American (United States Census Bureau, 2010). Racial classifications are social constructs based on skin color; some scholars theorize racial classifications to be biologically anchored (Bashi & Mc Daniel, 1997; Fries-Britt et.al, 2014; Morning, 2007; Morning, 2019). The hierarchy of social status of individuals and groups in the United States originated with the colonization of Native Americans and enslavement of Africans. However, the concept of race as a means of classification dates as far back as the 16th century when Europeans considered non-Whites subhuman with innate inferiority to White Europeans (Tuckwell, 2002). The establishment of this hierarchy perpetuated the oppression, marginalization, and dehumanization of ethnic communities such as Asians, Latinx, immigrants, and migrants to the United States. This social structure has served to benefit the White “majority” and disenfranchise the racial “minority” from social, economic, academic, and judicial resources. The racial hierarchy has served to justify the confiscation of land and resources, the history of enslavement, forced removal and encampment of minority individuals. The direct implications of racializing groups and hierarchy based on race manifested in dialogue about the black – white binary, which brought the emergence of race scholars. Race still permeates political, systemic, judicial, educational, and social aspects of individuals and groups in the United States. One racial group impacted by race, racial classification, and racialization is the Native American community.
The practice of racializing Native American (NA) individuals began with European contact and colonization. The NA group classification has been one that has been carefully considered by a variety of systems, scholars, and institutions from many legal, social, economic, political, biological and other dimensions, and has grown to over 33 different definitions of classifications (Jacobs, 2014; Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011; Garroutte, 2001; Garroutte, 2003). The United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (U.S.-BIA), under the United States Department of the Interior uses the term American Indian and defines American Indian as a “person who has blood degree from and is part of a federally recognized tribe or village as an enrolled member” (2018).

In contrast to the definition of the U.S.-BIA, the United States Census Bureau (2010) uses the following definition for race-based population estimates, “a person having origin in any of the original peoples of North or South America, including Central America, and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment. This category includes people who indicate their race as American Indian or Alaska Native or report entries such as Navajo, Blackfeet, Inupiat, Yupik, or Central American Indian groups or South American Indian groups.” The most recent race-based census data reported a total United States population of 308.7 million; of this total, 5.2 million individuals reported American Indian or Alaska Native as their race (United States Census Bureau, 2010). The Native American/Alaska Native (NA/AN) population comprises 1.7% of the total population of the United States and is comprised of individuals who indicated their only race to be American Indian/Alaska Native (2.9 million, 0.9%) and individuals who indicated they were a combination of American Indian/Alaska Native and one or more other races (2.3 million, 0.7%). Despite the NA/AN population representing less than 2% of the total population in the United States and being one of the smallest minority groups in the United States, the NA/AN population is among the fastest growing minority group in the U.S. The
population demonstrated a 27% increase from 2000 to 2010, rising from 4.2 million to 5.2 million. The number of individuals who claimed only American Indian/Alaska Native identity alone grew from 2.5 million to 2.9 million, demonstrating a population growth of 18% over the same ten-year period. Even with the growing number of individuals claiming American Indian/Alaska Native identity, the overall total population of American Indians/Alaska Natives remains so small they are not included in race-based reporting and estimates for the United States Census.

The United States Census Bureau and Bureau of Indian Affairs, both Bureaus of the United States federal government, have differing definitions of Native Americans complicating the understanding of how to classify this group. One definition includes Indians from North, Central, and South America. Similarly, one definition includes Alaska Natives while the other does not explicitly include or exclude Alaska Native to be distinguished as a different group from Native Americans. Further complicating racial classification, neither definition gives recognition to the diversity within the group. The NA population in the United States is comprised of 573 federally recognized tribes, approximately 66 state recognized tribes, and still others who remain unrecognized by state or federal government (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010; U.S Department of Interior, 2010; Haozous, et. al. 2014). The diversity among tribes includes diversity in language, culture, and history (Haozous, et. al. 2014). The issue with census data, racial categories limiting individuals to a blanket Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Hawaiian Native box is that the box does not communicate the rich diversity in language, culture, and traditions and perpetuates the limitations, misconceptions, and stereotypes that all Natives are the same.
Historically, the racial classification of Native Americans has been disadvantageous to Native Americans, originating with initial contact resulting in colonization. A discussion about Native Americans and the United States without the context of historical events that influenced the difficulties Native Americans have faced is a disservice to their history. These difficulties include the significant loss of ancestral and tribal land, forced removal and relocation, genocide, warfare, disease, starvation, boarding schools, sterilization campaigns on Native American women, forced assimilation, linguistic cleansing, and imprisonment for practicing cultural and tribal practices (Adams, 1995; Garroute, 2003; Haozous, et.al, 2014; Smith, 2013; Thorton, 1990). The historical dehumanization and minimization of Native American humanity, in addition to the numerous definitions used to define Native Americans as a race, complicates how an individual perceives, understands, and develops their racial identity. Furthermore, it complicates an individual’s understanding of how they experience interactions with members from other racial groups.

**Problem Statement**

The study of Native American populations by various disciplines and perspectives is numerous. As previously discussed, multiple definitions of Native Americans attempt to identify who is or is not NA/AI from legal, biological, cultural, political, and historical viewpoints. Garrouette (2001) and Jacobs (2014) reported that there are more than thirty-three definitions of “American Indian” in the United States federal legislation alone. Studies have found that racial identity is an important aspect of an individual’s psychological adjustment and development (Alvarez, 1996; Bryant Jr. & Baker, 2003; Canabal, 1995). Numerous studies have attempted to link racial identity development to other aspects of health, including social and educational outcomes for NA/AI individuals; however, these studies have demonstrated insignificant
findings (House, Stiffman, & Brown, 2006). Currently, identity assessment measures for Native American populations that are developed, measured, interpreted, and normed on NA/AI populations do not exist, and therefore the study of identity formation and its link to other aspects of health lacks the foundational understanding of Native American identity from a Native American perspective to begin with.

Native American populations have a unique intersection of race, ethnicity, and culture. The Native American population, as a minority group in the United States has historically experienced bias and prejudice based on the superficial color of their skin with little regard for the distinctive ethnic and cultural experiences that are unique to Native Americans. Ethnic, Cultural and Acculturation studies have explored multiple dimensions of Native identity. As a result, there is scarce literature regarding how Native American populations perceive their racial identity, the formation of racial identity, and methods of measuring racial identity among Native American populations.

Helms (as cited by Sue, 1998), describes racial identity development theory as the way an individual makes appraisals about themselves and others as racial beings. Helms, one of the most prominent researchers on racial identity, argued that race and racism shape the psychological development of individuals, particularly those who live in environments that racialize groups such as the United States. Persons of color, Native Americans included, are socialized in the United States to categorize groups of people based on the superficial perception of skin color, thus are exposed to the biases, stereotypes and attitudes that are rooted in perceptions, beliefs, and stereotypes of race. An individual’s awareness of their racial identity influences how they interact with others within their same racial group and those outside of their racial group. Racial identity theory claims that individuals experience varying levels of
awareness of how they appraise themselves, how others unlike them appraise them, and group identity. This awareness is influenced by sociopolitical factors, two such factors that are important to consider for Native American individuals are how reservations, and forced or voluntary relocation has influenced their racial identity. Furthermore, since colonization, indigenous languages worldwide are in danger of extinction (Jacobs, 2014). The loss of language due to assimilation accompanies the loss of culture and traditions because many Native American tribes did not have written language.

There is a paucity of literature exploring Native American identity from a racial perspective. Through an extensive search, the study conducted by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) utilized the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity to explore racial identity in Native American populations. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) is discussed in further detail in chapter two. Native American identity research, prior to Gonzalez and Bennett has focused primarily on cultural and ethnic identity (Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011; Trimble, Helms & Root, 2003; Trimble & Dickson, 2005). Contributing to empirical research and adding literature to support the reliability and validity of a measurement tool to assess racial identity in Native Americans enriches the implications for culturally informed practice, intervention, instruction, and future study.

Psychology, more than any other discipline, has imposed European definitions of reality upon the world (Howitt & Owusu-Bempah, as cited by Wilson, 2008). This is especially true with minority populations such as Native Americans. Counseling psychology has also established a long history of developing instruments for research, training, and practice (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The accessibility of researched scales that are tested and developed for the application to Native American populations is paramount to reducing the
misinterpretations, over pathology and diagnosis of a population that has been subject to the standards of western psychology and providing Native scholars pathways to redefining what is “normal” among their people.

Exploring the ways that Native American individuals experience racial identity provides a pathway to a greater understanding of how race influences human experience. The implication of not having studies that address the racial identity of the Native American experience continues to ignore that NA/AI individuals have a racialized experience and diminishes the negative influence of the racialization of NA/AI people. Further, studies regarding race will improve understanding of the within group differences and similarities within the diversity of tribal nations in the United States. Understanding the influence of race and the oppression racial minorities experience on identity formation provide the framework for improving assessment, interventions, training and future work with Native American individuals, families, and communities.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to address the problematic concern of having research completed by non-Native scholars about Native American identity. This study will examine the reliability of the Native Identity Scale (NIS) when the measure is used with a sample from self-identified Native American adults from the southwest region of the United States. This study, based on an extensive search, will be the second time the NIS is utilized in a study, therefore a related purpose of this study is to contribute to the scarce body of literature that currently exists where the NIS is applied, thus providing empirical evidence for the continued development of the NIS. In addition, this study will examine how tribal language fluency influences participants’ responses to each of the subscales Centrality, Public Regard, Humanist and
Oppressed Minority. The study will also examine how the racial composition of the community an individual was raised in influences their responses in each subscale. Furthermore, this study hopes to examine and gain insight to understanding how the interaction of tribal language and the racial composition of the community participants were raised in influences racial identity as measured by the NIS.

**Research Questions**

The current study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. Is the Native Identity Scale an effective measure for assessing racial identity among Native Americans?
2. Does the Native Identity Scale identify the same factors in Native Americans from the Southwest region of the United States as the study conducted by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) with Native Americans from the Midwest region of the United States?
3. Does the racial composition of the community where Native Americans were raised impact responses to the Native Identity Scale?
4. Will tribal language fluency of Native Americans impact responses to the Native Identity Scale?

**Research Hypotheses**

This study will test the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: The Native Identity Scale will be an effective measure of Native American identity in individuals self-identifying as Native American from the Southwest region of the United States.

Hypothesis 2: The factors (Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority) found in the study by Gonzalez and Bennet (2011) with Native Americans from the
Midwest region of the United States will emerge with Native Americans from the Southwest region of the United States.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of racial identity will exist in Native American individuals raised in reservation communities as compared with Native American individuals raised off the reservation or in mixed racial or mostly white communities.

Hypothesis 4: Native Americans with higher levels of tribal language fluency will have higher levels of racial identity than Native Americans with lower levels of tribal language fluency.

Hypothesis 5: Participants with language fluency raised in Native American communities will have higher levels of racial identity than participants with lower levels of language fluency raised outside of Native American communities.

Definition of Terms

This section provides meaning to specific terms that the researcher will utilize throughout this dissertation. Terms may also be discussed or further explained in other sections of this document.

Cultural Identity - In this dissertation, cultural identity will encompass the aspect of self-concept that connects to the values, beliefs, languages, rituals and traditions of a group of people that pass from generation to generation. This definition is consistent with definitions used in studies that focus on cultural identity as dimension of identity (Sue & Sue, 2003).

Culture - For the purposes of this dissertation, culture is a term that will describe the collective/communal or individual values, beliefs, languages, rituals, and traditions of a group of people that pass from generation to generation. This definition is consistent with definitions
found in the review of related literature regarding identity and culture (Thompson & Carter, 1997; Sue & Sue, 2003).

**Ethnic Identity** - For the purpose of this dissertation, ethnic identity will describe the aspect of self-concept where one’s ethnicity is more salient. This includes the part of identity that connects a person’s self-concept and knowledge of their social grouping to their ethnicity. This definition is consistent with other definitions found in related literature regarding identity and ethnicity (Tajfel, 1981; Zimmerman et al., 1996; House, Stiffman & Brown, 2006).

**Ethnicity** - In this dissertation, ethnicity will be the term used to describe the shared physical and cultural characteristics based upon a person’s historical nationality or social group. Sue & Sue (2003) use a consistent definition of ethnicity to distinguish the differences in ethnicity, culture, and race when discussing identity among racial minorities.

**Federally recognized tribe** - For the purpose of this dissertation, a federally recognized tribe will be defined as an American Indian or Alaska Native tribal entity that has a government-to-government relationship with the United States government. This definition is consistent with how the Bureau of Indian Affairs (2018) and the United States government define and acknowledge federally recognized tribes. Furthermore, the United States government recognizes that federally recognized tribes possesses certain inherent rights of self-government (i.e., tribal sovereignty) and are entitled to receive certain federal benefits, services, and protections because of their special relationship with the United States. At present, there are 566 federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes and villages.

**Native American** - For purposes of this dissertation, Native American is a term that will encompass American Indian, Native people, Indigenous people, and Alaskan Natives. This is consistent with the Bureau of Indian Affairs definitions even though there is no single definition,
federal or tribal criterion, or standard that establishes a person's identity as American Indian or Alaska Native. However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (2018) states that an American Indian is an individual who has blood degree from a federally acknowledged tribe or village.

Additionally, determining one’s Native American identity includes the knowledge of tribal culture, history, language, religion, and familial kinships. Native American identity also includes how strongly a person identifies himself or herself as American Indian or Alaska Native.

**Race** - In this dissertation, race will describe the categorization associated with visible features, i.e. skin and physical features, which are linked to moral, intellectual, and cognitive assumptions that form the social construct intended to maintain social norms. This definition is consistent with the descriptions by Thompson and Carter (1997) and Sue and Sue (2003).

**Racial Identity Development** - For the purpose of this dissertation, racial identity development describes the self-concept that is a life long, ongoing development and negotiation of how an individual interprets and receives messages about themselves from members of other racial groups. This definition builds on the way that Helms (1995) and Sue (2003) define racial identity development in related literature.

**Southwest United States** - For the purpose of this dissertation, the southwest region of the United States will be defined as Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Nevada and California.

**Summary**

This first chapter, the introduction, provides an overview of the historical context of racializing Native Americans in the United States, followed by a statement of the problem, purpose of this current study with hypothesis and research questions for investigation. A section
for stating the research hypotheses was also in this chapter. Finally, this section concludes with a section defining terms that appear throughout this dissertation. All of this is to provide an introductory framework and context for the rest of this dissertation.

The organization of the remaining chapters of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter two will focus on providing a review of related literature relevant to this study. The review of related literature will also provide a contextual understanding of the importance of this study. Chapter three describes the methodology and analysis used to conduct this study. Chapter four will present findings of the study. Finally, Chapter five will include a summary of the implications of the study for research, training and practice, limitations, and areas for future study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section will provide an overview of literature relevant to the purpose of this dissertation. The chapter will include the following topics: (a) Scale Development; (b) Ethical Challenges and Considerations; (c) Indigenous Methodologies; (d) Native American History in the United States; (e) Racial Identity; (f) Native American Identity; and (g) the Native Identity Scale. A summary at the end of chapter two will highlight important concepts and ideas that inform this study.

Scale Development

In the counseling psychology discipline, there are many examples of the development, validation, and application of scales to measures for behavioral, intellectual, cognitive, and identity scales. Worthington and Whittaker (2006) claim that counseling psychology has a rich history of developing psychometrically sound instruments for application in research, practice and training. A common method of scale development and validation is with the use of factor analysis (Gorsuch, 1983; Dawis, 1987; Comrey & Lee, 1992; Fabrigar et al, 1999). In scale development research, there are two common analyses used to identify latent constructs from a large number of items. Both Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) reduce or confirm the underlying factors from a larger construct. Confirmatory Factor Analysis confirms and validates a scale after an EFA defines factors and relationships between factors, thus the CFA’s confirmatory nature. Due to the developmental nature of the NIS used in this study, an Exploratory Factor Analysis is used as the primary analysis. Here, the
best practices for EFA that have been reviewed in the scale development research literature will be reviewed including how to select sample sizes, extraction methods, item retention and deletion, and scale length.

Worthington and Whittaker (2006) and Kahn (2006) reviewed, summarized, and presented best practices for Exploratory Factor Analysis application and use for research purposes. There is agreement in the literature that in the initial development of new measures, the first step includes exploring what meaningful factors or themes emerge from a large set of variables. Fabrigar et al (1999), Tinsley and Tinsley (1987), and Worthington and Whittaker (2006) all cite best practice guidelines for samples sizes as follows: 100 is poor, 200 is fair, 300 is good, 500 is very good, and 1,000 is excellent based on the recommendations from Comrey (1973). Considered too simplistic, others have suggested that 10:1 or a 5:1 subject to variable ratio minimum is adequate for analysis. Researcher purpose determines extraction methods, if the factor analysis is descriptive or inferential. Descriptive extraction methods include Principal Components, Principal Factors, Image Analysis, and Minimum Residual analysis. Descriptive extraction methods are sample specific and require replication for generalizability. Inferential methods include Canonical Factor Analysis, Maximum Likelihood, and Alpha Factor Analysis. To generalize from sample to populations, researchers commonly use inferential methods for analysis. Communalities help to determine the extraction method. Another best practice discussed in the literature is the determination of factor retention. Eigenvalues and Kaiser Criterion ≥1 is logical for retention (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Kahn, 2006). Other factors to consider when determining factor retention are scree plots, total variance, or the use of parallel analysis. Due to strengths and limitations of factor retention and conflicting information, retention methods should use multiple methods (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Kahn, 2006;
Ethical Challenges and Considerations

Social science researchers have excluded ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations, including Native Americans, thus perpetuating the underrepresentation of Native American populations, concerns, and issues in social science research. This disparity is partly because researchers have found it difficult to recruit participants who represent ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations (Areán & Gallagher-Thompson, 1996; Huntington & Robinson, 2007; Spence & Oltmanns, 2011). Methodological and ethical issues concerning research with these populations remain the cornerstone to the dearth of studies that include ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations. Researchers must consider ethical issues that arise when working with ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations. If ethical issues are left unconsidered, researchers risk inflicting more harm than benefit to participants. For example, in 2003, a small, economically impoverished Havasupai tribe at the bottom of the Grand Canyon granted permission for researchers affiliated with a university to take DNA samples to research and attempt to find genetic clues to the tribe’s high incidence of diabetes. Additional research later revealed researchers used the blood samples for additional research to investigate mental illness and theories of the tribe’s geographical origins, without the tribe or participants’ informed consent (Harmon, 2010). Important ethical considerations researchers should have taken into consideration but overlooked included, respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. Perhaps
even more disturbing is the cultural violation of investigating geographical origins that would contradict the tribe’s traditional beliefs. Linking mental illness to DNA samples without informed consent perpetuates stereotypes and negative views of a population that is already hesitant to participate in empirical studies. Examples such as this and others, like the Tuskegee Syphilis study, still carry weight when it comes to vulnerable populations trusting researchers (Noah, 2003).

In these examples, the basic tenets of ethical practice (i.e., respect for persons, beneficence and justice) were all ignored. Additionally, the examples provide insight as to why other ethical considerations within study methodology arise, such as recruiting participants and informed consent processes. Reasons for the difficulty in recruitment include participant’s distrust of researchers, lack of information about research, lack of information on how collected data will be used, negative attitudes towards researchers, and not knowing or understanding how their participation can be beneficial (Areán & Gallagher-Thompson, 1996; Areán, Alvidrez, Nery, Estes & Linkins, 2003; Lau, Change & Okazaki, 2010; Spence & Oltmanns, 2011). Informed consent forms contain jargon, bureaucratic, and difficult language that participants have difficulty understanding enough to give true informed consent (Huntington & Robinson, 2007). It is an ethical obligation that researchers fully inform participants of the research processes and methodologies and how data, information gathered and results from the research will be used (American Psychological Association, 2017).

When working with ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations, there are varieties of methodological issues that raise concern. Some specific issues with previous research methods are that measures utilized may not be appropriate for the population, translation and language barriers, recruitment methods, and interpretation of results in a way that
may not accurately reflect the samples (Areán & Gallagher-Thompson, 1996; Areán, Alvidrez, Nery, Estes & Linkins, 2003; Ægisdottir, Gerstein, Çinarbas 2007; Knight, Roosa & Umaña-Taylor, 2009; Lau, Change & Okazaki, 2010). Measurement tools and constructs within psychology are predominately based on and developed for White, middle-class populations. Often researchers take such measurement tools and apply them cross-culturally without questioning how cultural difference influence results. In the case of individuals who only speak their tribal language (e.g., Navajo), language barriers become evident right away, as there are often no equivalent words or phrases for different mental health concepts in tribal languages (i.e., there is no Navajo word for depression). Researchers, then, would have a rigorous task of translating concepts or ideas to get at a construct similar to the English meaning. The translations of constructs from one language to another with no consideration that norms, behaviors, and observations from one group may not be accurately translated, if at all. Some researchers have referred to this phenomenon as linguistic equivalence (Ægisdottir, Gerstein, & Çinarbas 2007). Depression studied across cultures, but culturally different experiences of depression necessitate adaptation of measures for different contexts. Consider a non-Native, English speaking researcher approaching a Native American person who only speaks their tribal language fluently, with a depression scale for research; the researcher would have difficulty describing the concept of depression and accurately translating and administering the scale. Additionally, what contributes to the onset or manifestation of depressive symptoms within the Native population might differ from individuals who are White, Hispanic-American, or even those who are Alaskan Native.

The consensus among researchers about cross-cultural research is that, for the research to reflect results that would make sound inferences about ethnic minority and economically
disadvantaged populations, it is imperative that research methodology be reflective of the
cultural considerations of the population. It is no longer, and has never been, good practice to
make an observation of a phenomena that occurs across multiple racial groups and
socioeconomic status and use methods of measurement based on a single population, often White
middle class participants, without diligently examining and considering how the phenomenon is
experienced and perceived based on historical, cultural, and social contexts. The effort to
thoroughly examine, report, and establish the varying levels of equivalence, from item
equivalence to scalar equivalence, is important to the research process. Establishing equivalence
requires that researchers examine all aspects and perspectives of the observed phenomena they
are attempting to measure (Ægisdottir, Gerstein, & Çinarbas 2007).

While the challenges that methodology practices present in research involving ethnic
minority and economically disadvantaged populations are daunting and technical, they are
necessary, especially considering the inferences based on the results of studies.
Researchers have called for a culturally based approach when research includes ethnic minority
and economically disadvantaged populations (Caldwell, et.al., 2005; Norton & Spero, 1996;
Sekaran, 1983; Taylor-Ritzler, Balcaza, Sanchez, Spector & Cooper, 2006; Suarez-Balcaza &
Carcia-Iriarte, 2008; Ægisdottir, Gerstein, Çinarbas 2007). Not only are culturally based
approaches ethical for researchers, but they are good for scientific practice because they allow
research to be defined and reflect more accurately the diversity and complexity of individuals,
communities and populations.

Counseling psychology, as a field that claims its foundations in the scientist-practitioner
model, has an ethical obligation to ensure that research, and the methods and ethics employed,
demonstrate acknowledgement of racial, cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic differences. This
would involve significant investment of time, relationships, and outreach within a community. Utilizing community members in a collaborative effort to build research measures, constructs, and methodology, is more ethical and practical than utilizing the same method across various populations, and leads to the development of more appropriate measurement tools. A culturally-based approach to developing research grounded in behaviors, observations, and constructs that are specific to the population being studied would prove to be more effective in making inferences, and thus the generalizations made from such studies would be more accurate and relevant (Knight, Roosa, Umaña-Taylor, 2009). Instead of approaching research with a “one size fits all” method, researchers would benefit from responding to the unique needs, experiences, values, and beliefs of the populations they study and build methods grounded in the unique needs of the population. Studies have recommended that researchers engage in outreach and build positive relationships to recruit and retain participants who are from racial minority and economically disadvantaged groups. While both strategies are a step in the right direction, it is not enough to do outreach and build positive relationships only for maintaining methodologies that neglect the uniqueness of the population of study. It is important that every aspect of research is relevant to the population of study, which reinforces the importance of more culturally based approaches to research involving ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations. This dissertation examining Native American Identity is an effort to provide a culturally based study to contribute to the existing body of empirical literature.

**Indigenous Methodologies**

Now that the ethical duty and responsibility that researchers have to ensure that studies include a cultural basis have been articulated, a review of literature related to the necessity for Native American (NA) research, including the ways that NA scholars have explored how to
create research methodologies that are culturally based will be detailed. Creating NA research and methodologies is imperative to countering the distrust that Euro-western research has created among NA communities. NA research improves trust by providing culturally ethical and culturally honorable methodologies. Native American researchers like Trimble (2007) have recognized the need for more research that is multicultural. Tuhiwai-Smith (2012) makes the following statement about Euro-Western research:

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

The implicit harm that research has inflicted upon Native American communities only serves to justify why research regrading NA communities needs to start with NA researchers who conceptualize, perform, interpret, and complete research. Mertens, Cram, and Chilisa (2016) state that for indigenous peoples, the purposeful gathering of information and distillation of meaning informs knowledge. They argue that the negative reaction to research is not about the idea of research; instead the practices, who practices, and who and how research is applied. The Native American ways of sharing knowledge have always been present in NA communities. Western culture determined that current empirical, quantitative, and written documented research were superior to Native American knowledge and knowledge sharing. Wilson (2008) claims that Native American research methodology needs to incorporate the values of Native American peoples, even if they do not align with those of Euro-Westernized research methods. He calls for
the incorporation of cosmology, worldview, epistemology, and ethnic beliefs to reflect the Native American way of being. Furthermore, Native American paradigm is important for multiple reasons, most importantly the ability for Native American people to create their own methods, theory, and practice, and make determinations and definitions based in their own cultural, historical, environmental, and spiritual background for what is normal and abnormal (Wilson, 2008).

Native American research has been predominantly qualitative, rooted in the culture of storytelling, and the strong oral and pictorial history. The onset of colonizing knowledge sharing has led to a system of academe and knowledge sharing that determined written knowledge is the standard for legitimate knowledge. Written knowledge has become the standard in academe knowledge, and as Native American learners navigate the academic world, they have had to learn how to translate their indigenous ways of knowing to fit the dominant paradigm. As the number of Native American researchers and scholars grow, and research about Native American communities completed by Native American scholars for Native American communities and for Native American use, the evolution of Native American research methods and paradigms will continue to expand. As Native American research paradigms continue to advance, the tendency to compare Native American research to the normative, mainstream, and academic traditional Euro-Western paradigm will diminish, thus facilitating the rise of a paradigm that is uniquely Native American, for Native American people, by Native American people (Mertens, Cram, Chilisa, 2016; Wilson, 2008). Further, proponents for indigenizing research will argue that Native American methodologies and paradigms will reflect and recognize the values of Native American peoples’ connections between people, past, present, and future, living and non-living, environment, and spiritual/cultural practice, and become the new norm for creating, producing,
and sharing qualitative and quantitative Native American knowledge. Wilson (2008) and other proponents for Indigenizing methodologies, especially in the field of psychology, claim that Native American research paradigms are important. Indigenized methodologies allow Native American theory, methods of practice, training, and most importantly allow Native American definitions to determine what is “normal” and “abnormal.” Furthermore, the opportunity to determine distinctions of qualitative and quantitative knowledge and concepts come from the Native people, and communities themselves.

One method of including Native American living into research includes Participatory Action Research (PAR). PAR allows researchers to work alongside community members to identify issues and strengths and mobilize community members to action-oriented solutions (Arellano, Balcazar, Alvarado, Suarez, 2015). Others have demonstrated how PAR allows researchers to establish relationships and common cause with Native communities. Because of the lack of standardized procedures, critics of PAR might not hold these studies with the same level of regard as quantitative studies. However, it does challenge mainstream research and allows Native communities and research stakeholders to redefine the way research paradigms ground themselves in the values of the population being studied (Cochran, et.al. 2008). Predominantly, PAR has been qualitative. While Native American issues are numerous, it is far less common to have statistics grounded in a Native American paradigm. The advancement of Native American research methodologies and paradigms would include indigenizing quantitative methods of research. In their text, Walter and Andersen (2013) mainstream quantitative methods are criticized because they are viewed to be transparent and accepted by mainstream academe while also being resisted and rejected as an inaccurate representation of the Native American experience. Walter and Andersen (2013) lay out and outline how quantitative research methods
need to incorporate Native American methodologies. For example, they review how to frame constructs, what research questions to ask, how to interpret statistics, and presenting statistics that have importance in ensuring that Native American voices are included in quantitative methodologies. They conclude that the statistics are not problematic, rather it is how non-Native researchers frame, define, interpret, and represent constructs. Indigenizing statistics is challenging the mainstream conceptualization and interpretation of statistics to include the lens, voices, and experiences of Native American people.

**Native American History in the United States**

As previously discussed, there are barriers researchers face when attempting to expand empirical studies that include minority populations. To neglect reviewing the history and provide context of Native Americans in the United States would be an ethical injustice. The relationship and history of Native Americans and the United States government dates as far back as the beginning of the establishment of the United States. There are substantial historical events that have shaped how Native Americans view and feel about White people, the American government, and any institution created by the Western, non-Native society. Such events include forced removal of tribes from ancestral lands and the relocation to government established reservations, forced removal, and force assimilation of Native children through religious-based schools. These events and others, the research will explore in further detail, including the history and relationship between Native Americans. The complexities of the relationship between Native Americans are carried into perceptions that Native Americans have of working with government entities, schools, or those who are non-Native (Deloria, 1997). The historical relationship Native Americans have had with the United States government since colonization has created a barrier of distrust. This section is a brief review of literature pertaining to the
Native Americans in the United States, intended to give context to why there is hesitation for some Native populations to participate in research. In 1492, the event described as the Native American Holocaust killed an estimated 150 or more Native Americans (Garrett & Pichette, 2000). This genocide, based on the presumption that colonization of Native Americans meant they are to be conquered, and in many cases eradicated. This erasure established through systematic dehumanization and included not only people, but also their languages, culture, and spiritual/religious practices. The United States began collecting census data in 1790, and despite being the original inhabitants of North America, the United States census excluded Native Americans who embraced tribal identity from census data until 1880. This exclusion was based on the Native Americans were not considered “American” citizens (Anderson & Fineburg 1999; Farley 1991). As such, Native Americans could not hold land, which contributed to the way Native Americans and colonizers established a long pattern of land cessation.

Over a period of approximately 280 years, from the mid-1600 to the 1890’s, the United States and Native American nations and tribes signed an estimated 400 treaties (Turner, 2002). Since 1787, an estimated 750 land cessions have occurred over tribal lands that once belonged to Native American tribes (Turner, 2002). The Bureau of Indian Affairs with the U.S. government claimed that land cessions happened with mutual agreement from Native Americans. In 1824, under the Department of War, the federal government established the Bureau of Indian Affairs to oversee treaty negotiations and issues concerning Native American affairs. The loss of historical land under lawful pretense is important because Native Americans have maintained a significant relationship with their traditional homelands. Many tribes honor these sites as ceremonial and significant to their cultural and traditional history. The historical ways in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs took tribal lands set a standard for how the federal government worked with tribes.
Land loss did not end with just cessations; during the 1800’s, The United States government forcibly removed Native Americans from their native lands to reservations (Turner 2002). This forced removal often benefited white settlers. White settlers claimed historical Native land while Native Americans forced to relocate and live on desolate and poor lands foreign to them. Laws such as the Indian Removal Act of 1830, The Dawes Act of 1887 and the Allotment Period of 1880-1935 made it lawful to disband tribal communities and displace Native Americans to federally defined reservations. By 1934, it is estimated that the United States government stole approximately 90 million acres of tribal land from Native Americans who inhabited the land (Kawamoto, 2001; Garrett & Pichette, 2000). Examples of the relationship between land and people continues in present day. Examples continue in recent media and legislation. For example, the fight to keep the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) off lands sacred to the Dakota Natives. Another example includes the fight in southern Utah to protect the Bears Ears National Monument, which includes land that is sacred to the Natives of the area. Finally, in Hawaii, Natives fight to oppose the building of a mass telescope on their sacred Mauna Kea.

In addition to claiming dominance over land and a history of displacing Native Americans from their lands, colonization also brought the displacement of children in the form of boarding schools. Carlisle Indian Industrial School founded in 1879 as the first Indian Boarding school. Starting in 1880’s to the early 1900’s, the United States government policy forcibly removed Native American children from homes and families to attend boarding schools (Pember, 2007). The boarding school policy that forcibly removed Native American children as young as age six from their parents’ homes made children attend church-run schools where children faced forced assimilation. The boarding school movement has been described as “one of the most destructive and genocidal federal policies” (Bubar & Jumper Thurman, 2004). This
campaign often was associated with the slogan “Kill the Indian Save the Man” and punished Native American children who spoke their tribal language instead of the English language. In addition, boarding school prohibited Native American children from using their tribal birth names, and boarding schools forced White names on them.

The government system, of classification based on race and ethnicity, justified the denial of rights and resources to oppressed groups. Examples such as forced removal from land were justified by classifying that Native Americans were not citizens, and therefore could not hold land. The Indian Citizen Act of 1924 marked the first time in federal history that the United States government granted citizenship to Native Americans (Garrett & Pichette, 2000). However, despite citizenship, Native Americans continued to endure treatment as a removable population. In the 1950’s, the federal government implemented the Voluntary Relocation Program for Native Americans, promising a new start and access to a better quality of life to anyone willing to move their family away from tribal lands into the city.

Prior to 1978, boarding schools and the forced removal of Native children imposed on them Christianity. Land cessations restricted access to sacred sites for religious ceremonies. The government has enforced policies restricting the religious rights of Native Americans. In 1978, the Native American Religious Freedom Act granted religious freedoms and protections to Native Americans. In doing so, the Act allowed Native Americans to practice their ceremonial traditions on land without restriction, use substances that ceremony requires without criminalization, and finally, the freedom to practice ceremony without interruption (Rannow, 1982). In addition to being granted religious freedom, the Indian Child Welfare Act was passed in 1978 (Gross, 2003; Garrett & Pichette, 2000) which granted tribal rights to govern the removal of any child from their family to decrease the adoption of Indian, or Native American
children to non-tribal homes (Duran 2014). It was not until 1994 that government passed legislation allowing Native Americans to be self-governing.

The historical trauma that Native Americans have endured continues to have long lasting impact among today’s Native American generations. Boarding schools influenced how Native Americans view “going away” to pursue an education (Deer & Endroes; 1993). Family members may be encouraging of education but may not necessarily be supportive of going to live away from home in college dorms. Furthermore, the persistent dehumanization, oppression, and extortion of Native Americans contribute to how many Native Americans continue to face misrepresentation as exotic and entertaining and are often stereotyped to be “stoic warriors.” Native Americans of both genders face racial stereotyping and are often described as gamblers, alcoholics, and living off of federal funds or casino funds (Hanson; 1989). Mascots depicting Native American caricatures perpetuate negative stereotypes (Fryberg, et.al, 2008). A result of the repeated trauma experienced by colonization and subsequent policies, Yellow Horse Brave Heart (Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 2003, 1998 in Yellow Horse Brave Heart et al. 2011) introduced the concept historical trauma. Historical trauma, defined as the “cumulative emotional and psychological wounding across generations including the lifespan which emanates from massive group trauma” (p. 283). The sociopolitical history between the United States and Native Americans has manifested in policies and legislation that perpetuated the elevation of the White society and the oppression and genocide of Native Americans. Scholars like Whitbeck, Adams, Hoyt, and Chen (2004) have expanded the study of historical trauma and published studies that attempt to measure the impact of historical trauma. Despite these atrocities, Native American tribes continue to exist across the United States. The impact that policies and legislation enacted manifest in the disparities in the Native population.
The historical mistreatment of Native Americans manifests in multiple ways, one such way is that Native Americans have long experienced increased health disparities in comparison to other racial groups in the United States. These health disparities in the Native American population continue despite a history of legislation put in place to provide health services to Native Americans. In 1787, a special government-to-government relationship was established between members of federally recognized tribes and the United States federal government to provide health services to members of federally recognized tribes. This agreement, based on Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, created numerous treaties, laws, Supreme Court decisions, and Executive Orders. Under treaties the federal government formed the Indian Health Service to address the health needs of Native Americans. However, the Indian Health Service has added to the historical trauma experienced by Native Americans. For example, from 1972 through 1976, Indian Health Services reportedly sterilized Native American women without their consent or knowledge (Bubar & Jumper Thurman, 2004). Public Law 93-638 allowed tribes the right to self-management of health programs (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2019). This allowed tribes to negotiate contracts with the United States government to allow tribes to oversee, plan, organize, conduct, and administer health programs that the United States government previously administered.

The historical context in which Native Americans exist in the United States is important to understanding the racialized messages they receive about their group. The next section will discuss general models of racial identity development.

**Racial Identity**

Racial identity is an important construct to review in order to give important context to this study. In this section, the writer will summarize how the structures and use of racial
construct and racial classifications continue to oppress racial minorities. Next, the author will review an explanation of the general construct of racial identity. The author will review these constructs to provide a foundational understanding of how race has affected the development of identity. Finally, this section will end with a review of models of racial identity development.

Tuckwell (2002) reports that as early as the sixteenth century, scholars have used race as a biological classification to differentiate the Christian decedents of Adam and Eve and those whom they encountered through exploration of the world. Early classification systems such as race were used to assert superiority over non-Europeans. The classification of Africans as subhuman, suggesting a lower form of species and an innate inferiority to White, European explorers is an example of how this early classification system asserted superiority and justified the mistreatment of non-European, non-White individuals. Despite the lack of empirical evidence that race is biological, the application of race and racial classification remained a socio-political construct to continue to justify the assumed inferiority of racial minorities. This continued to be a recurring theme in history and as the United States was colonized, race also continued to be a hierarchy used to establish White dominance, elevate White settlers, and justify the oppression of those presumed to be inferior (Tuckwell, 2002; Thompson & Carter, 1997).

Racial classification has fed into racism and racist attitudes. Racism has impacted the ways that racial minority individuals and groups have encountered interactions with multiple systems including judicial, academic, consumer, housing, and government. Researchers acknowledge that many racial minorities have endured mistreatment due to the impact of race and racism. However, none permeates the trauma, dehumanization, and the oppression Native American, and Black people have endured since colonization. Both have received explicit messages about their race being inferior; therefore the forced removal from lands, forced removal of children, loss of
culture, language, traditions, and other atrocities have been justified. This history has influenced the racial identity development of entire groups of people.

In scholarly literature, the definition of racial identity used is “a sense of group or collective identity based on one’s perception that he or she shares a common heritage with a particular racial group” (Helms, 1990, p.3 in eds. Thompson & Carter, 1997, p. 1-2). Racial identity develops through racialized experiences individuals have throughout their lifetime. Development begins with messages received from home, which continues throughout the lifetime. The basic premise of racial identity is the racialization of groups of people and the ways that individuals perceive and experience events that are racially based, include racial biases, and racial prejudice. Thompson and Carter, (1997) describe racial identity as the continual process of an individual determining which group they do and do not identify with. Racial identity development has been theorized and is a subject studied by social sciences, including counseling psychology.

In 1971, William Cross introduced to scholars the study of racial identity development with the study of Black racial identity and Nigrescense theory. Cross is among the first to explore the impact of race on identity development. Nigrescense explored the internal process of the Black experience. Furthermore, Cross explored the Black individual experience of human diminishment from White people, and the transformation into a refined worldview that allows Black individuals to appreciate the self and others as racial beings. Almost a decade later, Janet Helms expanded on this theory and introduced the People of Color model that was inclusive of other racial minorities and their experiences. Helms’ People of Color Model for identity development is one of the main methods used in training. Researchers have used the model as the theoretical basis for racial identity development research. The following summary of Helms’
model is from Thompson and Carter (1997). Helms’ People of Color Model for racial identity development describes five phases individuals experience. The first phase, Conformity, has two modes: an active and passive mode. Active conformity is the characteristics of overt displays of cultural denigration and White idealization. Passive conformity is when a person ignores their internalized racism and ignores the impact race has on their social interactions with those who are like them and those outside their racial groups, particularly White people. The second phase, Dissonance, is when a person of color begins to experience inconsistencies in treatment from others despite efforts to conform to White standards. In this phase, one begins to realize the racial inequalities in the way White people and people of color are treated. The third phase is Immersion/Emersion. In this phase, a person begins to define their identity in one of two ways. Regarding Immersion, a person will begin to define themselves in a rigid manner consistent with stereotypes of their group, thus they Immerse into their group culture, or they will progress into Emersion. Emersion is the formation of new perspectives of one’s identity informed by realistic understandings of the messages they receive about their racial group (sociopolitical, cultural, etc.). The fourth phase in the model is Internalization. In this stage, a person is able to fully integrate their evolved identity into everyday life, rejecting racism and racial injustices when recognized and experienced. Finally, the fifth phase is Integrative Awareness, where a person is able to accept, refine, and integrate positive aspects of themselves and other cultures/groups to form a more integrated identity. Researchers have studied Helms’ model and then expanded and modified the model over time. One expansion of the model is with Sue and Sue’s model of Racial/Cultural Identity Development, which is summarized next.

Sue & Sue’s Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model (R/CID) as summarized in the 2003 text identifies five phases of identity development: Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance
and Immersion, Introspection, and Integrative Awareness. Conformity is the phase where a person completely conforms to the dominant group; in dissonance, a person begins to feel conflicted regarding racial experiences and identification. In the Resistance and Immersion phase, one begins to resist the dominant group and immerse into their own group. In introspection, the person experiences a level of hatred to the dominant group, binary black/white thinking exists with little compromise. Finally, in Integrative Awareness a person emerges with an evolved identity, proud of their culture, choosing the best parts of both dominant, and their own group cultures, beliefs, and views.

Racial identity models have led to exploration of other dimensions of identity, encouraging scholars to examine Multiracial identity, Biracial identity, Feminist identity, Womanist identity, LGGBTQ Identity development and many other models of identity development. Wijeyesinghe and Jackson III (2012), in their text, summarize new perspectives of identity from multiple aspects including models that introduce intersectionality, or how multiple identities such as race, gender, sexual orientation, and religion all intersect in identity development. See Figure 1 as an example of only one of the models of identity in the literature.

In another chapter, Jackson III (2012) discusses another perspective of how Black heritage grounds Black Identity and other dimensions of identity intersect with and influence the process of internalizing messages.

The study and research of racial identity development has allowed research to examine the impact of race and racial messages. These studies have informed the training of psychologists, encouraging trainees to examine their own identity development and challenges and biases they may carry in their current phase of development. Furthermore, it allows trainees to understand where clients, students, and supervisees are in their own development, thus
providing an understanding of where to meet them and a conceptual framework of where they can grow. A racial identity scale is a tool that explains and elaborates how one identifies with their own group or another, assesses internalized views and perceptions of how one feels others, and a person’s satisfaction with their culture perceive them. Models of American Indian, Indianness, and Native American Identity have begun to emerge in research. Next, the author will summarize the models that have explored Native American Identity.


Figure 1

Internalization through the Lens of Intersectionality

Native American Identity

Now that the author has summarized definitions of racial identity, the next topic to review and summarize is Native American identity. This section will also include some models of Native American Identity. Horse, et.al. (2005) claimed there is no monolithic American Indian identity, explaining that the identities are myriad due to the diversity of tribes and the complex dual citizenship that individuals have with tribe and nation. The issue with the
definitions of Native American identity is that no singular way of identifying captures the dimensions of identity. No standalone identification seems to work because each one alone excludes a group. Scholars have acknowledged the complexity of defining Native American identity. Garroutte (2003), Hamill (2003), Bryant & LaFromboise (2005), Jacobs (2014), are among the scholars that have explored the complexities of identity. One commonality among Native identity scholars is that they all acknowledge that the traumas endured by Native people and continual oppression of tribes and native nations influence how individuals perceive messages about their group. Further complicating identity is the unique dual citizenship Natives have. The tribal policy for identification, self-determination, or formal recognition through tribal enrollment are determinants of citizenship of Native Americans individuals. Native Americans, as of 1924, are also citizens of the United States. In the literature related to Native American identity, four major themes have been identified: self-identification, cultural, biological, and legal identifications (Garroutt, 2003; Horse, 2005). These themes add to the intricacies of Native American identity, each encompasses an aspect of identity that helps to define and understated the complexity of Native American identity.

Self/personal identification describes those who identify as Native American but may not meet tribal enrollment requirements (Garroutte, 2003). The most recent United States census estimates saw a significant increase in individuals self-identifying as Native American (Doyle & Kao, 2007). Others who fall into the self-identification category are individuals who are “born again” Indians or those who claim to have been “adopted into” a tribe. There are some, like Mihesuah (1998), who claim that individuals should not be able to self-identify unless they also have parentage, ancestry, and blood quantum, otherwise individuals fabricate their identities. In summary, self-identification or personal identification is acceptable when supported with an
additional way of identifying such as cultural, biological and/or enrollment status to confirm their self-identification. Definitions of cultural identification are often associated with one’s participation, knowledge, and involvement in cultural practices (Garoutte, 2003; Brown, Dickerson, & D’Amico, 2016). Often, the biological definitions of identity link to blood quantum, determined by the degree of blood quantum parents pass onto children (Garoutte 2003, Robertson, 2013). Higher blood quantum denotes more legitimacy to Native identity. Federal guidelines require a defined blood quantum to recognize Native Americans, thereby linking biological and legal definitions of identity. As discussed in Chapter one, there are numerous legal definitions. Being a “card-carrying” Native American with federal and legal definitions to support your identity, opens access to federal resources that are protected by policy, treaties, and agreements between the United States government and federally recognized tribes and their members. The complexity of Native American identity has lent itself to a variety of models of Native American identity development.

Lucero (2010) proposed a 4-stage model for Urban American Indian Identity. The first being “Stage 1: The Struggle,” which is associated with teenage years, and characterized by rejection of Native cultural connections, caused by confusion, feelings of being lost, and detachment from their Native group. This stage, described as an emotional struggle where one struggles with what it means to be Native. “Stage 2: The Catalyst,” often occurring in mid-20’s, is characterized by an event or experience that is so significant it encourages a person to think about their “Indianness” and pushes them to want to grow and know more about who they are and where they come from. Stage 2 propels individuals into “Stage 3: Going Back – Returning to the People.” Stage 3, associated with mid to late twenties; when individuals feel drawn to return to their tribal homelands, often to search for and find connections to their people,
language, family, and culture. Lucero describes that individuals need to find some resolve, some connection in stage 3 before moving on into the next stage. The last stage, “Stage 4: Living on the Red Road – Integrating Native Identity,” is associated with late 20’s to early 30’s. In this stage, a person integrates their Native identity into everyday life, in which they find ways to participate in their tribal culture. Being Native and integration of their cultural ways becomes a conscious choice.

Witko (2008) proposed another model of identity that introduced the Five Categories of Indianness, a model providing a framework for the assimilative processes urban Native Americans experience. The first category, Traditional Person, characterized by understanding traditional “old ways,” and being fluent in tribal language with little or no English language fluency. The traditional person also participates in rituals and practices related to their tribe. The second category, the Transitional Person speaks both English and their tribal language. The transitional person practices traditional rituals and practices but is not immersed in them like the Traditional person is, yet they are still not accepted by dominant culture. The third category, The Marginal person is characterized by the complexity of rejection of dominant culture and inability to live “old ways” perhaps due to location, access or lack of knowledge. Marginal persons, described as displaced or relocated. Marginal persons often lack the connections and support that Native communities offer, and are at higher risk for social and psychological problems. The fourth category, called the Assimilated person, embraces and feels accepted by dominant culture. An assimilated person will identify more with dominant culture than their tribal culture and may even deny their Native identity. The final category is the Bicultural person. The Bicultural person is an integration of both traditional and dominant cultures; they manage to navigate tribal and dominant society with acceptance from both cultures. The Five Categories of Indianness has
similarities and is comparable to the one of the general models of racial identity previously addressed.

These models benefit Native American research and defining the identity because they do attempt to define and explore identity through cultural and ethnic lens. Though both Lucero and Witko models are helpful in providing a framework and understanding of the Native American experience, they are limited to describing the urban Native American experience. The models do not address the identity development of Native Americans who live primarily on reservations, those who grew up on reservations and relocated to urban areas for work, school or other reasons. Furthermore the models focus on the cultural identity, or the way that a person experiences the blending of their Native culture with the dominant culture. The models are population specific to Urban Natives and are limited to exploring cultural identity. These limitations leave gaps in the literature. One existing gap is exploring how Native Americans experience race and how those experiences influence their racial identity development.

Other ways of exploring identity have been by examining acculturation, ethnic identity, cultural identity, and bicultural identity. House, Stiffman and Brown (2006) provide an extensive literature review of measures developed to assess identity among Native American populations. One of the earliest studies by Mohatt and Blue (1982) attempted to define identity with the utilization of an empirical measure. The study, cited in literature, describes a measure that empirically assesses an aspect of Native American identity called tiospaye, or degree of traditionalism among Lakota Sioux Nation members (House, Stiffman & Brown, 2006). Another early measure of Native American identity is the Rosebud Personal Opinion Survey (RPOS). The RPOS is cited in various studies and used to examine NA/AI identity development. The RPOS measures dimensions of acculturation, or the measure of how ethnic
minority individuals assimilate into the majority culture. Initially, the scale had twelve components: Language use, value orientation, social behavior and customs, social interaction network, religious affiliation and practices, community of residence, occupational status, formal education attainment, identification with traditional culture, and ancestry or blood quantum. The RPOS examined the following dimensions: acculturation language, education, occupational status, blood quantum, social behavioral and social memberships, activities, value orientation, and cultural attitudes (Hoffmann, Dana & Bolton, 1985; House, Stiffman & Brown, 2006).

An impactful study completed by Oetting and Beauvais (1991) argued that cultural identity was more orthogonal than linear. In their study, the researchers introduced the Orthogonal Cultural Identification Measure, which assessed biculturalism and individual perceptions of Native American culture, mainstream culture, or a combination of Native American and mainstream culture. Oetting and Beauvais claimed that identifying with a culture could be a personal strength. The theory was developed during work with Native American youth ages 13-17, thus limiting the generalizability.

In another study, Zimmerman, Washienko, Walter, and Dyer (1996) developed the Measure of Enculturation. The three-year study collected data and used an exploratory factor analysis to find underlying factors to measure Enculturation. The study was completed over three years with three different samples. Zimmerman, et.al. used the labels Study One, Study Two and Study Three to denote the samples and data collected over the three-year period. The longitudinal nature of collecting data from the same participants over a three-year period helped in the validity of the scale. Participants included youth ages 7-18, Study One (N = 120). All participants in Study Two (N=69) participated in Study One, there were no new participants reported and researchers reported a 53% retention rate of participants between Study One and
Study Two. In Study Three (N = 42), researchers reported a 0% retention rate, the sample in Study Three did not include any participants from the first or second study. Results of the study contributed to understanding biculturalism among youth. Zimmerman, et al. (1996) focused on Enculturation as an aspect of identity. Results indicated that the model created supported the theoretical framework presented in previous literature researchers reviewed. Zimmerman, et al. (1996) also stated that the results of their study fit with multidimensional models of ethnic identity.

Yetter and Foutch (2013) adapted the Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) developed in 2004 by Umana-Taylor Yazedijan, and Bamaca Gomez to Native American youth. Researchers sampled from Native American youth grades seventh through twelfth (N=144) from Oklahoma. The EIS was administered to participants with a demographic questionnaire. Researchers used a confirmatory factor analysis to test the applicability of EIS to this Native American sample. Results demonstrated that the EIS does not fit with the sample used in the study. Researchers detected a close fit and suggested future study to continue to examine the EIS applicability to Native American populations. The exploration of the complexities of Native American identity include the creation of a scale to capture what Native American identity is and the adaptations of scales to use with Native American populations have also been used. Thus far, the writer discussed at length quantitative studies; however, there remain a growing number of qualitative studies that explore the complexities of Native American identity.

One impactful study was a qualitative study of Culture and Ethnic identity among youth, parents, and elders. The 2006 study by House, Stiffman, and Brown sampled from Native Americans from the Southwest (N=24), with ages that ranged from 13 to 90 years old. Researchers identified six themes that related to identity, they were Traditions, Legacy, Physical
characteristics and language, Values, Hardship, and Community. These themes were significant across age groups. Traditions captured the importance of ceremony, customs, and beliefs that pass from generation to generation. Legacy focused on the inheritance of historical importance of land, expectations, stories, and legends. Physical characteristics and language focused on the tribal language and the common physical characteristics of Native Americans. Values captured what was important such as spirituality, helping others, sharing, respect, resistance, and humor. Hardship focused on acknowledgement of limited resources, trauma, and discrimination. Finally, community reflected community, family, and belonging. Qualitative studies, by nature of allowing participants to share their experiences through story or open ended questions are able to capture more of the complexities of Native American identity by demonstrating that identity is not exclusive to the self, but extends to history, land, language, family, and community.

The literature for empirical research exploring Native American identity is often limited to youth participants or by examining bicultural, biracial, or multiracial populations. The research has focused on the cultural and ethnic aspects of identity (Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011; Trimble, Helms & Root, 2003; Trimble & Dickson, 2005). Few studies have addressed race as a dimension of identity among Native American populations. The NIS serves as a basis for researchers to begin to explore race as a dimension of Native American identity.

**The Native Identity Scale**

In psychology, the study of race as a dimension of Native American identity is limited. The few studies found focus on racial identity development profiles. For example, the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS) developed by Helms’ utilized by multiple studies with Native Americans attempts to understand the impact of race on identity (Bryant Jr. & Baker, 2003; Bryant Jr. & LaFromboise, 2005; Watson, 2009). These studies have been
limited to examining college age students and examining profiles of their racial identity development.

Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) introduced the Native Identity Scale to explore aspects of how Native Americans experience racial identity. The Multidimensional Model for Racial Identity (MMRI) served as the conceptual framework for the NIS. The MMRI was developed to understand how race is significant to understanding self-concept among African Americans (Sellers, et.al, 1998). The MMRI is not a developmental model, but rather it is a tool to examine where an individual’s racial identity status is. Sellers, et.al (1998) claimed that previous studies of identity following mainstream approaches focused on how racial groups developed personal self-concepts with the race/group they belong to as the foundation. The MMRI differed from previous research by focusing more on the meaning of being a member of a group.

To operationalize the MMRI, Sellers, et.al. (1998) developed the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) to measure the dimensions of the MMRI. The MIBI is comprised of three subscales that measure centrality, ideology, and regard. The Ideology subscale is comprised of four subscales (Nationalist, Assimilation, Minority, and Humanist) and Regard is comprised of two subscales (Private Regard and Public Regard). The definition of salience, not operationalized, as the dimension was better suited for quasi-experimental conditions. To test the MIBI, Sellers, et.al. (1998), conducted a study. The study had a sample size of 474 African Americans who were students at two universities. Reliability of the subscales ranged from .70 to .79. Internal validity of Private and Public Regard subscales were initially not acceptable (.60 and .02, respectively), but after revision of the items the reliability improved to .78 and .78. This study demonstrated that the MIBI was a valid and reliable tool to measure dimensions of the MMRI model.
The MMRI is comprised of the following dimensions: Racial Salience, Racial Centrality, and Racial Regard, which includes Public and Private Regard, and Racial Ideology including Nationalist, Oppressed Minority, Assimilationist, and Humanist. Sellers, et.al. (1998) provided the following definitions of each of the dimensions on the MMRI. Salience is how an individual perceives their race as part of their self-concept in a situation or event. Sellers et al. did not operationalize salience. Centrality is a measure of how, based on race an individual defines who they are. Centrality is consistent and stable despite situation or events, thus it is measurable on a scale. Public Regard is the way that those individuals outside the African American race view them negatively or positively. Private Regard is the way that African Americans perceive other African Americans as well as how they perceive being part of the African American race. Ideology is how individuals believe, act, feel, and form opinions based on the way they feel members of their race should act. Nationalist refers to the uniqueness of being African American and acknowledging that their experience is unique from any other race. Oppressed Minority reflects how individuals feel a sense of solidarity with other oppressed minority groups. The Assimilationist scale measures the way that a person acknowledges the similarities between one’s race and the rest of American society. Finally, the Humanist subscale reflects how one acknowledges similarities across race and values “the human race.” These measures from the MIBI and the conceptual framework of the MMRI served as the foundation for the NIS. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) hypothesized that MMRI could be an acceptable framework for developing a Native Identity Scale. Part of their argument for applicability was that African Americans and Native Americans have both experienced historical forced relocations and cultural suppression in the United States.
Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) replaced the terms “African American” and “Black” with the terms “Native American” and “Native” for all 56 items of the MIBI and included six additional items that were specific to Native American culture. The six additional items that were added by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) were not detailed or provided. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) utilized an exploratory factor analysis to extract four underlying factors: Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority. The final scale had 25-items. The study provided the groundwork for a scale to measure racial identity among Native Americans grounded in a combination of existing theory and an indigenous framework. The sample population was limited to one tribe, which therefore limits its generalizability.

Summary

In summary, Chapter two reviewed related literature. Key concepts that shape this study include following accepted practices for scale development, validation, and application. Chapter two reviewed the accepted practices that guide this study’s method and analyses. Historically, social science research has excluded minority populations from research and research processes, thus perpetuating unanticipated harm. Key concepts for shifting this practice and guide this study to closer align with Native American practices in research. The major issues with these research attempts have been that they primarily used the norms and expectations of the dominant culture (i.e., Western/White/however you would characterize the dominant culture) to try to interpret Native American behavior. Thus, Native American behavior is too often interpreted in terms of norms and expectations not shared by the tribal culture leading to misattributions of behavior, over-pathologizing of behaviors, and misinterpretation of observations and behaviors (Anderson & Ellis, 1995). Furthermore, they often exclude Indigenous methodologies that reflect the values, beliefs, and life experiences of Indigenous people. The chapter summarized
the contentious historical relationship Native Americans have with the United States, and how the relationship shapes the current research. This summary provides a historical review of policies and legislation that affected Native American ways of life, families, and freedoms that contributed to experienced traumas. All of this provided the foundation for this dissertation’s focus on racial identity. Finally, the chapter reviewed related racial identity literature to provide context to the how this study is adding to the previous study by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011). The author summarized a number of empirical studies that have previously investigated dimensions of racial identity. Finally, the author discussed the Native Identity Scale in depth. These previous studies do not explore racial identity as a dimension of identity; this study intends to fill that gap in the current literature.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter will review methods and procedures this study used for this investigation. The chapter will include the following topics: (a) Participants; (b) Measures; (c) Procedures; and (d) Analysis. The summary for chapter three will summarize important methodological and procedural aspects of the study.

Participants

The investigator collected data from 221 initial participants. Of the 221 participants, the investigator excluded 14 participants from analysis due to no affiliation with a tribe from the southwestern United States. An additional two participants were not included in the analysis due to incomplete Native Identity Scales. Chapter 4 contains more details about reliability of the scale, subscales, and variable interactions. The final sample size was 205 participants. Table 1 details and summarizes the frequencies of participant characteristics are detailed in Table 1 and summarized below.

Of the 205 participants, 146 (71.2%) identified as female, and 59 (28.8%) identified as male. Participants ages ranged from 18 to 72 years ($M = 38.27$, $SD = 11.16$). Participants reported their highest level of education attained as follows: some high school ($n = 2, 1\%$), high school diploma/equivalent ($n = 24, 11.7\%$). Education beyond high school equivalence that participants reported included business or trade school ($n = 6, 2.9\%$), some college ($n = 50, 24.4\%$), Associates or two-year degree ($n = 30, 14.6\%$), Bachelor’s or four-year degree ($n = 50, 24.4\%$), some graduate or professional school ($n = 11, 5.4\%$), graduate or professional degree ($n = 31, 15.1\%$). Participants who reported other education not listed ($n = 1, 0.5\%$). Participants
reported their primary tribal identification Navajo \((n = 131, 63.9\%)\), Pueblo \((n = 38, 18.5\%)\), Apache \((n = 17, 8.3\%)\), Gila River \((n = 4, 2\%)\), Colorado River Indians \((n = 3, 1.5\%)\), Hopi \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Bishop Paiute \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Yaqui \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Tohono O’odam \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Hupa \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Zuni \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\), and Chumash \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\). A majority of participants indicated that they only affiliate with one tribe \((n = 166, 81\%)\). Some participants indicated more than one tribal affiliation \((n = 33, 16.1\%)\) and six participants did not answer the question about affiliation with more than one tribe. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of participant characteristics.

In addition to tribal affiliation, participants responded to questions regarding their first language. Participants also responded to questions about the racial composition of the community where they grew up. The first language breakdown of participants was English \((n = 96, 46.8\%)\), Tribal Language \((n = 47, 22.9\%)\), a combination of English and Tribal Language \((n = 56, 27.3\%)\), no answer provided \((n = 5, 2.4\%)\), and other \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\). The sample reported that the tribal languages participants spoke were as follows: Navajo \((n = 63, 30.7\%)\), Keres \((n = 28, 13.7\%)\), Apache \((n = 4, 2\%)\), Hopi \((n = 2, 1\%)\), multiple tribal languages \((n = 2, 1\%)\), Yaqui \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\), Zuni \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\). There were some participants who reported that they spoke a tribal language not affiliated with southwestern tribes \((n = 2, 1\%)\), and some who did not indicate a tribal language \((n = 102, 49.8\%)\). Participants reported their tribal language fluency as very fluent \((n = 40, 19.5\%)\), speak conversationally \((n = 30, 14.6\%)\), speak with some trouble \((n = 38, 18.5\%)\), speak a little \((n = 66, 32.2\%)\), cannot speak \((n = 30, 14.6\%)\), and no answer given \((n = 1, .5\%)\). Most participants indicated that the community they were raised in was mostly comprised of Native Americans \((n = 147, 71.7\%)\), while others shared that the racial composition of the
community they were raised in was mixed \((n = 43, 21\%)\), mostly White \((n = 11, 5.4\%)\) or other \((n = 4, 2\%)\).

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Participant Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some H.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. or Equivalent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Trade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A./A.S./2-year degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s/4-year degree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate/professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated with 1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated ≥2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary tribal affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila River</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Paiute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohono O’odam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants indicated the racial composition of the communities they currently reside in were as follows: mostly Native \((n = 95, 46.3\%)\), mixed \((n = 63, 30.7\%)\), mostly White \((n = 41, 20\%)\), other \((n = 5, 2.4\%)\), and no answer given \((n = 1, 0.5\%)\). Table 2 summarizes the tribal language descriptive statistics.
Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Tribal Language and the Community Participants were Raised*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Language</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo English and Tribal language</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer Provided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribal Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keres</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple SW tribal Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Lang not affiliated with SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you speak your Tribal Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribal Language Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Fluent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Conversationally</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with some trouble</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak a little</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Speak</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition of Community Raised In</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Native American</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

**Demographic Survey.** The demographic survey used in this study, is detailed in Appendix H. Using the demographic survey, participants were asked to indicate their gender, age, tribal affiliation, indication of Native language spoken, cultural/religious affiliation,
socioeconomic status, physical and mental health status, and participation in pow-wow’s. If participants endorsed that they affiliated with more than one tribe or race, the demographic questionnaire included an option to indicate what other tribes and/or race they identified with. The investigator also requested information about participant employment, number of hours they work each week, individual and family income, the racial composition of the community where they grew up, how often they attend religious and spiritual events related to their tribal affiliation, Pow-wow participation, and physical and mental health status. The demographic questionnaire asked participants to select a response from a list pre-determined by the researcher. Additionally, there were questions that allowed participants to provide qualitative responses to questions.

**Native Identity Scale.** The Native Identity Scale (NIS; Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011; Appendix I), as previously discussed, developed by John Gonzalez and Russell Bennett (2011) through modification and adaptation of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) using the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) as a conceptual framework for applicability to the Native American population. To test the MMRI and its applicability to Native Americans, Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) revised and modified 56 items in the MIBI by replacing the word “Black” with “American Indian” and included an additional six items, specific to Native American culture. After exploratory factor analysis, 25 items were retained for the Native Identity Scale.

The NIS is a measure of an individual’s self-perception regarding aspects of one’s Native identity. The scale consists of 25 items measured on a Likert-type scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7). The scale consists of four subscales or factors measuring different aspects of identity. Factor 1, Centrality, consists of nine items that measure the importance of
one’s Native identity. Higher scores in Factor 1 indicate that an individual strongly values their Native identity. Factor 2, or the Humanist subscale, consists of seven items. This subscale measures how one might relate to non-Natives. High scores in this subscale demonstrate that an individual accepts the commonalities one has with non-Natives. Factor 3, the Public Regard subscale, consists of four items and measures how one believes the public perceives them. Participants who indicate higher scores on the Public Regard subscale believe that others perceive them positively. Factor 4, the Oppressed Minority subscale, consists of five items and measures how much an individual identifies with other oppressed groups. Higher scores in this subscale indicate that individuals feel a sense of solidarity with other oppressed groups. In the initial study, the researchers used the sum of the items loading on each factor. Gonzalez and Bennett’s analysis found that Factor 1’s variance value was 19.4%, $M = 59.45$, $SD = 6.26$ and Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$. Factor 2’s variance value was 10.8%, $M = 30.24$, $SD = 8.36$, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .70$. Factor 3’s variance value was 9.1%, $M = 14.47$, $SD = 5.15$ and Cronbach’s $\alpha = .65$. Factor 4 had a variance value of 8.9%, $M = 25.11$, $SD = 6.01$ and Cronbach’s $\alpha = .66$. Gonzalez and Bennett utilized the sum scores of each subscale to report descriptive statistics for each factor. Dr. Gonzalez granted permission to use the NIS, see Appendix J.

**Procedures**

To participate and be included in the study, participants were required to meet three criteria: (a) be 18-years-old or older at the time of participation, (b) identify as being Native American, and (c) have affiliation with a tribe from the southwest region of the United States. The investigator excluded individuals who did not meet criteria from the study. The investigator completed this during the spring of 2019. Approval from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) from Western Michigan University preceded recruitment from the
population of adults who identified as Native American. See Appendix K for the HSIRB approval letter.

Data collection relied on the snowball method of recruitment. The snowball effect is a common method of participant recruitment for studies. The investigator chose the snowball method of recruitment as a method of including cultural consideration to potential participants. Wilson (2008) emphasizes gathering information be community driven and relational. To include relational and community driven recruitment, the investigator sought assistance from individuals, groups, and committees who were familiar with the investigator and the study. The investigator sent inquires to be permitted to set up a table for in person recruitment to individuals, committees, and groups that the investigator was familiar with through prior work, and common interest in work with Native communities, thus emphasizing the relationships that were previously established to serve as a method to send inquires to potential participants, see Appendix A. The prior established relationship assisted in providing initial trust to consider participation. The relational way of recruitment also served as a method to gather data in a way that was consistent with Indigenous methodologies. Data was collected utilizing two primary recruitment efforts; the first was face-to-face recruitment at gatherings and events aimed at Native American individuals such as conferences with topics pertaining to Native American issues. Recruitment also occurred at social gatherings and pow-wows. The second method of data collection was online recruitment. The investigator sent e-mails and social media invitations to affiliates the investigator was familiar with and those affiliates forwarded inquires for participation to other Native American individuals (snowball effect) for maximum recruitment efforts.
Every participant received an overview and purpose of the study prior to beginning the survey. The informed consent reminded participants that participation was voluntary and if at any point during the study they felt uncomfortable, they may withdraw from participation. Those recruited face-to-face with a script to introduce the study and request for participation; and if they verbally consented, each participant heard a recruitment script and received a packet to complete that included the informed consent form. Refer to Appendix B for the full consent form. Participants also received the option to be included in a drawing for $25 Visa Gift Card and example attached, see Appendix G, demographic questionnaire, and the NIS. Participants read and signed an informed consent form and were assured personal information provided would be kept confidential. The investigator provided paper and pen questionnaires, and the NIS to complete on site and return to the investigator. The investigator collected only the signed page of the informed consent, completed demographic questionnaire, completed NIS, and optional email for the $25 Visa Gift card from participants. The signed informed consent forms were stored separate from completed questionnaires to ensure confidentiality. When requested, one on one or small group time for additional questions was provided for participants to ensure all questions they had were answered. This additional time also provided time for the investigator to reinforce the sense of community and relational data collection that the snowball method of data collection provided.

The second method of data collection was utilizing the snowball effect via e-mail and social media to invite participation. Individuals who were associated with Native American organizations, such as Directors of Native American Student Affairs at universities, scholarship organizations, Native American Parent Teacher Associations and other individuals who were affiliated with listservs, were sent an email requesting permission to sample from their
organizations, see Appendix D. When participants granted permission, each participant received an email with a brief overview and purpose of the study. At the end of each email, a link was included to take participants to the informed consent, demographic questionnaire, and NIS for completion. Prior to starting the questionnaire, the participants read the informed consent form and, by completing the survey, they indicated their consent to be included in the study, see Appendix E. When participation via email recruitment did not yield participation, the investigator requested to amend the HSIRB to include social media as a method of recruitment. The investigator used the same scripts for email and social media recruitment.

On average, the total survey time ranged from nine to fifteen minutes. As an incentive, participants had the option of providing their email address for a drawing for one of two $25 Visa gift cards. Prior to the exclusion of participants from the analysis, 104 participants completed the study online and 136 completed the study via face-to-face recruitment.

Analysis

The use of the Native Identity Scale is relatively new, with only one publication of the scale (Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011). The investigator used the Exploratory Factor Analysis method to analyze the NIS, identify factors and factor loadings, and explore item reduction if necessary. This method of analysis provided a quantitative basis to determine how items on the NIS represent dimensions of identity in the sample population. Further analysis was done using Two-way Analysis of Variance to determine how the independent variables of tribal language fluency and racial composition of the community where participants grew up affected how participants responded to items on the NIS. To complete analysis, the language fluency responses changed from a 5-point Likert scale to three categories to represent language fluency as independent variables. *Not at all, some and fluent* represented the three levels of language
examined. Racial composition of the community individuals were raised in was also condensed from four conditions, with the fourth being an open qualitative option, to three conditions for analysis. *Mostly Native, mixed,* and *mostly White* were conditions that represented the racial composition of communities. There were less than five qualitative answers written in the “other” space and all were names of cities; after examination of each qualitative answer, they were determined to fit best in the “mixed” category. In the current study, factor scores consisted of the mean across items of each subscale versus the sum scores of each factor. It was determined that sum scores were helpful if the factors had the same number of items loading; however due to items loading from four to nine it was determined comparing means across items would provide a more accurate comparison between factors.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed key methodological and procedural processes utilized in the study including participants, instruments and data collection and analyses. All letters, emails, informed consent, and scripts are in the appendices, see Appendix A through Appendix G. A copy of the demographic survey and Native Identity Scale can be reviewed in Appendix H and Appendix I. Methods and procedures described in this chapter were consistent with accepted principles for replicating studies that use exploratory factor analysis (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Kahn, 2006).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents preliminary data analyses followed by reliability analyses for the Native Identity Scale based on the model presented by Gonzalez and Bennett. The chapter also includes the Analysis of Variance used to explore how dependent variables influenced the responses to the Native Identity Scale. A summary at the end of the chapter summarizes the key findings of the data analysis.

Preliminary Data Analysis

For the purpose of this study, a power analysis demonstrated the optimal number of participants for this study ($N \geq 200$). Gorsuch (1983; in Worthington & Whittaker, 2006) stated that minimum participant numbers using the participant to item ratios of 5:1 or 10:1 were acceptable. Scale development research has also demonstrated that participant pools 150-200 with communalities higher than .50 are adequate, or with 10:1 participant to item ratio with factor loadings of $|\cdot4|$ (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The investigator considered these guidelines and remembered the barriers that research encounters with the Native American population. A power analysis was completed and a sample of 200 is adequate to meet minimal requirements. Anticipating that some participants who completed surveys may not have met inclusion criteria and that some participants may not have fully completed the survey, datum were collected and continued until there were 221 participants to ensure the final sample was greater than 200. As previously mentioned, 16 participants were excluded from the data analysis due to not meeting all study participation criteria or not completing the survey. Double-checking a batch of 10 was entered until the entire sample was entered ensured the accuracy of data entry.
The completion of assessments for missing data and outliers by performing a frequency distribution analysis also helped to ensure data accuracy. Participants with missing data were double-checked to ensure missing data was not entry error. Less than 2% of data were missing. There were no outliers on the participant responses on any items of the NIS scale.

Before analysis, three items were reverse scored on the Humanist subscale. The initial study reverse scored two items. After preliminary review of factor loadings, observations demonstrated that three questions negatively loaded. Two of the questions were the items that were reverse scored in the initial study. Review of the factor loadings and wording of the questions helped to determine that an additional item would be reverse scored prior to data analysis. The three reverse scored items were “Native American people should not marry someone from another race,” “Native American’s and Whites can never live in true harmony because of racial differences,” and “White people can never be trusted where Native Americans are concerned.”

**Reliability of the Native Identity Scale**

One purpose of the study was to test the reliability of the NIS with adults who identified with tribes from the Southwest region of the United States. The investigator hypothesized that the NIS would be a reliable measure of Native identity for individuals who self-identify as Native American from the southwest region of the United States. To test the reliability of all 25 items of the NIS, a reliability analysis was completed. Cronbach’s Alpha below .70 demonstrates low reliability. The reliability of the Native Identity Scale in this study was acceptable, (Cronbach’s $\alpha= .73$). The previous study did not report the reliability of all 25 items together, so a comparison is difficult to determine when examining all 25 items of the NIS.
The four factors extracted in the initial study identified with the subscales Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority. The investigator examined the reliability of each subscale using the same items defined by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011). The reliability of Factor 1, Centrality, was acceptable (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$). In the initial study, Centrality was also acceptable (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$). The reliability for Factor 2, Humanism in this current study was not acceptable (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .65$) which was lower than the initial study’s reported reliability for this subscale (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .70$). Factor 3, Public Regard had a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$, demonstrating an acceptable and stronger reliability in this sample when compared to the initial study (reported Cronbach’s $\alpha = .65$). The Oppressed Minority subscale in this study had unacceptable reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .64$), below the initial study’s reported reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .66$).

In summary, the current study demonstrated that the NIS, a 25-item measure is a reliable tool to investigate how Native Americans in the Southwest perceive their racial identity. The 25-item scale demonstrated reliability as a whole scale. The reliability of the subscales with the factor loadings proposed by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) had varying results when applied to a sample of Native Americans from the Southwest region of the United States. The Centrality and Public Regard subscales demonstrated acceptable reliability; the other subscales Humanist and Oppressed Minority, were below acceptable reliability scores.

**Native Identity Scale and Factor Analysis**

Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) proposed a four-factor model to explore Native American identity. This study hypothesized that the same factors would emerge when the sample of self-identified Native Americans from the Southwestern United States completed the Native Identity Scale. To test this hypothesis, the investigator performed a multiple exploratory factor analyses
using the data gathered. Exploratory analyses using principle components analysis and maximum likelihood analysis with orthogonal (varimax) and oblique (promax) rotations were completed. The analyses included extractions of four, five, and six factors. After each exploratory analysis, the investigator conducted thorough examination of the percentage of variance, communalities, eigenvalues, scree plots, and factor loadings. Additional analysis included the examination of each outcome of the EFA using a correlation matrix of each. To determine scale length and number of items in each factor the investigator also considered how items fit into each factor. Finally, the investigator examined the data set for deleted items using exploratory reliability analyses. After all exploratory analysis were reviewed, a four factor solution (orthogonal rotation) with 24 items was most statistically and indigenously acceptable.

The current study proposes a 24 item, four-factor model of the Native Identity Scale. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) proposed a 25-item, four factor NIS, the data analysis in this study demonstrated an NIS with 24 items and four factors. The factor analysis results and the way items loaded together determined retention of items. In the case where there were occurrences of cross loadings, each cross-loaded item the investigator examined with three considerations: overall fit, fit with theme of the subgroup of items, and fit with the phrasing of the group of items. One item, “Native American people should not consider race when buying art or selecting a book to read,” was not retained. After consideration, the investigator did not retain this item primarily because it loaded on three of the four factors. After deliberating the item and its fit with items from each of the three factors, it loaded on, this item did not fit into any of the defined factors nor did it fit with the theme of the factors. Not retaining the excluded item increased reliability of the overall NIS and increased reliability in each of the defined four factors.
The selected solution was a principal components analysis with a factor extraction of four and a varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. Six iterations were required to reach the selected solution. Communalities of the selected items ranged from .232 to .666. Table 3 presents the factor loadings of the 24 items from the NIS. In cases where items loaded on two factors, consideration for statistical strength and how items fit with other items within the factors were used to determine where the item fit. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .762 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was highly significant ($p < .0005$). The four factors explained 48.57% of the Native Identity Scale. Reliability of the four factors were tested. Of the four factors, three were in the acceptable range: Factor 1 (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$), Factor 2 (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$), and Factor 3 (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$). Factor 4 demonstrated low reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .61$). See Table 4 for descriptive statistics for each of the factors. In this study, the investigator kept the names of the factors and subscales consistent with the previous study because the previous factor names adequately reflected the items in the factors extracted. Furthermore, consistency in names of factors would serve to provide consistency for future studies that may use the NIS to examine Native identity. Factor 1, or Centrality, measures the importance of one’s Native identity. High scores in Factor 1 are indicative that an individual values being Native and that being Native is a core part of one’s identity. Nine items comprise the Centrality subscale. Participants responses to items in the centrality subscale indicated that participants valued their Native identity ($M = 6.27, SD = .75$). Factor 2, or the Humanist subscale, measures how one might relate to non-Natives. High scores in this subscale demonstrate that an individual accepts the commonalities one has with non-Natives. Seven items comprise the Humanist subscale. Participants responses to items in the Humanist subscale demonstrated that participants were likely to accept commonalities individuals have with non-Natives ($M = 4.99,$
### Table 3

*Factor Loadings of Items from the Native Identity Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Humanist</th>
<th>Public Regard</th>
<th>Oppressed Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am Native American.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Native American is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, being Native American is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be Native American.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to Native American people.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for Native Americans to surround their children with NA art, music, and literature.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Native American language is important for Native American people.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong attachment to other Native American people.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for all Native American reservations to be recognized as sovereign.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The struggle for Native American sovereignty in America should be closely related to the struggle of other oppressed groups.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The racism Native Americans have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans will be more successful in achieving their goals if they work together with other oppressed groups.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other people who experience racism similar to Native Americans.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans and Whites have more things in common than they have differences.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans should learn about oppression of other groups.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, other groups view Native American people in a positive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, Native Americans are considered good by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society views Native American people as an asset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, others respect Native American People.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people can never be trusted where Native Americans are concerned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American people should not marry someone from another race.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans and Whites can never live in true harmony because of racial differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans should have the choice to marry people from other races.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40 .53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Only items with factor loadings above .300 are shown. Boldface print indicates the factor on which the item retained.*
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for the Subscales of the Native Identity Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The entire NIS scale had 25 items with each subscale containing the following number of items, Centrality (9 items), Humanism (4 items), Public Regard (4 items), Oppressed Minority (4 items).

The range of responses for items in each subscale were from 1= Strongly Disagree to 7= Strongly Agree.

SD = 1.35). Factor 3, the Public Regard subscale measures how one believes the public perceives them. Individuals with higher scores indicate that an individual believes that others perceive them positively.

Four items comprise the Public Regard subscale. The responses that participants reported indicated that they neither “strongly agreed” nor “strongly disagreed” that others perceived them positively (M = 4.09, SD = 1.19). Factor 4, the Oppressed Minority subscale measures how much an individual identifies with other oppressed groups. Higher scores in this subscale indicate that individual’s feel a sense of solidarity with other oppressed groups. Four items comprise Oppressed Minority subscale. Overall, respondents felt a sense of solidarity with other oppressed groups (M = 4.90, SD = .95). The subscales appear to represent distinct dimension of Native identity, as subscale scores were not highly correlated. This is demonstrated and summarized in Table 5.
Table 5

*Factor Correlations between NIS Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.143*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)*

Native Identity Scale and Two-Way Analysis of Variance

The third and fourth research hypothesis pertained to the influence that the two variables, racial composition of the community where participants grew up and tribal language fluency would influence the outcomes of the Native Identity Scale. To investigate and analyze the data, the investigator used an Analysis of Variance. This section will discuss each of the subscales and the findings of each independent variable on the subscale and then the finding of the interaction of both independent variables on each of the subscales.

**Centrality.** This section reports the independent influence of racial composition of the community where participants grew up and the reported tribal language fluency has on centrality. The influence of the racial composition of the community participants were raised in on how participants responded to centrality scores was not statistically significant $F (2, 195) = .492, p = .612$. Centrality scores were similar for those raised in mostly Native communities ($M = 6.28$, $SD = .78$), those raised in mixed communities ($M = 6.27$, $SD = .66$), and those raised in mostly White communities ($M = 6.16$, $SD = .80$). Regardless of where participants grew up, participants reported high scores on the Centrality subscale. Tribal language fluency did not have a significant effect on how participants responded to items on the Centrality subscale $F (2, 195) = .309, p = .73$. The tribal language fluency did not influence the responses to items on the
Centrality subscale. The participants who indicated they do not speak their tribal language at all ($M = 6.25, SD = .72$), those who indicated they spoke some of the tribal language ($M = 6.25, SD = .75$) and those who indicated they spoke their tribal language fluently ($M = 6.36, SD = .80$).

Regardless of the tribal language fluency of participants, they reported high scores on the centrality subscale. Table 6 demonstrates the means and standard deviations of how the combined interaction of tribal language fluency and racial composition of the community where participants grew up influenced the Centrality subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Fluency</th>
<th>Racial Composition of Community</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of the interaction of tribal language fluency and racial composition of the community participants were raised in on the Centrality subscale was not statistically significant $F (4, 195) = 0.690, p = .60$.

**Humanist.** The investigator conducted a two-way ANOVA to examine the effect racial composition of the community where individuals grew up and an individual’s tribal language fluency had on the scores on the Humanist subscale. The influence of the racial composition of the community participants were raised in on how participants responded to Humanist subscale was not statistically significant $F (2, 195) = .022, p = .98$. Humanist scores were similar for those raised in mostly Native communities ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.31$), those raised in mixed...
communities ($M = 5.33, SD = 1.44$), and those raised in mostly White communities ($M = 5.48, SD = 1.27$). Regardless of where participants grew up, participants reported scores close to the mid-point on the Humanist subscale. When the effect of tribal language fluency alone was examined, it was found that tribal language fluency had an influence on the way participants responded to the Humanist subscale $F(2, 195) = 6.46, p = .002$. Participants who indicated they did not speak their tribal language at all ($M = 5.47, SD = 1.23$) and those who indicated they spoke some of their tribal language ($M = 5.06, SD = 1.26$) had higher subscale scores than those who spoke their tribal language fluently ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.52$). Tukey HSD demonstrated that a significant difference existed between fluent speakers and those who do not speak their language. A significant difference also existed in fluent speakers and those who spoke some of their language. The difference between the participants who indicated they did not speak their tribal language and those who spoke some of their language had no significant differences. Next a two-way ANOVA was completed to examine how the interaction of tribal language fluency and racial composition of the community participants were raised in were influenced by the Humanist scale. Table 7 summarizes the means and standard deviations for the interactions of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Fluency</th>
<th>Racial Composition of Community</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interaction of both variables did not have a significant effect on how participants responded to items in the Humanist subscale, $F (4, 195) = 2.36, p = .055$. This $p$ value is right at the cut off for significance, suggesting further investigation may shed light on how the interaction between language fluency and racial composition of community’s where people are raised in influences a person’s humanistic views.

**Public Regard.** The investigator examined the influence of each independent variable on Public Regard. The influence of the racial composition of the community participants were raised in on how participants responded to Public Regard scores was not statistically significant $F (2, 195) = .98, p = .37$. Public Regard scores were not different for those raised in mostly Native communities ($M = 4.22, SD = 1.11$), those raised in mixed communities ($M = 3.83, SD = 1.26$), or those raised in mostly White communities ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.37$). Regardless of where participants grew up, participants reported scores close to the mid-point on the Public Regard subscale. Tribal language fluency did not have a significant effect on how participants responded to items on the Public Regard subscale, $F (2, 195) = 1.99, p = .14$. Tribal language fluency did not influence the way that participants responded to items on the Public Regard subscale. The participants who indicated they do not speak their tribal language at all ($M = 3.57, SD = 1.27$), those who indicated they spoke some of the tribal language ($M = 4.08, SD = 1.13$) and those who indicated they spoke their tribal language fluently ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.19$) did not differ on their Public Regard subscale scores. Regardless of language fluency, participants responded to Public Regard subscale with answers close to the scale’s midpoint. Table 8 demonstrates the mean and standard deviations for the interaction between the interaction of language fluency and racial composition of the community where participants grew up in and influence they have on the Public Regard subscale. The influence of the interaction of tribal
language fluency and racial composition of the community participants were raised in on the Public Regard subscale was not statistically significant, \( F(4,195) = 0.837, p = .50 \). Table 8 provides a summary of the mean, standard deviations for participants grouped by their language fluency and racial composition of the community they grew up.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Fluency</th>
<th>Racial Composition of Community</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oppressed Minority. The last subscale Oppressed Minority, reflects how participants view their relationships with other oppressed minority groups. The investigator examined the influence of each independent variable on the Oppressed Minority subscale. The influence of the racial composition of the community participants were raised in on how participants responded to Oppressed Minority subscale was not statistically significant \( F(2, 195) = .369, p = .69 \). Oppressed Minority subscale scores were not statistically different for those raised in mostly Native communities \((M = 4.68, SD = .90)\), those raised in mixed communities \((M = 4.74, SD = 1.07)\), or those raised in mostly White communities \((M = 4.70, SD = .66)\). Regardless of where participants grew up, participants reported scores close to the mid-point of the Oppressed Minority subscale. Tribal language fluency did not have a significant effect on how participants
responded to items on the Oppressed Minority subscale, $F(2, 195) = .680, p = .51$. Participants who indicated they do not speak their tribal language at all ($M = 4.85, SD = .93$), those who indicated they spoke some of their tribal language ($M = 4.65, SD = .96$) and those who indicated they spoke their tribal language fluently ($M = 4.72, SD = .83$) did not demonstrate a significant difference in how they view their relationship with other minority groups. Regardless of language fluency, participants reported scores close to the middle of the Oppressed Minority subscale. Table 9 demonstrates the means and standard deviations of how the interaction of both independent variables influenced the Oppressed Minority subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Fluency</th>
<th>Racial Composition of Community</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Mostly Native</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly White</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of the interaction of tribal language fluency and racial composition of the community participants were raised in on the Oppressed Minority subscale was not statistically significant $F(4,195) = 0.849, p = .50$.

**Summary**

Chapter four included the findings from the data after analysis. First, the chapter started with the preliminary data findings, followed by the reliability analysis of the Native Identity Scale. Next, the author presented the findings from the Exploratory Factor Analysis, followed by the findings of each latent factor. Finally, the chapter concluded with a summary of the
findings from the Analysis of Variance on each of the subscales. The next section will provide more detail about the interpretation of the findings and implications for practice, training, and research.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The principal purpose of this study was to address the current lack of empirical studies that address racial identity among Native American populations by exploring the racial identity of self-identified Native Americans in the southwest region of the United States using the Native Identity Scale. This section will start with a summary of the findings, which will include the hypotheses that the study confirmed or rejected. The rest of this section will include a discussion about the findings, and limitations of the study. Additionally, this chapter will include a brief discussion regarding the implications for practice, training, and research, and implications for working with Native American communities. Finally, this section will include a section that discusses suggestions for future research.

Summary of Findings

In summary, Hypothesis 1: The Native Identity Scale (NIS) will be an effective measure of Native American identity in individuals self-identifying as Native American from the southwest region of the United States. The study analyzed and confirmed this hypothesis. To test reliability for the whole scale, the reliability coefficients of the entire 25-item scale using data from the sample of participants from the southwest. The whole scale had an acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .73$). Subscales demonstrated varying reliability scores. Centrality and Public Regard both had acceptable reliability coefficients, while the Humanist and Oppressed Minority subscales demonstrated reliability coefficients that are not acceptable.

Hypothesis 2: The factors (Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority) found in the study by Gonzalez and Bennet (2011) with Native Americans from the
midwest region of the United States will emerge with Native Americans from the southwest region of the United States. The study rejected this hypothesis. An exploratory factor analysis demonstrated a similar four-factor model for Native American adults affiliated with tribes from the southwest region of the United States. The underlying factors, however, loaded different items on to the factors. The Centrality and Public Regard factor loadings remained the same in both studies. In this study, four items loaded onto the Humanist subscale and seven items loaded on to the Oppressed Minority subscale, which differed from the original study. One item was not retained which resulted in a 24-item NIS model with four underlying factors.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of racial identity will exist in Native American individuals raised in reservation communities as compared with Native American individuals raised off the reservation or in mixed racial or mostly white communities. This study rejected this hypothesis. The data analysis demonstrated no significant differences indicated that the racial composition of the community participants grew up influenced the way participants responded to the factors of racial identity.

Hypothesis 4: Native Americans with higher levels of tribal language fluency will have higher levels of racial identity than Native Americans with lower levels of tribal language fluency. There were no significant differences found in the Centrality, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority subscales. However, there were significant differences on the Humanist subscale between participants who reported speaking their tribal language fluently and those who reported not speaking their tribal language at all. There were also significant differences on the Humanist subscale between those who reported speaking their tribal language fluently and those who only spoke some of their tribal language.
Hypothesis 5: Participants with language fluency raised in Native American communities will have higher levels of racial identity than participants with lower levels of language fluency raised outside of Native American communities. The study and analysis of data rejected this hypothesis. There were no significant findings in the interaction between language fluency, and the racial composition where community participants grew up and the subscales of the NIS. In this next section, the discussion will focus on the findings, interpreting and discussing the findings in relation to the previously stated research questions.

Research Question 1

The intention of this study was to answer the research question: Is the Native Identity Scale an effective measure for assessing racial identity among Native Americans.

When a sample from self-identified Native Americans affiliated with tribes from the southwest region of the United States was given the NIS, the population sample reflected that the NIS with the 25-items Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) retained was promising. Cronbach’s alpha was acceptable for the purpose of empirical studies. The whole NIS demonstrated promise in measuring the status of an individual’s racial identity status. The NIS gives insight into the overall perception an individual beliefs and attitudes that are associated with being Native. The modification of the MIBI led to the MMRI (Sellers, et.al., 1998). The MMRI is the foundation for the NIS. Sellers, et.al. (1998) cautioned the use and applicability of the MMRI to other groups stating that there are historical and cultural experiences that are unique to the African American population it was based on. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) suggested that the shared experiences of oppression, forced removal and the historical trauma endured by African Americans was similar enough to the experiences of Native Americans that the adaptation of the MMRI would yield a promising tool. Results from two independent studies with samples from
different regions of the United States and a seven-year difference between both studies demonstrated that the Native Identity Scale is a reliable tool to measure Native American racial identity. Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) reported the reliability of the subscales and not the reliability of the whole scale, this study provides the whole scale reliability to support the NIS’s overall reliability to be a useful tool for future application and use with Native American populations.

To further test the promise of the applicability of the NIS, the investigator examined the four factors proposed by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011). Measuring a dimension of measurement and consistency in related items grouped together, researchers use Cronbach’s alpha to evaluate the internal consistency. The results of the Centrality, and Public Regard subscales demonstrated acceptable reliability. Centrality results demonstrated that the items in the subscale were consistent in measuring the dimension of racial identity that being Native American is a core aspect of their identity. The Centrality subscale differs from other dimensions of identity as it is a measure of the consistency across situations and experiences individuals have being Native, and with their core identity being salient to their everyday experiences (Sellers, et.al., 1998). Items that loaded on to this subscale included language, art, music, literature, and land (reservations), indicating that these aspects were all part of an individual’s core Native identity. This speaks to claims from Native scholars that identity can be difficult to define because one’s identity relates to language, land, and culture (Hack, Larrison & Gone, 2014; House, Stiffman, & Brown 2006). The Centrality subscale’s reliability was acceptable in both this study and the previous study by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011); samples from Midwest and the Southwest regions of the United States demonstrated that the items in the subscale provided a consistent and reliable measure of how Native Americans experience Centrality.
The Public Regard subscale also demonstrated acceptable reliably with the sample of Native Americans from the Southwest. The items in the subscale demonstrated consistency in measuring the way Native Americans in the Southwest experience their perception of how non-Natives view Native Americans. Items in the Public Regards subscale included items asking how they feel non-Natives view, value, and perceive Native Americans. Higher scores on this scale reflect that a person believes that non-Natives value, and view Native Americans in a positive manner. Findings from this scale ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.19$) suggest that respondents either disagreed (3), were unsure/undecided (4) or agreed (5) with each of the items on the scale. There were no outliers in the scale. Sellers et al. (1998) described two different approaches in literature, the first claims that public regard plays an important part in the way individuals identify with their own group. This includes how public devaluing of one’s group leads to more negative evaluations of that group. The second claim is that cultural factors such as community, family, church (in the case of African Americans) mitigate the internalization of the public’s devaluation of one’s racial group.

Native American populations experience perpetuations of inaccurate stereotypes. Native Americans in media are often represented with teepee, buckskins, feathers, horse riding people with limited English speaking ability and hostile, stoic warrior personas (Garrouette, 2003; Fryberg, Markus Oyserman & Stone, 2008; Leavitt, Covarrubias, Perez, & Fryberg, 2015). Even in modern depictions of Native Americans, they remain stereotyped as poor, uneducated, prone to addictions, or as born again, hippie mystic type people. The public’s continued use of Native Mascots, Halloween costumes, and cultural appropriation in the fashion industry continue to perpetuate inaccurate representations of Native Americans. While the findings of this subscale may suggest that the sample is unsure of how the public views them, perhaps considering the
Public Regard subscale in the context of how respondents replied to the Centrality subscale offers insight to Native American identity. Their culture, the core of their Native American identity serves as a protective factor to mitigate the internalization of stereotypes and negative public perceptions. While the midscale scores might reflect indifference, or uncertainty about how respondents identify with their groups, which would be consistent with a deficient model of interpretation, I argue that the Public Regard findings from this sample demonstrate the resilience of the respondents. Consistent with previous studies that concluded that Native Americans value their language, culture, and traditions, these values serve as the foundation for recognizing their strength and resilience. This communicates that despite what public messages are, Native people have their centrality subscale characteristics anchored in those core values, beliefs and traditions; thus centrality provides protective factors for how messages from non-Natives are experienced. Further exploration and future validation and reliability studies will only serve to strengthen the Public Regard as an aspect that contributes to Native American identity.

The Humanist and the Oppressed Minority subscales both had reliability coefficients that were not acceptable. The standards of reliability coefficients are grounded in Western standards, norms, and research; therefore, it is important when examining the reliability of scale and subscales to consider from a Native perspective what enumerating identity means. Despite not having acceptable reliability, the subscales still tell a story that fits into the overall picture of identity. Sellers et al. (1998) described the Humanist measure reflects how one thinks in terms of human race, do not think in terms of race, and have tended to score lower in Centrality because they do not emphasize race. The subscale, defined by Sellers et al. (1998) also includes how a person is concerned with other issues that influence the human experience such as the
environment, peace, and sociopolitical influences. The Humanist subscale included items related to Native Americans being able to marry outside of their race, and the other two related to trust and harmony between Native Americans. Although these factors loaded together, the narrowness of the items may not fully capture the concept of humanism. When the Humanist subscale, considered in the context of the Centrality subscale, the Centrality subscale spoke to the land, community, and a sense of belonging to a greater community. The low reliability in the Humanist subscale may be indicative of the items not reflecting and capturing how Native Americans experience the humanist ideology. Interpretation should be done with caution because the humanist ideology or the appreciation of human kind, environment, and issues that influence the human experience are not part of the Native American identity. The Oppressed Minority subscale should also be interpreted with caution.

Sellers et al. (1998) described the Oppressed Minority subscale to reflect the recognition of similarities between their group and other minority groups experiencing oppression, and to reflect coalition building with other minorities and interest in other cultures outside their own. Much like the Humanist subscale, the Oppressed Minority subscale demonstrated low reliability. The items in the subscale reflected the similarities Native Americans might share with other minority groups through racism, oppression, and struggle. The scale may not accurately reflect the ways that Native Americans can relate to other minorities groups. For example, the boarding school era is specific to Native Americans and is still a recent event in the consciousness of Native Americans who still have grandparents who experienced boarding schools. Another example is the continued use of Native Americans as mascots. When there is a team in Washington, Cleveland, and many local high schools across the nation who use a cartoon caricature depicting your likeness with a red face and over exaggerated features; perhaps it
creates hesitation to answer, “There are other people who experience racism and injustice similar to Native Americans.” This can be difficult to answer because there are no other mascot examples to compare experiences. Findings suggest further study because the items do not fully reflect the Native American experience in how they perceive their similar experiences of oppression, racial injustice, and racism with other minority groups.

Overall, the Native Identity Scale is a promising tool to measure Native Americans’ experience of their identity. An important take away from this section is that the NIS provides a beginning to start building a case for norming and standardizing a scale to be more Native specific and reflective of Native populations. Reliability is only one aspect of scale development. Part of the analysis of the data gathered included investigating and comparing underlying factors of the Native Identity Scale to those from the Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) study.

**Research Question 2**

This study aimed to answer the research question: Does the Native Identity Scale identify the same factors in Native Americans from the southwest region of the United States as the study conducted by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) with Native Americans from the midwest region of the United States?

Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) proposed the Native Identity Scale, starting with 62 items, including a combination of the 56 items of the MIBI and an additional six items specific to Native culture. With the use of Exploratory Factor Analysis, a 25-item, four factor were extracted from the 62 items. The result was the 25-item Native Identity Scale (Gonzalez & Bennett, 2011). The Exploratory Factor Analysis results in this study demonstrated differences
in the way the items loaded onto the factors. Additionally, the number of items retained in this study differed from the 25-item scale proposed by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011).

The way that items loaded on to factors in this study had some differences from the way that they loaded on to factors in the previous study. The Centrality and Public Regard subscales had no differences in both studies, and had the same items load on to the factor. This suggests that items that measure Centrality and Public Regard, as dimensions of Native American identity were consistent across both studies, further suggesting that the items capture the way that Native Americans experience Centrality and Public Regard.

The Humanist subscale in this study had three less items than the previous study. One of the items “Native American people should not consider race when buying art or selecting a book to read,” that loaded on to the Humanist subscale in the previous study was not retained in this study. When taken into consideration the lack of visibility of Native Americans in media in general, this item may not be a relatable question for Native Americans. There are limited options, and books lack the representation of Native Americans in general so it is not a question of consideration but a lack of choice. The item “Native Americans should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race” that loaded onto the Humanist subscale in the previous study loaded onto the Oppressed Minority subscale in this study. The investigator will discuss this item in further detail in the discussion of the Oppressed Minority subscale. The four items that loaded onto the Humanist subscale in this study included two questions regarding the way Native Americans relate to White people and two items relating to marrying outside one’s racial group.

Finally, the Oppressed Minority subscale in this study had two additional items load onto the factor when compared to the previous study by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011). The two
additional items that loaded onto the Oppressed Minority subscale were “Native Americans should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race,” and “Native Americans and Whites have more things in common than they have differences.” In the previous study, these items loaded on to the Humanist subscale. The Oppressed Minority subscale in the MMRI model measured the awareness one has of oppression and the perceived solidarity with other oppressed minority groups. Historical context of the relationship between Native Americans and Whites and White institutions i.e. schools, government, health systems, can explain how these items directly asking about oppressors can load onto the Oppressed Minority subscale. The perception and experience of oppression from White people is part of the Native American experience.

In summary, the underlying factors extracted using the exploratory factor analysis in this study were similar and consistent with the previous study. The way that the items loaded on to the underlying factors had differences in Humanist and Oppressed Minority subscale. These subscales also demonstrated low reliability. The low reliability and the difference in factor loadings are suggestive of the need for further investigation. The next section investigates how racial composition of the community where participants grew up and tribal language fluency may influence the subscales of the Native Identity Scale.

**Research Question 3**

Racial identity development theory assumes that early experiences influence the development of racial identity. Therefore, this study investigated the following research question: Does the racial composition of the community where Native Americans were raised impact responses to the Native Identity Scale?
The participants reported that $n = 147$ (71.7%) of them grew up in communities that were mostly Native American, $n = 43$ (21%) grew up in racially mixed communities, and $n = 11$ (5.4%) grew up in communities that were mostly White. There were no significant findings to demonstrate that where participants grew up had an influence on Centrality, Humanist, Public Regard, or Oppressed Minority. From this, it can be assumed that these subscales on the Native Identity Scale were not significantly influenced by the communities participants were raised in.

Centrality, which measures the consistency of one’s identity being an important aspect of self, did not have significant differences indicating that despite the racial makeup of where one was raised, individuals maintained a strong sense of being proud of being Native, and had a greater sense of belonging to their tribe. Furthermore, they felt that language, art, and music all influenced their sense of identity. Early experiences in racial identity development aided in development of a strong sense of belonging and Native identity across dimensions despite the racial composition of the community participants were raised in. As previously discussed, aspects of centrality may serve as protective factors for how Native Americans perceive messages from the public; that being said, it makes sense that regardless of where participants grew up, the racial composition of the community they were raised did not demonstrate influence on the Public Regard subscale. The Oppressed Minority subscale also demonstrated that where people grew up did not influence their responses to the scale. This may support the argument that the items in the Oppressed Minority subscale may reflect latent factor overall, however the items in the subscale are not reflective of the way Native Americans make connections, acknowledge similarities with other oppressed minority groups or express their humanistic ideology.
In summary, this study’s findings demonstrated no differences between Native Americans who grew up in communities that are mostly Native American, mixed or mostly White occurred. Another consideration is that there were not enough participants in each group, therefore the analysis was not adequately powered for significant differences. The next section will discuss findings about how tribal language fluency influenced the subscales of the Native Identity Scale.

**Research Question 4**

The last question this study sought to investigate was: Will tribal language fluency of Native Americans impact responses to the Native Identity Scale?

The demographic survey measured tribal language fluency. From the sample, n = 40 (19.5%) of the respondents were fluent in their tribal language, n = 74 (65.3%) spoke some of the language ranging from a little to conversationally and n = 30 (14.6%) indicated that they did not speak their tribal language at all. Findings demonstrated tribal language fluency did not have a significant influence on Centrality, Public Regard, and Oppressed Minority subscales.

The one subscale that tribal language fluency did demonstrate significant influence on was the Humanist subscale. Higher scores on the Humanist subscale demonstrate that individuals have a more humanistic ideology, i.e. that we all come from the “human race.” In racial identity development, an individual de-emphasizing race is characteristic of the Integrated Awareness stage. Post Hoc testing demonstrated that when participants reported those who speak their tribal language fluently have lower Humanist subscale scores when comparing those who were fluent in their tribal language to the groups that spoke none of their tribal language and those who spoke some of their tribal language. It was discussed how this study had only four
items load on to the Humanist subscale, therefore limiting the scope of understanding the way that humanist ideology is experienced by Native Americans.

The Centrality subscale, included items that reflect the knowledge of language as an aspect of centrality. The subscale is an indicator that knowledge of tribal languages is an important concept for the way an individual experiences their Native American identity, however a person does not necessarily have to speak their language to feel a sense of belonging and pride for being Native. Tribal language fluency did not influence the Public Regard subscale and data analysis demonstrated reliability. Findings suggest that despite speaking their tribal language or not it did not influence how a person perceived non-Natives negative or positive perception of them. As discussed earlier, aspects of Centrality may serve as a protective factor for individuals. Reviewing the results in the whole context of identity, one can surmise that a person’s value, beliefs and sense of belonging that are present in Centrality serve to protect how one feels a sense of belonging to the Native American group. Analyses demonstrates that individual’s tribal language fluency does not influence an individual’s view of public perception. To conclude, the tribal language fluency did not influence Oppressed Minority, suggesting that tribal language did not influence one’s sense of solidarity with other minority groups.

The biggest take away from the research questions are the findings supporting the reliability of the Native Identity Scale being a reliable tool to examine racial identity among Native Americans; aspects of the Centrality subscale also seem to reflect a strength in how one perceives their identity as Native American. The next section will discuss additional conclusions from the data in this study.
Beyond the Research Questions

In addition to examining the independent influences of the racial composition of the community where participants grew up and their tribal language fluency on each of the subscales, an additional analysis was conducted to determine if the interaction of both variables together had influence on the subscales. The combination of communities and language did not have any significant influence on any of the subscales. It did not matter if participants grew up in mostly Native communities and did not speak their language, spoke some of their language, or spoke their language fluently. In mixed communities and did not speak their language, spoke some of their language, or spoke their language fluently; or if they were raised in mostly White communities and did not speak their language, spoke some of their language, or spoke their language fluently – it did not have any impact on the Native Identity Scale subscales. As the Native Identity Scale is being developed and better defined to measure how Native Americans experience racial identity, the way that scales are heavily influenced by variables might be helpful as the scale is being better defined. This study demonstrated that early racial experiences in the community participants were raised in did not have significant influence on their racial identity as adults. In addition, two of the subscales, Humanist and Oppressed Minority, are not completely accurate in capturing the experiences of Native Americans with those subscales. Other variables, experiences, and messages participants received in early childhood were consistent and strong enough that experiences around racial identity was not defined by growing up in mostly Native, mixed or mostly White communities.

The data analysis found trends in education, gender, frequency of cultural participation, importance of cultural participant, and reported mental health. This next section briefly summarizes these observations.
Education. The sample is comparatively educated with 172 of the participants endorsing having some college education to having a graduate or professional degree. The educational breakdown of the participants is as follows: some High School n = 2 (1%), High School or equivalent n = 24 (11.7%). Those who reported education greater than high school reported the following, Business or Trade school n= 6 (2.9%), some college n= 50 (24.4%), Associates or two-year degree or equivalent n = 30 (14.6%), Bachelor or 4-year degree n = 50 (24.4%), some Graduate school n = 11 (5.4%), Graduate or Professional degree n = 31 (15.1%) and other n = 1 (0.5%). The analysis of data did not include comparisons between levels of education, however the implications of the overall education of the sample is important to discuss. A critical assumption about education beyond high school is to receive higher education beyond high school; one is required to leave the reservation or local community because there are few tribal institutions of learning for one to earn their two or four-year degrees. The impact of leaving the reservation for education has direct influence on how one perceives their racial status in society.

First, leaving the reservation for educational purposes provides opportunities for racial encounters that would otherwise not occur. The experiences one has based on race while living on the reservation are often limited therefore, progress through stages of racial identity development are also limited. Second, education challenges one to think critically and evaluate experiences individuals have with those who are like them (other Native Americans), and those outside their group, non-Native people. The experiences that education has afforded participants may be reflected in the ways that they are able to respond to questions on the Native Identity Scale, further it may have influenced the responses to the subscales. Although there was no analysis completed to compare different levels of education and responses to each subscale, it would be an area of interest for future studies to examine.
**Gender.** In the sample, there were 146 participants who identified as female and 59 who identified as male. Table 10 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for each of the subscales for men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Female M</th>
<th>Female SD</th>
<th>Male M</th>
<th>Male SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no statistically significant differences in how men and women responded to any of the scales. Both women and men responded to each of the subscales in similar manners. The Centrality subscale had the highest in responses for both men and women. Women then scored the Humanist subscale as the second highest subscale, followed by the Oppressed Minority subscale and the Public Regard subscale had the lowest reported scores. After Centrality, the Oppressed Minority subscale had the second highest scores for men, followed by the Humanist subscale and the Public Regard subscale had the lowest reported scores.

Both men and women felt that elements of Centrality were important. Both genders’ responses to the Public Regard subscale were also the lowest in the subscales, suggesting that men and women both experience elements of public regard in a similar way. Men had responses on the Oppressed Minority subscale that were slightly higher than women, though the differences were not significant enough to be statistically meaningful, it did put the Oppressed Minority subscale as the second highest scoring subscale among men in the study. Higher scores in the Oppressed Minority subscale are indicative of feeling more solidarity with other minority groups. Perhaps the general stereotypes that exist about minority men has an impact of feeling
more solidarity with other minority groups. Perhaps Native American men experience more instances of overt racism than women do such that it influences their way of feelings of solidarity with other minority groups. Examining how genders experience elements in Oppressed Minority and the Humanist subscales would be a good direction for further investigation. The way women responded to the Humanist subscale was slightly different from the way men did, such that it elevated the subscale to the second highest subscale for women. The Humanist subscale is related to a humanist ideology, in this study in particular the subscale items were related to accepting Native Americans marrying outside their race and having harmony and respect with White people. Women might be more likely to accept interracial marriages than men might. Women may also be more open to looking beyond racial differences to live in harmony with White people than men. In conclusion, the overall sample size was perhaps too small to fully capture the differences, however future studies might examine how Oppressed Minority and Humanist subscales are experienced by both genders. The large difference in sample size between genders may also account for not capturing significant differences. The next section examined how participation in cultural/spiritual practices associated with one’s tribe correlates to each of the subscales.

**Frequency of Cultural Participation.** Participants reported how often they participate in the cultural/spiritual practices associated with their tribe. Responses were on a six point Likert scale anchored by (1) never and (6) very frequently $(M = 4.00, SD = 1.54)$. There were 40 (19.5%) participants who indicated they participate very frequently, 44 (21.5%) reported participating frequently, 58 (28.3%) reported occasional participation, 20 (9.8%) reported participation, 27 (13.2%) reported very rare participation and 15 (7.3%) reported never participating in cultural/spiritual practices associated with their tribe. One participant (.5%) did
not respond to the question pertaining to how often they participate in the cultural practices associated with affiliated tribe. There was no correlation between the frequency of participation in cultural/spiritual events and the subscales. Participation in cultural/spiritual practices has no observable relationships to how participants experience elements of the Native Identity Scale.

**Importance of Cultural participation.** Participants rated the importance of their participation in the cultural/spiritual practices associated with their tribe. Responses were on a five point Likert scale anchored by (1) not important and (5) very important; ($M = 3.80, SD = 1.41$). There were 89 (43.4%) who responded very important, 49 (23.9%) who indicated important, 31 (15.1%) indicated moderately important, 14 (6.8) slightly important, 17 (8.3%) who indicated that participation in their tribal cultural/spiritual practices was not important. Five (2.4%) participants did not answer the question. There was no correlation between participation and the subscales, despite 82.4% of the participants indicated that participation in cultural/spiritual practices was important. This may suggest the importance of participation in cultural/spiritual practices has no observable relationships with how the participants experience elements on the Native Identity Scale.

**Mental Health Status.** The participants self-reported their current mental health status. Responses were on a six point Likert scale anchored by (1) very poor and (6) excellent; ($M = 4.35, SD = 1.12$). There were 28 (13.7%) participants who reported excellent, 69 (33.7%) who reported very good, 71 (34.6%) who reported good, 27 (13.2) who reported fair, 6 (2.9%) who reported poor, and 2 (1%) who reported very poor mental health status. Two participants (1%) did not answer the question pertaining to current mental health. Participants reported overall good mental health. The correlation findings demonstrated no observable relationship between
the participant’s mental health and the way they experience elements of the Native Identity Scale.

It was interesting to find slight differences in the way men and women responded to the subscales, although, no significant differences in gender comparisons were present. It is an area for future studies to consider. The correlational examinations between frequency of participation in cultural/spiritual practices, importance of participation in cultural/spiritual practices, and the subscales of the Native Identity Scale did not demonstrate significant relationships but also provided the framework for additional investigation. The next section will discuss how the findings may contribute to conceptualizing Native identity.

**Conceptualizing Native Identity**

Throughout the process of this study, the intention was to bring to the forefront of identity research Native knowledge and Indigenous ways of knowing, understanding, and sharing knowledge. This was a process that included weaving together academic, mainstream standards with less widely acknowledged Native American knowledge. Mainstream racial identity theory has been described in stages, phases, or statuses that individuals continuously experience. The term stage often refers to a defined period of time, a step to reach a new stage. The term stage is appropriate when discussing some developmental theory, especially when stage refers to mastering one stage before being able to move to the next developmental stage. The term, phase, often used to describe a distinct period or stage in a series of events like phases of grief, phases of illness. Phases are often dismissive of events, attitudes or concerns; “oh he/she is just going through a phase.” Status defined as a social, professional standing of someone or something; has negative connotations that imply superiority. The terms conjure
images of ladders, and staircases, which do not accurately represent the experience of Native American.

Native American identity literature reflects the ways that scholars have attempted to capture the concept of identity with language that is a more accurate representation of what the Native American experience is. The concepts *levels of consciousness, Indianness, dimensions,* and *intersectionality* are used to describe the phenomenon of how Native Americans experience identity. This study has been to ground research in a Native perspective, by a Native researcher for the benefit of Native communities. It has been difficult to find the right terms to describe the phenomenon that Native Americans experience. The concept of one’s identity is more than just a phase, a stage, or a status. One’s Native identity is exponentially more than a box to check on a form. Identity is a core, an anchor that holds Natives stable, grounded in a world that has dehumanized, stereotyped, and perpetuated harm on to them for generations. That core, that anchor or the center of identity is the satisfaction, pride, and happiness of being Native, belonging to a Native community. The Centrality subscale demonstrated this across two studies, and with samples from two different regions of the United States. Despite the linguistic, traditions, and culture differences, Native Americans in the midwest and southwest agree that identifying with their Nativeness is a core aspect of their identity.

Steps, phases, and stages does not accurately conceptualize the way that Native American cultures understand identity. When I met with participants to recruit them for this study face-to-face, they had stories; they had Indigenous ways of introducing themselves that were consistent with their traditions, languages, and tribal cultures. Besides learning their names, the first way participants identified themselves was through kinship, tribe, or clan. They shared how where they came from, what family they belong to, is how they anchor themselves in this world to
others. In the Navajo culture, an individual introduces themselves via their clans. It is through this traditional kinship, one identifies their family, their grounding in the world, and their positioning in the universe. They share with you a glimpse into their family and history. This kind of intimacy upon first meetings is not normative in Euro-Western standards. This kind of introduction differs from non-Native introductions that focus on identifying name, accolades, and credentials. By doing this perhaps, the hope is to establish a connection; however, it is more often to establish mastery, expertise, or dominance regarding what may follow.

The models of identity that are present often are in a linear fashion using language such as stages, phases, and status. When presented in nonlinear fashion, identity models describe parts of identity can be clearly separated and the point of joining or intersection can be identified. These conceptualizations do not reflect the degree of intimacy, or the very private and personal nature of what an individual’s identity means for Native Americans. The intimate nature of how they perceive their identity that reflects both a sense of belonging and connectedness to others, calls for a different way of conceptualizing identity (Ramsey, 2014; Schulz, 1998). This gap requires a model without stages, steps, phases, or statuses that focuses instead on conceptualizing Native American identity as multidimensional and malleable. Observations from qualitative and quantitative findings paired with personal experience when encountering other Natives, despite the tribal background, language, and kinship being part of and belonging to a Native Community is important. Picture clay on a pottery wheel. The clay remains the same; the clay remains consistently clay, just as Centrality remains consistent. The ways that Native Americans respond to experiences and pressure of uncontrollable external experiences such as racism, oppression, views of them in different conditions i.e., academic settings, department stores, sporting events, shape the way Native Americans respond to non-Natives and others, however the core identity
remains the same. The shape, dimension, opening, and character of the clay changes dependent on the pressure applied by the external force, and the clay remains clay. Centrality serves as an anchor and grounding for all the other aspects of identity to anchor to despite the experiences and events that may happen.

Figure 2

Native American Identity

Figure 2 reflects how the primary way of identifying serves as an anchor for individuals and the other dimensions, or levels of consciousness coexists with the anchor or core identity. Having a core identity, an anchor for identity explains that part of identity that is always present, it does not shut off or change salience, it is how a person identifies. The other dimensions are the ways that identity responds to experiences or situations. This model is reflective of the way that Diné experience and express identity.

Diné Identity and What Scholars of Identity Can Learn from the Diné

Diné, more commonly known by their English name, the Navajo people, hereafter referred as, Diné, have a unique worldview. When examined, it is apparent that Diné have been
living and teaching for generations an integrated model of racial awareness. This section will review some of the fundamentals of Diné philosophy, and examine how embedded in the worldview of the Diné is a powerful understanding of the world and the people that occupy it.

Diné scholars, such as Lee (2006), have reported that the traditional Diné perspective is based on two principles, Hozhó and Sa’ah Naaghaáí Bik’eh Hózhóón which are the foundation of the Diné worldview. Haskie (2002) cites the Griffin-Pierce (1992) definition of Hozhó. Hozhó, defined as the complex cultural, philosophical and spiritual concept that orients the Navajo universe. It is the concept of balance, beauty, and harmony. Dr. Wilson Arnoilth (in Haskie, 2002; and Lee, 2006) explains the concept of Sa’ah Naaghaáí bik’eh hózhóón. Sa’ah Naaghaáí bik’eh hózhóón is a philosophy with no single definition. It is a concept that exemplifies the values, beliefs, wholeness, the natural path of learning for traditional Diné. A person who lives in accordance with Sa’ah Naaghaáí bik’eh hózhóón conceptualizes with a lens and perspective that everything is in harmony with the natural world. These principles come from the understanding of creation and establishes K’e for Diné people (Lee, 2006; Haskie, 2002). Hozhó, Sa’ah Naaghaáí Bik’eh Hózhóón and K’e are central to identity for Diné.

K’e is the Diné way of identifying one’s self. The Diné believe that the primary way of identifying oneself is to do so by acknowledging one’s clans. The Diné clan system, based on four clans, the first clan representing the maternal lineage of the individual, thus representing whom the person is (Farella, 1984; Willging 2002). The second clan identifies whom the individual is born for, or the individual’s father, the third and fourth clans represent the individual’s maternal and paternal grandfather (Farella, 1984; Topper 1987; Willging, 2002). This clan system helps individual’s identify where they are in relation to generations of historical relatives and present kin (Topper 1987; Willging, 2002). Additionally, the clan system
helps an individual identity kinship among strangers, establishes rules for marriage, obligations, and serves as a checks and balances to maintain harmony (Farella, 1984; Topper 1987; Willging, 2002).

Diné identity derived from creation stories. In these stories of the historical account of where the Diné come from, what they have persevered, the land, language and kinship are powerful. These pillars guide how the Diné relate to other people, the world, experiences and inform and shape the way the Diné view human life. Diné identity encompasses language, history, relationships, the harmony, and balance of the natural world. Historically, Diné did not describe others by race or skin color, rather by the experience and interaction people had with each other. An example of people being described by experience and not skin or land of origin shared by Lee (2006) is Mexican people. The Diné language refers to the Mexican people as Naakaii, or “those who roam” (Lee, 2006).

Diné people have been living and teaching from generation to generation, the elements of Helms’ Integrated Awareness phase of racial identity development before racial identity development was a concept. Then how did racial identity become part of the Diné experience? Like many examples in history, race was a concept forced upon the Diné people. Despite the holistic and harmonious worldview, it did not stop colonization and those who came along from placing a racial category onto Diné people. Since contact with White colonizers, the Diné people have had to adapt to living with a racial minority status and the racism attached to such status. Despite this, the strength and power of the inborn and instinctive teachings of Hozhó, Sa’ah Naaghaáí Bik’eh Hózhóón and K’e have persevered. The belief and values that everything in the natural world has balance, purpose and importance, reinforces the purpose and importance to see beyond race. Hozhó, Sa’ah Naaghaáí Bik’eh Hózhóón and K’e are the strengthening
characteristics that promote the Diné identity despite race and racism. This strength and resilience can inform the way counseling psychology shapes practice, training, and research.

**Implications for Practice, Training, and Research**

Researchers have attempted to explain Native American life, family, and communities through research with the expectation that their contributions would provide significant insight and positive implications when working with Native American populations. The major issue with their attempts to do so has been that they have used norms, standards, and expectations based on dominant culture to try to interpret Native American behavior. Conflicts in such approaches arise when the tribal communities and individuals do not share those norms, standards, and expectations. This practice of forcing norms, experiences, worldviews, culture, or languages not shared by the tribal communities continues to attempt to assimilate Native Americans to a "better" culture (Anderson & Ellis, 1995). Considering this, to engage Native Americans in research, training and development of models, theories and practices that are better suited for their population, psychology needs to become aware of how historical events, racial paradigms and Western thinking, reactions, and beliefs about Native Americans influence how the profession approaches Native Americans and further creates limitations to the services, research, and training. Counselors working with Native Americans can work effectively by weaving tribal values, beliefs, and ideas with contemporary psychotherapy without falling into the trap of forcing them to assimilate into Western ideals or alienating their tribal practices (Diller, 2011; Sobeck, Chapleski, & Fisher, 2003). This current study and Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) add the Native Identity Scale as a reliable measure and a foundation to standardizing how to assess, measure, and understand racial identity among Native American populations with new
insight to how to provide interventions, train practitioners, and conduct research that are consistent with Native American identity.

Many of the issues that Native Americans face today are a result of the existing conflicts between Native American culture, traditions, values and beliefs, and mainstream American culture (Garrett & Garrett, 1994; Gone 2004; Mohatt, 2010). There are fundamental differences in the emphasis on traditional values, language, community, kinship, harmony with nature, modesty, and a deep respect for elders (DuBray, 1985; Pedigo, 1983; Sanders, 1987; Trimble, 1982; Garrett & Garrett, 1994) and the mainstream American culture’s emphasis on individualism, nuclear family, scientific explanation, self-serving behaviors, and reverence of youth (DuBray, 1985; Garrett & Garrett, 1994; Sanders, 1987). The Native Identity Scale lends its self as a means to bridge the gap and begin to assess how Native American individuals experience their Native American identity living in the crossroads of tradition and mainstream cultures.

**Implications for Clinical Practice.** Enhancing clinical practice starts with the acknowledgment that there are differences between Native Americans who grew up in urban areas and those raised on reservations and more rural areas (Witko, 2006). There is also literature supporting the tribal differences among the tribes of the United States. With many unique complexities that Native identity encompasses, it is important to understand that the “one size fits all” approach to working with Native American populations does not work. Aragon (2010) states that “there is no single best method to approach American Indian clients in the clinical milieu” (p. 25), additionally, a therapists’ approach with one client may not work with another client. Worthington and Dillon (2011) describe how counselors make adjustments in their practice on a client-by-client, session-by-session basis as a way to demonstrate their
multicultural competence in working with a diversity of clients, this delineates from the idea that counseling approaches are generic and manualized. The Native Identity Scale has implications for more specific interventions in clinical practice.

The Native Identity Scale, as a reliable tool, has direct implications for clinical practice. Literature suggests the integration of prayer, sweat lodges, peyote ceremonies and other healing rituals (Duran, 2006, LaFromboise, Trimble, & Mohatt, 1990) are more beneficial than the application of skills like anecdotal prescriptions. Gone (2013) further describes and theorizes the concept of “culture as treatment” as a way of integrating traditional practices as a means of healing historical trauma. These interventions are most effective with individuals who identify with their culture and have a sense of belonging. The NIS has demonstrated consistency in measuring identity, and more importantly assessing Centrality. The Centrality scores assess how an individual experiences their sense of satisfaction and acceptance of their Native identity, and a sense of belonging to a group. Higher scores on the Centrality subscale may be indicative of opportunities for practitioners to provide therapeutic spaces to utilize culture as treatment.

Culture as treatment, or moving beyond the mass adaptations of westernized theories and methods to fit a “different kind” of client, but joining with individuals to gain an understanding of their worldviews from the perspective of the individual. This will not only allow the field of psychology to gain deeper understanding of true diversity and multicultural competence but will also allow the field to move forward in a way that is not just an anecdotal fit for the client but move beyond that and truly benefit each client’s experience, worldview, values, and culture. Duran (2006), demonstrates how counselor’s might culturally respond to a client by trying to understand pathology as more than a diagnosis, or label, but consider that it may be a living entity, or spirit that is interfering with their lives in multiple realms, spiritual, mental, and
physical. This is far more powerful than employing cognitive behavioral interventions to stop the behaviors that manifest within a client. Approaching psychological concepts in a culturally centered way is paramount to Native American tribal cultures. As stated, tribal and traditional practices define concepts that westernized practices do not define. Without this understanding, the field of counseling psychology further alienates Native American individuals and perpetuates negative attitudes and perceptions Native Americans have of research. This is not to argue that practitioners need to become healers, or experts in the tribal cultures of their clients.

Understanding the way that Native Americans experience racial identity can assist in knowing how to join a client in their journey and how to create the therapeutic space to allow culture in a means of treatment or therapy. From a Diné perspective, the therapeutic process includes understanding where there may be disharmony, a fracture in balance and joining a client in identifying, repairing, and restoring it through identified strengths the client has.

One might ask what this looks like when a practitioner does not have expertise in the tribal knowledge and culture of clients. Building rapport and listening for how clients connect to their culture is important. Identity manifests in the way clients speak of kinship, where they come from, and with whom they spend time. Clients who are likely to have higher indicators on the NIS may refer to people they spend time with by traditional names, or might describe having multiple homes. Other examples include the way individuals speak about their familial relationships, sometimes having many siblings, moms, dads, or grandparents to describe in the English language the special kinships and familial relationships established by tradition. Individuals may speak favorably about past, present or future traditional events that they are excited to prepare for and participate in. Although they may not provide details about the events, their excitement about such events can be observable and informative about how they connect to
their culture, family and community. Listening and observing clients is important to understanding how tied they are to their culture.

When one does not have experience or expertise in the culture, it is important to understand how strongly clients are anchored in their culture, or how strong they identify with their culture. An example of a direct clinical implication with young parents whose culture and survival of their people centers on planting and traditional gardening. As part of the treatment plan, ask the parents to go back to their traditional gardening. The responsibility of growing and nurturing their gardens achieves two things. First, it reminds parents of their time as children with their parents, grandparents and extended families and the healthy structure of family time gardening provided for them as children. Second, it reaffirms for them they have the innate tools to parent by nurturing, tending to, taking care of, and providing an environment for growth. This example is not for every client, and should not become part of treatment plans until after identifying the way clients identify with their culture. Interventions like this would not be appropriate for those individuals who indicate lower scores on the Centrality subscale.

The importance of cultural centered approaches is more apparent in the study of identity development of Native Americans. Witko (2006) states that for Native Americans, defining who they are becomes a key aspect of Native American identity and establishing a positive self-esteem, therefore understanding identity from the perspective of Native Americans is better defined through cultural lens rather than existing models of identity in counseling psychology. The contemporary identity theories in the psychology and counseling psychology field are often too westernized and fail to understand or acknowledge the intricacies of Native American identity, which often leads to misunderstanding and the over pathologizing of Native American individuals. Additionally, for Native Americans, there is an added struggle of navigating the
world to avoid forced acculturation and assimilation that impacts identity perception and development. Rybak and Decker-Fitts (2009) argue that traditional practices and traditional understanding are key to the identity development of Native Americans and the NIS reinforces this, especially in this study where Centrality was the most salient dimension of identity.

**Implications for Training.** Counseling psychology cannot engage in conversations about multicultural competence without first recognizing that only 3% of White psychologists and only 5% of Racial/Ethnic minority psychologists provide services to American Indians/Alaskan Natives (American Psychological Association, 2017). This means 97% of White psychologists and 95% of Racial/Ethnic minority psychologists do not provide, or rarely provide services to the Native American population. Watt, Robinson and Lupton-Smith (2009) argued that the multicultural competency of a counselor is influenced by their racial identity development and attitudes regarding racial minorities; they found that the stronger the counselor’s identity the more aware they are of responding to the needs of racially different clients. Munley, Lidderdale, Thiagarajan, and Null (2004) indicated that individuals in the more advanced stages of racial identity development are associated positively with multicultural competency. The objective for covering racial identity development would be to both move future supervisors along in their development and model how to engage individuals in such dialogue for training purposes.

Exploring racial identity development cannot go without addressing White privilege, especially in a class where the students are predominantly White, ignoring and avoiding White privilege perpetuates racism and oppressive behaviors. It is often difficult for White students to view themselves as racial beings; beginning to explore their White identity would also mean confronting the privilege that White people have (Sue, 2006). Furthermore, counseling involves
the client, supervisee, and supervisor; therefore, avoiding discussion or lecture regarding all aspects of racial identity development, including how White privilege influences identity, would not only perpetuate racism, but could also unintentionally harm minority clients (Bowman, 1996; Hays & Chang, 2003; Hays, Change, & Dean, 2004; Ming Liu, Pickett, Jr, & Ivey, 2007).

Students cannot fully grapple with the idea of privilege without understanding how oppression and power play a role in racism. This is a direct way that the Native Identity Scale is able to improve training, the scale demonstrates how privilege of both the trainees and the discipline have served to uphold a standard that is not based on Indigenous values, beliefs, and ways of life. This provides the opportunity to introduce the power dynamics within therapy, supervision, and training; how power dynamics influence interpersonal processes, such as counseling, training, and supervision relationships is important for future psychologists to understand. Getting trainees to become comfortable with their own power and understanding that as the person in the position of power they have the capacity to influence another person (i.e. their supervisee, client, trainees), and how that can inadvertently influence how they can unconsciously use their positions of power as counselor to influence the counseling process, treatment goals, and outcomes. It is also imperative that trainees understand power is misused to keep racial hierarchy intact and the implications of how counselors can inadvertently misuse the power dynamics within counseling. Discussing power dynamics also gives opportunity to discuss the impact of institutional racism.

Institutional racism has its roots in the misuse of power to keep disenfranchised racial minority populations from accessing resources and allow White people to remain in control (Pack-Brown, 1999; Sue, 2006). It is important for trainees to understand that they are agents of an institution that is more often than not, not trusted by racial minorities and they (counselors
and supervisors) have an opportunity to influence positive relationships or perpetuate the mistrust that exists between racial minorities and institutions in power. Trainees who have supervision in their career plan also need to be able to communicate, model, and discuss addressing issues of racism, white power and institutional racism to create environments that are more welcoming to racial minority clients. If clients, especially Native American clients, can see that agents of an institution are not only aware of racial issues but also actively engage in discussions to dismantle and address such issues, they are more likely to continue seeking help rather than avoid interactions with such institutions.

When confronted with multicultural issues, White students have a tendency to claim a colorblind attitude, which often results in unintentional racism. Often individuals who are “unintentional” with their racism claim that racism in today’s society is no longer existent and that barriers for racial minorities are no longer there and take on colorblind attitudes (Barndt, 2007; Pack-Brown, 1999). Students confronted and challenged to examine their own racial identity, power, privilege, and influence on institutions can become resistant to change and defensive to accepting that racism still exists. Therefore, as supervisors it is important to not only be aware of such issues, but also be prepared to guide students through the same journey and avoid, as best as possible, the pitfalls of trainees developing colorblind and unintentional racist attitudes (Fisher, 2011).

Watt, et.al. (2009) defined difficult dialogues as “an exchange of ideas or opinions between individuals that center on awakening potentially conflicting views of individual beliefs or values on issues concerning identity (i.e. racism, sexism, heterosexism, homophobia). Discussing approaches to engaging students in difficult dialogues and preparing them for the resistance and disengagement from such discussions is a necessary part of preparing supervisors.
if they are going to facilitate the growth and development of master’s level students to work in racially diverse settings. Learning to model and engage in respectful, yet difficult, dialogue regarding race can result in moving beyond ethnocentrism and will ultimately benefit the client/counselor work.

The impetus for all the aforementioned topics is to prepare trainees to use their training spaces as a place to prepare trainees to become more aware of racial inequalities. Glosoff and Durham (2010) state that continuing to raise issues regarding race, diversity, power, and privilege and advocate for what they describe as social justice, is an ethical imperative and requirement for all counselors. Furthermore, Arrendondo and Perez (2003) describe raising awareness of such issues is a major component of multicultural competence. Bringing attention back to the racial inequalities and the consequential effects it may have in therapy is important.

A challenge to teaching multicultural competency has always been to determine how to assess multicultural competency. Multicultural competence consists of cultural self-awareness, knowledge, and effective and ethical skills to provide services to culturally diverse groups (Kiselica, 1998; McRae & Johnson, Jr, 1991; Castillo, et al., 2007). Operationalizing multicultural competence is difficult. Therefore, Glosoff and Durham (2010) emphasize examining how effectively supervisees can absorb and integrate information to employ skills that demonstrate empathy, respect, and regard for multiple perspectives. It is imperative that supervisors know how to assess not only their own competency, but adequately assess the competency of their supervisees. If students can have a space to feel open to exploring their racial identity, and be open to exploring one with as many complexities as Native American identity is, they can enhance their skills and become better equipped to work with diverse clients. Another important implication for the Native Identity Scale is through how the overall scale and
each of the factors can inform how to conceptualize training based on Native philosophy. When guiding principles like the Diné philosophy of teaching and learning frame training and research, trainees receive a more multicultural focused training experience.

Training can be enhanced through Diné philosophy by having training programs identify what are their core pillars, what do those pillar encompass and how will they inform the kind of psychologist the program intends to train. There will be arguments that the American Psychological Associations ethics should already do this, however, like many laws and policies, they exist written out there on paper or the internet for reference and warning. The Diné philosophies of Hozhó, Sa’ah Naaghaái Bik’eh Hózhóón, and K’e are taught as a natural law, an innate way of existing in this world. Training new psychologist with embedded fundamental values that are foundational in appreciating multicultural work, as opposed to multicultural work being a branch of psychology, would shift the paradigm. It would affect biases, stereotypes, and racism if as early as undergraduate psychology an integrated awareness, appreciation for multicultural work is the message reinforced in each course, in each stage of educational development. Ingraining into the DNA of psychology that psychologists value the balance, purpose and order of everyone, despite color, religion, experience, place of origin as part of the identity of a psychologist instead of teaching that psychologists should aspire to a heightened integrated awareness. It sends a different training message when you train people that psychology is multicultural versus multicultural psychology is a subset of psychology.

Training multicultural psychologists, or enhancing multicultural competency intended to get students and supervisees to think about their own culture, race, and racial identity development is difficult. There is much literature about how to engage students in difficult dialogues, racial dialogues and to engage in their own development and growth in racial identity
development in an effort to raise multicultural competence. Earlier, the discussion about the degree that identity is an intimate aspect of one’s identity can form the basis for an implication for training and supervision. The salience of Centrality and the importance of how one relates to their group, feels a sense of belonging can inform the foundation to build dialogue. Consider, that dialogues about race do not have to be difficult but intimate. Introducing the concept Racial Intimacy. Racial Intimacy, defined as phenomenon that creates the healing connection that develops via vulnerability between two people from different races, invested in growth, development, and healing from the impact of race and the pain of racism. Racial intimacy focuses on the positive connections between people, thus encouraging those who join racially intimate dialogue to invest in the positive outcomes of dismantling the impacts of race and racism. The intimacy of such relationships formed in training, supervision, and cohort groups can promote the investment in growth, thus enhancing the multicultural training experience.

Native American people have an innate ability to tap into the core of their identity in those initial moments of meeting someone when the space feels safe. Native peoples have maintained the importance of sharing this vulnerability despite being systemically informed that their way of existing was not the norm, demonstrated in the strength and resilience of Diné philosophy. Creating healing pathways in therapy includes changing the norms. Finally, ingraining into the psychologist identity that psychology is multicultural can shift multicultural approaches from being an elective option to understanding that the work of psychology is naturally multicultural, thus dismantling the ways that race has forced the profession into holding non-White theories, concepts and knowledge as superior.

Finally, no amount of lecture or reflection is as valuable as gaining experiences with real people (Hill, 2003). Having more Native Americans in the field increases visibility and access to
Indigenous knowledge. Multicultural competence begins with understanding how race has influenced access racial minorities have to mental health services, it is a goal, that future supervisors understand multicultural competence not just as an ethical obligation but a professional responsibility.

**Training Non-Native Psychologists.** Non-Native people can have a difficult time trying to expand their way of knowing to consider paradigms that challenge their own, like a Native paradigm. One of the most difficult concepts to teach is race and racism. In addition to the implications for training and supervision previously discussed, there are two implications to incorporate Hozhó, or balance and beauty, dismantling the idea of a superior/inferior dichotomy that exists in knowledge and ways of knowing. Dismantling racism is a frightening concept to those who have benefited from racism for so long. Reframing from a negative notion of dismantling, or taking away – the Diné concept of restoring a disruption may provide a better pathway to undoing the harm and disruption created by race and racism. Approaching training models as from a restorative approach helps set the frame, lens, and view to be strength-based rather than the deficit based approaches that have led to Native American communities, families, and people being so cautious about western approaches to healing.

The Native Identity Scale and training non-Natives to understand the subscales and variables that make the scale can have direct implications for teaching non-Natives to identify what their central or core identity encompasses. By identifying what is at their core, trainees can then explore how to consider whole clients thus allowing trainees to have greater appreciation for what others bring despite language, culture, and religion. Striving to see beyond superficial race biases, stereotypes and preconceptions, and valuing centrality provides direct avenues to dismantling the hierarchy race creates, promotes, and perpetuates.
Training Native American Psychologists. Having the Native Identity Scale as a measure of how Native Americans experience race is simply validating. It validates that the ways that Native people experience the world is valuable, real, and something worth paying attention to. It validates that Native Psychologists do not always have to use tools and measures that were only normed for non-Native populations. It provides opportunity to engage them in redefining standards and norms to be more consistent with their own worldviews and continue to contribute to the growing knowledge in Native and Indigenous Psychology. There are so many implications, the most powerful is that in the science of observing, understanding, and explaining human behavior, there is a developing tool to help capture the complexities of Native American identity.

Psychology is already a multicultural concept to someone who comes from a Native American paradigm. Making room for Native American knowledge consistent with the way Native American trainees might experience the world means making space for indigenous research, and helping trainees to identify how to share that knowledge. Earlier, it was boldly stated that the Diné have been teaching, living, and practicing elements from Helms’ Integrated Awareness before there was even a concept of racial identity development. Before race, racism or racial identity were concepts that were studied and written, Native American values and traditions were teaching an integrated awareness as a way of life. Those who chose to become mentors, professors, supervisors, and chairs to developing Native Psychologists can enhance their role by acknowledging the traditional and indigenous ways of knowing that have existed for generations upon generations. Tapping into any factor on the Native Identity Scale can reinforce traditional knowledge and reinforce that cultural knowledge is just as valid and important as western knowledge. A concept that is well defined in tribal language may not be translatable to
the English language, so listening, opening up spaces traditionally held by western academe so that those concepts have life is vital to training Native Psychologists. The Native Identity Scale provides contribution to building that space.

**Implications for Research**

Many of the issues that Native Americans face today are a result of the cultural conflicts between Native American and mainstream American culture (Garrett & Garrett, 1994; Gone 2004; Mohatt, 2010). The fundamental differences being western culture valuing individualism and Native American culture valuing community, family and intergenerational connections. Native American researchers have suggested bridging the gap between the western and traditional perspectives is achievable when psychology has gained an understanding of how the Native Americans consider natural processes found in traditional and tribal practices but not defined clearly in the westernized, European, American, White psychology (LaFromboise, Trimble & Mohatt, 1990; Duran, 2006). The integration of tribal practices and input from tribal members would begin to bridge the existing gap in current westernized psychology and psychological approaches, theory and models that are more appropriate for Native American individuals. Research that strengthens Native and Indigenous Nations is invaluable to training, practice, and future research (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012).

This cultural conflict becomes even more apparent in the identity development of Native Americans. Witko (2006) states that for Native Americans, defining who they are becomes a key aspect of Native American identity and establishing positive self-esteem. For Native Americans, there is an added struggle of navigating to avoid acculturation and assimilation. Additionally, Rybak and Decker-Fitts (2009) state that traditional practices are key to the identity
development of Native Americans. Contemporary identity theories in counseling psychology fail to understand and acknowledge the intricacies of Native American identity.

As the research around scale development continues to grow, it opens the pathway for more quantitative research grounded in Native American perspectives, methodologies, and in the beliefs, values, and ethics of Native Americans for Native American use. When research sheds the threat of being a procedure that is conducted using Native American people, and becomes a process, a ceremony to gather information to define, describe, and set parameters to benefit the participants and communities it reinforces the self-determination and sovereignty of tribal nations. Perhaps the most powerful implication for research is that by contributing to the literature and content about quantitative data, scale development, and measures in counseling psychology, it provides a pathway for research to begin a healing process.

This study, though it was not outright stated, included methodologies that were consistent with the Diné philosophy Sa’ah Naaghaái Bik’eh Hózhóón, or the philosophy that is all encompassing, that frames the learning and teaching of Diné people. The aspect of Sa’ah Naaghaái Bik’eh Hózhóón that emphasizes knowledge comes from a four-part learning process: Nitsáhákees, (Thinking), Nahat’á (Planning), Iiná, (Living), and Siihasin (Reflection). Known as the Diné Philosophy of Education, the paradigm also fits research. Figure 3 summarizes the model for Diné Philosophy of Education.

The first phase Nitsáhákees, (Thinking), assesses what is important that is already known and what needs to be explored. The second phase Nahat’á (Planning), encompasses the plan of action for carrying out the study. The third phase Iiná, (Living), is the analysis of data followed by the fourth phase, Siihasin (Reflection) which is the incorporating of the findings to enhance learning. This way of engaging with knowledge that is a pillar of Diné identity to research,
learning, therapy, and consultation, and is a way for research to be ground in the beliefs, values, and principles that are in accordance with the Diné culture and identity.

---

**Diné Philosophy of Education**

- **Siíhasin**
  - Use Results to Improve Learning

- **Ííná**
  - Analyze Data and Assessment Results

- **Nitsáhákees**
  - What is important to assess?

- **Nahat’á**
  - Plan for data collection & assessment types

---

**Navajo Technical University, 2017**

Figure 3

**Diné Philosophy of Education**

---

**Implications for Working in Native American Communities**

The relationship counselors form with community and family members can have a positive impact on the therapy process (LaFromboise, Trimble & Mohatt, 1990; Rybak & Decker-Fitts, 2009). In recent studies, research supports a collaborative approach to working with Native Americans, specifically, collaborating with community members, elders, and clients to develop approaches to therapeutic treatment, works best with Native American clients (Gone, 2004; Gone, 2010; Mohatt, 2010; Trimble, 2010). Research also indicates that counseling psychologists interested in working with Native Americans should consider making a commitment to working with a Native American community (Gone, 2004). Given the 2017 data from the American Psychological Association’s report that less than 5% of psychologists are
working in Native American communities, they remain one of the most underserved populations; therefore, a commitment is critical.

The Native Identity Scale provided insight to what was central to Native American identity and provided an opportunity to re-conceptualize the way that identity can be viewed and taught and how that all has implications for clinical work, training, and research. One conceptual way of viewing work with Native American communities’ builds on Centrality being salient in one’s identity. The Whole Child, Whole Family, Whole Community approach (See Figure 4). This is not limited to children; thus, Child can be interchangeable with an identified client. Child is used in this example, because in accordance with Native ideology, a person no matter the age is always someone’s child. Mohatt (2010) suggested counselors seek the whole person without separating him/her from their culture. When therapists seek the whole person, there is room made to understand the client from the client’s perspective, making room for their spirituality, culture, family, and how large or small the influences of such aspects are on the individual’s current state (LaFromboise, Trimble & Mohatt, 1990; Mohatt, 2010). Working in tribal communities, especially in rural areas often means that communities are small, everyone is family, or knows one another. This approach works best in such communities. Central to the model is understanding identity from the tribal perspective, not necessarily an expert, but awareness of what core elements comprise identity. What traditions are significant, what practices, is the language used, is the tradition matriarchal? The central part of the model is the open space for understanding identity in a way that may not be consistent with your own.

As demonstrated in the Native Identity Scale, family, language, community, land, and language are all aspects that are core to Native American identity. Furthermore, the sense of belonging to one’s tribe and community are demonstrated to be important aspects of identity.
With that in consideration, one has to balance a Whole approach. What affects a child has direct implications for the family and has outreaching impact into the community. The other direction also is true; macro issues that influence the community overlap into impacting families and overlap into influencing a child. When working in tribal communities you cannot separate the child from the family, the family from the community or the child from the community. There are issues that may need attention at the macro level; these might be systemic from outside non-Native policy. Those macro issues affect families and have direct outcomes for children.

Figure 4

*Whole Child, Whole Family, Whole Community Approach*

For example, if an outsider comes into a tribal area not understanding how kinship systems work, or what the tribal and traditional norms are it would be easy for them to make assumptions that can have direct impact on all three levels. A minor comes into and describes they have more than one mom, and everyone lives together in an intergenerational home with grandparents and other children present. To an outsider this might raise a red flag, and lead to over pathologizing of the child leading to calling Child Protective Services (CPS). Now without
knowing that intergenerational homes are not only common but the traditional way of living and keeping a family together in balance and harmony, and without understanding that having multiple mom’s is the child’s way of trying to translate a kinship system based in their language into English a child is unnecessarily in the CPS system. This disrupts the family, and the family goes on to tell others in the community and now it disrupts the community and makes work within the community more difficult for the therapist.

This might be an over simplified example; however, it is here to provide a skeletal framework. Native American identity is complex and encompasses aspects beyond name and title. Identity is more than a social security number or a box to check. It is an aspect that is always present in how Natives view the world, experience the world, and interpret their experiences. It is their core, the anchor, and foundation. Working in communities where Natives are the majority, use extreme caution in applying western superiority, norms, and standards only after learning how important identity is to the community.

There are many implications for the Native Identity Scale. Some have been reviewed, and there remains the opportunity for further research to identify more direct implications for practice, training, research, and working with Native communities. These last sections will discuss the limitations of this study, areas for future research and concluding statements.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study, like other studies, has some limitations. One of the limitations of the study is that the sample and findings are limited to Native Americans who were associated with tribes from the southwest region of the United States. It was important to add to the current body of literature in a meaningful way. The previous study limited generalizability due to the sample limitations to Natives Americans from midwest region of the United States. Opening the study
to all Native Americans in the United States may have yielded greater participation numbers; however, doing so potentially would diminish the diversity in the tribes and comparisons between tribes may have been even more difficult to do if there were small numbers of participation from an identified tribe. The study was limited to Native Americans in the southwest region and the environment, historical context of the reservation locations and historical relationships the tribes have will differ from Native Americans from other regions of the United States.

Another limitation was the sample size. Miranda (1996) recognized and affirmed the importance of recruiting and maintaining minorities in research. Ideally for studies that use factor analysis, the best practice guidelines indicate sample sizes of 150-200 are adequate, sample sizes of 300+ are sufficient for exploratory factor analysis (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). There were other limitations in the sample. Age of participants is a limitation in this study. There were no participants under the age of 18 and none over the age 72. The findings therefore do not include how Natives older than 72 might perceive their identity. Education was also a limitation in this study. A majority of the participants reported having education beyond high school or equivalent, having experiences in urban areas where participants experience relationship and interactions with non-Native people may have influenced the perceptions about identity. The locations and events participants were recruited from is also a limitation. Participants recruited from events that targeted to attract Native Americans therefore; participants may have already had a high sense of Native identity. Additionally, the sample was mostly female. The greater number in female participants did now allow for an adequately powered comparison between genders to detect any significant differences to how participants responded to the Native Identity Scale.
Finally, the initial study started with 62 items from the MMBI scale and used EFA to find underlying dimensions and factor loadings, this study’s focus on the 25 items retained by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) has limitations. First, there are limitations in only focusing on the 25 items extracted did not allow for exploratory analysis of what underlying factors from the modified MMBI exist.

**Future Research**

Suggestions for future research would include a replication of the study completed and published by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011). This would include starting with a 62 item scale and a factor analysis to extract underlying factors and themes. This current study can also be replicated with an increased number of participants to investigate how results may be similar in the same region or in a different region of the United States. This current study and that by Gonzalez and Bennett (2011) differed in a few key ways, therefore a hybrid of the two studies may also lead to beneficial results that inform how identity is conceptualized. The current study did not include questions or analysis regarding how many non-Native friends and co-workers’ participants had. Similarly, the previous study did not include questions or analysis regarding language fluency and racial composition of the communities where participants grew up. Future studies may help to better understand and define the Humanist and Oppressed Minority constructs. Centrality was found to be a strong factor in this study, therefore the aspects of centrality that were so intricately tied to culture may also be the basis of doing a study that uses a scales for racial identity and cultural identity. A factor analysis of racial identity and cultural identity items may extract underlying factors that explain the complexity of how culture and race among Native Americans are woven together.
Future areas of study might include examining the differences, if any that exist in the way men and women respond to the Native Identity Scale and subscales. Additionally, an approach that starts with a qualitative study that gathers language Native Americans use to describe dimensions of identity to frame scale questions and items would add to scale development research. This study found differences that were not significant; however, the sample size in this study may explain the lack of difference. Future studies with larger sample sizes focused on a smaller number of tribes (2-3) would also benefit and add to the existing body of research. Studies with larger sample sizes and limited to 2-3 tribes will allow comparative analysis to be done between tribes. Finally, the Native Identity Scale has demonstrated reliability in two studies; after replication of this and the initial study, a confirmatory factor analysis would be beneficial to continue to add to the body of literature.

Conclusions

The Native Identity Scale demonstrated reliability as a measure of identity for Native American adults in the southwest United States. The complexity of Native American identity and intricacies of how race, culture, ethnicity, tradition, and at times language are woven together, making identity a complex concept to capture by numbers, data, and analysis. Native American identity is intimate, therefore academe can enhance training by creating spaces for racial intimacy, Native American knowledge and practice to provide opportunities for multicultural competence. Furthermore, this study serves to highlight that current constructs about racial identity among Native American populations need further investigation to capture its elaborate nature. This may be done by starting with a qualitative study and allow the stories of the people to determine the language, themes, and factors that make up identity. Another consideration is to include a cultural scale with the NIS for a factor analysis to investigate
underlying factors. The future study and scale development for capturing Native American identity from a racial perspective only adds to improved interventions, research, and training opportunities.

It is imperative that the impact of race and racism on Native American identity, lives, experiences, and systems continue to be studied. Race and racism continue to permeate the systems that influence political, judicial, educational, financial, and governing aspects of life in the United States. Therefore, even if Native American individuals do not have the language to describe how they experience race and racism, non-Natives still racialize Native American groups through the perpetuation of stereotypes, mascots, and race and racism still shape the way systems, and those in positions of power interact with Native American populations. A key take away from this study is that the resilience and strength demonstrated by the sense of belonging, community, family, and culture remain central to the way Native Americans define identity.

Many scholars have explored multiple dimensions of identity, including the study of Native American identity. The way that Native Americans have a unique culture, language, traditions, and history in the United States and its complexities that other racial groups do not have sets this study apart from other identity studies. The intent for this study was to add to the current, growing body of academic literature by examining identity through a Native American lens.

Now that the concepts of Hozhó and Sa’ah Naaghaái Bik’eh Hózhóón have been introduced, this dissertation will conclude by framing the study in the teachings anchoring the study in the Diné philosophy of learning and teaching. First, Sa’ah Naaghaái Bik’eh Hózhóón incorporates the way of knowing. This dissertation study is a way of demonstrating knowledge,
not just a demonstration of having knowledge. This dissertation also demonstrated the creating, planning and sharing of knowledge.

Following the process of Diné teachings, there was careful and thoughtful consideration given to this dissertation and its presentation. The formatting, of course has to be in accordance with the institution and discipline. The conceptualization of this dissertation through the Diné way of learning is as follows: in Chapter I and II, the philosophy of Nitsáhákees, or thinking was applied. The introduction and review of related literature provided the foundation to think and consider where gaps in literature about identity existed and where this study could contribute to the existing knowledge. In Chapter III was where Nahat’á, or the planning took place. The way the study was planned, including what population to sample from, what methodologies to incorporate, what measures to use, and how to synthesize, organize, and analyze the information was all planned. In Chapter IV Iiná, or the living of the plan came to be. The plan lived by data collection in accordance to what the investigator previously thought and planned. The plan for this study took life by gathering the enumerated stories of people who participated in the study. Finally, in Chapter V there was Siíhasin, or reflecting on the data, the stories, and the learning that came from the gathering of all the knowledge. Suggestions for future studies were provided to be the foundation for future researchers to begin thinking about and it is hoped that a plan will follow as will the life of a new study that will then feed new reflections and continue the cycle of learning, sharing knowledge, and making new knowledge.

Smith (2013) claimed that it is nearly impossible for Native researchers to be completely objective when conducting research because researchers immerse in the communities, culture, language, traditions, and lifestyle of the researched Indigenous populations. Smith (2013) shares:
We are often not only researchers, we are also relations, members of communities, advocates and sometimes therapists, guidance counselors, and facilitators of change (Smith, 2006). After studying all the rules and disciplines of the objective researcher, we know as Indigenous researchers that this will not benefit our people. Being objective is impossible. That does not mean we do not have the rigor in our research. (p. 95).

Tl’áashchí’í nishli, Hásh’ kłishni’i ba’shish chiin, Tó’áhaní da shí chei dóó Ash’hií da shí nalí. This is who I am. This is how I position myself in the universe, in the world, in academe, in research, in my community, and in my family. Finally, this is the how I approached this study. I thought about this dissertation. I planned this dissertation. I lived this dissertation. Finally, I reflected on the review of literature, methods, purpose, and analysis with good intention to provide knowledge and provide alternative ways of knowing that have previously been unacknowledged and deemed less superior. By adding to an existing and growing body of knowledge in a way that is grounded in a Native American lens, for Native American purpose and use there is Hozhó, balance and beauty being restored to the way that non-Native research has previously been harmful and disruptive to the Native American people.
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Appendix A: Letter Requesting to Set Up Table for In-Person Recruitment

Dear Director(s), Planning Committee, Organizer(s),

My name is Deidre Begay, and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Western Michigan University. I am requesting your assistance in my doctoral dissertation research project titled Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United Stated using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study.

The purpose of my research is to investigate the applicability of the Native Identity Scale to understand and conceptualize Native American/American Indian racial identity. My hope is that the results of the study will be used to add to understanding racial identity development among Native American/American Indian populations.

I am requesting your permission to allow me to set up a table or booth at your event to make contact potential participates for my study. The study involves participants completing a single anonymous survey that is estimated to take about 15 minutes to finish. Data collection and dissemination will be completely anonymous. No identifying information will be collected from individuals, and no identifying information will be collected concerning individual organizations, or events. Study findings will only be reported in aggregate across participants. This study has been approved by Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB).

Please let me know if I have your permission to recruit participants for this study by returning the enclosed form in the postage paid return envelope. If you have any questions about the study or would like additional information before making a decision, I would be very pleased to talk with you. Or, if there is another person on your staff who you would like me to contact to discuss the study and possible participation the attendees of your event please let me know. If you would like additional information, please contact me by phone at 505-860-8790 or by writing to me at deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu. My dissertation advisor is Dr. Joseph R. Morris, he can be reached at (269) 387-5112.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmly,

Deidre Begay, MA  
Western Michigan University
Western Michigan University
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D.
Student Investigator: Deidre Begay, M.A.
Title of Study: Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United States using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study

Participation Form

I, ___________________________________ (Director, Committee Chair, Organizer Name Printed) for _________________________________ (Name of event),

_____ grant permission

_____ do not grant permission

for Deidre Begay to set up a booth or table to make contact with potential participants in her doctoral dissertation anonymous research survey. .

__________________________________________ Signature

________________________ Date
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Western Michigan University
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D.
Student Investigator: Deidre Begay, M.A.
Title of Study: Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United States using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United States using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study." This project will serve as a dissertation for the requirements of the doctoral degree for Deidre Begay under the supervision of her doctoral program chair, Dr. Joseph R. Morris. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?

The purpose of this study is to gather information about factors that may relate to how Native American/American Indian individuals conceptualize their racial identity. We are interested in the overall responses of all the people who participate in this study, not in the responses of any single participant.

Who can participate in this study?

Study participants must self identify as Native American/American Indian, must be affiliated with a tribe in the Southwestern United States, and must be at least 18-years-old.

Where will this study take place?

Data will be collected at events aimed at Native American/American Indian populations. Though it is assumed that data collection will occur at a booth or table set up at the events, however a meeting space may be determined by organizers of the event.
What is the time commitment for participating in this study?

Participation in this study will take about 15 minutes.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?

If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a series of anonymous questions about yourself. All information and responses are completely anonymous.

What information is being measured during the study?

Information related to how Native American/American Indians think about their racial identity, tribal language fluency, reservation or off reservation upbringing will be collected during this study.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?

Potential risks of participating in this study are minimal and may include mild discomfort as you are asked to respond to a variety of questions on the surveys. Any discomfort is expected to be mild and no more than what an individual could expect to encounter as part of completing a personal survey. Participants have the option to discontinue answering the measures at any point if they experience discomfort. All questionnaires and responses are completely anonymous. No identifying information is requested about individuals or their institutions.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?

Participating in the study may give participants an opportunity to reflect on factors being investigated in the study, including racial identity, culture, and language fluency. Participation may also give participants the satisfaction of knowing they are contributing to research considered important for Native American/American Indians.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?

The time commitment required for participation is a potential cost to participants. Your total time is estimated to be about 15 minutes.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?
There is no compensation for participating in this study. However, participants have the option to submit their email addresses to be entered into a drawing for one of two $25 visa gift cards. Drawing will be held at the completion of all data collection.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?

Only research team members will have access to the data. Once the packets are collected, data has been entered they will be stored in a secure office in a locked file cabinet at the Center for Counseling and Psychological Services. In addition, results of this research study may be published or presented; however, study findings will only be reported in aggregate and no individual identifying information will be reported.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study.

If you have any questions about participation in this study, please contact the principal investigator Dr. Joseph R. Morris at (269) 387-5112, or the student investigator at deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu or (505) 860-8790. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

Completing this survey indicates that you have read and understand the contents of this letter and that you agree to take part in this study.

Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Deidre Begay, MA
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Dear Director(s), Planning Committee, Organizer(s),

My name is Deidre Begay, and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Western Michigan University. I am requesting your assistance in my doctoral dissertation research project titled Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United Stated using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study.

The purpose of my research is to investigate the applicability of the Native Identity Scale to understand and conceptualize Native American/American Indian racial identity. My hope is that the results of the study will be used to add to understanding racial identity development among Native American/American Indian populations.

I am specifically requesting your permission for me to send you an email containing a link to the online survey, which you would then forward to individuals affiliated with your organization. The study involves participants completing a single anonymous survey that is estimated to take about 15 minutes to finish. Data collection and dissemination will be completely anonymous. No identifying information will be collected from individuals, and no identifying information will be collected concerning individual organizations, or events. Study findings will only be reported in aggregate across participants. This study has been approved by Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB).

Please let me know if I have your permission to recruit participants for this study by replying to this email with one of the following replies:
I, (printed name) (printed title) for (Name of institution, organization, program printed here),

_____ grant permission
_____ do not grant permission

for Deidre Begay to administer an online survey to individuals affiliated with our program project.

***If you would like the athlete invitation email sent to a different member of your staff, then please write their name here: ________________________________ so that I may contact him/her.
If you have any questions about the study or would like additional information before making a decision, I would be very pleased to talk with you. Or, if there is another person on your staff who you would like me to contact to discuss the study and possible participation the attendees of your event please let me know. If you would like additional information, please contact me by phone at 505-860-8790 or by writing to me at deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu. My dissertation advisor is Dr. Joseph R. Morris, he can be reached at (269) 387-5112.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmly,

Deidre Begay, MA
Western Michigan University
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Appendix D: Potential Participant Email for Online Recruitment

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Deidre Begay, and I am a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. My experience as a Native American, Dine (Navajo) Woman has motivated me to understand how other Native Americans perceive and experience their identity from a racial perspective. As a result, I have developed a study exploring factors that may be important in understanding racial identity among Native American/American Indian populations. This study is my doctoral dissertation. The purpose of the study is to gather information about factors that relate to related to racial identity. This topic is an area considered important for future studies and implementation of interventions that are populations specific.

Your institution, program, project that you are affiliated with has given me approval to recruit participants to participate in this study, and my hope is that you will choose to participate. If you would like to participate, please click on the link below. The link will take you to more information about the study and an online survey that is estimated to take about 15 minutes to finish. The survey does not ask for any identifying information about you and is completely anonymous. None of your responses will be shared with your any one associated with the institution, program, project that provided forwarded this recruitment email to you. As an investigator, I am only interested in the overall trend of all of the responses and not any one individual’s responses.

I certainly hope that you will choose to participate in the study. If you would like to participate then click on the following link below. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu or call me at 505-860-8790. Thank you in advance!

INSERT LINK HERE

Warmly,

Deidre Begay
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
Appendix E

Online Informed Consent
You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United Stated using A Multidimensional Model; A Replication Study." This project will serve as a dissertation for the requirements of the doctoral degree for Deidre Begay under the supervision of her doctoral program chair, Dr. Joseph R. Morris. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?

The purpose of this study is to gather information about factors that may relate to how Native American/American Indian individuals conceptualize their racial identity. We are interested in the overall responses of all the people who participate in this study, not in the responses of any single participant.

Who can participate in this study?

Study participants must self identify as Native American/American Indian, must be affiliated with a tribe in the Southwestern United States, and must be at least 18-years-old.

Where will this study take place?

Data will be collected at events aimed at Native American/American Indian populations. Though it is assumed that data collection will occur at a booth or table set up at the events, however a meeting space may be determined by organizers of the event.
What is the time commitment for participating in this study?

Participation in this study will take about 15 minutes.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?

If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a series of anonymous questions about yourself. All information and responses are completely anonymous.

What information is being measured during the study?

Information related to how Native American/American Indians think about their racial identity, tribal language fluency, reservation or off reservation upbringing will be collected during this study.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?

Potential risks of participating in this study are minimal and may include mild discomfort as you are asked to respond to a variety of questions on the surveys. Any discomfort is expected to be mild and no more than what an individual could expect to encounter as part of completing a personal survey. Participants have the option to discontinue answering the measures at any point if they experience discomfort. All questionnaires and responses are completely anonymous. No identifying information is requested about individuals or their institutions.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?

Participating in the study may give participants an opportunity to reflect on factors being investigated in the study, including racial identity, culture, and language fluency. Participation may also give participants the satisfaction of knowing they are contributing to research considered important for Native American/American Indians.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?

The time commitment required for participation is a potential cost to participants. Your total time is estimated to be about 15 minutes.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?
There is no compensation for participating in this study. However, participants have the option to submit their email addresses to be entered into a drawing for one of two $25 visa gift cards. Drawing will be held at the completion of all data collection.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?

Only research team members will have access to the data. Once the packets are collected, data has been entered they will be stored in a secure office in a locked file cabinet at the Center for Counseling and Psychological Services. In addition, results of this research study may be published or presented; however, study findings will only be reported in aggregate and no individual identifying information will be reported.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study.

If you have any questions about participation in this study, please contact the principal investigator Dr. Joseph R. Morris at (269) 387-5112, or the student investigator at deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu or (505) 860-8790. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

Completing this survey indicates that you have read and understand the contents of this informed consent document and that you agree to take part in this study.
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During the in-person recruitment, the student investigator will read the following script:

My name is Deidre Begay from the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. I would like to invite you to participate in a research study designed to gather information about factors that may relate to Native American/American Indian identity.

To participate in the study, you must be 18-years-old, identify as Native American/American Indian and be affiliated with a tribe from the Southwestern region of the United States. Participation in this study will take about 15 minutes and involves completion of a survey packet. The surveys do not ask for any identifying information about you and is completely anonymous. None of your responses will be shared with anyone not associated with the study. As an investigator, I am only interested in the overall trend of all of the responses and not any one individual’s responses.

If you would like to participate, I will hand you a survey packet. When finished, place the packet within this box.

Does anyone have any questions at this time? (Pause) If you have questions later, please contact me at (provide email address) or you may contact the primary investigator, Dr. Joseph R. Morris at joseph.morris@wmich.edu.
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If you would like to be entered into a drawing for one of two $25-dollar Visa Gift Cards to be drawn at the completion of data collection, please enter your preferred contact email:

Email:_______________________________________________________________________

Please drop this into the box labeled “Drawing” and do not include it in your completed packet, this is to protect the integrity of your anonymity by not including it with your responses.

If you are a winner, you will be contacted by email by the student investigator to follow up with how to get the gift card to you.
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Please answer the following question to the best of your knowledge and ability. If at any time you wish to withdraw your participation, please stop.

General Demographics

Gender (specify): ________  Age: _________  Tribal Affiliation: ________

Do you affiliate with more than one tribe?  o  Yes  o  No

If you affiliate with more than one tribe what is your second tribal affiliation?

If you affiliate with more than two tribes what are your other tribal affiliations?

Other Racial Affiliations (specify):

Citizenship:  o  U.S. Citizen  o  Canadian  o  Other (specify): ________

Language

First Language:  o  English  o  Tribal/Native Language (specify): ________

o  Other (specify): ________

Do you speak your Tribal/Native Language?  o  Yes  o  No

Please indicate how well you speak your Tribal/Native Language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannot Speak</th>
<th>Speak a little</th>
<th>Speak will the some trouble</th>
<th>Speak conversationally</th>
<th>Very fluent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education and Employment

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

o  Elementary School  o  Associate or two-year degree

o  Some High School  o  Bachelor’s or four-year degree

o  High School diploma/equivalent  o  Some graduate/professional school

o  Business or Trade School  o  Graduate or Professional degree

o  Some College  o  Other (specify): ________

If you are a student what is your current status  o  Full-time  o  Part-time

o  Less than Part-time

If you are a student, please indicated what level of education you are currently enrolled in:

o  Business/Trade School  o  Undergraduate  o  Graduate

If you are employed what is your current occupation? ________

How many hours do you work each week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the best estimate of the annual income for you and your household before taxes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You Income</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>You Income</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between $40,001 and $60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $10,001 and $20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between $60,001 and $80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $20,001 and $30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between $80,001 and $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $30,001 and $40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>More than $100,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community, Spirituality/Religion and Culture

How would you best describe the primary community in which you were raised? 

What is the racial composition of the community you were raised?

- Mostly Native
- Mixed
- Mostly White
- Other (specify)

How would you best describe the primary community in which you reside? 

What is the racial composition of the community you were raised?

- Mostly Native
- Mixed
- Mostly White
- Other (specify)

What is your religious/spiritual affiliation? 

How often do you attend religious services?

- Never
- Very Rarely
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Always

How important is religion/spirituality to you?

- Not Important
- Slightly Important
- Moderately Important
- Important
- Very Important

Do you participate in cultural/spiritual practices associated with your tribal affiliation?  

- Yes
- No
How important is your participation in cultural/spiritual practices associated with your tribal affiliation?

- Never
- Very Rarely
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Very Frequently

How do you participate in Pow-wow’s?

- Dancer
- Drummer/Singer
- Arena Director/MC
- Other (specify):

How many Pow-wow’s did you attend in 2018? _________ In 2019? ________________

Current Health Status

How would you describe your current physical health?

- Very Poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Very Good
- Excellent

How would you describe your current mental health?

- Very Poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Very Good
- Excellent
Appendix I

Native Identity Scale
Appendix I: Native Identity Scale

NIS. Below are some statements people have told us about how they feel as a Native person.

Please read each statement and circle the number that fits your own feelings about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel that…</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1 Knowledge of Native American language is important for Native American people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 Society views Native American people as an asset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3 Native Americans should learn about oppression of other groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4 Native Americans and Whites can never live in true harmony because of racial differences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5 It is important for all Native American reservations to be recognized as sovereign.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6 Overall, Native Americans are considered good by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7 Native American people should not marry someone from another race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8 I am proud to be Native American.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9 Native Americans should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10 Native Americans will be more successful in achieving their goals if they work together with other oppressed groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11 I have a strong sense of belonging to Native American people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that…</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12</td>
<td>The struggle for Native American sovereignty in America should be closely related to the struggle of other oppressed groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13</td>
<td>Native American people should not consider race when buying art or selecting a book to read.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14</td>
<td>The racism Native Americans have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15</td>
<td>It is important for Native Americans to surround their children with Native American art, music and literature.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>White people can never be trusted where Native Americans are concerned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17</td>
<td>Being Native American is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18</td>
<td>Native Americans and Whites have more things in common than they have differences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19</td>
<td>I have a strong attachment to other Native American people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20</td>
<td>In general, other groups view Native Americans in a positive manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21</td>
<td>There are other people who experience racism and injustice similar to Native Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22</td>
<td>In general, others respect Native American people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23</td>
<td>In general, being Native American is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that…</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24  Native Americans should have the choice to marry people from other races.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25  I am happy that I am Native American.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Re: Native Identity Scale
Re: Native Identity Scale
Wed 8/27/2014 10:22 AM

Show all 2 attachments (108 KB) Download all

Save all to OneDrive - Western Michigan University

Hi Deidre,

Thanks for writing. I am happy to share the NIS with you. I have used it in a few other studies and am working on getting some papers sent out on that as well. Please feel free to use it and let me know how your study goes or if you have any question about the scale.

-john

John Gonzalez, PhD
Associate Professor
Psychology Department
Bemidji State University
1500 Birchmont Dr NE #23
Bemidji, MN 56601
218.755.2881
jgonzalez@bemidjistate.edu

Treasurer: Society for the Psychological Study Culture, Ethnicity, and Race (APA - Division 45)
On 8/25/14 10:01 PM, "Deidre Priscilla Begay" <deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu> wrote:

> Dr. Gonzalez,
> Hello, my name is Deidre Begay. I am currently a doctoral student at Western Michigan University. I am Navajo from Arizona trying to complete my degree. I have an interest in Native American Identity development and came across the study you did "Conceptualizing Native Identity with a Multidimensional Model," and wondered if you had the Native Identity Scale? Is it available for use in other studies? If possible I would like to use it in my dissertation study.
> 
> --

> Deidre P. Begay, M.A.
> Doctoral Student-Counseling Psychology
> Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
> Western Michigan University
> Kalamazoo, Michigan
> deidre.p.sanders@wmich.edu
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Western Michigan University

Institutional Review Board
FWA00007042
IRB00000254

Date: March 27, 2019

To: Joseph Morris, Principal Investigator
    Deidre Begay, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: IRB Project Number 19-03-25

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Conceptualizing Native Identity among Adults Affiliated with Tribes in the Southwestern United States with the Native Identity Scale: A Replication Study” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes to this project (e.g., add an investigator, increase number of subjects beyond the number stated in your application, etc.). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation.

In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the IRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

A status report is required on or prior to (no more than 30 days) March 26, 2020 and each year thereafter until closing of the study. The IRB will send a request.

When this study closes, submit the required Final Report found at https://wmich.edu/research/forms.

Note: All research data must be kept in a secure location on the WMU campus for at least three (3) years after the study closes.