

RESILIENCY FACTORS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIGENOUS
PEOPLE

By

Carol J. (Otter) Ladd-Yelk

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
With a Major in

Home Economics

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Investigation Advisor

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
August, 2001

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

<u>Ladd-Yelk (Otter)</u>	<u>Carol</u>	<u>J.</u>
(Writer) (Last Name)	(First)	(Initial)

Identification of Resiliency Factors in Native American Families
(Title)

<u>Home Economics</u>	<u>Dr. Karen Zimmerman</u>	<u>Aug. 2001</u>	<u>90</u>
(Graduate Major)	(Research Advisor)	(Month/Year)	(No of Pages)

American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual
(Name of Style Manual Used in this Study)

The purpose of this study was to identify resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors used by urban and reserve North American Indian parents. The focus for resiliency attitudes was identification at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels. The focus for the resiliency behaviors was identification at the individual, familial, culture specific and marital levels. Also a level of difference was examined for the urban and reserve respondents.

The subjects were North American Indian parents who resided on a reserve or urban setting. Most of the urban surveys were filled out by people who live or work in the St.Paul/Minneapolis metro area. The cultural affiliation of the urban respondents included people from the Great Plains Indian Nations, the Great Lakes Indian Nations, and the Southwest Indian Nations. The reserve respondents were from the

Six Nations Reserve in Ontario, Canada. All but two reserve participants identified themselves as Mohawk, Longhouse/Cayuga, or Onkwehonwe and the remaining two identified their affiliation as Blackfeet/ Ojibway and Ojibway.

The survey instrument consisted of three sections: Demographics, resiliency attitudes statements, and resiliency behaviors statements. The 34 resiliency attitude statements and the 30 resiliency behavior statements were designed by the researcher using information collected through the literature review.

The majority of the surveys were distributed at sites, in the Minneapolis /St. Paul metro area, and mailed to Ontario Canada. A University of Wisconsin-Stout research and statistical consultant analyzed the completed surveys. The frequency, mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item in section II-attitudes and section III-behaviors. Mean subscale scores were also calculated for section II and section III. The reliability of the attitude and behavior subscales were calculated using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient. A correlate was run for each subscale in section II with each subscale in section III on total subscale scores. T-Tests were run on all items in section II and section III plus the subscales for urban and reserve.

The research results regarding resiliency attitude revealed that the respondents agreed with more family resiliency attitudes than individual attitudes. Out of the 15 top ranked attitude statements eight were from the family subscale, five were culture specific

attitudes and only three of the top 15 ranked items were individual resiliency attitudes. According to the research on multi-cultural "Tribal" based cultures, "family" is of most importance. The high ranking and high frequency of family resiliency attitude statements confirms the cultural attitude of family interdependence. There were 7 culture specific items listed in the top 18 resiliency attitude statements. The most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked second: "I am thankful for what I have". The research results regarding resiliency behaviors revealed that the respondents agreed with more family resiliency behavior statements and cultural specific statements than individual behavior statements.

The results of this study found little difference between the urban and reserve respondents. Of the 34 resiliency attitude statements and the 30 resiliency behavior statements there were only eight items which revealed a significant difference.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with great joy that I express my gratitude to those who have been influential in my life and work. Thank you to my Grandmother Beulah Bently Clay who was my friend, my guidance, and my confident in the early years of my life. You were my childhood resiliency mentor. To Aunt Olivia Kitchenakow who taught me the Indian philosophy of sharing all we have with those who have not. You are the most beautiful Menominee woman I will ever know. Thank you to my best friend and husband Thomas Roger, to my beloved children Anton Makoke and AnnieMae Kitchenakow who have given me the greatest of joys that life has to offer. Thank you to my soul sister Linda Alvarez for her encouragement, guidance and love. A very special thank you to Dr. Karen Zimmerman who was my academic guide, a source of encouragement, and my friend. I am forever grateful that my life has been blessed by each of you.

Wae Wae Non Nemat!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction.....	1-5
Statement of Problem.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	7-8
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction.....	9
Resiliency Factors of the Child.....	9-12
Family Resiliency Research.....	13-16
Native American Resiliency Research.....	17-28
Chapter Summary.....	28-31
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	
Introduction.....	32
Purpose of Study.....	32
Subjects.....	33
Instrumentation.....	33-35
Administration of Data Collection.....	35-36
Data Analysis.....	36
Limitations.....	37
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
Introduction.....	38
Location of information.....	38

Demographic Information.....	38-49
Resiliency Attitudes.....	50-54
Resiliency Behaviors.....	55-59
Level of Significance of Attitudes and Behaviors.....	60-62
Level of Difference between Urban and Reserve.....	63-64
Discussion.....	65-79
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY	
Introduction.....	80
Summary.....	80-84
Conclusion.....	84-93
Research Recommendations.....	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95
APPENDIX.....	98

TABLE OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Location Where Data was Collected.....	38
2. Cultural/ Tribal Affiliation of Respondent.....	40
3. Gender of Respondent.....	41
4. Age Category of Respondent.....	42
5. Marital Status of Respondent.....	42
6. If Respondent is married, How Many Years.....	43
7. How many children in Respondent's family.....	44
8. Birth Order and Ages of Children.....	46
9. Highest level of education Respondent completed.....	47
10. Respondent Presently Employed.....	48
11. Income level of Respondent.....	49
12. Resiliency Attitudes-Rank order for total group.....	51-52
13. Subscale means for Resiliency Attitude Survey.....	53
14. Reliability of Resiliency Attitude Subscales.....	54
15. Resiliency Behaviors-Rank Order for Total Group.....	56-57
16. Subscale Mean for Resiliency Behavior Survey.....	58
17. Reliability of Resiliency Behavior Subscales.....	59
18. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix Resiliency Attitudes and Resiliency Behaviors.....	62
19. Level of Difference between Urban and Reserve.....	64

Chapter One Introduction

The American family structure has changed tremendously over the past one hundred years. The growing changes, over time, of technology, income source, social attitudes and role identity have added additional stressors to the family unit. The changing family structure such as single parent homes, blended homes, inter-racial, gay and lesbian homes, etc. have also created new avenues of stress on the family (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han, & Allen, 1997). Today's families face many issues that did not exist less than a generation ago. Garbarino (1997) described today's social world and environment as socially toxic to the development of children. "More generally, children and youth today must contend with a constant stream of messages that undermine their sense of security. If it isn't a threat of kidnaping, it's the high probability of parental divorce. If it isn't weapons at school, it's contemplating a future with dim employment opportunities" (Garbarino,1997, pg.14).

According to the U.S. Census Bureau (1999) report on current populations the current divorce rate is at fifty percent. Over 22 million children in the United States lived in biological-father-absent households in 1990 and approximately fifty percent of all children will live in a single parent family before adulthood (Bumpass & Sweet, 1989; Norton & Miller,1992 As cited in Manning, and Smock 2000).

Structural changes coupled with environmental changes emphasize the importance of research on stress and family resiliency.

There has been a natural progression of the research on stress, coping and resiliency of children, adults, and the family. Much of the early research focused on identification of stress, both catastrophic and normative, and coping skills of individual family members (Lavee, McCubbin & Olson, 1987). The research on child resiliency has identified an internal locus of control, a strong faith base and a positive self concept as factors that contribute to the resiliency process of a child. Environmental contributing factors that were identified in the research included family or a single adult in the life a child (Werner, 1995).

Comparable questions have been researched regarding resiliency of the "family". Hamilton McCubbin (1997) introduced a representational model of the relationship between risk factors, protective factors, family crises, and recovery factors (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han & Allen, 1997,pg.4.). The model presented the risk factors, family, level of disorganization, level of adjustment, crisis, level of adaptation with the family protective factors and family recovery factors determining resiliency (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han & Allen, 1997).

In the field of family resiliency research, the focus has expanded to encompass ethnic and cultural variations in the familial

structure. Studies on African American populations are growing in quantity and many answers regarding resiliency attitudes and behaviors have been found (McAdoo,1994; Dalla & Gamble,1998). However, many more questions remain for this culture as well as other cultures who are struggling and locked in a “survive” rather than a “thrive” mentality.

The Native American population is one such culture where pertinent research, very much needed, is lacking. More specific research on family resiliency factors of Native American families is almost nonexistent. Native American families encounter many of the same stressors as majority culture families such as poverty and single parent homes. According to the 1995 Census the percentage of families of the ten most populist tribes in North America below the poverty level ranged from 10.0 percent to 47.3 percent. Female householders with no husband present ranged from 16.0 percent to 36.0 percent. Many Native Americans must also face racism, blatant prejudice, and language barriers. Cross (1998) addressed some of the philosophical differences between Native Americans and white majority culture. The emphasis was on the Native American perspective of “balance” at the individual level and familial level. Family interdependence was also identified as a specific factor in Native American family resiliency. There exists a fundamental view among Native American cultures that each culture and person are different

and that no one is placed in greater importance or lesser importance. We are all placed at the same level of importance in the world. Several other studies on Native Americans emulated the same fundamental philosophy. Unfortunately, due to acculturation many languages, traditional philosophies and behaviors, "ways", which promoted healthy living were lost (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, & Dyer, 1998). The past 25 years has seen a resurgence in welcomed enculturation of the traditional values and philosophies. Those who have been denied their heritage want to learn. Identification of culture specific attitudes help to answer how a stressful situation for one culture may not be perceived as stressful to another culture. The same importance can be placed upon identification of culture specific behaviors. However, research regarding culture specific resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors is lacking.

Developing and using resiliency skills allows the family to weather emotionally turbulent, normative and catastrophic transitions. Identification of resiliency factors and culturally specific behaviors will assist in producing effective educational and therapeutic materials. What makes one particular family succeed where others have failed? How can one family produce strong competent offspring in our socially toxic environment?

The sample in this study was a convenience sample of volunteers from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ontario, Canada who kindly gave of their time and cooperation to the researcher and proxy. Therefore, the results of this study should not be interpreted as representative of behaviors and attitudes of other groups and Nations of urban and reserve North American Indigenous peoples.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the attitudes and behaviors among urban and reserve Native American mothers and fathers that promote resiliency. The specific objectives of this research were to:

1. Determine attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
2. Determine specific cultural attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
3. Identify behaviors which promote family resiliency
4. Identify specific cultural behaviors which promote family resiliency.
5. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.
6. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency behaviors at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Individual Resiliency

Individual resiliency is defined as follows: A disposition that allows an individual to “thrive” rather than simply “survive” when faced with high risk environments. The characteristics which promote resiliency were described in the literature as: good coping abilities under adverse conditions, good communication skills, good problem solving skills, an internal locus of control, temperamental characteristics that elicit positive response, affectionate, good natured, easy to deal with. “Resilient children appear to have developed a coping pattern that combines autonomy with an ability to ask for help when needed” (Werner, 1995, pg. 143).

Family Resiliency

Family resiliency is defined as follows: “The property of the family system that enables it to maintain its established patterns of functioning after being challenged and confronted by risk factors: elasticity. And 2. The family’s ability to recover quickly from a misfortune, trauma, or transitional event causing or calling for changes in the family’s patterns of functioning: buoyancy” (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han, & Allen 1997, pg. 2).

Culture Specific

_____ Culture specific resiliency is defined as follows: The characteristic resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors that distinguish uniqueness from other cultures. The some culturally unique behaviors and attitudes that were described in the literature were: "Supportive social networks; flexible relationships within the family unit; a strong sense of religiosity; extensive use of extended family helping arrangements; the adoption of fictive kin who become as family; and strong identification with their racial group" (Stack,1974; Boyd-Franklin, 1989; McAdoo, 1993a: Allen 1993 as cited in McAdoo, 1994, pg.22).

Chapter Two Literature Review

Research has examined resiliency factors of the child/adolescent and the family structure. Several studies have assisted in identification of behaviors of the individual, the family, and environment that promote resiliency. Unfortunately there is very little research that examines a multi-cultural approach to family resiliency. What makes one child from the poorest of reservations succeed and another fail? What profound influence exists in those minority children who succeed? These are questions we need to answer. A review of pertinent literature on child resiliency, family resiliency, and multi-cultural resiliency follows.

Resiliency Factors of the Child

Factors that affect the resiliency of the child include the "individual," the "family," and the "society" (Werner,1995; Brooks, 1994; Benard, 1995). Individual Resiliency Factors

The characteristics of a resilient baby have been described as: good natured, easy to care for and affectionate (Werner, 1995; Brooks, 1994). Werner(1995) reported that one of the key abilities of resilient babies is the ability to elicit or actively recruit nurturance and support from an adult care giver. The characteristics of resiliency in middle childhood and adolescent individuals include possessing a sense

of autonomy, advanced problem solving skills, communication skills, social skills, and cognitive-integrative abilities (Werner, 1995; Brooks, 1994). Most importantly, resilient children possess a high level of self esteem, internal locus of control and a feeling of hope (Werner, 1995; Brooks, 1994). The importance of self esteem was also addressed by Novick (1998), "Self-esteem and self efficacy are key elements contributing to resiliency, allowing the child to cope successfully with challenges. Rather than behave as though they are at the mercy of fate, resilient children take an active stance toward an obstacle or difficulty" (Rutter, 1985; Werner & Smith, 1982, 1992, As cited in Novick 1998, pg.201). For children to "thrive" rather than simply "survive" they must experience successes. "...In order for resiliency to flourish, one's efforts must be successful and gratifying in some way, at least some of the time" (Novick, 1998, pg. 201).

Family

Brooks (1994) reported that resilient children were more likely to come from a home environment that supported the child's needs with "...warmth, affection, emotional support, and clear-cut and reasonable structure and limits"(Rutter, 1985; Werner, 1993 as cited in Brooks, 1994). The importance of family communication and adaptability were also cited as important to a child's resilience. Wills, Blechman & McNamara (1996) conducted a study on the effectiveness of family support in building competence in children and adolescents.

The focus was on effective family communication, and adaptability of the child/adolescent using coping skills and competencies to avert undesirable life events and developmentally inappropriate behaviors. The study analyzed substance use contingent upon level of competence and family support. The results revealed a significant relationship between life events, level of family support interactions and frequency of substance use. "There was a strong relationship between negative life events and substance use for students with low support, but the impact of life events was reduced for students with high support" (Wills, Blechman & McNamara, 1996 pg.119).

According to Werner (1995), in the case of family discord in which the parent was unavailable for the child another relative such as a sibling, or a grandparent could serve as surrogate to supply the nurturing and guidance needed.

Society

Research has reported on the significance of one adult who cared, gave emotional support, counsel and comfort. "The presence of at least one caring person—someone who conveys an attitude of compassion, who understands that no matter how awful a child's behavior, the child is doing the best he or she can given his or her experience—provides support for healthy development and learning"(Benard, 1995, pg. 5). When a family member is not

available, a teacher, coach, clergy, or someone else in the community that can be a supportive influence may serve as surrogate to the child.

Lowenthal (1999) discussed the importance of social support systems, informal and formal, to the family. Formal services such as basic parent education, stress management, and family therapy may be particularly helpful in reducing abuse. Informal support systems such as family or close friends who can provide help with tasks of job searching, child care, counsel and financial help. "Taking advantage of such informal support can help dysfunctional families to end the cycle of abuse and to function more positively" (Barnett,1997 as cited in Lowenthal, 1999, pg. 208).

Summary

_____The information on individual resiliency characteristics and behaviors of the individual, family promoting, and society were used to create survey attitude statements and behavior statements. The key elements of an internal locus of control, a feeling of hope, family support and the presence of a resiliency mentor will be included in the survey.

Family Resiliency Research

It is important to note that family resiliency can be achieved if the paternal and maternal influence is healthy and emotionally stable. Richardson and Hawks (1995) acknowledged the importance of individual resiliency as a precursor to family resiliency. "Once the individual has developed some of the traits of resiliency, then interpersonal resiliency at the couple/ partner/ parent level can be enhanced."(Richardson & Hawks, 1995, pg. 240).

McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han, and Allen's (1997) research had identified two categories of behavior that were vital to the resiliency of the family: family protective factors, and general family resiliency factors. These factors could be defined as values and behaviors that the members of the family unit deem important to the foundation and structure, thus, building a strong unit capable of withstanding emotionally turbulent situations.

The protective factors specifically aid the family with the ability to adjust to a change either normative or catastrophic. According to McCubbin, McCubbin Thompson, Han and Allen, (1997), protective factors influence the family's ability to function and thrive in a socially toxic environment. Moreover, "...adjustment, which involves the influence of protective factors in facilitating the family's ability and efforts to maintain its integrity, functioning, and fulfill developmental tasks in the face of risk factors..."(McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson,

Han and Allen, 1997, pg.5). Some of the family protective factors that aid a family during the entire life cycle are: celebrations, family hardiness, time and routine of the family, and traditions (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han & Allen 1997). Although each factor depicts a different scenario there is a presence of a shared common theme. In each case exists the basic elements of togetherness, and shared positive interaction. Celebrations emphasize positive interaction of family and community members. Celebrations usually include a feast and hours of supportive, positive dialog with emphasis on the importance of each member. Family hardiness and time and routine emphasize the family unit as a "functioning" unit in which each member plays an important role whether it be task completion or recreation.

General resiliency factors are those values and behaviors that aid a family in the ability to adapt to changes either normative or catastrophic. The effectiveness of the resiliency factor is dependent upon the crisis situation. McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han, and Allen (1997) identified ten general resiliency factors: family problem solving and communication, equality in the relationship, spiritual base, flexibility, truthfulness within the family system and from others, sense of hope, family hardiness, family times and routines, social support and health. Communication, equality, truthfulness, hardiness, time and routine reflect behaviors that emphasize the importance of

achieving a sense of control and normalcy to the situation. Phrases such as “keeping the train on the track” or “keeping the boat afloat” have been used in describing familial behavior in the face of change. Spirituality and hope allow the family to believe in a reason or purpose beyond their comprehension. The family survives with a sense of divine intervention and/or reaping positive consequences for admirable behavior (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han & Allan, 1997).

The effectiveness of families to cope and promote resiliency were found to be dependent upon the attitudes, and resiliency behaviors used. McCubbin, and McCubbin (1988) examined family types and classified family behaviors and attitudes into four categories: vulnerable families, secure families, durable families, and regenerative families. The behaviors and attitudes were evaluated for effectiveness regarding normative transitions. The vulnerable family, deemed least effective, cope with problems using negative emotion, “getting upset”, and blaming others. They show less respect, caring and understanding for family. These families indicate less pride, sense of control, purpose and appreciation. Secure families also cope with problems using negative emotions and blaming, show less respect, caring and understanding. However, these families differ in hardiness. They feel a sense of purpose, control, and are valued for efforts. “In general secure families are active and in control, but when faced with difficulties are also less supportive of each other, less caring, and loyal,

and less tolerant of hardships” (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988, pg. 251). Durable families are those with a lower sense of purpose, appreciation, meaningfulness in life, and sense of control. “ Durable families may have less basic internal strengths, but they appear to compensate for this deficiency by having a strong coping repertoire characterized by caring, respect , trust, reduced tension, and calmness” (McCubbin & McCubbin,1988, pg. 251). The Regenerative family, deemed most effective, cope with problems in a trusting, respectful, calm manner. These families accept stress in life events and rely on faith. They work together to problem solve. They are secure in their sense of purpose, meaningfulness, sense of control, and are valued for their efforts. When faced with hardships, these families appear to be more caring, loyal and tolerant(McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988).

Summary

The information on family resiliency characteristics and behaviors were used to create survey attitude statements and behavior statements. The key elements of family problem solving and communication, equality in the relationship, spiritual base, flexibility, sense of hope, family times and routines, and social support and good health were included in the survey.

Native American Resiliency Research

Cultural specific attitudes and behaviors that promote resiliency have not been thoroughly examined in the literature. The information that was gathered about attitudes and behaviors was gleaned from the following research studies.

Attitudes

To understand the behavior of the individuals and families one must be educated on the basic philosophy of the culture. Research on resiliency revealed two world views: linear and relational (Cross, 1998). "The Linear world view is rooted in European and mainstream American thought. It is very temporal, and it is firmly rooted in the logic that says cause has to come before effect. It is based on cause and effect relationships in a temporal relationship" (Cross, 1998,pg.145) According to Cross (1998) one of the many positive aspects of the linear view is the ability to identify individual components and their role in the resiliency process and to obtain a measurable cause and effect. "If we can demonstrate a linear cause and effect relationship between a helping intervention and the resolution of a problem then we can usually find the support to conduct the service" (Cross, 1998, pg.146).

The relational view of family resiliency is firmly based in tribal cultures. It has been described as fluid and existing beyond the barriers of time and space. It is the simple philosophy of "balance" in

one's life. Cross (1998) described as follow: " It is intuitive, non-temporal and fluid. The balance and harmony in relationships among multiple variables, including metaphysical forces, make up the core of the thought system. Every event is in relation to all other events regardless of time, space, or physical existence. Health is said to exist only when things are in balance or harmony" (Cross, 1998, pg. 147).

Cross (1998) explained the philosophy using the Medicine Wheel. The Medicine Wheel is a circle divided into four quadrants. The wheel is used to teach many concepts and/or ideas such as, but not limited to, the physical world, the aging process, race relations, and the relational view (Cross, 1997). When teaching the relational view using the Medicine Wheel, the four quadrants are divided and labeled as follows: context, mind, spirit, body (Cross, 1997). Each of the four quadrants represents certain elements dependent upon the theme. The quadrants are said to be in a constant state of change. Because of this constant state of change, we do not remain the same person throughout the day. Elements such as hunger, physical exhaustion, intellectual gains and environment change throughout the day which, in turn, makes us different people at different times of the day. If a person can achieve a balance throughout the day, it is said they are in good health (Cross, 1997).

When viewing family resiliency under the relational model, one is looking at a complex interrelationship of the four quadrants in an

attempt to answer the same questions asked of the linear model.

However, in the relational model it is the "inter relational balance of quadrants" and not a "cause and effect".

The contextual quadrant represents family and community environment. It is a unique system in which individual independence is fostered in an interdependent environment. Each contributes without expectation of compensation. The environment provides role models and leaders, tribal elders and healers (Cross, 1998). The mental quadrant represents self reflection and learning through stories. It is said of many cultures that much of the lessons about culture, behavior, values, and social skills are taught through stories. The physical quadrant represents the family structure. "...how we relate to our kin, how we act as a system, and how we sustain each other will greatly influence the balance in our lives" (Cross, 1998, pg. 152).

The spiritual quadrant represents the good and bad energy, encompassing prayer and ceremonies. "Teachings, community, and family come together to bring about a balance between the two in ourselves and in the family" (Cross, 1998, pg.153).

It is important to note that the "factors" of the linear view and the "quadrants" of the relational view are very much the same. The difference lies in how we relate to them. The linear view is based on cause and effect. The relational view is based on the balance of all

quadrants. Each of these “factors” and “quadrants” identify attitudes and behaviors critical to the achievement of resiliency.

Although Native American Indian cultures vary in ceremonies and living patterns, the fundamental attitude of being “thankful” for what they are given is universal. Holding an attitude of being “thankful” leads a person to look at life from a different perspective than others. If a person is looking for the positives in one’s life to be thankful, the focus is placed on the positives in ones life rather than negatives. This focus on positives shapes and permeates the cultural attitudes. The cultural attitude influences cultural behavior. In Traditional Native culture every child is considered a very precious gift. Native culture dictates a prophetic value for each child. Those children who are born with a difference are considered “special” and valued for their capabilities. Whereas, in European based culture the very same children would be labeled as “defective” and devalued for their incapacibilities. This is an example of a culture specific attitude which promotes resiliency. McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson and Thompson’s (1998) research on the resiliency of ethnic families support this contention. The Native American Indian culture is accepting of all members despite disability. “Although Native American Indian values vary between specific tribes, the overall Native American Indian definition of illness or disability focuses less on the inabilities of the children involved, and centers instead on the function of the children

whatever their abilities, can serve within the family and the community” (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, & Thompson, 1998, pg. 28). From a tribal perspective each child is seen for the potential good that they can do for the preservation of the tribe. This attitude not only assists in family resiliency but promotes individual resiliency through a view of self worth.

Cultural identity has also been researched as a resiliency promoting factor. Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, and Dyer(1998) studied the effects of enculturation and frequency of substance abuse on Native American youth. The researchers contended that a high cultural identity, and high level of self esteem would result in a lower level of alcohol and substance abuse. The researchers viewed enculturation as a protective factor against alcohol and substance use. “Native American youths’ identification with and participation in their cultural traditions is expected to have a positive influence on their self-esteem because self-acceptance and self-worth are exemplified in adolescents’ affinity to their cultural background” (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, & Dyer,1998, pg.200).

Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, and Dyer (1998) examined the degree of enculturation and subsequent effects. The reasoning was based on the knowledge of Native Spirituality which promotes respect for all gifts, especially respect for the gift of one’s body. An adolescent who practices their cultural spirituality is more

likely to be alcohol and substance free than an adolescent who merely identifies with their ethnicity at a superficial level. "Similarly, enculturation is expected to be associated with lower levels of alcohol and substance use because Traditional Native American culture provides youth with a spiritual foundation that prohibits such behavior" (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter & Dyer,1998, pg. 200).

Enculturation measurements used for this study encompassed cultural affinity, family activities, and Native American identity. The other measurements included; perceived family drug abuse problems, self esteem, and alcohol and substance use. The sample included 94 Native American adolescents, 44 males and 50 females.

The results of this study supported the enculturation hypothesis in two out of the three analysis. " The results indicate that the regression of alcohol and substance use on self-esteem is significant only for youth who report average or higher levels of cultural identity... High levels of cultural identity interact with self-esteem for predicting alcohol and substance use. Youth with low self esteem but high levels of cultural identity reported the most alcohol and substance. Youth with high levels of both self esteem and cultural identity reported the lowest levels of alcohol and substance use" (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter & Dyer,1998, pg. 213). "The results are encouraging as they reflect direct effects of enculturation on self-esteem. One way to enhance Native American youth self-esteem may

be to help them develop a greater understanding of and interest in their cultural heritage” (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, & Dyer, 1998, pg. 214).

It is important to remember that Native Americans have faced acculturation for hundreds of years. Many elders still living remember the eastern boarding schools in Pennsylvania and the punishments endured for being Indian. Many of these elders still refuse to talk of “old ways” and pass on their language. Traditional stories, teachings and languages have been permanently lost. This becomes a concern when addressing degree of enculturation. One may highly identify themselves as Native American and yet lack the knowledge and environment to foster esteem. Many grasp the knowledge of their own “ways” that are available and seek other Nation’s traditions and rituals to enhance their own. A great example of such behavior can be viewed in the participants of the Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota Sun Dance. Men from many nations travel hundreds of miles to learn and participate in a ritual that is not of their own but yet speaks to their soul.

Behaviors

Dalla and Gamble (1998) examined the social support structures of Navaho Indian adolescent mothers. The study focused on pregnant or parenting teen mothers. Each completed a series of self- report

questionnaires. The questionnaires consisted of demographic information, listings of significant people in their lives and the relation to the respondent. The results revealed that the primary source of social support came from family members. "Specifically, each participant included at least one family member in her support network, and 63.4% included four or more family members. Thus similar to other young pregnant and parenting women (particularly African-American and Hispanic youth) family members were considered important sources of informal support"(Dalla & Gamble, 1998, pg.189).

Dalla and Gamble's (1998) research coincided with Cross's (1998) explanation of the informal support structure of the Native American family: "Our relations, relatives, or kin often form systems of care that are interdependent and system reliant. Healthy interdependence is the core of the extended family. It does not foster dependence and does not stifle independence. Rather it is a system in which everyone contributes in some way without reciprocity" (Cross, 1989, pg. 151).

Faced with a lack of research on Native American resiliency and inspired by Cross's (1998) contention that 98 percent of all cultures are tribal in nature, African American resiliency was also researched. The goal was to identify any culture specific behaviors or attitudes that promote family resiliency. Perhaps there was a tribally based

commonality in behaviors that could be extrapolated from one culture to another.

A unique characteristic of the culture that promoted family resiliency was not found. Rather, research revealed many commonalities among varying cultures: A consistent theme of individual and family resiliency behaviors cited in cultural context and a need for a "community".

McAdoo (1994) examined several minority cultures and found many similarities regarding family. "Supportive social networks; flexible relationships within the family unit; a strong sense of religiosity; extensive use of extended family helping arrangements; the adoption of fictive kin who become as family; and strong identification with their racial group"(Stack,1974; Boyd-Franklin, 1989; McAdoo, 1993: Allen, 1993 as cited in McAdoo, 1994, pg.22). McAdoo (1994) contends that many people across the globe possess these patterns. However, people of color may have a greater concentrations of "collective actions" of family rather than "individualistic" behaviors. This researcher's childhood memories support McAdoo's(1994) findings. Life on the reservation meant that everyone was either an "Auntie" or an "Uncle" or a "Cousin". As I grew, the outside culture's qualifier of blood line was a confusing factor for me to understand. Bailey and Carroll(1994) identified many of these cultural similarities as "healing forces" for the African American population. Family,

extended family, and positive relationships, religious involvement, community participation, oral tradition, positive communication and racial awareness...etc were cited as being essential for healing the individual and the community. Bailey and Carroll (1994) used the basic ideas of individual and family resiliency and applied them to the African American culture.

The need for connection and community resonated through much of the research. According to Cross (1997), ninety eight percent of the world's cultures are/were tribal in nature. This included many of the European cultures: Irish, Celtic, Scottish, Sami, ...etc. African cultures were also tribal oriented. "Tribal" means interconnected, supportive, and caring for the needs of all the people. This "tribal" mentality was lost and the "individual" mentality was instated. Researchers are now reporting on the effects of a lack of community.

Kotlowitz (1994) reported on the war-like conditions in Chicago's public housing neighborhoods. Included were life stories of young African American boys, ages 8, 9 and 11, who lived with poverty, drugs, gunfire, and the fear of death. The final analysis included the obvious need for better housing, health care, and law enforcement plus the need for a sense of community. "We are mistaken if we think that we can take even the best equipped school with the most experienced teachers and put it in a neighborhood like

Henry Horner and expect it to make a difference. It will make no difference in the lives of the children if we don't also rebuild community, if we don't address the other forces at work on the lives of the children" (Kotlowitz, 1994, pg.13).

The base philosophy of tribal mentality and community is interconnectedness. A person feels the need to be connected or interact positively with another. This idea is obviously not a new revelation. Prisons have been using solitary confinement as a means of punishment for years. Genera (1994) studied the effects of a peer relationship on depression. The study attempted to match up mutual peer supporters who would keep in contact with their paired "at risk" mother. The mutual supporter's role was empathetic listener and maintain a positive presence. However, some gave a little advice, but most just lent a positive presence. The desired outcome was a decline in emotional depression of the "at risk" mothers. However, the results were inconclusive. Some mothers were frustrated because they were looking for a "teacher" and the peers were not allowed to serve in that capacity. A few others experience a personality clash and did not get along with their peer supporter. However, many of the "at risk" women recognized the need for supportive relations and a sense of community and made steps to form connections such as the PTA .

The necessity for connection, community, and interdependence was a common theme found in each of the multi-cultural studies. Each

of these concepts can be viewed as a base philosophy of Tribal cultures.

Summary

The information on culture specific resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors were used to create survey attitude statements and behavior statements. The key elements of supportive social networks; flexible relationships within the family unit; a strong sense of religiosity; extensive use of extended family helping arrangements; the adoption of fictive kin who become as family; and strong identification with their racial group were included in the survey.

Chapter Summary

Investigation into individual resiliency, family resiliency, and Native American resiliency has revealed pertinent information needed in the construction of a questionnaire. The literature identified characteristics which promoted resiliency at the individual, familial, and environmental levels. The individual resiliency promoting characteristics that were described in the literature included a sense of autonomy, good communication and problem solving skills and good social skills. The most important of all attributes were a high self esteem and an internal locus of control. The resiliency promoting environment would include families who meet the child's needs, give affection and emotional support and set clear limits and expectations.

Immediate family members are not the only relatives who can foster this environment. Extended family members could and have provided resiliency promoting environments for children. The society was also found to impact individual resiliency. Research reported on the importance of one adult who cared and believed that the child is doing the best they can with what they have been given.

Family resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors included: family problem solving skills , good communication, a sense of equality for each member, flexibility , truthfulness, spirituality, sense of hope, time and routine, and hardiness. A family who can problem solve is a capable family and shows a sense of control. A family who possesses good communication skills can divert from injurious dialog and can convey feelings based in love. A family who shares a sense of equality for each member will more likely stay intact because each member will want to be part of the unit. Flexibility in a family allow each member the freedoms to pursue their own interests and possible life paths. Truthfulness is essential when establishing and maintaining trust in a family. Spirituality gives a family an ultimate purpose for being and guide for behavior. A sense of hope allows a family to trust in a better future for all. Time and routine and hardiness set expectations and limits and establish valuable time for each member to be a part of positive dialog and family togetherness. The more resiliency skills a family possesses, the more resilient the family would be in the face of

normative or catastrophic transition. All of these skills promote an atmosphere of positive, respectful, interaction among the family members. A sense of family pride or esteem was also mentioned in the literature.

Native American Family resiliency research included a relational view of existence. Everything is interconnected and each person must achieve a balance to be in healthy state. "Thankfulness" was also recognized as a cultural trait which promoted resiliency. To be thankful is to look for the positive in ones existence. When one seeks the positive, the negatives receive little acknowledgment. Enculturation was also researched as a possible resiliency contributor. Promotion of Traditional cultural beliefs and ceremonies were examined as a potential means of decreasing alcohol and substance use. The emphasis of this research was based on the Spirituality of the people to value everything as a gift which included their body. The remaining multi-cultural articles addressed concepts of "connection", "interdependence", and the need for "community". The same resiliency factors, individual and family, are found in each culture. They are simply seasoned with a little cultural spice. Religiosity is a good example. The African American faithfully centers much of their life around the church and related activities, as many other cultures do. Many Native American consider their culture and religion one in

the same. They "live" their religion. Their place of worship may be a Longhouse, Lodge, or under the sun.

Chapter Three Methodology

This chapter includes the purpose, research intentions, subjects, instrumentation, data administration, and data analysis used in this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the attitudes and behaviors among urban and reserve North American Indian mothers and fathers which promote resiliency. The specific objectives of this research were to:

1. Determine attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
2. Determine specific cultural attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
3. Identify behaviors which promote family resiliency
4. Identify culture-specific behaviors which promote family resiliency.
5. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.
6. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency behaviors at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.

Subjects

The subjects for this research were Native American urban and reserve mothers and fathers. The total number of participants was 62. There were 39 urban North American Indian and 23 reserve North American Indian participants. The majority of the urban respondents either lived or worked in the St. Paul/Minneapolis metro area. The reserve respondents were from the Six Nations Reserve in Ontario, Canada.

Instrumentation

The instrument used for this study consisted of three sections: demographics, resiliency promoting attitudes, and resiliency promoting behaviors. Section I of the survey addressed the demographic information. This section included questions regarding cultural affiliation, gender, age, marital status and length of marriage, number of children and respective ages, education level, employment, and income level.

Section II of the survey addressed resiliency promoting attitudes at the individual, familial, and cultural levels. This section consisted of 34 descriptive statements regarding attitude. There were 10 positive and negative "individual" resiliency statements, 12 positive and negative "family" resiliency statements, and 12 positive and negative "culture" statements. The responses to the statements were

measured using a Likert Scale. The numerical scoring ranged from 1= disagree strongly, 3= slightly disagree, 5=undecided, 7= slightly agree, 9=agree strongly.

Section III of the survey addressed resiliency promoting behaviors at the individual, familial, and cultural levels. This section consisted of 30 descriptive statements regarding behavior. There were 5 individual resiliency behavior statements, 14 family resiliency behavior statements, and 11 culture specific behavior statements. The responses to the statements were measured using a Likert scale: N= never, R= rarely, S=sometimes, F=frequently, AA=almost always and were scored on a 1 to 5 scale.

McAdoo's (1994) examination of several minority cultures found a stronger emphasis on "family" and "community" and less emphasis on individualistic attitudes and behaviors among ethnic minorities. Therefore less emphasis was placed on individual resiliency attitudes and behaviors. Some concepts that were included in the "individual" resiliency attitude statements were: an internal locus of control, a belief in a brighter future, and the presence of a resiliency mentor.

The family resiliency attitude statements were based on Hamilton McCubbin's (1997), general resiliency factors: Family problem solving, communication, equality, spirituality, flexibility, truthfulness, hope, family hardiness, family times and routines, social support, and health.

The culture specific attitude statements were based on Native American cultural attitude information found in Cross's (1998) Native American philosophy, Connors and Donnellan's (1998) research on Navajo family cultural resilience, Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, and Dyer's (1998) research on enculturation and substance use and McAdoo's (1994) research on strengths and realities of African American families. Concepts included were: supportive social networks, flexible family relationships, a strong sense of religiosity, extensive use of extended family helping arrangements, adoption of fictive kin who become family, and a strong racial identity.

Administration Of Data Collection

The questionnaire was administered using several different venues. Parents from the American Indian Early Childhood Family Education Center in St. Paul Minnesota were asked to participate and the parents completed a survey during a nightly meeting. The survey was also distributed to people with American Indian Education in St. Paul, Minnesota. These volunteers filled out this survey during a breakfast meeting. There was also, necessary, mailings to Ontario, Canada and several places in the state of Wisconsin. Most of the surveys were distributed by the researcher. The surveys that were mailed were delivered to a proxy who distributed them on the researchers behalf. In all cases the subjects were informed of the

purpose of the survey, that participation was strictly voluntary and all information would be kept strictly confidential.

Data Analysis

The data analysis varied depending upon the section of the questionnaire. The data analysis used in section I Demographics was frequency counts and percentages.

The data analysis used in section II Attitudes was: frequency, mean, standard deviation calculations for each item. The average score was calculated for each of the subscales; individual, familial, and culture specific.

The data analysis used in section III Behaviors was: frequency, mean, standard deviation calculations for each item. The average score was calculated for each of the subscales; individual, familial, culture specific, and marital. ___

Other tests were run on the subscales. The reliability of the attitude and behavior subscales were calculated using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient. A correlate was run for each subscale in section II with each subscale in section III on total subscale scores. T-Tests were run on all items in section II and section III plus the subscales for: Group 1- urban and Group 2- reserve.

Limitations

This study used a small convenience sample of volunteers from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ontario, Canada who kindly gave of their time to this study. Therefore, the results of this study should not be extrapolated to represent other groups and nations of urban and reserve North American Indian people.

Chapter Four Results and Discussion

This chapter presents and discusses the results of a survey administered to North American Indian parents who lived on a reservation or urban setting. The survey consisted of demographic information, resiliency attitude statements, and resiliency behavior statements.

Location Information

The survey was administered to a total of 62 Native Americans. Of the 62 completed surveys, 23 came from North American Indian parents who live on the Six Nations Reserve in Ontario Canada. The remaining 39 surveys were completed by urban non-reserve Indian parents from the Minnesota and Wisconsin.

TABLE 1:
Location Where Data Was Collected

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1 urban	39	62.9	62.9	62.9
2 reserve	23	37.1	37.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Demographic Information

The purpose of the demographic section (section 1) was to obtain information regarding: cultural affiliation, gender, age, marital

status, length of marriage, number of children, ages of children, education level, employment, and income level.

Cultural/Tribal Affiliation of Respondent

The respondent was requested to identify their cultural /tribal affiliation. Out of the 62 completed surveys, 58 subjects responded to this question. Three of the four that did not answer this question were currently taking steps to have their "rightful" affiliation, according to bloodline, acknowledged by said Tribal Council. Until such point materializes these people can not claim their heritage(affiliation). The fourth respondent that did not complete this question was an Inuit Elder from Alaska. Table 2 is an excellent representation of the urban Indian culture. Most of the urban surveys were filled out by people who live or work in the St.Paul/Minneapolis metro area. Listed are Nations from the Great Plains Indian Nations, the Great Lakes Indian Nations, and the Southwest Indian Nations. Many of these families have had to move away from their reserve homes to secure employment and are creating an urban Indian community of many Nations. Twenty three of the surveys were completed by reserve Indians from the Six Nations Reserve in Ontario, Canada. Twenty one of the survey participants identified themselves as Mohawk, Longhouse/Cayuga, and Onkwehonwe. All three of these identifiers are descriptors of the people. Mohawk and Onkwehonwe are more

general descriptive terms for the culture. Onkwehonwe means original tribe of people. Longhouse/Cayuga is the religion of the Mohawk/Onkwehonwe people. For these people, their religion and culture are one in the same. The remaining two reserve survey participants identified themselves as Ojibway and Ojibway/Blackfeet. These surveys are much more homogeneous in population compared to the urban Indian participants. See Table 2.

Table 2:
Cultural/Tribal Affiliation of Respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1. Ojibway	6	9.7	10.3
2. Menominee	6	9.7	10.3
3. Native American	1	1.6	1.7
4. Midawakta Sioux	2	3.2	3.4
5. Lakota	1	1.6	1.7
6. Chippewa	2	3.2	3.4
7. Oglala Lakota	1	1.6	1.7
8. Yankton Sioux	2	3.2	3.4
9. Ponca/Creek	1	1.6	1.7
10. Cherokee	2	3.2	3.4
11. Dakota Sioux	2	3.2	3.4
12. Sisseton Whapeton	1	1.6	1.7
13. Navajo	1	1.6	1.7
14. Apache	1	1.6	1.7
15. Taos Pueblo	1	1.6	1.7
16. Ho-Chunk	1	1.6	1.7
17. Anishinabe	1	1.6	1.7
18. Mexican	1	1.6	1.7
19. Mandan	1	1.6	1.7
20. Navajo & Lakota	1	1.6	1.7
21. Bad River Ojibway	1	1.6	1.7
22. Mohawk	21	33.9	36.1
23. Ojibway/Blackfeet	1	1.6	1.7

Gender of Respondent

Table 3 indicates the results of the gender of the respondents. The results revealed that more females completed the survey than

males. Females contributed 78.7 % of all completed surveys and males contributed 21.3 % of all completed surveys. Many of the urban surveys were filled out by participants of a parent educational group. Most of those participants were mothers.

TABLE 3:
Gender Of Respondent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	1 male	13	21.0	21.3
	2 female	48	77.4	78.7
	Total	61	98.4	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.6	
Total		62	100.0	

Age Category of Respondent

Question 3 of the demographic information requested the respondent to identify their age within a 4 year range. The youngest range listed on the survey was 16-19 and the oldest range listed was 61-65. There was a line provided that was labeled as "other" if they happened to be older or perhaps younger. The results revealed an age range of 16 to 66 or older. One participant did not list her age but listed her eldest daughter's age as 51 years old which would probably place the woman's age at 66 to 70 range. The most populous age range was 41-45 years with 12 survey participants. The second most populous range was 20 to 25 with 11 survey participants. See Table 4.

TABLE 4:
Age Category Of Respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1. 16-19 years old	3	4.8	4.8
2. 20-25 years old	11	17.7	17.7
3. 26-30 years old	8	12.9	12.9
4. 31-35 years old	4	6.5	6.5
5. 36-40 years old	7	11.3	11.3
6. 41-45 years old	12	19.4	19.4
7. 46-50 years old	7	11.3	11.3
8. 51-55 years old	6	9.7	9.7
9. 56-60 years old	1	1.6	1.6
10. 61-65 years old	1	1.6	1.6
11. 66 or older	2	3.2	3.2
Total	62	100.0	100.0

Marital Status of Respondent

Question number 4 of the demographic information requested the participants to give their current marital status. The results revealed that 28 of the participants were currently married. The remaining 34 were not currently married. See Table 5.

TABLE 5:
Marital Status Of Respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1. Never married	15	24.2	24.2
2. Single	10	16.1	16.1
3. Married	24	38.7	38.7
4. Divorced	8	12.9	12.9
5. Remarried	4	6.5	6.5
6. Widowed	1	1.6	1.6
Total	62	100.0	100.0

If Respondent is Married, Number of Years

If the respondents answered married or remarried on question 4 marital status, they were required to give number of years within a 4 year range on question 5. The marital years ranged from 1-5 up to 31+ . The results revealed that although 28 responded as married or remarried one respondent did not complete number of years. Out of the 27 respondents 7 or 25.9% were married 1-5 years. The 1-5 year range was the largest group. The 11-15 and 16-20 ranges both had 5 respondents each and counted as the second largest groups. There was only one response to the 26-30 years which accounted for the smallest of all ranges. See Table 6.

TABLE 6:
If Respondent Is Married, How Many Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1. 01-05 years	7	11.3	25.9
2. 06-10 years	2	3.2	7.4
3. 11-15 years	5	8.1	18.5
4. 16-20 years	5	8.1	18.5
5. 21-25 years	3	4.8	11.1
6. 26-30 years	1	1.6	3.7
7. 31 years or longer	4	6.5	14.8
Total	27	43.5	100.0
Missing System	35	56.5	
Total	62	100.0	

How Many Children in Respondent's Family

The respondents were requested to list the number of children in their family. The number of children per family ranged from 0 to 9.

Of the 62 respondents, 24 listed two children in their family. This group accounted for 38.7 percent and was the largest of all groups. The second largest group of respondents, at 13, listed one child and accounted for 21.0 percent of the group total. The range of 1 to 3 children in the family accounted for 79.0 percent of all respondents. One perplexing response listed 0 children. It is unclear as to why the respondent did not list any children given the point of interest of the survey. One explanation could be an expectant mother or father to be. See Table 7.

TABLE 7:
How Many Children In Respondent's Family

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 0 children	1	1.6	1.6
1 child	13	21.0	21.0
2 children	24	38.7	38.7
3 children	12	19.4	19.4
4 children	4	6.5	6.5
5 children	3	4.8	4.8
7 children	3	4.8	4.8
8 children	1	1.6	1.6
9 children	1	1.6	1.6

Ages of Children

The respondents were requested to list the ages of their children. According to the findings there was one age missing per birth order group. The age of one 1st child was missing. The age of one 2nd child was missing. This held true for each birth order group except for the 9th child. There was only one 9th child and the age was listed. The

findings also revealed a wide range of ages from 01years or less to 54 years. As revealed in Table 8, 29 out of the 60 children ranked first child were age 11 or younger, 12 were 14 years to 20, 16 children were 22 to 31 years old and 3 were 50 to 54years old. There were 21 of 47 second ranked children under the age of 11, 12 children ages 12 to 18, 12 children ages 21 to 29 and 2 ages 48 -53 years old. Eleven of the 21 third birth order children were ages 11 or younger, 5 children were 12 to 20, 3 children were ages 21-28, and 2 - 3rd ranked children were 46-52 years. There was a decrease in the number of children in the fourth through ninth birth order ranking. Only 11 were recorded to be fourth birth order: 4 were 8 or younger, 4 were 13-18, 1-23 year old, 1-43 year old, and 1-50 year old. There were 7 fifth ranked children: 3 were 8 or younger, 1 age 17, 1 age 21, 1 age 43, and 1 age 50. There were 4 children recorded sixth birth order: 1 age 8, 1 age 21, 1 age 38, and 1 age 49. There were 4 children recorded seventh birth order: 1 age 7, 1 age 19, 1 age 33, and 1 age 47. There was one child recorded as eighth birth order age 30, and one child recorded ninth birth order age 26. See Table 8.

TABLE: 8
Birth Order And Ages Of Children

	1 ST	2 ND	3 RD	4 TH	5 TH	6 TH	7 TH	8 TH	9 TH
01 years old or less	2	6	1	2	1				
02 years old	1	1	3						
03 years old	8	4	1	1					
04 years old	6	1	1						
05 years old	1	1							
06 years old	2	4							
07 years old	1	2			1		1		
08 years old	1		1	1		1			
09 years old	3	1	2		1				
10 years old	2	1	1						
11 years old	2		1						
12 years old		2	1						
13 years old		1	1	1					
14 years old	4								
15 years old		1		1					
16 years old		1	1	1					
17 years old	1	3			1				
18 years old	1	4	1	1					
19 years old	4						1		
20 years old	2		1						
21 years old		2	1		1	1			
22 years old	2	4							
23 years old	1	1		1					
24 years old		1							
25 years old	2	1	1						
26 years old	1	1							1
27 years old	3	1							
28 years old	3		1						
29 years old	2	1							
30 years old	1							1	
31 years old	1								
32 years old									
33 years old							1		
34 years old									
35 years old									
36 years old									
37 years old									
38 years old									
39 years old						1			
40 years old									
41 years old					1				
42 years old									
43 years old				1					
44 years old									
45 years old									
46 years old			1						
47 years old							1		
48 years old		1							
49 years old						1			
50 years old	1			1	1				
51 years old	1								
52 years old			1						
53 years old		1							
54 years old	1								

Highest Level of Education Respondent Completed

The participants were required to identify the highest level of education they had completed. The results of the survey revealed a wide range of academic levels. Of the 62 respondents 57 or 91.9 percent had achieved a high school diploma or higher degree. Of the 62 respondents 21 or 33.9 percent were college graduates and 6 or 9.7 percent held master's degrees. There were 5 respondents who held and eighth grade level education. See Table 9.

TABLE 9:
Highest Level Of Education Respondent Completed

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1 8 th grade	5	8.1	8.1
2 High school	25	40.3	40.3
3 2-year technical	5	8.1	8.1
4 College graduate	21	33.9	33.9
5 Master's degree	6	9.7	9.7
Total	62	100.0	100.0

Respondent Presently Employed

The respondents were requested to identify their present employment situation. The results of the survey revealed that 61 of the 62 respondents answered this question. Of the 61 that did answer 43 or 70.5 percent were presently employed. See Table 10. The number of respondents who answered not employed were 18 or 29.5 percent. Some of those respondents who answered not presently employed were in the process of acquiring a high school diploma. One

such respondent who was a single mother of two very young children was expected to graduate with honors from an alternative school in St. Paul. Perhaps the addition of a question regarding present educational endeavors would give a much clearer portrait of the population. See table 10.

TABLE 10:
Respondent Presently Employed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	1 yes	43	69.4	70.5
	2 no	18	29.0	29.5
	Total	61	98.4	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.6	
Total		62	100.0	

Income Level of Respondent

The respondents were requested to identify their income level within a provided range. There were five ranges from which to select: The lowest being \$8,000-15,000, and the highest level provided was \$50,000 or more. There were sixty responses to this question. The most frequently identified income range, with 26.7 percent, was \$15,000-25,000. The lowest income range, \$8,000-\$15,000, was the second most frequently identified with 23.3 percent. The two lowest income ranges accounted for over 50.0 percent of all respondents. See Table 11.

TABLE:11
Income Level Of Respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 1. \$ 8,000-\$15,000	14	22.6	23.3
2. \$ 15,000-\$ 25,000	16	25.8	26.7
3. \$ 25,000-\$ 35,000	11	17.7	18.3
4. \$ 35,000-\$ 50,000	9	14.5	15.0
5. \$ 50,000 or more	10	16.1	16.7
Total	60	96.8	100.0
Missing System	2	3.2	
Total	62	100.0	

Resiliency Attitudes

The purpose of this section was to review the results from the Resiliency Attitudes section of the survey. This section indicates the results from the survey and the reliability of the subscales.

Attitudes

Table 12 displays the resiliency attitude statements ranked in order from most highly agreed with to least agreed with by the respondents. There were 10 attitude statements that received a mean score of 8.16 or higher in the strongly agree category. There were 14 attitude statements that received scores of 7.94 to 7.02 in the agree category. The nine lowest ranked items had mean scores of 6.87 down to 4.58 from agree to uncertain category.

The top ranked attitude statement was: "My family's happiness is very important to me." with a mean score of 8.89. The second highest ranked statement was "I am thankful for what I have." with a mean score of 8.63. "It is important to spend some time as a family." was ranked third with a mean score of 8.56. The fourth highest ranked item had a mean score of 8.46 "When my children talk, I listen. The fifth highest ranked item was "I have goals for myself." with a mean score of 8.44.

The least agreed with statement was ranked thirty-third and had a mean score of 4.58 was "I feel I am continually doing things for my friends", this was the uncertain category. The statements that were

ranked 32-29 were as follows: 32nd "My family makes me tired"(X=5.03), 31st "Failure frightens me"(X=5.05), 30th "I frequently feel misunderstood by my community"(X=5.76), 29th "My children are better than their peers"(X=6.05). See Table 12.

TABLE 12:
Resiliency Attitudes-Rank Order For Total Group

My family's happiness is very important to me.	8.89	1
I am thankful for what I have.	8.63	2
It is important to spend some time as a family.	8.56	3
When my children talk, I listen.	8.46	4
I have goals for myself.	8.44	5
I am hopeful about the future.	8.34	6
I give my children hugs <u>only</u> as a reward.	8.31	7
Family "togetherness" is not a priority in life.	8.21	8
It is important to connect with the land and my culture.	8.18	9
I can recall at least one adult who loved me, no matter what.	8.16	10
I encourage expression of feelings.	7.94	11
Household responsibilities must be share by all members.	7.94	11
We must share with those who do not have.	7.90	12
Those I consider "family" are not necessarily blood relation.	7.84	13
I do not have time to help my child with homework.	7.77	14
My culture helps define who I am.	7.73	15
We are 'there to catch each other when we 'fall'.	7.63	16
Religion is an important part of our family life.	7.56	17
We are given love and support from friends and our community.	7.55	18
<u>My</u> wants and needs come before my family's.	7.52	19
If I want something, I will find a way to get it.	7.45	20
My thoughts and feelings are appreciated by my family.	7.39	21
My relatives do not help each other.	7.29	22
Most of the mistakes that I have made are not my fault.	7.02	23

Table 12 continued

Community members are important to my family.	6.87	24
My friends are quick to criticize me.	6.82	25
If I don't like something I change it.	6.73	26
I have little control over my life and future.	6.51	27
I share mutual values and customs with my community.	6.11	28
My children are better than their peers.	6.05	29
I frequently feel misunderstood by my community.	5.76	30
Failure frightens me.	5.05	31
My family makes me tired.	5.03	32
I feel I am continually doing things for my friends.	4.58	33

Subscales of Resiliency Attitude Survey

Section II Resiliency Attitude statements consisted of three subscales: individual, family, and culture specific. Table 13 includes the subscales mean scores for : individual, family, and culture specific. Each attitude survey statement has been listed under the appropriate subscale.

The results revealed the family resiliency subscale scored the highest mean with a 7.74 and a standard deviation of .69. The second highest subscale was individual resiliency with a mean score of 7.28 and a standard deviation of .89. The culture specific subscale had the lowest means at 7.04 and a standard deviation of 1.01. See Table 13.

TABLE 13:
Subscale Means For Resiliency Attitude Survey

Subscales	Mean	Stand. Dev.
<u>Individual Resiliency</u> I have little control over my life and future. I am hopeful about the future. I give my children hugs <u>only</u> as a reward. If I want something, I will find a way to get it. I have goals for myself. Most of the mistakes that I have made are not my fault. Failure frightens me. I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what. My friends are quick to criticize me. If I don't like something I change it.	7.28	.89
<u>Family Resiliency</u> My thoughts and feelings are appreciated by my family. Religion is an important part of our family life. Household responsibilities must be share by all members. My family makes me tired. It is important to spend some time as a family. My family's happiness is very important to me. I do not have time to help my child with homework. When my children talk, I listen. Family "togetherness" is not a priority in life. We are 'there to catch each other when we 'fall'. I encourage expression of feelings. <u>My</u> wants and needs come before my family's.	7.74	.69
<u>Culture Specific</u> We are given love and support from friends and our community. Community members are important to my family. We must share with those who do not have. I am thankful for what I have. Those I consider "family" are not necessarily blood relation. It is important to connect with the land and my culture. My culture helps define who I am. I share mutual values and customs with my community. My relatives do not help each other. My children are better than their peers. I feel I am continually doing things for my friends. I frequently feel misunderstood by my community.	7.04	1.01

Reliability for the Resiliency Attitude subscales

The three resiliency attitudes subscales were tested for reliability using Cronbach's Alpha and Standardized Item Alpha. The individual subscale received an alpha of .4208 and a standardized alpha of .4174.

The family subscale received an alpha of .4400 and a standardized

alpha of .4909. These two subscales did not meet the .65 or better requirement to be considered reliable for group prediction. However, the culture specific subscale received an alpha of .6434 and a standardized alpha of .7231. This subscale did meet the .65 or better requirement to be considered reliable for group prediction.

TABLE 14:
Reliability Of Resiliency Attitude Subscales

Scale	Items	Reliability Coefficient	
		Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha
Individual	10	.4208	.4174
Family	12	.4400	.4909
Culture Specific	12	.6434	.7231

Resiliency Behaviors

_____ The purpose of this section was to review the results from the resiliency behavior statements of the survey. This section indicates the results from the survey and the reliability of the subscales.

Behaviors

Table 15 displays the resiliency behavior statements ranked in order from most frequently engaged behaviors to least frequently engaged behaviors by the respondents. There were 11 behavior statements that received a mean score of 4.00 or higher indicating engagement of behavior was either frequently or almost always. There were 10 behavior statements in the sometimes to frequently engaged behaviors. The range of these ten items was 3.51 to 3.96. The nine least frequently engaged in behaviors had a mean score range of 3.42 down to 2.82 which placed them in the sometimes to rarely category. The top ranked behavior statement was "I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children" with a mean score of 4.49. The second highest ranked behavior was "I hug my children at least once a day" with a mean score of 4.44. The third highest behavior was "I tell my family I love them" (X=4.43). The fourth ranked behavior was "I help out without expectation of reward." And the fifth ranked behavior was "I make time to converse

with my spouse". An interesting note is that four of the top five ranked items were considered family resiliency behaviors.

The least frequently engaged behavior ranked number 28 with a mean score of 2.82 was "I do not answer the phone during meal time." The behaviors ranked 27-24 were as follows: 27th "We take family vacations" (X= 3.10), 26th "I volunteer at my children's school" (X=3.16), 25th "We take educational outings(museum, conservatory, etc.)"(X=3.18), 24th "I teach my children stories and songs from my cultural heritage"(X=3.21). See Table 15.

TABLE 15:
Resiliency Behaviors-Rank Order For Total Group

I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children.	4.49	1
I hug my children at least once a day.	4.44	2
I tell my family I love them.	4.43	3
I help others without expectation of reward.	4.26	4
I make time to converse with my spouse.	4.22	5
I teach my children self help skills.	4.19	6
I help out without being asked.	4.16	7
I drive my children to extra curricular activities.	4.15	8
I read to my children.	4.07	9
We participate in Cultural celebrations.	4.06	10
I give my extra clothing and housewares to someone who needs them.	4.00	11
I kiss my spouse before I leave for work.	3.96	12
I tell stories of our family history.	3.92	13
I set a curfew and/or bedtime for my children.	3.89	14
I use humor to release tension.	3.82	15
I admit when I am wrong.	3.82	15
I maintain communications between me and my child's teachers.	3.82	15
I schedule private time with my spouse.	3.70	16

table 15 continued

I check my children's homework.	3.68	17
I play recreational games with my children.	3.67	18
We have friends who are "Auntie"s and "Uncles" to my children.	3.51	19
We negotiate choices with the family.	3.42	20
I exercise for both physical and mental health.	3.36	21
I pray with my children.	3.31	22
I talk with my neighbors.	3.23	23
I teach my children stories and songs from my cultural heritage.	3.21	24
We take educational outings (Museum, Conservatory, Etc.).	3.18	25
I volunteer at my children's school.	3.16	26
We take family vacations.	3.10	27
I do not answer the phone at mealtime.	2.82	28

Subscales of Resiliency Behavior Survey

Section III resiliency behavior statements consisted of four subscales: individual, family, culture specific, and marital. Table 16 includes the subscale mean score and standard deviation for : individual, family, culture specific and marital. Each behavior statement has been listed under the appropriate subscale.

The results revealed the individual resiliency subscale scored the highest mean with a 3.98 and a standard deviation of .57. The second highest subscale was marital with a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 1.1. The culture specific subscale mean score was 3.81 and had a standard deviation of .62. The lowest subscale

score was the family resiliency behaviors with a mean of 3.57 and a Standard Deviation of .65. See Table 16.

TABLE 16:
Subscale Mean For Resiliency Behavior Survey

Subscales	Mean	Stand. Dev.
<u>Individual</u> I exercise for both mental and physical health. I hug my children at least once a day. I read to my children. I teach my children self help skills. I admit when I am wrong.	3.98	.57
<u>Family</u> I play recreational games with my children. We take family vacations. I volunteer at my children’s school. I maintain communications between me and my child’s teachers. We negotiate choices with the family. I do not answer the phone during meal time. We take educational outings(Museum, Conservatory, Etc.). I set a curfew and/or bedtime for my children. I check my children’s homework. I drive my children to extracurricular activities. I tell my family I love them.	3.57	.65
<u>Culture Specific</u> I talk with my neighbors. I give my clothing and housewares to someone who needs them. I help without being asked. We have friends who are “Aunties” and “Uncles” to my children. I teach my children stories and songs from my cultural heritage. We participate in cultural celebrations. I pray with my children. I tell stories of our family history. I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children. I use humor to release tension. I help others without expectation of reward.	3.81	.62
<u>Marital</u> I kiss my spouse before I leave for work. I make time to converse with my spouse. I schedule private time with my spouse.	3.96	1.1

Reliability for the Resiliency Behavior subscales

The four resiliency behavior subscales were tested for reliability using Cronbach's alpha and standardized item alpha. The individual subscale received an alpha of .4973 and a standardized alpha of .5098 and was not considered reliable for group prediction. The family resiliency behavior subscale received an alpha of .7709 and a standardized alpha of .7760, therefore the family resiliency behavior subscale was considered high enough for group prediction. The culture specific resiliency behavior subscale received an Alpha of .7743 and a standardized alpha of .7850 and was thus considered high enough for use in group prediction. The marital behavior subscale received an alpha of .7993 and a standardized alpha of .8112. The marital subscale was usable for group prediction purposes. The family, culture specific, and marital all met the .65 or better requirement to be considered reliable for group prediction purposes. The individual resiliency subscale did not meet the .65 requirement to be considered reliable for group predictions. See Table 17.

TABLE 17:
Reliability Of Resiliency Behavior Subscales

Scale	Items	Reliability Coefficient	
		Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha
Individual	5	.4973	.5098
Family	11	.7709	.7760
Culture Specific	11	.7743	.7850
Marital	3	.7993	.8112

Level of Significance of Attitudes and Behaviors

A Pearson Correlation Coefficient matrix was run for resiliency attitude mean subscale scores with resiliency behavior mean subscale scores. The results revealed eight correlations scored at the .001 level of significance: culture specific attitudes correlated with family resiliency attitudes scored .000, culture specific behaviors correlated with family resiliency attitudes scored .000, culture specific behavior correlated with culture specific attitude scored .000, family resiliency behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, culture specific behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, marital behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, cultural specific behaviors correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .000, and marital behaviors correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .000. There were four correlations at the .01 level of significance: family resiliency attitudes correlated with individual resiliency attitudes scored .002, family resiliency behaviors correlated with family resiliency attitudes scored .009, marital behaviors correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .002, and marital behaviors correlated with culture specific behaviors scored .01. There were three correlations that scored at the .05 level: individual resiliency subscale correlated with cultural specific attitudes scored .036, individual resiliency subscale correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .019,

individual resiliency attitudes correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .048. The correlation of culture specific attitudes and marital behaviors scored a .059 which is considered to be a trend. See Table 18.

**TABLE 18:
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT MATRIX
RESILIENCY ATTITUDES AND RESILIENCY BEHAVIORS SUBSCALE SCORES**

		Individual Resiliency Attitudes	Family Resiliency Attitudes	Culture Specific Attitudes	Individual Resiliency Behaviors	Family Resiliency Behaviors	Culture Specific Behaviors	Marital Behaviors
Individual Resiliency Attitudes	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	1.000 .62	.389 .002 62	.267 .036 62	.296 .019 62	.254 .048 61	.208 .105 62	.222 .122 50
Family Resiliency Attitudes	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.389 .002 62	1.000 .62	.536 .000 62	.290 .022 62	.330 .009 61	.452 .000 62	.431 .002 50
Cultural Specific Attitudes	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.267 .036 62	.536 .000 62	1.000 .62	.179 .165 62	.203 .117 61	.482 .000 62	.269 .059 50
Individual Resiliency Behaviors	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.296 0.19 62	.290 .022 62	.179 .165 62	1.000 .62	.695 .000 61	.485 .000 62	.573 .000 50
Family Resiliency Behaviors	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.254 .048 61	.330 .009 61	.203 .117 61	.695 .000 61	1.000 .61	.636 .000 61	.526 .000 50
Cultural Specific Behaviors	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.208 .105 62	.452 .000 62	.482 .000 62	.485 .000 62	.636 .000 61	1.000 .62	.359 .010 50
Marital Behaviors	Pearson Corr. Sig. (2-tailed) N	.222 .122 50	.431 .002 50	.269 .059 50	.573 .000 50	.526 .000 50	.359 .010 50	1.000 .50

Level of Difference between Urban and Reserve

To determine a level of difference between urban and reserve respondents, a T-test was run on section II resiliency attitude items and subscale scores, and section III resiliency behavior items and subscale scores. The T-test scores revealed eight significant differences between urban and reserve respondents.

There was one significant difference on a resiliency attitude item at the .001 level of significance: "My children are better than their peers." The urban respondents mean score was 5.18. The reserve respondents scored this item significantly higher at ($X= 7.52$).

One resiliency attitude survey item and one resiliency attitude subscale revealed differences between the two groups at the .01 level of significance. Item 216 "I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what" received an urban mean score of ($X= 7.74$) and a reserve ($X=8.91$). The individual resiliency attitude subscale was given an urban mean of 7.03 and reserve mean of 7.71. In both cases the reserve group scored significantly higher than the urban group.

At the .05 level of significance there were two resiliency attitude items, two resiliency behavior items and the culture specific resiliency attitude subscale score differences between the urban and reserve groups. Item 213 "Failure frightens me" was scored by the urban respondents at $X= (4.36)$ and much higher by the reserve at $X=(6.22)$. Item 230 "My wants and needs come before my family's"

was scored by the urban respondents at $X=(7.10)$ and the reserve respondents at $X=(8.22)$. The cultural specific attitude subscale for urban was a mean of 6.83 and reserve mean was 7.39. Behavior item 301 "I talk with my neighbors," was given an urban mean score of 3.03 and a higher mean score by the reserve respondents of 3.55. Item 325 "I pray with my children" was scored much higher by the urban ($X=3.62$) than the reserve respondents ($X= 2.78$). There were no other differences detected therefore it can be concluded that there was little difference between the urban and reserve Indians. See Table 19.

TABLE 19:
LEVEL OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN URBAN AND RESERVE

Item	Urban	Reserve	T-test	df	Level of Sig.
213 Failure frightens me.	X. =4.36 S.D.=2.66	X. = 6.22 S.D. = 3.01	-2.550	60	.013 (.05)
216 I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what.	X. = 7.74 S.D.=2.46	X. = 8.91 S.D.= .43	-2.886	41	.006 (.01)
226 My children are better than their peers.	X. =5.18 S.D.=3.21	X. = 7.52 S.D.= 2.04	-3.509	59	.001 (.001)
230 My wants and needs come before my family's	X. = 7.10 S.D.=2.67	X. = 8.22 S.D. = 1.38	-2.161	59	.035 (.05)
Att Ind Avg. Subscale score Individual Resiliency Attitudes	X. = 7.03 S.D.=.841	X. = 7.71 S.D.= .8219	-3.106	60	.003 (.01)
Att. Cult. Avg. Subscale score Attitude Cultural Specific	X. =6.83 S.D.=1.06	X. = 7.39 S.D.= .8319	-2.181	60	.033 (.05)
301 I talk with my neighbors.	X. = 3.03 S.D.=.94	X. =3.55 S.D.=1.04	-2.082	59	.042 (.05)
325. I pray with my children.	X. = 3.62 S.D.=1.46	X. = 2.78 S.D.= 1.65	2.065	60	.043 (.05)

DISCUSSION

The researchers primary intent was to identify and describe the attitudes and behaviors among urban and reserve Native American mothers and fathers that promote resiliency.

The survey consisted of three parts: demographics, resiliency attitudes, and resiliency behaviors. Sixty two North American Indian parents participated in the survey. The respondents were placed into one of two categories determined by location: urban or reserve. Thirty- nine of the respondents were Identified as urban American Indian parents and 23 were identified as reserve American Indian parents for a total sample of 62 respondents.

Most of the urban surveys were filled out by people who lived or worked in the St. Paul/ Minneapolis metro area. The cultural affiliation of the urban respondents revealed a diverse population of Native Americans representing the Great lakes, the Great plains and Southwest Indian Nations. All of the reserve surveys were filled out by members of the Six Nation Reserve in Ontario, Canada. The reserve sample was much more homogeneous than the urban sample. The age range of the respondents was from 16 to over 60 years old. The most populous age ranges were 41-45 and 20-25. These two age ranges accounted for 37.1% of all participants.

There were 48 female respondents and 13 male respondents in this study. Females accounted for over 78% of all completed surveys.

Many of the surveys filled out by the urban population were participants of a parent education class. All of those participants were mothers except for two fathers who attended regularly. This may account for some of the gender imbalance of survey participants.

Twenty eight of the participants indicated that they were currently married and the remaining 34 were not. Some of the respondents answered as single or never married. However, they were in a couple relationship for several years with the co-parent of their children. One such respondent had been coupled with her mate for the past 13 years and continue a strong loving relationship. They have four children and provide those children with a 2 parent home. They meet all the criteria of a married couple except for the legal document. Perhaps an addition of a "currently coupled" choice could have been added.

Of those respondents who were married, seven reported being married between 1 to 5 years, five respondents had been married between 11 and 15 years, and five respondents had been married 16-20. Two participants had responded 6-10 years of marriage and the remaining eight respondents were married 21 years or longer.

Seventy-nine percent of all those surveyed reported having 1-3 children. There were four families with 4 children, three families with 5 children, three families with 7 children, one family with 8 children, and one family with 9 children. One perplexing response listed 0 children.

It is unclear as to why the respondent did not list any children given the point of interest of the survey. One explanation could be an expectant mother or father to be. The ages of the children ranged from 01 or less to 54 years old. From this information it can be concluded that the sample includes multiple generations. The sample included a wide range of academic levels: 91.9 % of all respondents had completed high school or higher degree, one third of respondents were college graduates, and 9.7 % held master's degrees. There were five respondents who held an eighth grade level of education.

Forty-three of the respondents were currently employed. The number of respondents who answered not employed was 18 or 29.5 percent. Some of those respondents who answered not presently employed were in the process of acquiring a high school diploma or higher degree. One such respondent who was a single mother of two very young children was expected to graduate with honors from an alternative school in St. Paul. Perhaps the addition of a question regarding present educational endeavors would give a much clearer portrait of the population.

The average income range for the 60 responses was \$15,000-\$25,000 per year. The second most frequently identified income range was \$8,000-\$15,000. The two lowest income ranges accounted for over 50.0 percent of all respondents to this question. It is interesting

to note that although 91.9% of all respondents achieved a high school diploma and 43.6 percent of those achieved a Bachelors or Master's degree, the average income levels of these respondents is considered "low income". This is a great example of disparity of wages for people of color.

Resiliency Attitudes

The five top ranked attitude statements support McAdoo's (1994) contention that people of color maintain a "collective" more so than an individualistic mentality. Three of the top ranked attitude statements were family resiliency attitudes: First ranked, "My family's happiness is very important to me" (X= 8.89), third ranked, "It is important to spend some time as a family" (X= 8.56), and fourth ranked, "When my children talk, I listen"(X=8.46).

The second highest ranked statement was a culture specific attitude: "I am thankful for what I have"(X= 8.63). The fifth highest ranked item was an individual resiliency attitude: "I have goals for myself"(X= 8.44).

Continued examination of the item ranking lends further support to the literature. Out of the fifteen most highly agreed with statements, only three of those statements were from the individual resiliency subscale. "I have goals for myself." was ranked fifth, "I am hopeful about the future." was ranked sixth, and "I can recall at least

one adult who loved me no matter what." was ranked tenth. There were 8 family resiliency items in the top 15 ranked items. The five least agreed with items consisted of three negative- culture specific statements, one negative individual resiliency statement, and one negative family resiliency statement. The culture specific statements speak to the equal importance of each member of a community, the interdependence of the family system, and contribution without reciprocity (Cross, 1998). Each of these statements were written as such to agree would be unsupportive. These statements were among the five least agreed with among the respondents: thirty-third, "I feel I am continually doing things for my friends" (X=4.58), thirtieth, "I frequently feel misunderstood by my community" (X=5.76), twenty-ninth, "My children are better than their peers" (X=6.05). The negative family resiliency item was ranked thirty-second: "My family makes me tired"(X=5.03). The negative individual resiliency item was ranked thirty-first: "Failure frightens me"(X=5.05). The ranking of the culture specific items supports Cross's writings (1998) on the voluntary interdependence of the extended family, McAdoo's (1994) presence of supportive social networks and McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson and Thompson's (1998) value of a child based on abilities rather than inabilities.

The resiliency subscale scores emulate the research on minority resiliency attitudes. In Tribal based cultures, the family is of

great importance and a vital tool for survival. Each member of the family contributed in some way which established self worth in each member. The family also contributed to the well being of the Tribe. The family resiliency subscale scored the highest of the three subscales ($X = 7.74$). The second highest subscale was the individual resiliency subscale with a mean score of 7.28. The culture specific subscale had the lowest means at 7.04.

Resiliency Attitude Subscale Reliability

All three resiliency attitude subscales were tested for reliability of group predictions using the Cronbach's alpha and standardized alpha. The individual and the family resiliency attitude subscales did not meet the .65 requirement to be considered reliable for group prediction. Further rewriting of the individual and family attitude statements is recommended. The culture specific subscale did meet the .65 requirement for reliability of group prediction with an alpha of .6434 and a standardized alpha of .7231. The culture specific resiliency subscale was considered reliable for group prediction.

Resiliency Behaviors

The five top ranked resiliency behavior statements consisted of two family resiliency behaviors : First ranked, "I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children" ($X = 4.49$), third,

"I tell my family I love them" (X=4.43). One individual resiliency behavior second ranked: "I hug my children at least once a day"(X= 4.44). One culture specific behavior, fourth ranked, " I help out without expectation of reward" and a marital behavior was ranked fifth, "I make time to converse with my spouse". An interesting note is that at least one behavior from each resiliency subscale was in the top five ranking.

Three of the five least engaged behaviors were family resiliency promoting behaviors that the working poor would find difficult to achieve. Each of these behaviors requires money and accessibility. The urban Indians may have an accessible location but may lack the funds to do so. The reserve Indians may not have local access to museums, concert halls and other educational institutions. The behavior statement "We take family vacations" (X= 3.10) was ranked twenty-seventh, "I volunteer at my children's school" (X=3.16) was ranked twenty-sixth, and "We take educational outings (museum, conservatory etc.)"(X=3.18) was ranked twenty-fifth. The behavior statement "I do not answer the phone during meal time" (X= 2.82) was the least engaged behavior and ranked twenty-eighth. A surprising outcome of the rankings was the behavior statement "I teach my children stories and songs from my cultural heritage"(X=3.21) which ranked 24th. According to Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter and Dyer's (1998) research, on

enculturation and substance use, Native American adolescents who possessed a high self esteem and a high degree of enculturation were less likely to engage in alcohol and substance use. Given the nature of the population one would expect to find cultural teaching to be ranked much higher. One possible explanation could stand with the parents and their own life experiences. It is not uncommon to find Native people who have experienced a life of Acculturation and do not have any knowledge of their identity to pass on to their children. Perhaps that is why there is much emphasis among Native cultures to teach language, custom, and culture to the younger generations. Another possible explanation for the low ranking of this item could be the "Traditional" teachings of the that particular nation. Many Traditional Native American Cultures share child rearing among the tribal members. It was commonplace to have an "Uncle" or other family member teach about clans and culture. For the "Traditional" respondents , the job of teaching culture would fall to a relative. Thus, the parent would not teach their children cultural stories and songs.

Resiliency behavior subscale

The results of the resiliency behavior subscale scores revealed the individual resiliency subscale scored the highest mean with a 3.98 and a standard deviation of .57. The second highest subscale was marital with a mean score of 3.96 and a standard

deviation of 1.1. The culture specific subscale mean score was 3.81 and had a standard deviation of .62. The lowest subscale score was the family resiliency behaviors with a mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of .65. The results of the resiliency behavior subscale scores required comparison of the resiliency behavior statements with resiliency attitude statements to clarify the difference in results of attitudes vs behaviors. The difference that did exist was a difference in roles. The resiliency attitudes statements reflected resiliency promoting skills for oneself whereas the behaviors statements spoke to the parental role as a resiliency promoter. Brooks (1994) described the individual resiliency promoting environment as a family who met the child's needs, gave affection and emotional support and set clear limits and expectations. Perhaps this is further support for the contention that people can experience a less than resilient life and still become a resiliency promoter (Benard 1995). Further investigation into the differences in familial attitude subscale scores vs familial behavior subscale scores generated a possible explanation for the lower ranking of behaviors. As stated in a previous discussion, some of the resiliency promoting behaviors require extra funds. According to the demographic information 50% of the respondents listed incomes of \$25,000 or less. Many of the behaviors such as family vacations, volunteering, educational outings, and extracurricular activities would

not be plausible options to low income families and thus, negatively affect the ranking for the resiliency behavior subscale scores.

One of the major forms of stress on the family unit is poverty. Low income families lack the monetary resources to practice these family resiliency behaviors. This information supports one of many viable explanations for the necessity of higher budget costs for services catering to the poor. Programs that cater to the poor have the usual costs of any other program such as housing fees, equipment, staff, etc... When providing services to the poor one must consider additional costs such as transportation, food, cultural consultants, language interpreters, special needs staff, resources and equipment. And yet the budgets at the Federal and State levels continue to be cut.

Reliability Of The Resiliency Behavior Subscale

The resiliency behavior subscales were tested for reliability using Cronbach's alpha and standardized item alpha. Three of the four subscales met the .65 requirement to be considered reliable for group prediction. The family resiliency behavior subscale received an alpha of .7709 and a standardized alpha of .7760, The culture specific resiliency behavior subscale received an Alpha of .7743 and a standardized alpha of .7850 and the marital behavior subscale received an alpha of .7993 and a standardized alpha of .8112. The individual, family, and marital subscale surpassed the .65 requirement and are

considered reliable for group prediction purposes. The individual resiliency subscale received an alpha of .4973 and a standardized alpha of .5098 which did not meet the .65 requirement to be considered reliable for group predictions. Further rewriting of individual behavior items is recommended.

Level of Significance of Attitudes and Behaviors

A Pearson Correlation Coefficient matrix was run for resiliency attitude mean subscale scores with resiliency behavior mean subscale scores. The results revealed eight correlations scored at the .001 level of significance: culture specific attitudes correlated with family resiliency attitudes scored .000, culture specific behaviors correlated with family resiliency attitudes scored .000, culture specific behavior correlated with culture specific attitude scored.000, family resiliency behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, culture specific behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, marital behaviors correlated with individual resiliency behaviors scored .000, cultural specific behaviors correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .000, and marital behaviors correlated with family resiliency behaviors scored .000. Five of the correlations at the .001 level of significance involved the culture specific attitude subscale and the culture specific behavior subscale. This finding supports McAdoo's(1994) contention of commonality

regarding resiliency factors among varying cultures. According to McAdoo(1994) people across the globe possess the following patterns: "Supportive social networks; flexible relationships within the family unit; a strong sense of religiosity; extensive use of extended family helping arrangements; the adoption of fictive kin who become as family; and strong identification with their racial group"(Stack,1974; Boyd-Franklin, 1989; McAdoo, 1993: Allen, 1993 as cited in McAdoo, 1994, pg.22). However, people of color may have a greater concentration of "collective actions" of family rather than "individualistic" behaviors. According to Cross(1997), ninety eight percent of the world's cultures are/were tribal in nature. This included many of the European cultures: Irish, Celtic, Scottish, Sami, ...etc. "Tribal"; meaning, interconnected, supportive, and caring for the needs of all the people. Therefore, it is not surprising to find such high correlations when the fundamental attitudes and behaviors are considered universal. There were four correlations at the .01 level of significance and three correlations at the .05 level of significance. An interesting note was the correlation of culture specific attitudes and marital behaviors scored a .059 which is considered to be a trend. These high correlations between subscales reveal a close relation to the overall concept of resiliency.

Level of Difference between Urban and Reserve

A T-test was run on section II resiliency attitude items and subscale scores, and section III resiliency behavior items and subscale scores to determine a level of difference between the urban and reserve respondents. The T-test scores revealed eight significant differences between urban and reserve respondents.

There was one significant difference on a resiliency attitude item at the .001 level of significance: "My children are better than their peers." The urban respondents mean score was 5.18. The reserve respondents scored this item significantly higher at ($X = 7.52$).

One resiliency attitude survey item and one resiliency attitude subscale revealed differences between the two groups at the .01 level of significance. Item 216 "I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what." received an urban mean score of ($X = 7.74$) and a reserve ($X = 8.91$). The individual resiliency attitude subscale was given an urban $X = (7.03)$ and reserve $X = (7.71)$. In both cases the reserve group scored significantly higher than the urban group. One possible explanation could be the lack of consistent community for the urban respondents. It is the experience of this researcher to be met with unconditional acceptance and genuine warmth from the people on my home reservation. Although 30 years have passed since my occupancy, I am still to this day recognized and embraced as a

relative and life long friend. This is a behavior that rarely occurs in the urban setting.

At the .05 level of significance there were two resiliency attitude items, two resiliency behavior items and the culture specific resiliency attitude subscale score differences between the urban and reserve groups. Item 213 "Failure frightens me" was scored by the urban respondents at $X= (4.36)$ and much higher by the reserve at $X=(6.22)$. Item 230 "My wants and needs come before my family's" was scored by the urban respondents at $X=(7.10)$ and the reserve respondents at $X=(8.22)$. The cultural specific attitude subscale for urban was $X=(6.83)$ and reserve was $(X=7.39)$. Behavior item 301 "I talk with my neighbors," was given an urban score of $(X= 3.03)$ and a much higher score by the reserve respondents at $(X=3.55)$. A simple explanation for this difference lies with the small geographic range of most reservations. Small reservations with few residents leads one to know their neighbors well. Whereas, in larger urban areas people tend to keep to themselves and subscribe to the saying "Big fences make good neighbors". Item 325 "I pray with my children," was scored much higher by the urban at $(X=3.62)$ than the reserve respondents at $(X= 2.78)$. The issue of the use of the word "pray" is a plausible explanation for the low ranking by the reserve respondents. The use of the term "pray" was also not acceptable to many respondents. Many Indian nations practice giving thanks for what they have. They

consider praying an Anglo behavior. The intent of this statement was to identify importance of Spirituality in one's life. The use of different terminology is greatly recommended.

Chapter Five Summary Conclusion, and Recommendations

This final chapter contains a summary of the study on identification of resiliency factors utilized by Native American parents. A literature summary, the purpose, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis were included. The results of the study and conclusions drawn follow. Recommendations for further research conclude this chapter.

Summary

The literature identified characteristics at the individual, familial, and cultural specific levels that promote resiliency. The individual resiliency promoting characteristics that were described in the literature included a sense of autonomy, good communication and problem solving skills, and good social skills. The most important of all attributes were a high self esteem and an internal locus of control (Werner, 1995: Brooks, 1994). The individual resiliency promoting environment would include families who meet the child's needs, give affection and emotional support and set clear limits and expectations (Brooks,1994). Immediate and extended family members can provide a resiliency promoting environment for children. Research reported on the importance of one adult who cared and believed that the child is doing the best they can with what they have been given.

Family resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors included: family problem solving skills , good communication, a sense of equality for each member, flexibility , truthfulness, Spirituality, sense of hope, time and routine, and hardiness(McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson, Han & Allen, 1997). All of these skills promote an atmosphere of positive, respectful, interaction among the family members. A sense of family pride or esteem was also mentioned in the literature.

Native American family resiliency research included a relational view of existence. Everything is interconnected and each person must achieve a balance to be in healthy state. "Thankfulness" was also recognized as a cultural trait which promoted resiliency. To be thankful is to look for the positive in ones existence. When one seeks the positive, the negatives receive little acknowledgment (McCubbin, McCubbin, Thompson & Thompson, 1998). Enculturation was also researched as a possible resiliency contributor. The emphasis of this research was based on the Spirituality of the people to value everything as a gift which included their body (Zimmerman, Ramirez, Washienko, Walter, & Dyer, 1998). The remaining multi-cultural articles addressed concepts of " connection", "interdependence", and the need for "community" (McAdoo, 1994; Bailey & Carroll,1994; Kotlowitz, 1994.)

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the attitudes and behaviors at the individual, familial, and cultural levels, among urban and reserve Native American mothers and fathers which promote resiliency.

The study focused on the following intentions:

1. Determine attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
2. Determine specific cultural attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency.
3. Identify behaviors which promote family resiliency
4. Identify culture-specific behaviors which promote family resiliency.
5. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.
6. Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency behaviors at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.

Instrumentation

The assessment tool for this research project was pilot tested on 10 urban or reserve Native American parents in September, 2000.

The survey consisted of three parts. The first section, section I

Demographics, consisted of 10 questions: Cultural affiliation, gender, age, marital status, length of marriage, number of children, ages of children, education level, employment level, and income level.

The second section, section II Attitudes, was developed by the researcher to measure resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and cultural levels. The researcher used information collected through the literature review to create 34 statements. The statements were weighted using a Likert scale measurement of 1-9 (Disagree Strongly to Agree Strongly).

The third section, section III Behaviors, was also developed by the researcher using collected information from the literature review. This section consisted of 30 resiliency behavior statements designed to measure resiliency at the individual, familial, culture specific, and marital levels. The behavior statements were measured using a Likert five point scale of N-AA (Never to Almost Always).

Data Collection

The majority of the surveys were distributed at sites, in the Minneapolis /St. Paul metro area, and mailed to Ontario, Canada. A few other surveys were mailed to different areas of the U.S. The distribution occurred in February and March 2000. The survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete and was collected by the researcher or a proxy acting on the researcher's behalf. The survey

sample consisted of 23 reserve and 39 urban North American Indian parents.

Data Analysis

A University of Wisconsin-Stout research and statistical consultant analyzed the completed surveys. The frequency, mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item in section II and section III. The average score was calculated for each of the subscales in section II and section III; individual, familial, culture specific and marital. ____

The reliability of the attitude and behavior subscales were calculated using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient. A correlate was run for each subscale in section II with each subscale in section III on total subscale scores. T-Tests were run on all items in section II and section III plus the subscales for: Group 1- urban and Group 2- reserve.

Conclusions

_____The answers to the research questions shared a common view of importance of family, family interconnectedness, and supportive community.

_____ Research intention 1: Determine attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency. The research results regarding resiliency attitude revealed that the respondents agreed with more family resiliency attitudes than individual attitudes.

Eight out of the 15 top ranked attitude statements were from the family subscale. Five out of the 15 top ranked attitudes items addressed the culture specific attitudes and only three of the top 15 ranked items were individual resiliency attitudes. The most agreed with statement was: "My family's happiness is very important to me"(X= 8.89). The second highest ranked statement was a culture specific attitude: "I am thankful for what I have"(X= 8.63). The third highest was a family attitude: "It is important to spend some time as a family" (X= 8.56). The item ranked fourth was a family attitude: "When my children talk, I listen"(X=8.46). The fifth highest ranked item was an Individual resiliency attitude: "I have goals for myself"(X= 8.44).

The family resiliency subscale scored the highest of the three attitude subscales with a mean of 7.74 and a standard deviation of .69. The second highest subscale was individual resiliency with a mean score of 7.28 and a standard deviation of .89. The culture specific subscale had the lowest means at 7.04 and a standard deviation of 1.01. Thus respondents agreed with all three subscales.

Research intention 2: Determine specific cultural attitudes of Native American mothers and fathers which promote family resiliency. According to the research on multi-cultural "Tribal" based cultures, "family" is of most importance. The high ranking and high frequency of family resiliency attitude statements confirms the cultural attitude of

family interdependence. There were 7 culture specific items listed in the top 18 resiliency attitude statements. The most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked second: "I am thankful for what I have"(X= 8.63). The second most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked ninth: "It is important to connect with the land and my culture"(X=8.16). The third most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked twelfth: "We must share with those who do not have"(X=7.90). The fourth most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked thirteenth: "Those I consider "family are not necessarily blood relation" (X=7.84). The fifth most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked fifteenth: "My culture helps define who I am"(X=7.73). The sixth most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked seventeenth: "Religion is an important part of our family life"(X=7.65). The seventh most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked eighteenth: "We are given love and support from our community"(X=7.55).

An interesting note that deserves mention is that most "Traditional" American Indian people consider their Spirituality and culture one in the same. Many respondents did not agree with the term "religion". One respondent wrote on his survey " Religion is for people who do not want to go to hell." "Spirituality is for people who have been there." The intent of the question was to stress the importance of our belief systems as base of our culture. Perhaps the

use of different terminology would have achieved the desired response.

Research intention 3: Identify behaviors which promote family resiliency. The research results regarding resiliency behaviors revealed that the respondents agreed with more family resiliency behavior statements and cultural specific statements than individual behavior statements. Of the fifteen top ranked behavior statements 7 were family resiliency behavior statements: The top ranked resiliency behavior statement was "I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children"(X=4.49), the third ranked statement was: "I tell my family I love them"(X=4.43), the sixth ranked statement was: "I teach my children self-help skills"(X=4.19). "I drive my children to extra curricular activities"(X=4.15) was ranked eighth, "I read to my children"(X= 4.07) was ranked ninth, "I set a curfew and /or bedtime for my children" (X=3.89) was ranked fourteenth, and the fifteenth ranked family resiliency behavior statement was: "I maintain communications between me and my child's teachers."(X=3.82). There were two individual resiliency behavior statements: second ranked "I hug my children at least once a day." (X=4.44), and fifteenth ranked "I admit when I am wrong" (X= 3.82). There were two marital behavior statements ranked in the top 15: fifth ranked "I make time to converse with my spouse" (X=4.22) and fifteenth ranked "I maintain communications between me and my child's

teachers.”(X=3.82). The results of the resiliency behavior subscale scores revealed the individual resiliency subscale scored the highest mean with a 3.98 and a standard deviation of .57. The second highest subscale was marital with a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 1.1. The culture specific subscale mean score was 3.81 and had a standard deviation of .62. The lowest subscale score was the family resiliency behaviors with a mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of .65. Thus all behavior subscales were scored as “sometimes” to “frequently” engaged behaviors. Comparison of the resiliency behavior statements with resiliency attitude statements acknowledged a difference in roles. The resiliency attitudes statements reflected resiliency promoting skills for oneself where as the behavior statements spoke to the parental role as a resiliency promoter.

Research intention 4: Identify Culture-specific behaviors which promote family resiliency. There were six cultural specific behavior statements in the top 15 ranking. They were as follows: Fourth ranked “I help others without expectation of reward”(X= 4.26), seventh ranked, “I help out without being asked”(X= 4.16), tenth ranked “We participate in cultural celebrations” (X=4.06), eleventh ranked “I give my extra clothing and housewares to someone who needs them” (X=4.00), thirteenth ranked “I tell stories of our family history”(X= 3.92), and fifteenth ranked “I use humor to release tension”(X=3.82).

Research intention 5: Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians. There was one resiliency attitude item at the .001 level of significance: "My children are better than their peers". The urban respondents mean score was 5.18. The reserve respondents' mean for this item was significantly higher ($X = 7.52$).

One resiliency attitude survey item and one resiliency attitude subscale revealed differences between the two groups at the .01 level of significance. Item 216 "I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what" received an urban mean score of 7.74 and a reserve mean of 8.91. The individual resiliency attitude subscale mean was 7.03 for urban and 7.71 for reserve. In both cases the reserve group scored significantly higher than the urban group.

At the .05 level of significance there was one individual resiliency item, one family resiliency item, and the culture specific resiliency attitude subscale score differences between the urban and reserve groups. Item 213 "Failure frightens me" was scored lower by the urban respondents (4.36) and higher by the reserve (6.22). Item 230 "My wants and needs come before my family's" mean was 7.10 for the urban respondents 8.22 for the reserve respondents. The cultural specific attitude subscale mean for urban was 6.83 and 7.39 for reserve.

Research intention 6: Determine a level of difference regarding resiliency behaviors at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels among urban and reserve North American Indians.

_____At the .05 level of significance there were two resiliency behavior items. Behavior item 301 "I talk with my neighbors," had an urban mean 3.03 and a much higher mean by the reserve respondents ($X= 3.55$). Item 325 "I pray with my children" was scored much higher by the urban respondents ($X=3.62$) than the reserve respondents ($X= 2.78$). This researcher was fortunate to be given an explanation for the difference regarding "prayer". It is the practice of the Onkwehonwe people to give thanks rather than pray. Some of the reserve respondents objected to the use of the word "pray", others said praying is for Anglo people. A few of the reserve respondents interpreted the meaning as "giving thanks" and were not offended. The urban respondents did not voice the same objections. Many Nations pray and give thanks as a part of their spirituality. This would explain the .05 level of difference between the reserve mean score and the urban mean score. It is important to remember that each Nation may possess the commonality of "Tribal" society, however, many differences do exist whether it be a simple matter of semantics or a philosophical issue.

Conclusion Summary

This UW-Stout study focused on identification of resiliency attitudes at the individual, familial, and culture specific levels and resiliency behaviors at the individual, familial, culture specific, and marital levels used by Native American mothers and fathers. A level of difference was also examined for geographic location of urban vs reserve.

The research results regarding resiliency attitudes revealed that the respondents agreed with more family resiliency attitudes than individual attitudes. The most agreed with statement was: "my family's happiness is very important to me."($X = 8.89$). The family resiliency subscale scored the highest of the three attitude subscales with a mean of 7.74 and a standard deviation of .69.

According to the research on cultural attitudes, the high ranking and frequency of family resiliency attitude statements supports the cultural attitude of family interdependence. There were also 7 culture specific items listed in the top 18 resiliency attitude statements. The most agreed with culture specific statement was ranked second: "I am thankful for what I have"($X = 8.63$).

The research results regarding resiliency behaviors revealed that seven of the top fifteen ranked behavior statements were family resiliency behavior statements: The top ranked resiliency behavior statement was "I use positive encouraging words when speaking with

my children”(X=4.49), the third ranked statement was: “I tell my family I love them”(X=4.43),

There were also six cultural specific behavior statements in the top 15 ranking. The highest was fourth ranked “I help others without expectation of reward”(X= 4.26). It can be safely concluded that family resiliency attitudes and behaviors are a part of the culture specific attitudes and behaviors. The results of this study found little difference between the urban and reserve respondents. Of the thirty-four attitude statements and the thirty behavior statements there were only eight items which revealed a significant difference. There was one significant difference on a resiliency attitude item at the .001 level of significance: “My children are better than their peers” The urban respondents mean score was 5.18. The reserve respondents scored this item significantly higher (X= 7.52). One individual resiliency attitude survey item and the individual resiliency attitude subscale revealed differences between the two groups at the .01 level of significance. Item 216 “I can recall one adult who loved me no matter what” received an urban mean score of 7.74 and a reserve mean of 8.91. The individual resiliency attitude subscale was given an urban mean of 7.03 and reserve mean of 7.71. In both cases the reserve group scored significantly higher than the urban group. At the .05 level of significance there were two resiliency attitude items, two

resiliency behavior items and the culture specific resiliency attitude subscale score differences between the urban and reserve groups.

Research Recommendations

It is important to continue to identify Native American cultural attitudes and behaviors for preservation purposes, education, social programming and related services. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research have been suggested:

1. Continue further research on identification of Native American culture specific attitudes which promote resiliency.
 2. Continue research on identification of Native American cultural specific behaviors which promote resiliency.
 3. Group comparisons of urban with urban and reserve with reserve regarding resiliency promoting attitudes and behaviors.
-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, C., A. and Carroll, J. (1994). Healing forces in African-American families. In H.I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson and J. A. Futrell (Eds .) , Resiliency in African -American Families (pp. 117-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Benard, B.(1995). Fostering resilience in children. ERIC Digest. Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Brooks, R.B. (1994). Children at risk: Fostering resilience and hope. American Orthopsychiatric Association, 64, (4), 545-553.

Connors, J. & Donnellan, A., (1998). Walk in beauty: Western perspectives on disability and Navajo family / cultural resilience. In H. I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson, J. E. Fromer (Eds.), Resiliency in Native American and Immigrant Families (Pp. 159-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, T. (1998). Understanding family resiliency from a relational world view. In H.I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson, J. E. Fromer (Eds.), Resiliency in Native American and immigrant families (pp. 143-157).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dalla, R.& Gamble, W. (1997). Social networks and systems of support among American Indian Navajo adolescent mothers. In H.I. McCubbin, EA. Thompson, A. I. Thompson, J.E. Fromer (Eds.), Resiliency in Native American and immigrant families(pp. 183-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Garbarino, J. (1997). Educating children in a socially toxic environment. Educational Leadership, 54, (7),12-16.

Genera, N., P. (1994) Culture, resiliency, and mutual psychological development. In H.I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson and J. A. Futrell (Eds.), Resiliency in African -American families (pp. 31-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kotlowitz, A. (1994), Breaking the silence: Growing up in today's inner city. In H.I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson and J. A. Futrell (Eds.), Resiliency in African -American families (pp. 3-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Lowenthal, B. (1999). Effects of maltreatment and ways to promote children's resiliency. Childhood Education, 75,(4), 204-209.
- Manning, W.& Smock, J., (2000). "Swapping" families: Serial parenting and economic support for children. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 62, (1), 111-123.
- McAdoo, H. P. (1994) African-American families: Strengths and realities. In H.I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson and J. A. Futrell (Eds.) , Resiliency in African -American families (pp.17-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCubbin, H., McCubbin, M., Thompson, A., Han, S.& Allen, C., (1997). Families under stress: What makes them resilient. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 89,(3), 2-11.
- McCubbin,H.& McCubbin, M. (1988). Typologies of resilient families: Emerging roles of social class and ethnicity. Family Relations, 37, 247-254.
- Richardson, G.& Hawks, S. (1995). A practical approach for enhancing resiliency within families. Family Perspective, 29, (3), 235-250.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics & Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, (1990). Characteristics of American Indians by tribe and language, American Indian and Alaska Native Populations, CP-3-7.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics & Statistics Administration, Bureau of, the Census, Congressional Information Service, Inc., Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 196, March 1999.
- Weinreb, M.(1997). Be a resiliency mentor: You may be a life saver for a high-risk child. Young Children, 52, (2), 14-20.
- Werner, E., E. (1995). Resilience in development. Current Directions in psychological Science. Pg 81-85.
- Wills, T., Blechman, E., & McNamara, G. (1996). Family support, coping, and competence. In E. M. Hetherington, and E. A. Blechman (Eds.) , Stress, coping and resiliency in children and families (pp. 107-133) . Mahwah, N. J. : Laurence Erlbauno Associates.

Zimmerman, M., Ramirez, J., Washienko, K., Walter, B., & Dyer, S. (1998). Enculturation hypothesis: Exploring direct and protective effects among Native American youth. Resiliency in Native American and immigrant families (pp. 199-220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX

CONSENT FORM

I understand that by returning the/this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that no identifiers are needed and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about participation in the research or subsequent complaints should be addressed first to the researcher or research advisor and second to Dr. Ted Knous, Chair, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 HH, UW-Stout, Menominee, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

RESILIENCY FACTORS OF NATIVE AMERICAN.

This questionnaire is part of a study to explore resiliency in Native American families. Your cooperation in the study would be of great help. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY. Please answer All the following questions. Do not leave any blank.

Section I: General Information

1. Cultural Affiliation: _____.

2. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

3. Your Age:

_____ 16-19 _____ 31-35 _____ 46-50 _____ 61-65
_____ 20-25 _____ 36-40 _____ 51-55 _____ Other
_____ 26-30 _____ 41-45 _____ 56-60

4. Marital Status:

_____ Never Married _____ Single _____ Married _____ Divorced _____ Remarried

5. If married, how many years?

_____ 1-5 yrs _____ 11-15 yrs _____ 21-25 yrs _____ 31+ yrs
_____ 6-10 yrs _____ 16-20 yrs _____ 26-30 yrs

6. How many children in your family? _____.

7. What are the ages of your children? _____.

8. What is the highest level of education that your have completed?

_____ 8th grade. _____ 2 year technical _____ Master=s degree
_____ High school _____ College graduate. _____ Ph. D.

9. Presently Employed? _____ Yes. _____ No.

10. Income Level: \$8,000- \$15,000- \$25,000- \$35,000- \$50,000-
 _____ \$15,000, _____ \$25,000, _____ \$35,000, _____ \$50,000 _____ Above

Section II: Attitudes

Indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the attitude statements below by selecting a number from 1 to 9.

If you agree strongly with the statements, enter a 9. If you disagree strongly, enter a 1. If your feelings are not as strong, select a number between 1 and 9.

Consider each statement carefully, but evaluate it as rapidly as you can. There are no right answers. The best responses are your personal opinions.

If you have adult children, please refer back to their childhood years and answer accordingly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Disagree Strongly		Slightly Disagree		Undecided		Slightly Agree		Agree Strongly

1. _____ I have little control over my life and future.
2. _____ My thoughts and feelings are appreciated by my family.
3. _____ Religion is important part of our family life.
4. _____ Household responsibilities must be shared by all members.
5. _____ My family makes me tired.
6. _____ I am hopeful about the future.
7. _____ I give my children hugs only as a reward.
8. _____ It is important to spend some time as a family.
9. _____ If I want something, I will find a way to get it.
10. _____ I have goals for myself.
11. _____ Most of the mistakes that I have made are **not** my fault.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Disagree Strongly		Slightly Disagree		Undecided		Slightly Agree		Agree Strongly
12. _____	My family's happiness is very important to me.							
13. _____	Failure frightens me.							
14. _____	We are given love and support from friends and our community.							
15. _____	I do not have time to help my child with homework.							
16. _____	I can recall at least one adult who loved me, no matter what.							
17. _____	Community members are important to my family.							
18. _____	We must share with those who do not have.							
19. _____	Those I consider 'family' are not necessarily blood relation.							
20. _____	When my children talk, I listen.							
21. _____	Family 'togetherness' is not a priority in life.							
22. _____	My relatives do not help each other.							
23. _____	We are 'there' to catch each other when we 'fall.'							
24. _____	I encourage expression of feelings.							
25. _____	I am thankful for what I have.							
26. _____	My children are better than their peers.							
27. _____	My friends are quick to criticize me.							
28. _____	It is important to connect with the land and my culture.							
29. _____	I feel I am continually doing things for my friends.							
30. _____	<u>My</u> wants and needs come before my family's.							
31. _____	My culture helps define who I am.							

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Disagree Strongly		Slightly Disagree		Undecided		Slightly Agree		Agree Strongly

32. _____ I frequently feel misunderstood by my community.

33. _____ If I don't like something I change it.

34. _____ I share mutual values and customs with my community.

Section III: Behaviors

The following statements are behaviors used in family resiliency. Please circle the response that applies to the frequency of use. If your children are grown and living away from your home, please reflect back to the time that they were living with you.

N = never **R** = rarely **S** = sometimes **F** = frequently **AA** = Almost always

- | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. I talk with my neighbors. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 2. I play recreational games with my children. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 3. I exercise for both physical and mental health. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 4. I give my extra clothing and housewares to someone who needs them. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 5. We take family vacations. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 6. I use humor to release tension. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 7. I help out without being asked. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 8. We have friends who are "Auntie"s and "Uncles to my children. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 9. I help others without expectation of reward. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 10. I volunteer at my children's school. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 11. I maintain communications between me and my child's teachers. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 12. I teach my children stories and songs from my cultural heritage. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 13. We negotiate choices with the family. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 14. I do not answer the phone at mealtime. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 15. We take educational outings (Museum, Conservatory, Etc.). | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 16. I set a curfew and/or bedtime for my children. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 17. I check my children's homework. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 18. I drive my children to extra curricular activities. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 19. I tell stories of our family history. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 20. I hug my children at least once a day. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 21. I tell my family I love them. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 22. I use positive encouraging words when speaking with my children. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 23. We participate in Cultural celebrations. | N | R | S | F | AA |
| 24. I read to my children. | N | R | S | F | AA |

N = never **R** = rarely **S** = sometimes **F** = frequently **AA** = Almost always

25. I pray with my children. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

26. I teach my children self help skills. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

27. I admit when I am wrong. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

If you are currently partnered please answer the following:

28. I schedule private time with my spouse. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

29. I kiss my spouse before I leave for work. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

30. I make time to converse with my spouse. **N** **R** **S** **F** **AA**

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire.