

THE EFFECTS OF ACCULTURATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD INTER-GROUP
RELATIONS ON WELL-BEING AND ASSERTIVENESS IN A COAST SALISH
GROUP

by

Eleanor Edith Cruise
B.A., Trent University, 1980

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
Psychology

© Eleanor Edith Cruise 1986

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

February, 1986

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Eleanor Edith Cruise

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of thesis: The Effects of Acculturation and Attitudes
toward Inter-group Relations on Well-being and
Assertiveness in a Coast Salish Group

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. William Krane

~~Dr. James Marcia~~
Senior Supervisor

~~Dr. Ray Koopman~~

~~Dr. Marilyn Bowman~~

~~Dr. June Beynon~~
External Examiner
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved: February 27, 1986

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

The Effects of Acculturation and Attitudes Toward Inter-Group

Relations on Well-being and Assertiveness in a Coast Salish Group

Author: _____

(signature)

Eleanor E. Cruise

(name)

April 16, 1986

(date)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to determine the effects of acculturation and attitudes toward inter-group relations on social adjustment in a Coast ~~Saish~~ Indian community. Individual acculturation position was assessed by means of a generic Acculturation Survey which was developed for the study. The survey sampled the domains of socioeconomic position, sociocultural activities and values. Attitudes toward relations with the dominant culture were assessed by means of the Ethnic Identification Scale. Six measures associated with Well-being (Bradburn's scale) and two measures of Assertiveness, derived from the Adult Self-Expression Scale, served as indices of social adjustment. Questionnaires were administered in highly structured interviews of 44 band members. Principle components analysis of items from the Acculturation Survey resulted in three distinct factors or "acculturation positions". The first factor was named "Bicultural Integration" since loadings indicated high levels of participation in both Indian and non-Indian sociocultural activities and values. The second factor was named "Cultural Assimilation" due to the high loadings of variables indicating unidirectional adoption of behaviour and values of the dominant culture. The third factor was named "Economic Integration" since economic indices were high but values took the direction of tradition. Means of acculturation factor scores and the median of Ethnic Identification Scale Rejection were used as cut-off scores to classify subjects as

high or low for two-way analyses of variance. Although comparisons were significant in only 5 of 24 tests, 8 trends toward significance were also obtained. While favouring Rejection of relations with the dominant culture has previously been found to be associated with stress and marginality, it was found to be associated with good adaptations for some groups in the present sample. Rejection appeared to be about as adaptive as the more stressful Bicultural Integration. The co-existence of Rejection and Cultural Assimilation was more adaptive than Non-Rejection and Cultural Assimilation. The latter was stressful and its advantages emerged only in comparison to Rejection combined with non-Cultural-Assimilation. Those tending toward Economic Integration showed minimum advantage. The variety of acculturation positions and their differential effects indicate that acculturation is a variable which requires control at the level of the individual for precision in research, and that measures of it may have utility for clinical purposes. Results are discussed in terms of theories of group relations and measurement issues are examined.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. James Marcia and the other members of my committee, Dr. Ray Koopman and Dr. Marilyn Bowman, for their assistance and encouragement during the course of this work. I am also grateful to Dr. Mary Lee Stearns for her valuable advice.

Special thanks are due to Julie Rice Wyse whose cheerful and knowledgeable assistance was essential in the data collection, and to Chief Jerry Brown and Max Allard whose appreciation and encouragement were indispensable.

Finally, I wish to thank the Salish men and women who took the time to participate in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	viii
A. Introduction	1
The Process and Outcome of Acculturation	3
Factors Affecting the Outcome of Acculturation	11
Toward Definition of Acculturation Positions	18
An Expanded View of Acculturation Positions	24
B. The Present Study	32
I. Method	33
Subjects	33
Experimenters	36
Measures	36
Procedure	45
Statistical Analyses	47
II. Results	49
Demographic Variables, Well-being and Assertiveness	50
Principal Components of Acculturation	60
Ethnic Identification Scale Variables	66
Effects of Acculturation and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being	71
Relationships Among All Variables	91
III. Discussion	99
The Relationship of the Acculturation Positions Found to Theory	99

The Use of Rejection with Acculturation in the Analyses	101
Acculturation Position, Rejection and Social Adjustment	102
Measurement Considerations	122
Directions for Future Research	128
References	130
C. Appendices	137
Appendix A: Acculturation Survey and its Scoring System	138
Appendix B: Ethnic Identification Scale and its Scoring System	149
Appendix C: The Adult Self Expression Scale and its Scoring System	153
Appendix D: Well-being Scale and its Scoring System	159
Appendix E: Information Sheet for Subjects	173
Appendix F: Consent Form	175
Appendix G: Descriptive Statistics on all items of the Acculturation Survey	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Proportions of the sample grouped by Reserve, Sex, Age, Marital Status, and Employment Status 35
2	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Reserve 51
3	One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Reserve on Assertiveness and Well-being 52
4	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Age 54
5	One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Age on Assertiveness and Well-being 54
6	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Sex 55
7	One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Sex on Assertiveness and Well-being 55
8	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Marital Status 56
9	One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Marital Status on Assertiveness and Well-being 56
10	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Employment Status 57
11	One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Employment Status on Assertiveness and Well-being .. 58
12	Comparison of (Overall) Assertiveness statistics by Sex and Age between the Salish sample and the standardization samples 59
13	Descriptive statistics on selected items of the Acculturation Survey 61
14	Intercorrelations of items selected from the Acculturation Survey 63
15	Factor structure resulting from principal components analysis after varimax rotation 64
16	Descriptive statistics on the subscales of the Ethnic Identification Scale 67

17	Correlations among Acculturation factors, Ethnic Identification Scale variables, Age, and Sex	68
18	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Bicultural Integration x Rejection (R17)	74
19	Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Bicultural Integration and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being	74
20	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Cultural Assimilation x Rejection ..	82
21	Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Cultural Assimilation and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being	84
22	Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Economic Integration x Rejection ...	87
23	Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Economic Integration and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being	89
24	Intercorrelations among independent and dependent variables	92
25	Intercorrelations among Well-being variables	94
26	Happiness and Well-being intercorrelations	97
13a	Descriptive statistics on all items of the Acculturation Survey	178

PART A
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of acculturation and attitudes toward inter-group relations on social adjustment within a group of Coast Salish Indian people. "Amerindian" or "Indian" peoples in Canada have been encouraged to integrate and enjoy the benefits of an affluent society; yet their communities have endured more severe poverty and social problems than other minorities for many years. Anthropologists, historians and sociologists have described the effects of European contact and land appropriation on Indian cultures in three ways: documentation of cultural patterns or their reconstruction from vestigial aspects and historical accounts; descriptions of sociocultural organization and phasic change; and discussions of politics and economics. Some of these efforts have concerned Coast Salish people in particular (see the work of anthropologists, Lane, 1953, and Kew, 1970), but psychological research with Salish people is rare. In studies of North American Indians in general, psychologists are frequently concerned with specific issues, such as locus of control or alcohol consumption patterns, and, in most domains, their work has involved diverse ethnicities, leaving the reviewer with an insurmountable problem of questionable generalizability. However, more general approaches which examine the relationship between sociocultural and psychological variables have been productive. In the sections to follow, the theory of acculturation will be discussed and the empirical question of the causal relationship between acculturation and other sociocultural factors with

psychologically maladaptive states will be examined.

The Process and Outcome of Acculturation

Acculturation, as defined by a group of anthropologists (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936),

"comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups."

Thus, acculturation is a non-specific process with two features: inter-group contact involving increasing familiarity with an alien culture and cultural change which results from contact. Change due to acculturation may occur selectively in diverse realms, including technology, religion, values, and social organization (Siegel, Vogt, Watson, & Broom, 1953). As an example of selectivity, basic premises concerning the nature of man and the universe may persist in the face of technological change (Siegel et al., 1953). Siegel et al. (1953) theorized that behaviour and beliefs which stem from deeply held social values, concerning right and wrong, propriety and desirability, are most resistant to change. Most susceptible are art and leisure activities. Given that cultures differ in many ways, the process is unlikely to be uniform over time or in final outcome.

The definition of acculturation allows for reciprocal influence, a "melting pot" notion, also known as "fusion"

(Siegel et al., 1953). Fusion is mutual inter-cultural influence that results in development of a third system with a "reconfiguration" of elements of the original systems (Siegel et al., 1953). This would only hold in conditions in which neither of the two groups uses coercion toward conformity or has power over the other. According to Gordon (1964), a society is unlikely to become a true melting pot. Even without coercion, differences in religion and race per force and persistence of tradition through choice preclude the possibility.

In any case, the degree of reciprocal influence is inevitably imbalanced. The ethnic group which makes most of the adjustments is not necessarily the aboriginal group or the group of long-standing tenure in the geographical area. Rather, it is the group with the least political and economic power or with the smaller population (Lieberson, 1961). Canadian Indians fall into both categories as minorities having tenure but lacking power. Coercion toward acculturation has been applied to them by means of legislation which outlawed some religious ceremonies until the passing of the Indian Act in 1951, and by other means, such as the residential school system (Waubageshig, 1970). These are some aspects of a concerted attempt toward "Christianizing" and "civilizing...inferior infidels" (Kahn, 1982). In recent years, economic interests have sometimes forced acculturation. For example, in order to construct a hydro-electricity installation, the Grassy Narrows Ojibway band in Ontario was relocated by the Canadian government, and the relocation

resulted in rapid, pervasive acculturation (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1983).

For Canadian Indians, the outcome of acculturation, or "acculturation position", is variable. Because acculturation has been mainly onesided, effective acculturation positions exclude fusion and are limited to "assimilation", "separation", and "integration". An ineffective position, termed "marginality", may also result. These four distinct outcomes will be defined.

Assimilation

Assimilation is the "unilateral approximation of one culture in the direction of another, albeit a changing or ongoing other" (p.988, Siegel et al., 1953). It involves acceptance of the behaviour patterns and values of the other culture, the loss of most of the traditional culture's heritage (Redfield et al., 1936), and change in identification group toward identification with the other culture (Gordon, 1964). The absence of prejudice and discrimination are prerequisite to accessibility of the institutions of the dominant culture. In the case of visible minorities in particular, it is usually effected by intermarriage which eventually renders members of different groups indistinguishable (Gordon, 1964).

Separation

— Separation is the removal of participation in the dominant culture with minimal positive inter-cultural relations and the return to traditional cultural patterns (Berry, Kim, Power, & Young, 1984). Separation occurs as a reaction "where because of oppression, or because of the unforeseen results of the acceptance of foreign traits, contra-aculturative movements arise...as compensations for an imposed or assumed inferiority, or through the prestige which a return to older pre-aculturative conditions may bring" (p.152, Redfield et al., 1936). Siegel et al. (1953) concurred, but specified that perceived threat was the impetus common to both reasons for separation. Among North American Indians, revivalist cults are occasional instances.

Separation which is enforced by the larger society is termed "segregation" (Berry et al., 1984). The Indian reservation system in Canada constitutes a form of non-enforced segregation. Mobility can be constrained by potential loss of rights and services, such as no-premium medical care, for those living off-reserve (Zentner, 1963a).

Separation is likely to become stultifying after the initial exhilaration due to the shrinking of economic, social, and cultural opportunities available and due to the accompanying "siege mentality" (Bochner, 1982). Thus, the consequences of separation may be mixed in value.

Integration

According to Siegel et al. (1953), integration is "stabilized pluralism" whereby neither group completely loses political and social autonomy. Shared institutions serve the interests of both groups or parallel institutions develop. Gordon's (1964) definition is similar: integration denotes cultural differentiation within a framework of social unity. Social unity derives from some set of shared values, rules and goals (Bochner, 1982). Thus, some form of economic or other meaningful involvement in the larger society accompanies maintenance of cultural identity. The individual may express cultural duality, i.e., "biculturalism" (LaFromboise, 1983), or may reduce involvement to that which subserves a specific (e.g., economic) interest.

Marginality

→ Marginality is a maladaptive state that occurs at the level of the individual, as the loss of a reference group with which to identify is central to the problem. The state may be pervasive within a group. The marginal person is one who:

"stands on the borders...of two cultural worlds but is fully a member of neither...He is...frustrated and not fully accepted by the broader social world he wishes to enter, ambivalent in his attitude toward the more restricted social world to which he has ancestral rights, and beset by conflicting cultural standards"

See amongst
Have
avoided
THIS

(p.56, Gordon, 1964).

Marginality is sometimes termed "deculturation" (Berry et al., 1984). Confusion, anxiety, feelings of alienation, and loss of identity are symptoms (Berry, Wintrob, Sindell, & Mawhinney, 1982). Powerlessness, meaninglessness, and normlessness may accompany these symptoms, as they are generally associated with estrangement of minority group members in the context of the dominant culture (Middleton, 1963). Marginality was classically regarded as debilitating by Park (1928, cited by Gordon, 1964) and Stonequist (1937, cited by Gordon, 1964), and also by Mann (1958) who operationalized the construct. To Gordon (1964) however, marginality may stimulate creativity. For Canadian Indians, the more common experience would seem to be of maladaptation. The construct validity of marginality, at least as a state, has been demonstrated by its consistent association with stress and with attitudes of rejection toward relations with the dominant culture in the face of increasing acculturation (Berry, 1976).

→ As the only maladaptive response to acculturation, the risk for marginality requires attention. Considering that identity is an issue in late adolescence, the integrity of Indian youth in some circumstances may be particularly in jeopardy. Some authors describe Indian youths as torn between two cultures; lacking the skills and opportunities to survive in either, some resort to self-destructive behaviour (Lake, 1982; French, 1976). Research on the epidemiology of psychiatric disorders indicates that

Indian youth account for much of the prevalence of substance abuse (Shore, Kinzie, Hampson, & Pattison, 1973; Termansen & Ryan, 1970) and suicide (Shore et al., 1973; Termansen & Ryan, 1970; Ministry of Indian & Northern Affairs, 1980; Lake, 1982; Sullivan, 1983) which are higher among Indians than in the normal population. Externally focused aggression among Indian adolescents is associated with school-leaving and with low respect for their heritage (Hammerschlag, Alderfer, & Berg, 1978). Stronger feelings of alienation have been found among adolescent Indian alcohol consumers than among their non-Indian peers (Holmgren, Fitzgerald, & Carman, 1983). While self-esteem does not differ between Indian and non-Indian children at lower school grades (Withycombe, 1973); it appears to decrease among Indians as age increases (Luftig, 1983). These findings among Indian youth of diverse ethnicities support the notion of a risk for marginality.

Conclusion:

Acculturation positions may appear by their mutually exclusive definitions to be more distinct than they are in reality. For example, individuals who appear to be on a course toward assimilation, even in terms of values, may continue to observe certain traditional customs. Some positions may be phasic and preliminary to others, given that cultures are dynamic and continually in flux. If separation is economically unfeasible it may yield to integration.

In Canadian society which maintains a policy of multiculturalism and therefore, implicitly, of self-determination, the choice among acculturation positions ideally belongs to the minority group. Assimilation is considered undesirable by most North American Indian groups (Gordon, 1964). As a fait accompli, it has few consequences for the group since their original ties evaporate. Separation does not require adaptation to the ways of the dominant culture in any specific respect and may be the resort when integration fails. The unilateral commitment involved in both assimilation and separation create a less complex situation than exists in aspirations toward integration. A preference for integration as the ideal mode of relations with the dominant culture was expressed by samples of Tsimshian and Carrier in British Columbia and of Cree in Quebec (Berry & Annis, 1974a). However, for the majority of Canadian Indian groups, the goal of integration has not been achieved, judging from the extraordinary prevalence of poverty; e.g., unemployment ranging from 35 to 75 per cent compared to 8 per cent in the national population, and 55 per cent of the total population on reserves receiving welfare payments in 1974 compared to 6 per cent of the national population (Ministry of Indian & Northern Affairs, 1980). Thus, the possibility exists that for many Indians none of these acculturation positions has yet been achieved as a final solution; but the nature of extant positions is unknown.

To adduce poverty as evidence of the deleterious effects acculturation would be an oversimplification. Economic prosperity and acculturation levels vary considerably among communities. Therefore, in order to inform the theory of acculturation, a wider perspective on the nature of the relationship that acculturation has with the phenomena of social adjustment is necessary. This discussion will therefore turn to a more general theory of acculturation, for which factors moderating its effects have been posited, and to the empirical literature which has tested some of the derivative theoretical propositions. An understanding of general factors is essential for prediction of inter-ethnic differences and will aid in predicting and understanding within-group variation.

Factors Affecting the Outcome of Acculturation

Since the 1936 publication of the memorandum on acculturation by Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, anthropologists appear to have accepted a general theory of acculturation which specifies (factors affecting its outcome) (Redfield et al., 1936; Siegel et al., 1953; Doob, 1957; Spicer, 1961). Siegel et al. (1953) defined three categories of derivative variables. With respect to the first category, the comparative nature of the groups, the important variables are rigidity of values and degree of social stratification. With respect to the second category, the nature of the inter-group relationship, a salient variable is coercion toward

acculturation by one group over the other. Another is the diffusion or constriction of personal interactions and the roles involved in these. With respect to the third category, the contact situation, three important variables are: ecology, or habitability of the geographical region and its potential for resource exploitation (or depletion) by a dominant group; and demography, or relative population sizes (Siegel et al., 1953); and the rate of progression of change (Parker, 1964; Chance, 1965). Outcome is a continuum of social integration to disintegration. The cohesion and autonomous control of the cultural system can be lost if one or more of these factors precludes the selective incorporation and transformation of alien cultural elements in a way that suits the group (Spicer, 1961). Factionalism can result and invite social problems. To avoid confusion of terms, the extremes of the outcome continuum will be referred to as "community intactness" and "cultural disintegration".

While the theory has been tested with respect to North American Indian groups, the complexity of the factors which moderate the effects of acculturation renders analysis of which are pre-eminent difficult. The factors and their derivatives are tremendously variable in application to Canadian Indian groups, who live in remote rural and urban locations, have varying amounts of lands and resources under their control, and traditionally have had strikingly different types of social organization. Another difficulty is that implications for the

psychologist's unit of analysis, individual adjustment, have been less central to the anthropologist than the persistence of customs, the incorporation of new customs, and, related to these, the intactness of the community. The outcome variable, community intactness or cultural disintegration, may be an independent variable for the psychologist if it affects individual adjustment. Objective measurement of the acculturation factors is rare. They are generally used as qualitative independent variables which distinguish groups.

For the present aim of analyzing within-group variation in acculturation position, knowledge of the moderating effects of these parameters on the results of acculturation serves only to provide a context for the group under study. Therefore the discussion of empirical findings, as follows, is merely illustrative. It is confined to a sample of studies which examined individual adjustment in relation to the three categories of factors.

The Contact Situation

Many remote reserves are in a contact situation where Indians constitute the majority. Therefore, on some reserves, traditional social controls may maintain and preserve the integrity of the community, assuming selective incorporation of alien cultural elements. However, the contact situation may interact with the situational context of individuals in its effects on their adjustment. On a measure of personality

adjustment, male Ojibway high school students from remote reserves were superior to Ojibway peers who lived within driving distance of non-Indian settlements (Latus & Bauman, 1980). Yet university students from remote reserves have responded maladaptively to stress, deactivating into passivity, compared to urban Indian and non-Indian controls who displayed heightened activation (Blue & Blue, 1983). Whether the contact situation interacts with situational contexts is uncertain. The level of intactness of both remote and near-urban communities resulting from prior acculturation were not specified in these reports. If community intactness in turn affects individual adjustment, it may have confounded the results of these studies.

The Relationship Between Groups

A similar result to that of Latus & Bauman (1980) was reported by Lefley (1976), concerning a situation where the inter-group relationship was controlled by the Indian group. A low-acculturation group of Seminoles was a separatist enclave which was economically independent and socially autonomous. The children in this group scored significantly higher on a measure of self-esteem than those of a nearby high-acculturation Seminole group, which was in a state of cultural disintegration, neglecting ceremonial observances and having some dependency on non-Indian society. Religion had been the source of social cohesion and the core of values (Lefley, 1976). Hence, community intactness, resulting from an inter-group relationship that featured socioeconomic autonomy, appears to be correlated with

individual adjustment.

The Nature of the Groups in Contact

Compatibility between the groups in contact on the dimensions of values and social stratification has been found to be associated with superior adjustment at the levels of both the community and the individual.

Values: Rigidity of values and their incompatibility with those of the dominant culture results in resistance to acculturation and deleterious effects on the group. In Great Whale River, Quebec, Barger (1977) found that integration into the non-Indian community interacted with ethnicity on a measure of culturally relevant social deviance. Higher scores on the measure of integration accompanied adequate individual adjustment in the Inuit sample, while lower integration scores accompanied adjustment in the Cree sample. A greater number of Inuit were economically well integrated. The causal factor to which these differences were attributed was the greater compatibility in values between the Inuit and the dominant cultures. The Inuit emphasized adaptability over conformity, allowing individual social mobility; whereas the Cree had strong norms requiring group consensus. The Inuit had variable bases of interpersonal associations, permitting diversity of personal involvements, as opposed to the kinship basis of interpersonal associations among the Cree. Inter-generational factionalism among the Cree indicated some degree of cultural disintegration.

Hence, the hypothesis concerning cultural compatibility in values was supported at the individual level in terms of social deviance and at the systems level in terms of community intactness. Whether cultural disintegration is merely correlated with individual adjustment or is causally related to it is not clear. The cultural compatibility variable as a precursor appears to be the cause of both.

Social stratification: Compatibility between groups on the dimension of social stratification, or the hierarchical structure of the society, permits ease of acculturation (Siegel et al., 1953). Higher levels of social stratification are a development of sedentary groups (Berry & Annis, 1974b). To illustrate, the Kwakiutl, who lived in permanent villages, had an explicit system of social ranking, and Kwakiutl individuals exhibited social mobility motives (Codere, 1961). Codere (1961) observed that radical social change, including the abandonment of the commercially-based potlatch system, had no extreme effects. Economic opportunism simply changed focus to alternative revenue sources, hence the similarities to status consciousness and "work ethic" values in the dominant culture.

Social stratification has been shown to have an inverse relationship with "acculturative stress", comprising measures of marginality and psychosomatic symptomatology, and a positive relationship with degree of acculturation (Berry & Annis, 1974a, 1974b). Social stratification was found to be unrelated to social deviance by Berry and Annis (1974a). However, the levels

of community intactness of their groups were not reported. When social stratification is low, as in migratory cultures, and cultural disintegration is high, then higher levels of social deviance may result. This relationship was observed in a Navajo sample (Graves & Graves, 1980). Social deviance was low only for a sub-group who had both economic access to the dominant culture and high acculturation levels.

Social stratification may be negatively correlated with rigid values, since rigid values seem to be peculiar to migratory groups. Values may be more strongly internalized in these groups for whom institutionalized social controls are uncharacteristic (Graves & Graves, 1980). In groups with highly structured social environments, perhaps values give rise to more external social controls.

Summary

The theory that acculturation is moderated by cultural compatibility in values and social stratification and by the nature of the inter-group relationship was supported. This was even in relation to individual adjustment, which is not the intended dependent variable. Acculturation per se does not appear to be pathogenic. It seems likely that cultural compatibility between groups is causal in relation to cultural disintegration. Cultural disintegration may be prevented by an inter-group relationship which precludes pervasive and non-selective acculturation. It also seems probable that cultural

disintegration causes individual maladjustment. This sequence may be avoided if economic access to the dominant culture exists.

Toward Definition of Acculturation Positions

In the previous section, the studies discussed had employed one or two measures of individual maladjustment in order to determine the effects of what are most often qualitative independent variables. To gain an expanded view of how individuals adapt to acculturation, additional variables are needed. One that has been useful is ethnic identification. A discussion of this variable will be followed by descriptions of the results of two factor analytic attempts at profiling acculturation positions.

Ethnic Identification

Since group of identification is one of the defining characteristics of all four hypothetical acculturation positions, this variable suggests the acculturation positions to which subjects are oriented, whether or not they have actually embarked in those directions. In groups for which acculturation is relatively novel, shifts in identification from the group of origin to the dominant group (Chance, 1965) and ambivalence in identification (Parker, 1964) are associated with high scores on indices of maladjustment when economic access to the dominant culture does not exist. If economic access exists, then adequate

adjustments maintain, whether or not ethnic identification shifts (Chance, 1965). Thus, changes in goals without simultaneous provision of access seem to have adverse effects.

The research of John Berry and his colleagues has used ethnic identification as a dependent variable, but by inference from attitudes toward inter-group relations. The attitudes are based on decisions made on two theoretical dimensions: the desirability of maintenance and development of the original cultural identity and customs, and the desirability of positive relations with the larger society (Berry et al., 1984). Their attitude measure, the Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS; Sommerlad & Berry, 1970), produces three subscale scores indicating degree of acceptance of assimilation, integration and rejection of relations with the dominant culture as preferred acculturation positions. In theory and empirically, favouring assimilation is more often associated with identification with the dominant culture, than favouring either integration or rejection. Favouring either integration or rejection is associated with identification with the original ethnic group. The attitudes favouring assimilation and integration correspond to the acculturation positions of the same names. The rejection attitude corresponds to both separation and marginality (Berry & Annis, 1974a; Berry et al., 1982). Rejection has also been found to be associated with a reaction in the form of re-affirmation of traditional forms among high-acculturation level Australian aborigines (Berry, 1970). The relationship between avowed ethnic

identity ¹ and attitude preferences has held in both Indian (Berry & Annis, 1974a) and non-Indian (Berry et al., 1984) ethnic minority groups.

Social stratification predicts attitudes and ethnic identity. In an inter-ethnic comparison of Canadian Indian groups (Berry & Annis, 1974a), a higher level of social stratification was associated with a higher frequency of preference for assimilation and lower frequencies of both other attitudes, while a lower level of social stratification was associated with higher frequencies of endorsement of rejection and integration. However, all groups were predominantly in favour of integration. The high social stratification group was also highest in acculturation (globally assessed) and lowest on measures of stress and marginality. However, current social conditions among groups were unspecified.

Attitudes toward inter-group relations can be flexible; for example, increases in political and economic autonomy of a Quebec Cree group resulted in the prior endorsements of rejection yielding to a higher frequency of acceptance of integration (Berry et al., 1982).

Thus, cultural compatibility implies acceptance of positive relations with the dominant culture and goals of integration or assimilation, as well as good adjustment. The systematic

¹The term "ethnic identity" will be used to refer to avowed identification group in order to distinguish it from "ethnic identification". The latter will refer to these attitudes which are correlated with avowed identity.

differences between ethnic groups in cultural compatibility and preferred acculturation position may indicate that the groups were adapting differently, although the relationship of the actual individual acculturation position to these other variables is unknown. Social conditions and degree of economic access may also affect ethnic identity and attitudes.

Profiles of Acculturation Positions

Factor analytic techniques have been useful in attempts to profile acculturation positions. In a study of the Cree, factor analysis revealed that acculturation was unidimensional (Berry et al., 1982). The acculturation variables (education, employment, ownership, language, literacy, and use of media) clustered on the first factor of the matrix together with age and the EIS variables, assimilation and rejection. This indicated that older people who were lowest in acculturation tended to favour rejection, that younger subjects with highest acculturation levels tended to favour assimilation, and that stress was not characteristic of either group. This result was regarded by the authors as unsatisfactory in terms of Cree cohesion and in terms of the ideal of multiculturalism. However, on a second factor, the attitude variable integration and the cognitive control variables loaded positively, while stress and marginality loaded negatively. This cluster, which was independent of acculturation, was regarded as an ideal adaptation.

The number and nature of dimensions that acculturation variables produce varies. Two dimensions emerged in Barger's (1977) study of Inuit and Cree. "Material" acculturation comprised possessions and type of residence; while "behavioural" acculturation comprised linguistic status, occupation, and lifestyle. The Inuit were higher than the Cree on both measures (and the factors were correlated), and a larger number of Inuit enjoyed wage employment and had abandoned residential mobility.

The fact that acculturation was one- and two-dimensional in these samples may be due either to the attitudes of the group or to the choice of variables used to define acculturation. The limited dimensionality may indicate that the new lifestyle was embraced in a wholesale manner by the high-acculturation subgroups. The traditional lifestyles had been abandoned rather recently in both samples. This, combined with a wholesale acceptance of the new, suggests that the new lifestyle was positively perceived, possibly due to the existence of economic access. Perhaps after time or in situations where economic access is lacking, perception of negative factors in the new lifestyle would increase and individuals would become somewhat more eclectic in choices of traditional patterns to retain and non-traditional patterns to adopt. The alternative interpretation of the limited dimensionality of acculturation is that a restricted range of variables was responsible. In the study that resulted in a single dimension (Berry et al., 1982), no variables representing traditional patterns were included,

and in the study that resulted in two dimensions (Barger, 1977), only a small number of variables represented traditional forms. Both attitudes and variables used may have been operative.

Summary

Ethnic identification and adjustment are predicted by social stratification, with groups higher on compatibility with the dominant culture being more likely to change group of identification. The fact that identification with the dominant culture has been found to be adaptive only so long as the accompanying aspirations can be realized may indicate that economic access is necessary for good adjustment, regardless of identification group.

Attitudes toward acculturation positions, which imply and correlate with ethnic identity, are flexible. However, in order to change in the direction of positive feelings toward inter-group relations, community autonomy may be prerequisite, at least in the case of groups low on social stratification. Such autonomy is one of the defining characteristics of integration as an acculturation position.

The acculturation positions that have been explored may indicate orientations, but in terms of the aspects of traditional life which were differentially retained and replaced, their natures are unknown. In conditions where economic access or community autonomy is lacking and cultural disintegration is occurring, longer-term experience of

acculturation might result in cultural retrenchment on the part of some group members and greater cultural replacement on the part of others. Thus, greater diversity in acculturation position might be expected to appear in groups with longer-term contact experience. On the other hand, greater diversity in acculturation position might be discovered in any group if the variables used permit adequate coverage.

An Expanded View of Acculturation Positions

In the studies which addressed the issue of the nature of within-group acculturation positions, both showed limited dimensionality. However, in both studies, acculturation was recent and was measured using a restricted range of variables, most of which were oriented toward immersion into the dominant culture, rather than covering both ends of the spectrum from traditionalism to assimilation. In reports on groups with higher levels of acculturation, there are few clues as to the nature of acculturation positions. For those groups with a longer-term experience of acculturation, current social conditions undoubtedly affect the capacity for integration, such as enduring poverty which can have its own incremental effects. Some authors speculate that this results in self-defeating attitudes, as well as tension and distrust with respect to the dominant culture (Hammerschlag, 1982; Lake, 1982). The history of groups with long-term contact experience may include periods of cultural disintegration and reintegration (Siegel et al.,

1953). If the contact situation and the relationship with the dominant culture have been constant for some time, acculturation positions might be expected to be relatively fixed or resolved, perhaps more so for older people. The nature of such positions is not well understood. The present study was an attempt to ascertain the nature of acculturation positions in an Indian community which has experienced such constancy as was described above, but for which the history of response to acculturation is undocumented. The expanded view resided in the use of a broad range of variables in the assessment of acculturation position. Acculturation and attitudes toward inter-group relations were used as independent variables to assess their capacity to discriminate scores on a set of dependent measures covering multiple aspects of individual social adjustment.

Measures

Acculturation: A measure of acculturation was needed. Since obviously global assessment of acculturation ² would not be useful and since no standardized measure for individual assessment that has known validity across Indian populations exists, a scale was developed. This included items concerning Indian and non-Indian sociocultural behaviour, socioeconomic

²For purposes of global assessment, Bowden (1969a, 1969b) developed a method of rating societies in terms of, e.g., subsistence economy, technology, property ownership, and political institutions. Research comparing naturally occurring groups which are distinct in level of acculturation might benefit from such systematic rating as this. More precise inter-ethnic and cross-study comparisons, and longitudinal within-groups comparisons would be of inestimable value in furthering the body of knowledge of cross-cultural psychology.

status, and Indian values. Values were included in order to uncover more subtle changes in orientation than are accessible with only demographic variables. The relationship of individual to community acculturation was not ascertained since a unidimensional model producing "levels" which could be compared to the overall community level was not envisioned. Some researchers have assumed a unidimensional model in ad hoc measures (e.g., Barnes & Vulcano, 1982) or have forced one with item analysis (Boyce & Boyce, 1983), but unidimensional "levels" do not reflect the selective reality of acculturation (Spindler, 1980). Therefore, within-group patterns produced by factor analysis were to be compared. ³ Replication of either Barger's (1977) two-factor structure or the unidimensional structure of Berry et al. (1982) was not expected, considering that their

³An additional motive was to pilot-test the generic acculturation survey created with a view toward eventual development of a clinical instrument to aid in psychological assessment of Indian clients by mental health professionals. If different acculturation positions have different consequences, such an instrument would be extremely useful. Clinical instruments standardized on Indian populations are virtually non-existent. On Wechsler Intelligence Scales, attempts have been made to establish whether an "Indian pattern" exists for children (McShane & Plas, 1984a, 1984b; Brandt, 1984; Connelly, 1983), but not for psychiatric samples. In a study of Indian alcoholics using the Eysenck Personality Inventory, Hurlbut, Gade and Fuqua (1982) concluded that separate norms were needed, but were able to offer the information that, while Indians score higher on psychoticism or "toughmindedness", on emotionality and on the lie scale, they score lower on extraversion. For schizophrenic and non-psychotic depression cases, MMPI profiles are indistinguishable, lacking a significant difference on any clinical scale (Pollack & Shore, 1980). Different values and ideologies may confound test response. Moreover, some psychiatric illnesses were expressed in different forms in traditional times (Shore & Manson, 1981). Acculturation may account for some proportion of the variance in clinical patterns.

subjects were still in the process of major change, while the sample of the present study had had long-term experience of acculturation.

Attitudes toward Inter-group Relations: In addition to a measure of acculturation, a measure of attitudes toward relations with the dominant culture was required since attitudes have been shown to correlate with adjustment (Berry, 1976), and since acculturation positions alone might very well fail to show predictive power if all extant lifestyles were uniformly adaptive or maladaptive. The attitude that an individual maintains is not the same as acculturation position or lifestyle, although they may be correlated. It is conceivable that individuals who differ in acculturation position may not differ in attitudes toward the value of their community and toward relations with the non-Indian community. The converse may also be true: that individuals with similar lifestyles may hold different attitudes. The relationship between attitudes and detailed acculturation positions has not been investigated. Attitudes were assessed using Berry's measure of ethnic identification (Sommerlad & Berry, 1970).

Dependent Variables: Most of the acculturation literature defines successful adaptations negatively; that is, in terms of low scores on indices of maladjustment. This is an unsatisfactory method for determining the traits which characterize well-adapted personalities. Hence, it was necessary to choose dependent measures which would assess well-

functioning. The dependent variables chosen were to reflect well-being and assertiveness. The items of the well-being indices were general enough to apply to individuals across cultural situations and socioeconomic statuses and were intended to reflect subjective happiness as well as social adjustment. The assertiveness measure was intended to assess subjects' social competence with non-Indians, since assertiveness is valued and adaptive in North American society (Argyle, 1982), but not in Indian cultures (LaFromboise, 1983). Assertiveness is defined as "the direct expression of one's feelings, preferences, needs, or opinions" (p. 407, Hollandsworth, Galassi, & Gay, 1977). Both in theory and empirically, it is situation-specific (LaFromboise, 1983). Assertive behaviour by Indians permits efficacy in the context of the dominant culture, but need not be invoked in Indian cultural contexts. Thus, it may indicate "biculturalism" (LaFromboise, 1983). Assertiveness is unlikely to be valued in Indian cultures because such "pan-Indian" values as non-interference, aversion to criticism or aggression, verbal reticence, observation rather than self-disclosure, and self-reliance are inimical to it (Sullivan, 1983; Tyler, Cohen, & Clark, 1982; Luftig, 1983). Behaviour of Indians based on the above "pan-Indian" values has often been misinterpreted by non-Indians as passivity and hostility. Direct suggestions or requests may appear interfering or manipulative to Indians (LaFromboise, 1983), whereas indirectness allows the target person the option of helping. Assertiveness training has been found effective with Indian clients as it purportedly

addresses their social difficulties in the dominant culture (LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983).

The Sample

A Coast Salish sample was selected. Like other northwest coast peoples, the Salish were traditionally sedentary, having an abundant food supply with an advanced fishing technology, and permanent winter villages (Drucker, 1965). Holding potlatches combined religious, social and commercial purposes, in that religious ceremonies were basic to the festivities, prestige was enjoyed by the host, links with affiliated houses were reinforced (Kew, 1970), and gifts eventually brought returns (Codere, 1961). Social status was clearly recognized and prestige-seeking was characteristic, although explicit ranking as existed among the Kwakiutl was absent (Kew, 1970). Therefore, social stratification among the Salish, while greater than among their migratory neighbours inland, was not maximal. Hence, cultural compatibility presumably exists between the Salish and the dominant culture in social stratification and in values also.

Abstracting further from acculturation theory, the contact situation and the inter-group relationship must be considered. The reservation in question is in a high contact situation, located on the edge of a town in the Vancouver-Victoria area of British Columbia where 70 per cent of the province's population is concentrated (Kew, 1970), and where tourism is an important

industry. Intensive settlement of Coast Salish traditional territory by Europeans began with the gold rush of 1858 (Kew, 1970), although trading with Europeans started in the late eighteenth century (Fisher, 1983). Before and after Canada obtained Dominion status, governments were coercive, for example, in the banning of religious ceremonies. However, community reintegration since then may have been successful to some extent, considering that the band is one of those which have assumed considerable control over its own affairs and resources, and it has attempted to revive religious ceremonies. The relationship of the band with non-Indians is largely co-operative, but racial discrimination is familiar. Since economic access was found to be important to adjustment, it should be noted that in recent times the band suffers hardship due to the closure of a sawmill and lay-offs at another mill. The inter-group relationship and comparative natures, the contact situation, and current conditions thus have both negative (likely history of disintegration, pervasive uncontrolled contact, current economic hardship) and positive (high cultural compatibility, some degree of autonomy) qualities.

Hypotheses

Without adequate precedents, a factual basis for generation of specific hypotheses concerning the factor structure was lacking. Obviously, predictions concerning the relationships between factors and the dependent variables were also

impossible. In a study of this type, the main purpose of which was to develop a measure of the independent variable acculturation, rather than to test specific hypotheses or to describe a sample, "predictions" might be more accurately termed "expectations".

An expectation that did have precedents concerned attitudes toward inter-group relations. The association of the attitude favouring rejection of relations with the dominant culture with maladaptive states was expected to hold for this sample, since it has consistently emerged in studies of diverse Indian groups (Berry, 1976). Hence, subjects with high scores on rejection were expected to have low scores on well-being. Since the symptomatology of marginality implies low social efficacy with non-Indians and marginality is associated with the attitude of rejection, it seemed likely that subjects with high scores on rejection would also have low scores on assertiveness. Attitudes favouring positive inter-group relations were expected to be associated with superior adjustments.

PART B
THE PRESENT STUDY

CHAPTER I

METHOD

Subjects

Forty-four subjects were randomly selected from a population of 392 Salish people living on or near a reservation in southwestern British Columbia. The reservation is oriented toward a small town in an economically depressed area which depends upon the fishing and lumber industries. The reservation is divided into 4 numbered areas. "Number 1" (as it is called by residents), the most densely populated area, is on the edge of the town's residential district. Numbers 2, 3 and 4 are about 7 kilometers from the town in a wooded area. Since Numbers 2 to 4 were not distinguishable in location and lifestyles, subjects on these were combined into one group and the areas were designated as "Number 4" Reserve. The variable, Reserve, thus had three classifications: Off-reserve, Number 1 and Number 4. Unemployment among the Salish people is higher than that of the region generally, is often chronic, and has resulted in poverty and its accompanying social problems. Such problems appeared more pervasive on Number 1, where impoverished living conditions are more visible; houses as a rule are smaller and built more closely together than on Number 4.

With regard to inter-group relations, many band members said that they had non-Indian friends and some people were employed

in racially mixed settings. However, inter-racial marriages appeared to be rare. Amiable relations with the non-Indian community might have been indicated except that a number of people said that they were concerned about racism among children in the local schools. This may indicate the existence of more pervasive problems in race relations, purportedly originating in the non-Indian community.

Evidence of persistence of traditional cultural patterns was clear. Longhouse ceremonial activities are enjoying a revival that began more than a decade ago. Some young people had been initiated, while many who had not still attend ceremonies. Canoe races are a regular annual event. Local public schools attended by the reserve children have Indian curriculum programs. Fluency in the Salish language, Halkomelem, is rare and is confined almost entirely to the middle-aged and elderly people, although most people have at least a small Halkomelem vocabulary; a recent introduction of organized language classes may change this. Obtaining seafoods is the most prevalent traditional subsistence activity and some men also hunt occasionally, but few people gather edible vegetation or medicinal plants.

The criteria for selection for the study were only that subjects be band members living (on- or off-reserve) and between the ages of 19 and 45 years. Six people refused the interview, constituting 12 per cent of the 50 people contacted in total. Table 1 provides n's and proportions of the sample from each geographical area, as well as its constitution in terms of sex,

age, marital status, and employment status. The n's from each area of the reserve were roughly proportionate to the populations of each area. The disproportion in representation

Table 1: Proportions of the sample grouped by Reserve, Sex, Age, Marital Status, and Employment Status

	Reserve			Sex		Age (years)		
	Off	1	4	Female	Male	24 or less	25 to 34	35 or more
<u>n</u>	9	24	11	28	16	12	22	10
<u>%</u>	20	55	25	64	36	27	50	23

<u>n</u>	Marital Status		Employment Status	
	Single	Married or Common Law	Not Working	Working
<u>n</u>	17	27	16	28
<u>%</u>	39	61	36	64

between the sexes is due to the fact that many young men had left the area and women were more readily available. The under-25-years and over-35-years age groups are under-represented compared to the 25-to-34-years age group. The under-35-years members are more common since a "baby boom" occurred about 10 years later in Indian bands (middle 1960's) than in the normal population (Ministry of Indian Affairs & Northern Development, 1980), but, within the youngest group, many band members had left the reserve. Employment included part-time work, home-making, or enrollment in an educational institution.

Although the interview format was not oriented toward clinical assessment, no subject exhibited obvious and severe

mental disturbance.

Experimenters

Two experimenters conducted the interviews. One was a woman who was a member of the band and the daughter of a band councillor. She appeared to have the respect and trust of band members generally. Her discretion and her genuine interest in the subjects were constant. The other experimenter was also female, but non-Indian. As a graduate student of clinical psychology, she had had training in clinical interviewing. The experimenters alternated in the roles of interviewer and scorer, each interviewing for one-half the time with each subject. This system was effective in maintaining a high interest level for all parties. Both experimenters played an active role in conversing with subjects. The subjects' frequent indulgence in humour was well-received and had the effect of balancing, without diminishing, the intimacy of self-disclosure. Two subjects were interviewed by only the band member, and the members of one married couple were interviewed separately and simultaneously.

Measures

The effects of the two independent variables (acculturation position and attitude toward group relations) on two sets of dependent variables reflecting social adjustment (well-being and

assertiveness) were to be assessed.

Although the measures used were intended as self-report scales, interviewing subjects rather than having them complete self-report inventories seemed more practical, as explanation of questions and informal discussion was often valuable in maximizing accuracy and simplicity. The time required for the highly structured interview (1 to 1.5 hours) was a factor in the somewhat restricted number of subjects.

Acculturation Survey (AS)

Subjects were informed that the section of the interview involving the Acculturation Survey (AS) concerned their lifestyles and some of their opinions.

The AS (see Appendix A) was developed in this study in order to assess the individual's relative position between "traditional" and non-traditional or "urban-oriented" lifestyles. Items sampled the domains of cultural and economic demographics, values, and attitudes toward technology and modernity. Every type of item used in the previous empirical attempts to measure Acculturation was also employed in the AS. The scale was meant to be generic for all North American Indians. The only items which might be relevant only to the Salish are contained in an "Indian Activities" list (II 9) and concern religious activities and the obtaining of local sea foods. All response alternatives ranged from theoretically traditional to urban-oriented or non-traditional. Some are

necessarily dichotomous but most have gradations between poles. Raising the issue of group identification was avoided, insofar as this was possible, in order to simply obtain a factual account of the individual's socioeconomic status and sociocultural behaviour.

Demographic items, contained in sections I and II, concern linguistic status, residential history, parents' and own education and occupation, material wealth, social and leisure activities and affiliations. A uniform scoring system was not feasible due to the differences in types of information obtained. Scales range from 2 points as for Birth Control (item III 10, "Do you believe that birth control is a good thing?"), which can only be answered "yes" or "no", to 48 points for Indian Activities (item II 9a), comprising 12, 5-point frequency ratings. For no item in the AS was inference on the part of the interviewers necessary. However, Family Income scores were ascertained from related questions such as occupation or, insofar as income depended on others, from known facts of the subject's living situation. Scores ranged from 0 (welfare) to 3 (earning a "good" wage or more than one earner in the household). The complete scoring system of the AS is listed in Appendix A.

Decisions concerning the values to be represented in the scale evolved from a consensus in the empirical ¹ and

¹In contrasts of Indians and non-Indians on standardized inventories of values (Pourier, 1976; Evans, 1976) or ad hoc inventories of "adaptive" values (Zentner, 1963b) differences do

theoretical literature (Lockart, 1981; Sullivan, 1983; Tyler, Cohen, & Clark, 1982; Bachtold, 1984; Miller, 1973; Luftig, 1983; Katz, 1979, 1980; French, 1976; Hay, 1977; Savishinsky, 1982), and those selected were verified by material available in the reserve's Cultural Centre. In section III, 6 values are expressed in 11 items, such that 5 values are each expressed in a pair of items but each pair is bipolar, with one item affirming a traditional view and the other affirming a non-traditional view. Both forms have positive features; e.g., Co-operation, "Whatever I have I share with others even if it's hard" (item 3, the traditional form of Co-operation) becomes "If I can look after my own spouse and kids but maybe not others, I am still a good person" (item 12, the non-traditional form of Co-operation). The other values items are Non-contradiction (items 2 & 9), Non-self-disclosure (items 5 & 15), Non-interference (items 6 & 16), Non-demonstrativeness (items 7 & 13), and Time Perspective (item 17). Values items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, with the exception of Time Perspective for which subjects marked a line to divide it into past, present and future (adapted from a description of a measure used by Shannon, 1975).

Items assessing attitudes toward technology and modernity (adapted from the Modernity Scale; Biesheuvel, 1969) are contained in Sections I and III. In Section I, these comprise

'(cont'd) not appear, probably because they do not address values which are specifically Indian. Using Indian values, ethnic group differences can be detected (e.g., Plas & Bellet, 1983).

Use of Hospitals (item 3) and Voting Pattern (item 5). In Section III, these are items 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 18, concerning respectively qualifications for holding political office, locus of control regarding how to "get ahead", the value of space exploration, acceptance of birth control, ideal number of children, primary interests, and ideal self. Some of these concern values also. Scaling of these also varies (see Appendix A).

For all items of the AS, high scores represent urban orientations while low scores represent traditional orientations. Ideal Number of Children is the only exception. Number stated was taken as is, but higher scores should be associated with traditional orientations. No raw score totals were computed; rather, factor scores were generated after principal components analysis of a subset of AS items, the criteria for whose selection will be discussed later.

The Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS)

Subjects were informed that the section of the interview involving the Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS; in Appendix B; Sommerlad & Berry, 1970) concerned their ideas about the relationship that their community should have with the larger society.

The EIS ² is a 25-item self-report inventory comprising

²Items and subscales were generated on the basis of theory rather than statistical analyses, and were tested on Australian aborigines (Sommerlad & Berry, 1970). Inverse relationships

negative and positive statements about various types of relations between the Indian culture and the dominant culture. It includes micro-relations (races of children with whom one's own children should play--item 22), and macro-relations (concerning economic independence--item 17). A final item inquires about group of identification. Response alternatives take the form of a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Scores on three subscales are obtained: Assimilation for which high scores indicate "the desire to lose Indian ways and to merge with the larger society"; Integration for which high scores indicate "the desire to maintain Indian ways while seeking positive relationships with the larger society"; and Rejection for which high scores indicate "the desire to maintain Indian ways while avoiding any major contact with the larger society" (p. 400, Berry & Annis, 1974). Identifications with the dominant culture (ascertained by item 25) are associated with Assimilation.

²(cont'd) between Assimilation and Integration are consistently obtained for Australian aborigines (Sommerlad & Berry, 1970; Berry, 1970) and for Canadian Cree, Carrier and Tsimshian (Berry & Annis, 1974a, 1974b), confirming their divergence re. maintenance of Indian ways. In the latter studies, Rejection was found to be negatively correlated with Assimilation, confirming their theoretical oppositeness, and positively but usually marginally correlated with Integration; confirming their sharing only the aspect of desire to maintain Indian ways. Reliabilities were found adequate for Cree samples (.68, .49 and .62 for Assimilation, Integration and Rejection, respectively) using Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Berry et al., 1982). Identifications were found to be with the larger society for Assimilation, and with the original group for Integration and Rejection, thus establishing concurrent validity. The model was further validated, using related measures, with Franco-Ontariens, Portuguese-Canadians and Korean-Canadians (Berry, et al., 1984).

Identifications with the aboriginal culture are associated with both Rejection and Integration. If a score on any subscale exceeds the median obtained in standardization, a subject is regarded as holding the attitude. Item classifications are listed in Appendix B.

The Adult Self-Expression Scale (ASES)

Subjects were told that the section of the interview involving the Adult Self-Expression Scale (ASES; in Appendix C; Gay, Hollandsworth, & Galassi, 1975) concerned the way that they expressed themselves with others.

The ASES³ is a 48-item, self-report measure of Assertiveness. Positive and negative items are based on two behavioural dimensions: interpersonal situations with object persons of various roles, e.g., "Do you express anger or annoyance to your boss or supervisor when it is justified?" (item 28); and types of assertive behaviour, such as expressing opinions, refusing requests, initiating conversations, expressing affect, and standing up for legitimate rights, e.g., "Do you insist that others do their fair share of the work?" (item 25).

³Test-retest reliability ($r=.91$) and construct validity using the techniques of factor analysis and discriminant analysis with respect to other related measures were established (Gay et al., 1975). Further validation was also successful using multitrait-multimethod procedures on multiple populations (Hollandsworth, Galassi, & Gay, 1977). For a sample of 233 Indians of diverse ethnicities and non-Indian controls, LaFromboise (1983) established acceptable reliability ($\alpha=.66$) and validity based on item-total correlations and factor analysis.

Subjects were asked to indicate how they usually express themselves or how they would express themselves if the situation were unfamiliar. Response choices comprise a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 0 (almost always or never) to 4 (never or rarely). (See Appendix C for scoring and item classifications.) The ASES yields a single total score. High scores indicate high levels of Assertiveness.

Subjects were asked to respond as if target persons were non-Indian whenever possible. Since 12 items referred to family members or intimate others who might be expected to elicit different behaviour from non-Indian target persons (as surmised by LaFromboise, 1983), scores for each were tallied and converted to a difference score based on per cent, Assertiveness with Others minus Family (Assertiveness O-F).

Well-being (WBS)

Subjects were informed that the section of the interview using the Well-being Scale (WBS; see Appendix D; Bradburn, 1969) concerned their involvement with other people and their satisfactions with life.

An adaptation of the lengthy Well-being interview measure of Bradburn ⁴ (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965; Bradburn, 1969) was used

⁴Bradburn's instrument is the result of a large-scale longitudinal study of well-being in the normal population. Test-retest reliabilities after 3 days range from .81 to .83 for the Affect components. Intercorrelations among items are consistent with theory. The indices used herein represent an attempt to preserve the item groups with known interrelationships.

to assess Well-being in terms of 6 specific indices and their composite: Overall Affect, Social Contact, Social Involvement, Novelty, Psychosomatic Stress, Marital Satisfaction, and Overall Well-being. Most items require retrospective (recent 2 or 3 weeks) reporting on overt behaviour such as number of families visited (P1a) in the past 2 weeks. Some items ask for more subjective, qualitative assessments such as happiness with the neighbourhood (P12), in general (H4), and with one's marriage (F9). However, most items require choices from a defined set of response alternatives. Overall Affect comprised 5 Positive Affect items and 5 Negative Affect items (H3). Social Contact comprised all items involving numbers of people with whom the subject was in contact in recent weeks (P1a, P1b, P2b, P8, and P9). Social Involvement was a measure of involvement in the community (items P2a, P3, P4, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, and P19). Novelty items concerned non-routine events (items P5, P6, P7, P10, P11a, and P11b). Psychosomatic Stress was an 11-item checklist (H8) of somatic anxiety symptoms and other items concerning worry (H1 and H2), illness (H6 and H7), energy level (H12 and H13), sleep disturbance (H9, H10, and H11), and seeking mental health services (H14 and H15). Marital Satisfaction involved 2 check-lists (F6 and F8) and assorted qualitative items concerning communication and contentment (F3, F4, F5, F7, and F9). Overall Well-being was a composite of 5 of these indices (equally weighted). Marital Satisfaction was excluded from the composite since only 27 subjects were married.

Since no scoring system was available, one was devised. Within each of the 6 indices, items were organized into meaningful units (i.e., if one question was merely a different aspect of another they were combined into one unit) and units were assigned equal weights. This produced per cent scores for all indices, except Overall Affect which ranged from 0 to 10. High scores indicate high Well-being, except on Psychosomatic Stress, for which high scores indicate higher numbers of symptoms.

Procedure

Subjects were approached directly and at random. They were interviewed in their homes or outdoors either immediately upon approach or at appointed times. Some off-reserve subjects were interviewed at the homes of relatives on the reserve. Only two interviews took place in the evening. The remainder were completed during working hours. Employed subjects were interviewed on days off or before or after work. Care was taken to ensure that no one could overhear, with the exception of young children.

The purpose of the study was explained in terms of the effects of lifestyles on well-being and individuals were given the form "Information for Subjects" (see Appendix E), and then asked to participate. They were assured of absolute confidentiality and of the voluntariness of their participation

(see the Consent Form in Appendix F). As each test involved obviously discrete topics, a brief explanation of each was given before proceeding. Tests were administered in the following order: Acculturation Survey (AS), Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS), Adult Self-Expression Scale (ASES), and Well-being Scale (WB). This order, which was held constant, led from the more factual to the more intimate in order to facilitate rapport. All measures were administered at once, except in the case of one subject whose interview occurred over two days. Explanations and re-phrasing of questions were standardized after the first interview. Because many subjects were not amenable to choosing among responses on 5-point continua, non-verbal behaviour was frequently used to expand dichotomous response choices to the intended scale.

Since many subjects expressed an interest in feedback, it was provided. This was after a considerable amount of data had been recorded (about 75 per cent) so that trends were known. Feedback involved reference to Indian and White Activities (item II 9) on the AS, attitude toward group relations from the EIS, level of Assertiveness from the ASES relative to norms, and Psychosomatic Stress and general community involvement from the Well-being scale. Care was taken to present the information as reflecting not abnormal adjustments and to elicit the subject's response to the information so that it could be discussed and any anxiety ameliorated. Although giving feedback involved a risk of biasing subjects who had not yet been interviewed, it

was thought to be an important factor in motivating subjects. The experiment had been explained in terms of providing a service to the band. Subjects were asked to avoid discussing the interview with others. Apparently, no negative message circulated, since enlisting subjects was not difficult. Furthermore, subjects who were interviewed last seemed to have only a vague notion as to the contents of the interview, and their scores appeared about as widely ranging as their predecessors'.

Statistical Analyses

The use of analysis of variance permitted the evaluation of the relative efficacy of acculturation position and attitude in discriminating among social adjustment scores. Confidence in the results of analysis of variance was greater than that which could have been placed in the results of correlational analyses, given the modest sample size. The following analyses were performed: (1) One-way analyses of variance of the effects of the demographic variables, Reserve, Age, Sex, Marital Status, and Employment Status, on the dependent variables were performed. The latter were 6 Well-being indices and their composite, and two Assertiveness scores, Overall Assertiveness and Assertiveness O-F. (2) A selection of 14 items from the Acculturation Survey was subjected to a principal components analysis. (3) Two-way (2x2) analyses of variance employing Acculturation factor scores and Ethnic Identification Scale

scores as classifiers were performed on the same dependent variables as in (1). (4) Tukey's Wholly Significant Difference Test (Myers, 1979) was used to contrast means of the dependent variables for the analyses of variance. A second series of analyses of variance of the dependent variables were performed. For these, demographic variables were added one-by-one as independent variables, along with acculturation factors and attitudes. Finally, (5) Pearson Product-Moment correlations were used to analyze the relationships among independent and dependent variables.

CHAPTER II

RESULTS

The analyses will be discussed in the following order:

- (1) the effects of the demographic variables Reserve, Age, Sex, Marital Status, and Employment Status on the dependent variables;
- (2) the selection and principal components analysis (PCA) of items from the Acculturation Survey (AS);
- (3) the design of the independent variables, Acculturation factors and Rejection (of relations with the dominant culture), and their effects in (2x2) analyses of variance on the dependent variables. The dependent variables were six Well-being indices and an Overall Well-being composite, and two Assertiveness scores, Overall Assertiveness and Assertiveness with Others Minus Family (O-F). Finally,
- (4) correlational analyses of relationships among independent and dependent variables will be discussed.

Some secondary analyses were also performed. Tukey's Wholly Significant Difference Test (WSD; Myers, 1979), was used to contrast the Well-being and Assertiveness means of the groups distinguished in the analyses of variance. The purpose of the WSD tests was to determine which means were responsible for effects. WSD tests were performed only for means based on n 's of 9 or greater and, where significant F 's were not obtained, for the largest and smallest means only. Analyses of variance were repeated using each of the abovementioned demographic variables

as a third independent variable along with the Acculturation factor and Rejection for a series of three-way analyses of variance of the Well-being and Assertiveness variables. The purpose of these analyses was to account for additional error variance and thereby determine whether effects and trends for the main factors still obtained. These analyses strained the n ; therefore their interactions with the main independent variables were suppressed. For the same reason, cell means for these analyses are unreliable. Since the purpose of the tests was corroborative in any case, descriptive statistics on these analyses are not included in sections to follow. The results of the WSD contrasts and the three-way analyses of variance will be discussed in conjunction with the results of the main analyses.

Demographic Variables, Well-being and Assertiveness

It should be noted that the dependent variable, Marital Satisfaction, was analyzed only with respect to the demographic variable, Sex, as cell n 's were too small for the other demographic variables. (Not all subjects were married.) For the entire sample, Marital Satisfaction had a mean of 75.71 ($n=27$, $SD=17.62$). The means for all groups with n 's greater than 9 were comparable to this: for Reserve Number 1, 81.02 ($n=15$, $SD=16.03$); for Age 25 to 34 years, 76.83 ($n=17$, $SD=17.63$); for Employed subjects, 74.64 ($n=19$, $SD=16.66$). Therefore, Marital Satisfaction appeared relatively invariant.

Of the analyses using demographic variables, only a few effects were observed.

Reserve

Descriptive statistics for all dependent variables as functions of Reserve are shown in Table 2. Differences between means were small for each dependent variable across Reserve groups. Standard deviations only differed substantially for the off-reserve group ($n=9$) on Novelty and on Assertiveness O-F, an

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Reserve

	Off			Reserve			4		
	<u>n</u>	Mean	SD	<u>n</u>	Mean	SD	<u>n</u>	Mean	SD
A ¹	9	112.44	24.29	24	119.17	24.69	11	122.46	32.81
A O-F ²	9	-1.85	16.22	24	-5.32	9.19	11	-4.86	11.09
O A ³	9	5.11	2.47	24	5.88	2.31	10	5.80	2.74
P S ⁴	9	48.62	22.43	24	48.74	22.90	11	55.59	14.44
S C ⁵	9	37.68	10.86	24	34.69	17.54	10	32.97	12.66
S I ⁶	9	37.58	12.33	24	49.52	11.67	11	53.00	12.82
N ⁷	9	44.67	14.88	24	45.73	18.32	11	56.13	21.63
O W-B ⁸	9	44.48	11.93	24	47.99	10.00	9	48.54	13.68

A¹=Overall Assertiveness S C⁵=Social Contact
A O-F²=Assertiveness Others-Family S I⁶=Social Involvement
O A³=Overall Affect N⁷=Novelty
P S⁴=Psychosomatic Stress O W-B⁸=Overall Well-being

uncertain difference considering the small n . The standard deviation for Psychosomatic Stress for Number 4, the out-of-town group ($n=11$), was markedly smaller than others, indicating that the slightly higher scores were relatively less variable. Significant group differences appeared on only one variable, Social Involvement, $F(2,41)=4.48$, $p<.0175$. (Details of all

analyses of variance for Reserve are shown in Table 3.)

Table 3: One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Reserve on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	512.15	2	256.07	0.36	NS
	W ²	29500.28	41	719.52		
Assertiveness O-F	B	80.85	2	40.42	0.31	NS
	W	5275.53	41	128.67		
Overall Affect	B	3.96	2	1.98	0.33	NS
	W	239.11	40	5.98		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	391.42	2	195.71	0.44	NS
	W	18171.97	41	443.22		
Social Contact	B	107.54	2	53.77	0.23	NS
	W	9461.58	40	236.54		
Social Involvement	B	1307.63	2	653.81	4.48	.0175
	W	5989.68	41	146.09		
Novelty	B	950.30	2	475.15	1.38	NS
	W	14165.61	41	345.50		
Overall Well-being	B	96.59	2	48.29	0.38	NS
	W	4936.89	39	126.59		

B¹=Between (throughout)

W²=Within (throughout)

WSD comparison of means for Social Involvement showed that subjects living off-reserve were significantly less involved (mean=37.58) than both the near-town group, Number 1 (mean=49.52; $q=3.5745$, $df=41$, $p<.05$) and group Number 4 (mean=53.00; $q=4.0141$, $df=41$, $p<.05$).

Age

Descriptive statistics for Age are shown in Table 4. Means were similar across Age groups. Age showed no significant effects on any dependent variables as can be seen from Table 5. However, standard deviations for the youngest Age group were larger than others for both Assertiveness measures. The lower

standard deviation of the youngest subjects for Psychosomatic Stress indicates a relative invariance of occurrence of multiple symptoms considering their mean. For Social Contact also the standard deviation of the youngest group indicates a greater uniformity than in the older age groups.

Sex

Descriptive statistics were comparable between the sexes, except for those concerning Psychosomatic Stress (see Table 6). On this variable, scores for the sexes differed significantly, $F(1,42)=4.64$, $p<.0370$, such that females reported more symptoms. Sex showed no other effects, as can be seen from Table 7, a summary of all analyses of variance for Sex.

Marital Status

Descriptive statistics for Marital Status can be found in Table 8. The standard deviation of single subjects for Novelty was substantially less than for the married (or common law) group and their mean was somewhat higher. Single and married subjects were significantly different only for Social Involvement, $F(1,42)=8.18$, $p<.0066$; higher Social Involvement was more typical of married subjects (see Table 9).

Table 4: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Age

	<u>24 or less</u>			<u>Years of Age</u> <u>25 to 34</u>			<u>35 or more</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
A ¹	12	111.17	31.76	22	120.73	25.76	10	122.90	21.17
A O-F ²	12	-1.97	13.17	22	-6.19	10.51	10	-3.82	10.47
O A ³	11	4.55	2.62	22	6.00	2.35	10	6.30	2.06
P S ⁴	12	51.59	17.05	22	48.94	22.93	10	52.30	21.67
S C ⁵	12	33.63	8.43	21	36.86	16.83	10	32.38	18.14
S I ⁶	12	42.33	12.12	22	48.82	13.63	10	52.75	11.34
N ⁷	12	51.26	18.55	22	48.41	18.26	10	43.69	21.11
O W-B ⁸	11	44.33	10.00	21	48.68	10.62	10	47.90	13.49

A¹=Overall Assertiveness S C⁵=Social Contact
A O-F²=Assertiveness Others-Family S I⁶=Social Involvement
O A³=Overall Affect N⁷=Novelty
P S⁴=Psychosomatic Stress O W-B⁸=Overall Well-being

Table 5: One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Age on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	947.50	2	473.75	0.67	NS
	W ²	29064.93	41	708.90		
Assertiveness O-F	B	144.19	2	72.09	0.57	NS
	W	5212.18	41	127.13		
Overall Affect	B	20.24	2	10.12	1.82	NS
	W	222.83	40	5.57		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	100.14	2	50.07	0.11	NS
	W	18463.25	41	450.32		
Social Contact	B	163.67	2	81.84	0.35	NS
	W	9405.44	40	235.14		
Social Involvement	B	626.21	2	313.11	1.92	NS
	W	6671.10	41	162.71		
Novelty	B	316.15	2	158.07	0.44	NS
	W	14799.76	41	360.97		
Overall Well-being	B	140.20	2	70.10	0.56	NS
	W	4893.28	39	125.47		

B¹=Between (throughout)
W²=Within (throughout)

Table 6: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Sex

	<u>Sex</u>					
	<u>n</u>	<u>Female</u> Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Male</u> Mean	<u>SD</u>
Overall Assertiveness	28	114.71	24.78	16	125.44	28.59
Assertiveness O-F	28	-4.76	11.65	16	-4.04	10.60
Overall Affect	27	5.56	2.39	16	5.94	2.49
Psychosomatic Stress	28	55.32	21.21	16	41.86	17.45
Social Contact	28	33.85	14.51	15	36.92	16.46
Social Involvement	28	47.13	12.66	16	49.38	13.94
Novelty	28	48.02	19.10	16	48.29	18.74
Marital Satisfaction	16	74.11	17.76	11	78.03	18.01
Overall Well-being	27	45.88	11.26	15	50.02	10.59

Table 7: One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Sex on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	1170.78	1	1170.78	1.70	NS
	W ²	28841.65	42	686.71		
Assertiveness O-F	B	5.36	1	5.36	0.04	NS
	W	5351.01	42	127.41		
Overall Affect	B	1.47	1	1.47	0.25	NS
	W	241.60	41	5.89		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	1846.95	1	1846.95	4.64	.0370
	W	16716.44	42	398.01		
Social Contact	B	92.28	1	92.28	0.40	NS
	W	9476.83	41	231.14		
Social Involvement	B	51.47	1	51.47	0.30	NS
	W	7645.84	42	172.52		
Novelty	B	0.76	1	0.76	0.00	NS
	W	15115.15	42	359.88		
Marital Satisfaction	B	100.52	1	100.52	0.32	NS
	W	7975.06	25	319.00		
Overall Well-being	B	165.41	1	165.41	1.36	NS
	W	4868.06	40	121.70		

B¹=Between (throughout)
W²=Within (throughout)

Table 8: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Marital Status

	<u>Marital Status</u>					
	<u>Single</u>			<u>Married or Common Law</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Overall Assertiveness	17	116.65	22.23	27	119.85	29.09
Assertiveness O-F	17	-1.84	11.03	27	-6.17	11.12
Overall Affect	16	5.06	2.67	27	6.07	2.20
Psychosomatic Stress	17	51.34	21.09	27	49.85	20.96
Social Contact	17	35.10	17.32	26	34.80	13.81
Social Involvement	17	41.39	10.61	27	52.07	12.87
Novelty	17	51.28	13.73	27	46.12	21.33
Overall Well-being	16	45.50	11.09	26	48.49	11.14

Table 9: One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Marital Status on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	107.14	1	107.14	0.15	NS
	W ²	29905.29	42	712.03		
Assertiveness O-F	B	196.00	1	196.00	1.60	NS
	W	5160.37	42	122.87		
Overall Affect	B	10.28	1	10.28	1.81	NS
	W	232.79	41	5.68		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	22.94	1	22.94	0.05	NS
	W	18540.45	42	441.44		
Social Contact	B	0.92	1	0.92	0.00	NS
	W	9568.20	41	233.37		
Social Involvement	B	1189.95	1	1189.95	8.18	.0066
	W	6107.36	42	145.41		
Novelty	B	278.17	1	278.17	0.79	NS
	W	14837.73	42	353.28		
Overall Well-being	B	88.78	1	88.78	0.72	NS
	W	4944.70	40	123.62		

B¹=Between (throughout)
W²=Within (throughout)

Employment Status

Descriptive statistics for Employment Status can be found in Table 10. Means and standard deviations appeared similar, and significant effects did not emerge for this variable as can be seen from Table 11. However, subjects who were employed showed a non-significant trend toward higher levels of Psychosomatic Stress (mean=54.36), $F(1,42)=2.88$, $p<.0970$, compared to those who were unemployed (mean=43.54).

Table 10: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Employment Status

	<u>Employment Status</u>					
	<u>Not Working</u>			<u>Working</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Overall Assertiveness	16	117.88	29.64	28	119.04	24.96
Assertiveness O-F	16	-3.21	9.39	28	-5.23	12.16
Overall Affect	16	5.50	2.90	27	5.82	2.11
Psychosomatic Stress	16	43.54	18.91	28	54.36	21.09
Social Contact	16	32.71	13.78	27	36.22	15.93
Social Involvement	16	46.85	13.12	28	48.57	13.17
Novelty	16	45.78	18.00	28	49.45	19.36
Overall Well-being	16	47.36	11.31	26	47.35	11.16

Table 11: One-way analyses of variance of the effects of Employment Status on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	13.72	1	13.72	0.02	NS
	W ²	29998.71	42	714.26		
Assertiveness O-F	B	41.60	1	41.60	0.33	NS
	W	5314.77	42	126.54		
Overall Affect	B	1.00	1	1.00	0.17	NS
	W	242.07	41	5.90		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	1191.94	1	1191.94	2.88	.0970
	W	17371.44	42	413.61		
Social Contact	B	123.67	1	123.67	0.54	NS
	W	9445.44	41	230.38		
Social Involvement	B	30.29	1	30.29	0.18	NS
	W	7267.02	42	173.02		
Novelty	B	136.66	1	136.66	0.38	NS
	W	14979.25	42	356.65		
Overall Well-being	B	0.00	1	0.00	0.00	NS
	W	5033.48	40	125.84		

B¹=Between (throughout)
W²=Within (throughout)

Comparisons to Established Norms

For the dependent variable, Overall Assertiveness, the Salish sample resembled the non-Indian standardization sample rather than the Indian one (see Table 12). Salish females had higher self-reported Assertiveness than the Indian standardization sample. Means of Salish males exceeded those of both other samples. With respect to Age, the Indian standardization sample showed a decline as Age increased, whereas the Salish sample, like the non-Indians, showed increasing Assertiveness with Age (until 30 years), although analysis of variance and WSD tests revealed that differences were not significant between Age groups for the Salish sample.

Table 12: Comparison of (Overall) Assertiveness statistics by Sex (a) and Age (b) between the Salish sample and the standardization samples (SS; LaFromboise, 1983)

(a)

	Salish			Sample Indian (SS)			Non-Indian (SS)		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
F ¹	28	114.71	24.78	147	107.9	19.8	268	114.78	21.22
M ²	16	125.44	28.59	85	110.4	19.7	192	118.56	18.57

¹F=females

²M=males

(b)

Age (years)	Salish		Sample Indian (SS)		Non-Indian (SS)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
19 or less ¹	--	--	111.5	18.6	113.74	19.35
20 to 24	110.5	34.30	111.9	19.0	115.48	21.21
25 to 29	123.89	29.33	108.6	16.5	120.73	20.76
30 or more	120.44	22.40	107.7	22.5	116.77	18.76

¹For Salish n=2

Standard deviations were greater in the Salish sample, particularly for males and younger subjects. Sex differences within samples were comparable with males tending toward higher scores.

Since an original scoring system for the Well-being variables was devised, direct comparisons of descriptive statistics could not be made to those of other samples. Comparisons of the relationships of some of these variables to the relationships reported by Bradburn (1969) will be discussed in the section "Relationships Among All Variables".

Summary

To summarize effects exerted by the demographic variables: Social Involvement varied as a function of Reserve and as a function of Marital Status. Subjects living off-reserve and single subjects were less involved with the community than others, but the number of people with whom they spend time (Social Contact) did not differ between groups. Psychosomatic Stress varied as a function of Sex (females being more symptomatic) and showed a trend with Employment Status (employed subjects being more symptomatic). Unfortunately, interactions among demographic variables could not be examined due to cell size limitations.

The comparison of the present sample to the standardization samples on Overall Assertiveness revealed higher means for the Salish sample than the Indian standardization sample, but corresponding Sex and Age differences within samples. Scores increased with Age and were higher for males. Variability was also greater for the Salish sample than for the standardization samples.

Principal Components of Acculturation

The relationships of Acculturation with the dependent variables were not examined until the best solution statistically and theoretically for the PCA was settled. In this way, tests on the dependent variables served as a type of

concurrent validation of the principal components (PC's).

Fourteen items were selected from the AS and subjected to principle components analysis. The reason for excluding items was that the sample size (n=44) was too small to justify use of more than 14 items. Items were excluded based upon the following criteria: poor discrimination (having skewed distributions), redundancy, less essential content, or unreliability. An attempt was made to retain balance in content, such that 7 items were socioeconomic and sociocultural in nature and 7 items concerned personal values or modernity. Table 13 lists the selected items with descriptive statistics. (Table 13a of Appendix G lists all original items.)

Since Ideal Number of Children and Possessions each had one missing value, these were replaced based on their two best

Table 13: Descriptive statistics on selected items of the Acculturation Survey (AS)

AS Items	n	Mean	Range	SD
I				
2. Residence History	44	-1.10	-3 - 1.5	1.56
II				
9. (a) Indian Activities	44	26.27	8 - 39	7.22
(b) White Activities	44	20.14	11 - 31	5.08
12. Education (years)	44	11.05	6 - 15	2.33
13. Possessions	43	7.84	2 - 11	2.40
14. Occupation	44	1.73	0 - 4	0.85
III				
5. Non-self-disclosure-5	44	1.36	0 - 4	1.20
7. Non-demonstrativeness-7	44	1.34	0 - 3	1.01
8. Utility of Space Exploration	44	1.55	0 - 3	0.88
9. Non-contradiction-9	44	1.68	0 - 3	1.14
11. Ideal Number of Children	43	3.30	2 - 9	1.30
12. Co-operation-12	44	1.73	0 - 4	1.09
16. Non-interference-16	44	2.43	1 - 4	1.02
Family Income	44	1.73	0 - 3	1.09

correlates from the 14 items retained. This was a conservative procedure, as opposed to one using all variables. No other missing data were replaced for any analysis.

Intercorrelations of the retained items are shown in Table 14. Many correlations are near-zero; others are moderate at best, indicating that few simple relationships existed for the sample as a whole. The degrees of freedom (42) constraint required a minimum correlation of 0.297 for significance ($p < .05$). Correlations generally took the expected positive direction. For all variables, high scores represented higher Acculturation levels, with the exception of Ideal Number of Children. For this variable, the stated number was taken as is. Since traditionally Indians tended to have larger families, high scores represented a traditional value and inverse correlations with other variables were expected. The fact that Indian Activities was negatively correlated with most variables indicates that higher participation in cultural activities was associated with higher scores on other variables, as higher participation received lower scores in conformity with the general scoring toward Acculturation. Hence, participants tended toward higher levels of Acculturation on other variables. Values variables tended to correlate positively with other variables, with the exception of Co-operation-12. Its tendency toward inverse correlations means that the ideal of sharing beyond the immediate family persists in the face of other types of change.

Table 14: Intercorrelations of items selected from the Acculturation Survey

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	1.000													
2	.126	1.000												
3	.006	-.266	1.000											
4	.372 ²	-.313 ¹	.321 ¹	1.000										
5	-.157	-.168	.251	.203	1.000									
6	.186	.024	.155	.455 ³	.299 ¹	1.000								
7	.257	-.298 ¹	.224	.193	.048	.054	1.000							
8	.013	-.067	.158	-.135	.133	-.079	.144	1.000						
9	-.083	-.031	.161	.170	.026	.332 ¹	-.127	-.294	1.000					
10	.048	-.196	.217	.146	.374 ²	-.117	-.067	.299 ¹	.108	1.000				
11	-.139	-.385 ³	.182	-.067	.056	-.031	.034	.135	.163	.114	1.000			
12	-.042	.146	-.288	-.325 ¹	-.227	-.184	-.172	-.168	.038	-.147	.092	1.000		
13	.068	-.023	.127	.187	.062	.247	-.093	.260	-.062	.221	.060	-.227	1.000	
14	-.007	.051	.104	.060	.386 ³	.322 ¹	-.136	-.040	.332 ¹	.229	.142	-.045	.193	1.000

¹=p<.05
²=p<.02
³=p<.01

- 1=Residential History
- 2=Indian Activities
- 3=White Activities
- 4=Education
- 5=Possessions
- 6=Occupation
- 7=Non-self-disclosure-5
- 8=Non-demonstrativeness-7
- 9=Space
- 10=Non-contradiction-9
- 11=Ideal Number of Children
- 12=Co-operation-12
- 13=Non-interference-16
- 14=Family Income

In the principal components analysis, the 3-PC solution was the most appropriate choice. For the 5-PC solution, all eigenvalues were greater than one; however, the structure was difficult to interpret, as was that of a 4-PC solution. In neither the 3- nor the 4-factor solution did Indian Activities load negatively (to indicate a high level of participation), contrary to expectations. The last factors, in each of these solutions, had only 4 and 5 loadings greater than .25. The 3-component solution with its much higher loadings and greater interpretability was preferred. The communalities were reduced, but still adequate. Residual correlations increased but not dramatically, with the largest 5 ranging in absolute value from .219 to .296. The other 86 residuals were less than .200. After varimax rotation, the 3-factor solution (shown in Table 15) accounted for 45.24 per cent of the variance and was interpretable.

Table 15: Factor structure resulting from principal components analysis after varimax rotation

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Non-contradiction-9	.645	-.063	.109
Indian Activities	-.566	-.154	.144
Possessions	.557	.073	.357
Non-demonstrativeness-7	.550	-.038	-.408
White Activities	.545	.328	.092
Education (years)	.166	.775	.262
Residence History	-.215	.639	-.084
Non-self-disclosure-5	.175	.526	-.391
Space	.002	-.021	.717
Family Income	.269	-.080	.702
Occupation	.006	.519	.614
Co-operation-12	-.366	-.480	.020
Non-interference-16	.344	.189	.138
Ideal Number of Children	.490	-.279	.061

Factor 1 was named "Bicultural Integration" (BI), since directions of both demographics and values were mixed. Indian Activities and to a lesser extent Residence History (demographics), Co-operation-12 and Ideal Number of Children (values variables) took the direction of tradition; yet White Activities loaded most highly on Factor 1. The other variables took the direction of Acculturation: the loadings of Possessions and, marginally, Family Income, revealed a degree of economic integration; and the remaining values revealed non-traditional attitudes, despite the high and discrete loading of Indian Activities.

Factor 2 was named "Cultural Assimilation" (CA) since all loadings were in the direction of Acculturation, except for Co-operation-12, the only vestige of tradition. The ideal of sharing beyond the immediate family represented by this item appears to be resistant to change. Indian Activities was negatively but marginally correlated, indicating some amount of participation. This factor was notable for its high loadings of Education, Occupation, and Residence History (but not Income), variables which are very likely at the core of cultural change, as well as endorsement of non-traditional values, such as smaller Ideal Number of Children, and acceptance of Self-disclosure, and, marginally, Non-interference.

Factor 3 was named "Economic Integration" (EI), intended to connote integration only in the economic sense, as occupational status was highest on this factor but values were traditional.

On Factor 3, demographic variables loaded less highly than on other factors, but Family Income and Occupation were highest here. Possession and Education were also notable. Thus, actual integration (economic) or the capacity for it was indicated. Space loaded positively, indicating acceptance of the utility of space exploration. While values tended to take the direction of Acculturation on the other factors, on Factor 3 the only values loading significantly, Non-demonstrativeness-7 and Non-self-disclosure-5, both took the direction of tradition.

Ethnic Identification Scale Variables

The Choice of Rejection

The Rejection subscale of the EIS served as a second independent variable in conjunction with each of the three Acculturation factors. The choice of Rejection from among the three subscales of the Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS; Assimilation, Integration and Rejection ¹) was justified on the basis of its score distribution, its relationship with the other subscales, and its greater face validity for the present sample.

¹Some of the terms used in the EIS and the Acculturation factor names overlap. This was necessary since terms refer to Acculturation positions for both measures. However, the EIS subscales imply ideal Acculturation positions, while the Acculturation factors represent actual Acculturation positions. The Acculturation factors are based on demographic facts and specific values (what people value and what they do socioculturally), while the EIS subscales are entirely concerned with attitudes toward group relations (what they believe about the relationship of the Indian and non-Indian communities).

While Integration scores were concentrated above Berry's (1976) median cut-off score, for both Rejection and Assimilation scores were spread above and below the cut-offs. Table 16 describes the distributions of scores for the three subscales of the EIS. The mean (24.45) for Assimilation was below Berry's

Table 16: Descriptive statistics on the subscales of the Ethnic Identification Scale

	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Greater than median¹</u>	<u>Less than median¹</u>
EIS-A ²	44	24.45	16 - 33	3.43	12	32
EIS-I ³	44	31.55	24 - 39	3.28	42	2
EIS-R ⁴	44	16.61	11 - 25	3.33	14	30

median¹=Berry's (1976) median

EIS-A²=Assimilation

EIS-I³=Integration

EIS-R⁴=Rejection

(1976) median cut-off score of 27, and 12 subjects appeared to endorse the attitude. For Integration, the mean (31.55) was well above the cut-off score of 27, and 42--all but 2--subjects endorsed the attitude. The mean for Rejection (16.61) was very near the cut-off score of 18, with 14 subjects appearing to endorse the attitude. Since attitudes favouring Integration characterized the sample almost absolutely, it would not have served as a useful classifier. The choice was reduced to either Rejection or Assimilation.

Correlations among subscales of the EIS, shown in Table 17, revealed that Assimilation and Rejection shared variance and therefore were somewhat redundant, while Integration was independent of both. The fact that no subject received only the

Table 17: Correlations among Acculturation factors, Ethnic Identification Scale variables, Age, and Sex

	BI ¹	CA ²	EI ³	EIS-A ⁴	EIS-I ⁵	EIS-R ⁶	EID ⁷
BI	1.000						
CA	.000	1.000					
EI	.000	.000	1.000				
EIS-A	.052	.160	.110	1.000			
EIS-I	-.053	.072	.234	-.216	1.000		
EIS-R	-.136	-.225	-.032	-.481***	-.045	1.000	
EID	-.073	-.056	-.270	.004	-.382**	.051	1.000
Age	-.015	-.201	-.210	.024	.257	-.036	.016
Sex	.090	.206	-.121	.151	-.320*	.018	.093

* p<.05
 ** p<.02
 *** p<.001

BI¹=Bicultural Integration
 CA²=Cultural Assimilation
 EI³=Economic Integration
 EIS-A⁴=EIS-Assimilation

EIS-I⁵=EIS-Integration
 EIS-R⁶=EIS-Rejection
 EID⁷=Ethnic Identity

classification of Assimilation indicated that this subscale in particular was redundant. (The relationships, also given in Table 17, among Ethnic Identification Scale variables, Acculturation factors, Age, and Sex will be discussed in the next section.)

Rejection was preferable to Assimilation since it had greater face validity for the present sample. Defined as total immersion into the dominant culture, Assimilation was not perceived as an objective or ideal of any subject interviewed. Few subjects agreed with the positive items, such as (item 3), "Any Indian who is successful should try to forget that he/she is of Indian descent." Disagreement with the negative items was common, but disagreement could be construed as due to favouring

the objective of Integration, rather than Assimilation. For example (item 14), "If a number of Indians are working on the same job, they should be put in the same section so they are together." Disagreement was ambiguous, as many subjects cited pro's and con's such as, "Indians do work well together, but if kept together they are more subject to racism," or "Keeping apart might be better for them to get along with whites, but it's harder on them." With this sort of reasoning, clearly the subject did not genuinely value Assimilation.

Rejection appeared to have face validity, since items suggested separatism; e.g. (item 1), "The Indians should be completely self-sufficient so they do not need to co-operate with the whites in any way." Rejection thus appeared to be the most meaningful measure for the present sample.

To reiterate, since Integration characterized all subjects and since Assimilation shared variance with Rejection, had doubtful face validity, and was redundant, the two subscales Assimilation and Integration were abandoned and Rejection was retained for the analyses of variance.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic Identity, a single item (item 25 of the EIS) inquires about group of identification by requiring subjects to indicate whether they consider themselves Indians (score of 0) or Canadians (score of 1). The response of "both" is not suggested but is scored (as 2). Ethnic Identity is not included in any of

the three EIS subscales. Thirty-two subjects said that they were Indians, 9 said that they were Canadians, and 3 subjects said that they were both. Ethnic Identity was only correlated significantly (and negatively) with EIS-Integration (see Table 17), indicating that subjects who claimed Indian identities were more likely to endorse the attitude favouring Integration.

Intercorrelations of Ethnic Identification Scale Variables with Acculturation Factors, Age, and Sex

Few of the intercorrelations of Acculturation factors with the EIS variables and Age and Sex, shown in Table 17, reached significance.

The non-significant correlations of Acculturation factors and EIS subscales indicate that actual Acculturation positions were for the most part independent of attitudes toward inter-group relations. Of these, two correlations approached significance: CA and Rejection showed a tendency toward a negative relationship, such that subjects who scored high on CA were unlikely to favour Rejection. EI and EIS-Integration tended toward a positive relationship, such that subjects who scored high on EI were likely to favour the attitude.

Ethnic Identity tended toward a negative relationship with EI, indicating that subjects who scored high on this factor were more likely to identify themselves as Indians than Canadians or both, compared to subjects who scored high on the other two factors (which obtained near-zero correlations with Ethnic

Identity).

Age was not significantly correlated with the independent variables; however, it tended toward negative correlations with both CA and EI, indicating that younger subjects were likely to score high on these factors. Subjects of mixed ages scored high on BI.

Sex tended to correlate positively only with CA, indicating that females were more likely to score high on the factor, whereas sex was unrelated to the other factors.

Age and Sex both tended to correlate with EIS-Integration, indicating that older subjects and males were more likely to favour the attitude. Subjects of various ages and both sexes endorsed the other two attitudes.

Effects of Acculturation and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being

Subjects were classified as high or low on each Acculturation factor and on Rejection for a series of 2x2 analyses of variance of Assertiveness and Well-being. For the factors, assignment of a high or low classification depended upon whether the subject's factor score was above or below the mean. Scores on Rejection (of relations with the dominant culture) were used to classify subjects as "Rejectors" or "Non-Rejectors", depending on a cut-off score that was one point less

than Berry's (1976) median. The use of Berry's score would have resulted in too many cells being inadequate in size. (Few people were adamant Rejectors, not surprisingly when almost all subjects endorsed EIS-Integration.) Creation of extreme groups by eliminating the portion of the sample scoring within some range of the cut-off for each variable might have been preferable, but sample size precluded this possibility.

The effects of each of the three Acculturation factors in conjunction with Rejection were analyzed separately with respect to each of the 8 dependent variables. The small sample size necessitated performing analyses of variance in series (as opposed to use of multivariate analysis of variance). Effects on Marital Satisfaction were not analyzed due to inadequate n 's. Results of the WSD tests and of re-analyses using demographic variables as third independent variables are reported in the discussion of each analysis.

Bicultural Integration (BI), Rejection and the Dependent Variables

Some cell sizes were inadequate to permit analysis of Bicultural Integration (BI) and Rejection. This situation was an inconvenience, but was not surprising from a theoretical point of view. Rejection ought to be incompatible with BI. The cell requiring both and the cell requiring that neither be present held the smallest numbers of subjects. In every case that benefitted, a two-point reduction (R16) for the Rejection cut-

off was used in a repetition of analyses so that any effects obtained with the 17 point cut-off (R17) could be compared for verification purposes. For the R16 analyses only one cell was plainly inadequate in size. R16 was useful for analyses of 6 dependent variables, Overall Assertiveness, Assertiveness with Others Minus Family, Overall Affect, Psychosomatic Stress, Social Involvement, and Novelty. Results of these tests are shown in Tables 18 and 19.

Assertiveness Indices: Rejectors who scored low on BI had lower scores than the other 3 groups on Overall Assertiveness. Although for BI and Rejection, Overall Assertiveness scores were not significantly different between groups, trends toward a main effect of Rejection, $F(1,40)=3.29$, $p<.0771$, and an interaction of BI and Rejection, $F(1,40)=2.99$, $p<.0917$, received some support. These trends were not supported using R16, but the Tukey WSD test comparing only the two means (R17) with adequate n 's revealed that the low-BI Rejectors were significantly lower in Overall Assertiveness (102.86) than high-BI Non-Rejectors (124.40; $q=3.3034$, $df=40$, $p<.05$). The low Overall Assertiveness score of low-BI Rejectors was the only one in the group which was lower than the mean for Indians in the standardization sample (see Table 12). However, the standard deviation of Non-Rejectors with high factor scores was much smaller than the others, indicating relative invariance of their high level of Overall Assertiveness. In each repeat analysis using the series of demographic variables, Reserve, Age, Sex, Marital Status, and

Table 18: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Bicultural Integration x Rejection

	<u>Bicultural Integration (R17)</u>											
	<u>Low</u>						<u>High</u>					
	<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>			<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
DV ^o												
1	8	130.88	28.05	14	102.86	27.54	15	124.40	19.19	7	123.71	26.22
2	8	-5.64	11.54	14	-3.37	13.11	15	-4.17	10.88	7	-6.15	9.00
3	8	5.25	2.61	14	5.64	2.53	14	6.07	2.40	7	5.57	2.37
4	8	52.31	28.92	14	40.65	16.79	15	52.00	16.94	7	64.46	19.34
5	8	28.59	11.92	14	33.50	11.30	15	40.48	18.91	6	32.74	14.61
6	8	42.10	11.30	14	49.30	14.58	15	50.73	11.57	7	45.94	14.86
7	8	43.01	19.39	14	42.04	16.07	15	56.35	20.12	7	48.47	16.90
8	8	42.78	9.35	14	48.12	11.89	14	51.63	10.21	6	41.69	11.01

	<u>Bicultural Integration (R16)</u>											
	<u>Low</u>						<u>High</u>					
	<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>			<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
DV ^o												
1	6	121.67	25.92	16	109.81	32.03	13	124.46	16.73	9	123.78	27.21
2	6	-1.62	9.90	16	-5.17	13.28	13	-4.38	11.72	9	-5.40	7.96
3	6	5.00	3.03	16	5.69	2.36	12	6.33	2.27	9	5.33	2.45
4	6	48.28	24.21	16	43.62	21.89	13	51.45	18.17	9	62.49	17.30
6	6	41.40	8.41	16	48.67	14.92	13	51.77	12.14	9	45.51	12.90
7	6	39.22	10.91	16	43.58	15.76	13	54.12	20.77	9	53.44	17.61

DV^o=Dependent Variable

1=Overall Assertiveness

2=Assertiveness O-F

3=Overall Affect

4=Psychosomatic Stress

5=Social Contact

6=Social Involvement

7=Novelty

8=Overall Well-being

Employment Status, as third factors, the same pattern emerged.

There were trends toward a main effect of Rejection and of an interaction of BI and Rejection on Overall Assertiveness. No main effects of the demographic variables were found.

For Assertiveness O-F, groups were not significantly different. The negative means for all groups indicated

Table 19: Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Bicultural Integration and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall Assertiveness	B ¹	509.52	1	509.52	0.83	NS
	R17 ²	2029.53	1	2029.53	3.29	.0771
	Int ³	1840.22	1	1840.22	2.99	.0917
	Error	24649.62	40	616.24		
	B	673.30	1	673.30	0.96	NS
	R16 ⁴	376.79	1	376.79	0.54	NS
	Int	299.08	1	299.08	0.43	NS
	Error	28032.56	40	700.81		
Assertiveness O-F	B	4.18	1	4.18	0.03	NS
	R17	0.20	1	0.20	0.00	NS
	Int	44.57	1	44.57	0.34	NS
	Error	5307.41	40	132.69		
	B	21.52	1	21.52	0.16	NS
	R16	49.96	1	49.96	0.38	NS
	Int	15.26	1	15.26	0.12	NS
	Error	5292.05	40	132.30		
Overall Affect	B	1.37	1	1.37	0.22	NS
	R17	0.03	1	0.03	0.00	NS
	Int	1.94	1	1.94	0.32	NS
	Error	239.36	39	6.14		
	B	2.26	1	2.26	0.38	NS
	R16	0.23	1	0.23	0.04	NS
	Int	6.72	1	6.72	1.12	NS
	Error	234.10	39	6.00		
Psychosomatic Stress	B	1360.23	1	1360.23	3.45	.0707
	R17	1.57	1	1.57	0.00	NS
	Int	1433.08	1	1433.08	3.63	.0639
	Error	15781.27	40	394.53		
	B	1163.94	1	1163.94	2.83	.1005
	R16	97.59	1	97.59	0.24	NS
	Int	591.68	1	591.68	1.44	NS
	Error	16470.46	40	411.76		
Social Contact	B	287.97	1	287.97	1.29	NS
	R17	18.74	1	18.74	0.08	NS
	Int	372.79	1	372.79	1.67	NS
	Error	8727.74	39	223.79		

Table 19, continued

Social Involvement	B	68.27	1	68.27	0.40	NS
	R17	14.35	1	14.35	0.08	NS
	Int	353.86	1	353.86	2.07	.1585
	Error	6854.22	40	171.36		
	B	124.41	1	124.41	0.73	NS
	R16	2.41	1	2.41	0.00	NS
	Int	438.39	1	438.39	2.58	.1159
	Error	6788.76	40	169.72		
Novelty	B	963.52	1	963.52	2.88	.0973
	R17	192.95	1	192.95	0.58	NS
	Int	117.58	1	117.58	0.35	NS
	Error	13371.68	40	334.29		
	B	1469.92	1	1469.92	4.33	.0440
	R16	32.36	1	32.36	0.10	NS
	Int	60.84	1	60.84	0.18	NS
	Error	13587.52	40	339.69		
Well-being	B	13.51	1	13.51	0.12	NS
	R17	48.56	1	48.56	0.42	NS
	Int	537.65	1	537.65	4.63	.0378
	Error	4409.17	38	116.03		

B¹=Bicultural Integration (throughout)

R17²=Rejection using 17-point cut-off (throughout)

Int³=Interaction (throughout)

R16⁴=Rejection using 16-point cut-off (throughout)

consistently but marginally lower levels of Assertiveness with Others relative to Family members. The lack of significance of target person indicated that whether the behaviour was exhibited in small or large measure, it was consistent across circumstances with respect to BI. Tests employing demographic variables showed no effects.

Well-being Indices: On Overall Affect, the composite of Positive and Negative Affect (item H3 of the SML), means were not significantly different between groups by any measure. This

was confirmed by WSD tests and by re-analysis using the demographic variables.

High-BI subjects had higher scores on Psychosomatic Stress. Group differences were not significant; however, BI showed a trend for both analyses, such that high-BI subjects reported more symptoms, for R17, $F(1,40)=3.45$, $p<.0707$, and for R16, $F(1,40)=2.83$, $p<.1005$. WSD tests showed non-significance for the single comparison possible for R17; but for R16, significance was obtained for the most distant pair of means when only one comparison was tested ($q=3.1569$, $df=40$, $p<.05$). This was for Rejectors who scored high (mean=62.49) and low (mean=43.62) on BI. This trend toward a main effect of BI on Psychosomatic Stress also emerged in all tests using the demographic variables. Non-Rejectors who scored low on BI had a much larger standard deviation than the other 3 groups, indicating greater variability in scores.

While the means of Psychosomatic Stress were somewhat higher for the two high-BI groups, the pattern for Rejection was reversed across the levels of BI, such that high-BI Rejectors were highest and low-BI Rejectors were lowest. This was the reason for the trend toward an interaction, $F(1,40)=3.63$, $p<.0639$, for R17. Although the trend was not supported by the analysis using R16, the interaction was supported in the tests which included demographics and thereby controlled more error variance. It showed trends when each of Reserve, Age, and Employment Status were included in analyses, and significant

effects when Sex and Marital Status were introduced. This indicated that scores of low-BI Rejectors differed from the other 3 groups. As in the one-way analyses of demographic variables, employed subjects and females again showed a tendency toward higher scores on Psychosomatic Stress.

For Social Contact, no significant differences were obtained by any measure.

For Social Involvement, high-BI Non-Rejectors (50.73) and low-BI Rejectors (49.30) had the highest scores. The group differences were not significant, but a trend toward an interaction of BI and Rejection emerged for both analyses, for R17, $F(1,40)=2.07$, $p<.1585$; for R16, $F(1,40)=2.58$, $p<.1159$. Notwithstanding the failure of the WSD tests to detect differences, the fact that the trend maintained even when a few subjects shifted cells appeared to indicate reliability. Moreover, trends toward an interaction were obtained when variance due to Age, Sex, Marital Status, and Employment Status was controlled. When Reserve was included in the analysis, the interaction of BI and Rejection became significant. Reserve exerted a main effect ($F(2,38)=5.48$, $p<.0081$), as it did in the one-way analysis with subjects on Number 4 scoring highest and off-reserve subjects scoring lowest on Social Involvement. Married subjects were also significantly higher, $F(1,38)=8.53$, $p<.0059$.

High-BI subjects had higher scores on Novelty than low-BI subjects. The trend for levels of Novelty to differ as a function of BI for R17, $F(1,40)=2.88$, $p<.0973$, became a significant main effect for R16, $F(1,40)=4.33$, $p<.0440$. WSD tests showed a significant difference between the two means which had adequate cell sizes ($q=2.9794$, $df=40$, $p<.05$), Low-BI Rejectors (42.04) versus high-BI Non-Rejectors (56.35) for R17, supporting the trend toward a main effect for BI. The means of the same groups compared for R16 were not significantly different, but means for high-scorers on BI (56.35 and 48.47) were consistently higher than for low-scorers (43.01 and 42.04). Moreover, the trend toward a main effect of BI maintained in all analyses using demographic variables.

On Overall Well-being, the composite of the 5 Well-being variables (excluding Marital Satisfaction), the highest mean was of Non-Rejectors who scored high on BI (51.63), followed closely by Rejectors who scored low on the factor (48.12). These two means were considerably greater than the others (42.78 and 41.69). This was due to the significant interaction for R17, $F(1,38)=4.63$, $p<.0378$. The two cells with the lower means held inadequate n's, a situation not alleviated by use of R16, so that they could not be compared to the two highest means (which were not significantly different from each other). The significant interaction of BI and Rejection also emerged in all analyses using demographic variables.

Summary: Overall, the fact that the pattern of Bicultural Integration and Rejection mainly comprised trends toward significance rendered their reliability dubious. Confidence in the single significant effect, that of an interaction on Overall Well-being, suffered due to the inadequate n's. However, trends that were evident for several variables received corroboration either from further analyses using the alternative Rejection cut-off score or from the WSD comparisons of means. All were confirmed by the introduction of the demographic variables into the analyses of variance which, had they been confounding variables, might have changed the picture. Results indicated: (1) a significant interaction on Overall Well-being such that high-BI Non-Rejectors and low-BI Rejectors had higher means than the other 2 groups; trends toward (2) an interaction and a main effect of Rejection on Overall Assertiveness, such that low-BI Rejectors scored lowest; (3) a main effect of BI and an interaction of BI and Rejection on Psychosomatic Stress, such that high-BI subjects and low-BI Non-Rejectors had more symptoms; (4) an interaction on Social Involvement, such that high-BI Non-Rejectors and low-BI Rejectors were highest; and (5) a main effect of BI on Novelty, such that high-BI subjects scored highest.

Females and employed subjects tended to show higher levels of Psychosomatic Stress. Married subjects and subjects who resided off-reserve had significantly lower levels of Social Involvement than others.

Of the 4 groups, high-BI Non-Rejectors and low-BI Rejectors were superior to both others. Neither the high-BI Non-Rejectors nor the low-BI Rejectors could be said to exceed the other:

(1) High-BI Non-Rejectors were higher than some other groups on Overall Well-being, Overall Assertiveness, Psychosomatic Stress, Social Involvement, and Novelty. (2) low-BI Rejectors were comparable to high-BI Non-Rejectors on Social Involvement and Overall Well-being, and they were lower, to their advantage, on Psychosomatic Stress. To their disadvantage, they were lower on Overall Assertiveness and Novelty.

Cultural Assimilation (CA), Rejection and the Dependent Variables

For Cultural Assimilation (CA), reclassifying subjects based on the Rejection cut-off of 16 conferred no advantage: using either R16 or R17, one cell contained only 8 subjects, while the size of the other cells three ranged from 10 to 15 subjects. Therefore, all analyses employed the original Rejection cut-off of 17. Details are shown in Tables 20 and 21.

Assertiveness Indices: For CA, Non-Rejectors had higher scores on Overall Assertiveness than Rejectors, due to a main effect of Rejection, $F(1,40)=4.23$, $p<.0462$. Although WSD tests failed to detect significant differences between means, the means of Rejectors (111.63 and 108.69) were lower than those of Non-Rejectors (127.23 and 125.90). Using demographic variables, Rejectors again showed consistent trends toward lower scores.

Table 20: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Cultural Assimilation x Rejection

	<u>Cultural Assimilation</u>											
	<u>Low</u>						<u>High</u>					
	<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>			<u>Non-Rejection</u>			<u>Rejection</u>		
	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
DV ^o												
1	10	125.90	20.86	13	108.69	26.33	13	127.23	24.08	8	111.63	33.06
2	10	-6.46	11.47	13	-8.92	9.48	13	-3.31	10.65	8	3.21	11.63
3	10	6.10	2.47	13	5.15	2.34	12	5.50	2.51	8	6.38	2.50
4	10	36.03	17.04	13	54.89	22.16	13	64.48	14.97	8	38.33	13.63
5	10	33.88	17.36	12	32.57	10.45	13	38.25	18.07	8	34.33	14.71
6	10	46.89	12.23	13	43.02	13.37	13	48.37	12.23	8	56.56	12.46
7	10	45.52	23.37	13	44.29	15.02	13	56.47	17.40	8	44.00	19.12
8	10	50.25	8.17	12	42.28	10.53	12	46.88	12.44	8	52.06	11.58

DV^o=dependent variable

1=Overall Assertiveness

2=Assertiveness O-F

3=Overall Affect

4=Psychosomatic Stress

5=Social Contact

6=Social Involvement

7=Novelty

8=Overall Well-being

Rejectors' means were close to means for the Indians in the human service agency standardization sample (107.9 and 110.4) as shown in Table 12.

Subjects who scored high on CA reported significantly higher Assertiveness O-F levels, $F(1,40)=5.39$, $p<.0254$. CA also tended toward a (weak) interaction with Rejection, $F(1,40)=1.87$, $p<.1796$, such that the highest Assertiveness O-F scores were of Rejectors who scored high on the factor. Although their mean (3.21) was most distant from all others (-6.46, -8.92 and -3.31), it held an inadequate n (8); hence, it was excluded from the WSD tests. The other pairs of means were not significantly different. The significant main effect of CA also appeared on all tests using demographic variables, but the trend toward an

interaction received only marginal support. It is safe to conclude only that both groups of subjects with high scores on CA had higher levels of Assertiveness O-F.

Well-being Indices: On Overall Affect, Social Contact, and Novelty, no significant group differences or trends emerged. WSD tests and tests using demographic variables confirmed these results.

CA and Rejection showed a significant interaction, $F(1,40)=17.12$, $p<.0002$, on Psychosomatic Stress, such that the highest scores were obtained by Non-Rejectors with high scores on the factor (mean=64.48), followed by Rejectors with low factor scores (mean=54.89). The latter group had a much higher standard deviation than others. These high-CA Non-Rejectors and low-CA Rejectors were both significantly different in WSD tests (respectively, $q=5.4110$, $df=40$, $p<.01$, and $q=3.5885$, $df=40$, $p<.05$) from low-CA Non-Rejectors whose mean was 36.03. Rejectors with high factor scores were excluded from WSD tests due to their small n (8). This interaction was also significant in all tests using demographic variables.

High-CA subjects had higher scores on Social Involvement. Group differences were not significant, but there were trends toward a main effect for CA, $F(1,40)=3.74$, $p<.0602$, and for an interaction of CA and Rejection, $F(1,40)=2.41$, $p<.1288$. Subjects with high scores on the factor showed larger means (48.37 and 56.56) than those with low factor scores (46.89 and

Table 21: Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Cultural Assimilation and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall	A ¹	47.96	1	47.96	0.07	NS
Assertiveness	R ²	2842.09	1	2842.09	4.23	.0462
	Int ³	6.75	1	6.75	0.01	NS
	Error	26845.85	40	671.15		
Assertiveness	A	616.22	1	616.22	5.39	.0254
O-F	R	43.53	1	43.53	0.38	NS
	Int	213.16	1	213.16	1.87	.1796
	Error	4569.82	40	114.25		
Overall Affect	A	1.00	1	1.00	0.17	NS
	R	0.01	1	0.01	0.00	NS
	Int	8.61	1	8.61	1.44	NS
	Error	233.47	39	5.99		
Psychosomatic	A	372.75	1	372.75	1.19	NS
Stress	R	139.78	1	139.78	0.45	NS
	Int	5346.74	1	5346.74	17.12	.0002
	Error	12495.56	40	312.39		
Social Contact	A	97.77	1	97.77	0.41	NS
	R	70.92	1	70.92	0.30	NS
	Int	17.65	1	17.65	0.07	NS
	Error	9344.93	39	239.61		
Social	A	595.95	1	595.95	3.74	.0602
Involvement	R	49.41	1	49.41	0.31	NS
	Int	383.29	1	383.29	2.41	.1288
	Error	6374.87	40	159.37		
Novelty	A	300.04	1	300.04	0.87	NS
	R	495.23	1	495.23	1.43	NS
	Int	334.03	1	334.03	0.97	NS
	Error	13814.98	40	345.37		
Overall	A	104.91	1	104.91	0.89	NS
Well-being	R	19.82	1	19.82	0.17	NS
	Int	441.33	1	441.33	3.76	.0600
	Error	4461.05	38	117.40		

A¹=Cultural Assimilation (throughout)

R²=Rejection (throughout)

Int³=Interaction (throughout)

43.02), but a reversal of size order occurred for Rejection within CA levels. The WSD tests did not confirm either trend; however, the cell with only 8 subjects which had the largest mean (56.56) was excluded from the comparisons. The main effect

of CA on Social Involvement was significant in analyses using the demographic variables, Reserve, Marital Status, and Age; and showed trends when Employment Status and Sex were included. The interaction was significant only when Reserve was used and showed trends when Age and Employment Status were used. It seems to be the result of confounding by Marital Status. In the one-way analysis, married subjects scored significantly higher on this variable and significance was also obtained in the three-way analysis, $F(1,38)=9.59$, $p<.0037$, where the interaction between CA and Rejection did not reappear. However, this interaction did emerge in the three-way analysis using Reserve where Reserve was also significant, $F(2,38)=7.34$, $p<.0020$. On-reserve subjects were higher on Social Involvement than off-reserve subjects. Nevertheless, the interaction is unreliable.

On Overall Well-being, a non-significant trend toward an interaction of the independent variables occurred, $F(1,38)=3.76$, $p<.0600$. The two largest means occurred for different levels of CA with opposite levels of Rejection; i.e., for Rejectors who were high on the factor (52.06) and for Non-Rejectors who were low on the factor (50.25). A WSD comparison of the mean of the latter group with the mean of Rejectors also low on CA (42.28) appeared to support the trend toward an interaction ($q=2.4286$, $df=38$), as did all tests using demographic variables.

Summary: For Cultural Assimilation and Rejection (1) a main effect occurred for Rejection on Overall Assertiveness, such

that Rejectors had lower scores; (2) a main effect occurred for CA on Assertiveness O-F, such that higher scores were obtained by subjects who scored high on CA (of these the highest mean was of Rejectors); and (3) a significant interaction occurred on Psychosomatic Stress, such that higher scores were obtained by high-CA Non-Rejectors and low-CA Rejectors. Non-significant trends occurred toward (4) a main effect and (5) a dubious interaction on Social Involvement, such that high-CA subjects had higher scores; and toward (6) an interaction on the Well-being composite, such that the higher scores were obtained by high-CA Rejectors and low-CA Non-Rejectors.

Among the 4 groups, high-CA Rejectors were clearly superior on Well-being. They were low on Psychosomatic Stress, and high on Social Involvement and Overall Well-being. They were also high on Assertiveness O-F.

Economic Integration (EI), Rejection and the Dependent Variables

For Economic Integration (EI), cell size was adequate for all analyses. Therefore, the cut-off score of 17 was used for Rejection. Summaries of analyses and descriptive statistics are shown in Tables 22 and 23.

Assertiveness Indices: Non-Rejectors scored significantly higher than Rejectors on Overall Assertiveness in a main effect of Rejection, $F(1,40)=5.03$, $p<.0306$. Means of Non-Rejectors were 131.73 and 122.00 compared to Rejectors' means of 113.91 and 105.30. Integration showed no significant difference. A WSD

Table 22: Descriptive statistics on Assertiveness and Well-being as functions of Economic Integration x Rejection

	Economic Integration											
	Low						High					
	Non-Rejection		Rejection		Non-Rejection		Rejection		Non-Rejection		Rejection	
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
A ¹	11	131.73	20.31	11	113.91	24.53	12	122.00	23.77	10	105.30	32.68
A O-F ²	11	-6.25	9.53	11	-4.74	13.07	12	-3.24	12.21	10	-3.82	10.76
O A ³	11	6.55	2.66	11	5.46	2.95	11	5.00	2.05	10	5.80	1.81
P S ⁴	11	53.06	24.40	11	51.85	17.59	12	51.24	18.84	10	45.00	24.07
S C ⁵	11	36.22	17.44	11	27.22	9.62	12	36.46	18.33	9	40.67	10.66
S I ⁶	11	51.05	12.84	11	47.09	12.99	12	44.68	10.75	10	49.39	16.42
N ⁷	11	50.07	21.42	11	42.42	17.30	12	53.21	20.41	10	46.11	15.65
O W-B ⁸	11	49.95	12.11	11	46.88	9.20	11	43.89	12.05	9	49.02	11.37

A¹=Overall Assertiveness
A O-F²=Assertiveness O-F
O A³=Overall Affect
P S⁴=Psychosomatic Stress

SC⁵=Social Contact
SI⁶=Social Involvement
N⁷=Novelty
O W-B⁸=Overall Well-being

comparison of the largest (low-EI Non-Rejectors) and smallest (high-EI Rejectors) means resulted in significance ($q=3.3571$, $df=40$, $p<.05$); this supported the main effect of Rejection. Using the demographic variables, the main effect of Rejection was consistently significant.

No group differences emerged for Assertiveness O-F.

Well-being Indices: High-EI subjects had higher scores on Social Contact than low-EI subjects in a trend toward a main effect for EI, $F(1,39)=2.27$, $p<.1403$. A WSD test, in which the most distant means were contrasted, those of the two Rejector groups (27.22 for low-EI and 40.67 for high-EI), resulted in a value slightly less than the critical q for significance at $p<.05$ ($q=2.835$, $df=39$). Using the demographic variables, trends were consistently obtained toward a main effect of EI on Social Contact.

A trend also occurred toward an interaction, $F(1,39)=2.11$, $p<.1546$, such that low-EI Rejectors had the lowest Social Contact mean of all, 27.22, compared to 36.22, 36.46, and 40.67. When error variance was controlled by adding demographic variables to the analyses, the trends toward an interaction of EI and Rejection that emerged consistently were weak.

No effects were found for the dependent variables: Overall Affect, Psychosomatic Stress, Social Involvement, and Overall Well-being.

Table 23: Two-way analyses of variance of the effects of Economic Integration and Rejection on Assertiveness and Well-being

	<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Overall	I ¹	920.76	1	920.76	1.42	NS
Assertiveness	R ²	3263.03	1	3263.03	5.03	.0306
	Int ³	3.41	1	3.41	0.01	NS
	Error	25967.19	40	649.18		
Assertiveness	I	42.18	1	42.18	0.32	NS
O-F	R	2.40	1	2.40	0.02	NS
	Int	12.01	1	12.01	0.09	NS
	Error	5298.42	40	132.46		
Overall Affect	I	3.86	1	3.86	0.66	NS
	R	0.23	1	0.23	0.04	NS
	Int	9.59	1	9.59	1.63	NS
	Error	229.05	39	5.87		
Psychosomatic	I	205.65	1	205.65	0.45	NS
Stress	R	151.97	1	151.97	0.33	NS
	Int	69.15	1	69.15	0.15	NS
	Error	18162.74	40	454.07		
Social Contact	I	498.04	1	498.04	2.27	.1403
	R	61.11	1	61.11	0.28	NS
	Int	463.29	1	463.29	2.11	.1546
	Error	8572.66	39	219.81		
Social	I	45.50	1	45.50	0.26	NS
Involvement	R	1.50	1	1.50	0.01	NS
	Int	206.11	1	206.11	1.17	NS
	Error	7034.05	40	175.85		
Novelty	I	127.46	1	127.46	0.35	NS
	R	595.36	1	595.36	1.66	NS
	Int	0.82	1	0.82	0.00	NS
	Error	14366.16	40	359.15		
Overall	I	40.09	1	40.09	0.32	NS
Well-being	R	11.01	1	11.01	0.09	NS
	Int	175.24	1	175.24	1.39	NS
	Error	4799.81	38	126.31		

I¹=Economic Integration (throughout)

R²=Rejection (throughout)

Int³=Interaction (throughout)

Demographic variables showed a few consistent effects throughout the 3 sets of analyses (for the 3 factors). When variance due to Reserve was controlled, a main effect on Social Involvement by Reserve occurred, $F(2,38)=4.93$, $p<.0125$. This

effect had maintained in all one-way and three-way analyses, as had the effect of Marital Status on Social Involvement, which again emerged, $F(1,38)=6.01$, $p<.0189$. The effect of Employment Status on Psychosomatic Stress again showed a trend as it did in the one-way and in the three-way analyses with Bicultural Integration but not with Cultural Assimilation. The effect of Sex on Psychosomatic Stress was significant in the three-way analysis with EI, $F(1,39)=4.51$, $p<.0400$, as it was in the one-way analysis; this was only a trend with Bicultural Integration and did not emerge with Cultural Assimilation.

Summary: For Economic Integration, (1) a significant main effect was found for Rejection on Overall Assertiveness, such that Rejectors scored lower. Non-significant trends also obtained toward (2) a main effect of EI on Social Contact with high-EI subjects scoring higher; and (3) an interaction on Social Contact, such that low-EI Rejectors had a much lower mean than the other 3 groups.

Among the 4 groups, none was well-distinguished in terms of scores on Well-being and Assertiveness. High-EI Non-Rejectors were higher on Overall Assertiveness and Social Contact, but high-EI Rejectors were comparable to them on Social Contact.

Note: Although results in which confidence may be placed are confined to those which received corroboration from further analyses, even these must be treated as tentative since interactions between the demographic variables and the main

independent variables were suppressed, and thus are unknown.

Relationships Among All Variables

Correlations Between Acculturation Factors and the Dependent Variables

Considering the complexity of effects and the frequency of interactions, the fact that only five correlations of independent variables with dependent variables were significant was not surprising. The correlation matrix is shown in Table 24.

BI was significantly correlated with Psychosomatic Stress ($r=.39$, $df=42$, $p<.01$) and with Novelty ($r=.42$, $df=42$, $p<.01$). For both of these dependent variables, trends toward main effects for BI had occurred (Table 18), such that means were larger for subjects high on BI; hence, moderate correlations were expected. For all other dependent variables on which main effects were not even suggested, correlations failed to reach significance or to support trends.

The fact that no adjustment measures were significantly related to CA is commensurate with the tendency toward interactions between CA and Rejection which accompanied every main effect (or trend) of CA for these analyses of variance (see Table 20).

EI factor scores were significantly and positively correlated with Social Contact scores ($r=.34$, $df=41$, $p<.05$);

Table 24: Intercorrelations among independent and dependent variables

<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Independent Variables</u>			
	BI ¹	CA ²	EI ³	R ⁴
A ⁵	.166	.090	-.039	-.265
A O-F ⁶	-.081	.208	.183	-.058
O A ⁷	-.078	-.034	-.047	-.051
P S ⁸	.385***	.077	-.071	.107
S C ⁹	.231	.164	.336*	-.071
S I ¹⁰	.190	.161	-.015	-.059
N ¹¹	.421***	.165	.167	-.191
M S ¹²	-.086	.036	-.335*	-.371**
O W-B ¹³	.076	.106	.157	-.172

* p<.05

** p<.02

*** p<.01

BI¹=Bicultural Integration

CA²=Cultural Assimilation

EI³=Economic Integration

R⁴=Rejection

A⁵=Overall Assertiveness

A O-F⁶=Assertiveness O-F

O A⁷=Overall Affect

P S⁸=Psychosomatic Stress

S C⁹=Social Contact

S I¹⁰=Social Involvement

N¹¹=Novelty

M S¹²=Marital Satisfaction

O W-B¹³=Overall Well-being

this dependent variable was the only one on which EI showed a trend toward a main effect (see Table 22). EI correlated negatively with Marital Satisfaction ($r=-.335$, $df=25$, $p<.05$).

Rejection and the Dependent Variables

For Rejection, only its inverse correlation with Marital Satisfaction ($r=-.37$, $df=25$, $p<.02$) was significant (see Table 24). A trend that occurred for Overall Assertiveness ($r=-.27$, $df=42$) was also toward an inverse relationship, such that higher scores on Rejection were associated with lower scores on these

variables.

Intercorrelations Among the Well-being Variables

The relationships among the 6 Well-being variables were examined to ascertain the nature of their relationships, and to determine which of them might make a good composite. Table 25 exhibits the results. The last two rows are of item-total correlations, more specifically, the correlations of variables with a Well-being composite which excludes the particular variable. For the second-to-last row, Marital Satisfaction was omitted from the composites and for the final row it was included in the composites.

Of the 15 intercorrelations, 6 were significant and an additional 4 or 5 showed trends (constrained by low df) in the expected directions. The "best" variable appeared to be Social Involvement, which was significantly correlated with 3 variables and showed trends in the expected directions on the other 2 variables. Overall Affect was a close contender correlating significantly with 3 variables and showing an additional trend toward a relationship with Social Contact ($r=.28$, $df=40$). Marital Satisfaction was significantly correlated with 3 variables but had near-zero correlations with Social Contact ($r=-.08$, $df=24$) and Novelty ($r=.11$, $df=25$). Psychosomatic Stress was correlated with 2 others, Marital Satisfaction ($r=-.51$, $df=25$, $p<.01$) and Overall Affect ($r=-.40$, $df=41$, $p<.01$). Social Contact was significantly correlated only with Social

Table 25: Intercorrelations among Well-being variables

	O A ¹	P S ²	S C ³	S I ⁴	N ⁵	M S ⁶
O A ¹	1.000					
P S ²	-.396***	1.000				
S C ³	.279	-.041	1.000			
S I ⁴	.509****	-.263	.363**	1.000		
N ⁵	-.006	.271	.290	.183	1.000	
M S ⁶	.454**	-.506***	-.075	.420*	.107	1.000
W-B ⁷	.492****	-.170	.377*	.570****	.013	.491**
W-B ⁸	.519***	-.279	.234	.573***	.174	---

* p<.05
 ** p<.02
 *** p<.01
 **** p<.001

O A¹=Overall Affect
 P S²=Psychosomatic Stress
 S C³=Social Contact
 S I⁴=Social Involvement
 N⁵=Novelty
 M S⁶=Marital Satisfaction
 W-B⁷=Well-being without criterion
 W-B⁸=Well-being without criterion
 but with Marital Satisfaction

Involvement (r=.36, df=41, p<.02). That Social Involvement, Overall Affect, and Marital Satisfaction appeared to be the "best" (in terms of the number of variables with which they were correlated) of the 6 Well-being variables was not surprising since 2 of them showed only trends (Social Involvement) or no effects (Overall Affect) in relation to the Acculturation factors and Rejection. Relatively unencumbered by complex relationships with the independent variables, they reflected uniform tendencies over the sample.

Novelty, Psychosomatic Stress, and Social Contact, on the other hand, varied between sub-groups in the analyses of variance and they appeared to be the "worst" in terms of the

number of intercorrelations with the other variables. The independence of Novelty was almost absolute.

To summarize, all combinations of Social Involvement, Overall Affect, Psychosomatic Stress, and Social Contact were correlated, except for the pair, Psychosomatic Stress and Social Contact. Marital Satisfaction correlated significantly with all variables except Social Contact and Novelty.

The Overall Well-being composite that excluded Marital Satisfaction was most highly and significantly correlated with Social Involvement ($r=.57$, $df=40$, $p<.001$), Overall Affect ($r=.49$, $df=40$, $p<.001$), and Marital Satisfaction ($r=.49$, $df=24$, $p<.02$). Thus, the best correlates of this composite were the 3 Well-being variables which were not well discriminated in the analyses of variance. The composite was also significantly correlated with Social Contact ($r=.38$, $df=40$, $p<.05$). The variables that did not contribute to the composite, Novelty ($r=.01$, $df=40$) and Psychosomatic Stress ($r=-.17$, $df=40$), were well discriminated in the analyses of variance so that their independence of the other Well-being variables was not surprising.

The correlations of variables with the Well-being composites which included Marital Satisfaction (and thereby reduce the n) maintained the higher correlations for Overall Affect ($r=.52$, $df=24$, $p<.01$) and Social Involvement ($r=.57$, $df=24$, $p<.01$). However, the correlation with Social Contact ($r=.24$, $df=24$)

deteriorated when Marital Satisfaction was included in the composite, owing to their near-zero relationship ($r=-.08$, $df=24$). Psychosomatic Stress improved somewhat ($r=-.28$, $df=24$), due to its strong relationship with Marital Satisfaction ($r=-.51$, $df=25$, $p<.01$), but did not reach significance. The contribution of Novelty improved but was still marginal ($r=.17$, $df=24$).

Thus, when Marital Satisfaction was included in the composite of Well-being, the variables which were poorly discriminated in the analyses of variance appeared best and those which were better discriminated in the analyses of variance appeared worst as contributors to Overall Well-being.

Happiness Intercorrelations

Bradburn (1969) found that Positive and Negative affect correlated discretely with different sets of variables; i.e., they were statistically independent. This did not appear to be the case for the present sample, as is clear from the correlations in Table 26. Although Positive and Negative Affect were not significantly related ($r=-.23$, $df=41$), in combination with each dependent variable they were correlated in similar measure but in opposite directions. Correlations of the individual Well-being variables with Positive and Negative Affect (Positive and Negative Affect together comprised Overall Affect) accounted for more variance than did their correlations with the composite.

Table 26: Happiness and Well-being intercorrelations

	Present Happiness	Past Happiness	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Overall Affect
Present Happiness	1.000				
Past Happiness	.080	1.000			
Positive Affect	.460**	.011	1.000		
Negative Affect	-.494***	-.073	-.230	1.000	
Overall Affect	.606***	.051	--- ¹	--- ¹	1.000
P S ²	-.159	-.128	-.188	.450*	-.396***
S C ³	.170	.231	.169	-.277	.279
S I ⁴	.410**	.142	.382*	-.420**	.509****
N ⁵	.011	-.250	-.063	-.062	-.006
M S ⁶	.485**	-.120	.258	-.469**	.454**
O W-B ⁷	.472**	.056	.564***	-.687***	--- ¹

* p<.05
 ** p<.02
 *** p<.01
 **** p<.001

¹=Overall Affect comprises Positive and Negative Affect and is contained in Overall Well-being

S C³=Social Contact
 S I⁴=Social Involvement
 N⁵=Novelty
 M S⁶=Marital Satisfaction
 O W-B⁷=Overall Well-being

P S²=Psychosomatic Stress

Present Happiness was significantly correlated with the affect variables, with Social Involvement, Marital Satisfaction, and Overall Well being, whereas Past Happiness was not.

Summary

The 3 significant correlations of dependent variables with independent variables were of those on which main effects were exerted by the Acculturation factors. The low correlations of all other pairs served to illustrate the point that the Acculturation factors (BI and CA) which were most capable of exerting effects on the dependent variables did so to a great

extent by interacting with Rejection. These interactions precluded high linear correlations. Within the group of Well-being indices, the variables which tended to intercorrelate well were those which were not well discriminated in the analyses of variance. These variables also correlated best with the Well-being composites. The structure of Well-being differed from that found by Bradburn.

CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION

The Relationship of the Acculturation Positions Found to Theory

The fact that three acculturation positions emerged in principal components analysis indicated that a multidimensional model of acculturation was necessary to describe the Coast Salish sample. Of the four acculturation positions that in theory may occur: assimilation, separation, integration, and marginality, only integration and assimilation were represented in the empirically derived acculturation positions. Integration took two forms in the factors, Bicultural Integration and Economic Integration. Assimilation was represented by the factor Cultural Assimilation.

The integration factors both exhibited the two definitive features of the position: retention of some aspects of traditional cultural patterns and participation in the dominant culture. The traditional patterns comprised activities and values for Bicultural Integration, and values for Economic Integration. Participation in the dominant culture took the form of activities and values for Bicultural Integration, and economic involvement for Economic Integration.

Cultural Assimilation corresponded to the hypothetical position of assimilation in that behaviour and values indicated adoption of the ways of the dominant culture on all the

variables used. This factor did not represent complete assimilation, i.e., immersion into and dispersion in the dominant culture, but a tendency toward assimilation was clear in the non-traditional, monocultural orientation.

The factor structure will be discussed in greater detail in the sections to follow on the effects of each factor.

The acculturation positions found seemed realistic in light of the long-term contact situation of the group. All three positions reflect acknowledgement of and some form of participation in the non-Indian community. The emergence of Cultural Assimilation is consonant with the theoretical cultural compatibility of the Coast Salish with the dominant culture. The two integration factors reflect the persistence of original cultural identity. This persistence may have been enhanced by the recent revitalization of religious practices and increased politico-economic autonomy of the group, although these changes are incomplete and have not yet yielded perceivable benefits for all band members. The partial revitalization may to some extent constitute a retrenchment reaction to the failure of integration.

Separation and marginality, the two remaining hypothetical acculturation positions, did not emerge as factors. By definition, separation involves monocultural traditionalism and social unity. Given the probable disunity in the group due to its only partial recovery from cultural disintegration, the fact

that a purely traditional stance did not emerge is not surprising. The fact that marginality did not emerge indicates that few people living on-reserve lack a reference group or reserve sub-group with which they may identify.

The Use of Rejection with Acculturation in the Analyses

As subjects were almost unanimous in endorsing the Ethnic Identification Scale (EIS) attitude favouring integration as a mode of inter-group relations, and little faith was placed in the EIS attitude favouring assimilation for the present sample, the EIS subscale measuring the attitude of rejection of relations with the dominant culture was selected as the second independent variable for use in conjunction with the factors in the analyses of variance. Discrimination power of the attitude and acculturation position in terms of social adjustment could then be compared. Disproportionately fewer subjects who scored high on Bicultural Integration and Cultural Assimilation endorsed Rejection; cell sizes did not vary with the factor, Economic Integration. The co-existence of Rejection with Bicultural Integration and Cultural Assimilation may appear to be counterintuitive, since involvement with the dominant culture would seem to be considerable for both; however, inspection of the results will reveal that the seeming paradox is explicable. Rejection and Economic Integration are compatible. As will be seen from the nature of this factor, subjects who scored high on it may have less invested in relationships with the non-Indian

community. Any involvement appeared to subserve economic purposes.

Acculturation Position, Rejection and Social Adjustment

Whether the acculturation positions would have differential consequences was unknown, but Rejection was expected to result in lower levels of social adjustment. Interactions between acculturation positions and the attitude, Rejection, were about as frequent as main effects; thus the attitude of Rejection was as important a discriminator as acculturation. However, contrary to expectations, few main effects for Rejection occurred. Overall, comparisons were significant in 5 tests of 24. In addition, 8 trends toward significance received corroboration from further analyses.

Bicultural Integration

The Nature of the Factor: On the first factor, loadings were paradoxical, some taking the direction of tradition, others reflecting urban orientations. The loadings of both Indian and "White" social, religious, and leisure activities were highest on this factor and co-existed nowhere else. The tendency toward histories of residing on-reserve is consonant with involvement in traditional activities. Values also represented a mixture of traditional and urban orientations. For example, a larger Ideal Number of Children and Co-operation were favoured, but the other Indian values (Non-interference, Non-demonstrativeness, and

Non-contradiction) were not accepted. Economic affluence was moderate, with Income loading less than moderately and Possessions loading highest. This clear duality in both activities and values gave rise to the name Bicultural Integration. Both other factors were less equivocal, with near-zero loadings of Indian activities and nearly unidirectional values. The moderate level of affluence was due to diversity among subjects on socioeconomic indices.

Age and sex were uncorrelated with factor scores on Bicultural Integration, indicating that high-scorers on the factor were of various ages and both sexes.

High-Bicultural-Integration subjects were also diverse in EIS attitudes toward relations with the dominant culture and Ethnic Identity. This was evident in the trivial correlations of the factor scores with EIS attitudes. On Ethnic Identity, the question whether subjects thought of themselves as Indian or Canadian, subjects generally seemed to take the question as a forced choice and said that they were Indians. However, Ethnic Identity was virtually uncorrelated with Bicultural Integration, indicating that subjects identified themselves as any of Indians, Canadians or both. This diversity on EIS variables, combined with the bidirectional values and activities, may reflect eclecticism or cognizance of cultural duality.

For convenience, the following names will be used to refer to the four groups distinguished in the analyses of variance of

Bicultural Integration and Rejection: Subjects who scored high on the factor and low on Rejection will be called "Biculturals". Subjects who were high on both the factor and Rejection will be called "Rejector Biculturals". Those low-Bicultural-Integration subjects who scored high on Rejection will be named "Rejectors", and the group scoring low on both independent variables will be named "Undifferentiateds". (This was despite the fact that most low-Bicultural-Integration subjects had scored high on some other factor.)

Bicultural Integration, Rejection and Social Adjustment: In all analyses, subjects who favoured Rejection were expected to have lower scores. Subjects who scored high on Bicultural Integration might also have been expected to obtain some low scores on Well-being, considering the potential for cognitive dissonance inherent in straddling two valued cultures. On the other hand, the rewards that a dual lifestyle brings might counteract this tendency. High-Bicultural-Integration subjects might have been expected to have high Assertiveness scores, according to LaFromboise's (1983) theory that selective Assertiveness may facilitate a bicultural style. However, only the expectation concerning Rejection had precedent to permit its being posited as a hypothesis.

Assertiveness was not specifically associated with Bicultural Integration. The trends for Overall Assertiveness were due primarily to one low score. The mean of the Rejector group was much lower than the means of the other three groups.

Scores of Biculturals were more invariantly high than those of the other three groups. Thus, LaFromboise's (1983) expected relationship between Assertiveness and Biculturalism was upheld only to this very limited extent. However, its test resided more specifically in the Assertiveness (O-F) With Non-Indians comparison, which indicated whether subjects selectively displayed the trait more often with non-Indians. No significant differences were found on this variable.

Well-being scores among Biculturals were superior to those of the other groups, except for the Rejectors who showed levels of Well-being which were similar to the Biculturals', contrary to the Rejection hypothesis. Of the 6 Well-being variables, only one was significantly different across groups. This was an interaction on Overall Well-being, on which Biculturals and Rejectors scored highest. The same split also held in a trend toward an interaction on Social Involvement. Thus, the Well-being of Rejectors appeared to be as high as that of the Biculturals on these two measures. Although Biculturals and Rejector Biculturals showed a trend toward higher scores on Novelty, they also showed a trend toward higher and less variable scores on Psychosomatic Stress. The trend toward an interaction of Bicultural Integration and Rejection on Psychosomatic Stress was due to the distant and lower mean of the Rejectors, who were less likely to exhibit stress symptoms. Overall, the only score of Rejectors that was inferior to Biculturals' was on the frequency of novel events in their

lives, but the Rejectors were superior in having lower levels of Psychosomatic Stress. These two groups had about the same levels of Overall Well-being and Social Involvement.

Rejector Biculturals and Undifferentiateds were lowest on Overall Well-being and Social Involvement, indicating that these were relatively maladaptive positions. Rejector Biculturals also had the highest mean for Psychosomatic Stress (although their mean was not contrasted with that of the Biculturals').

Implications: The pattern of scores for Bicultural Integration and Rejection indicates that Rejectors had made about as good an adjustment to acculturation as Biculturals, taking into account the stress of the Biculturals (and the higher Novelty of the Biculturals to counterbalance stress). Of course, "equality" across variables cannot be assumed.

Presumably, the high Well-being of the Biculturals is due to the intrinsic rewards of a flexible lifestyle which is accompanied by positive attitudes toward both cultures. However, the high level of Psychosomatic Stress which also characterized Biculturals requires explanation. Either the orientation of the Biculturals was not so well articulated that their difficulties were manageable, or simultaneous involvement with the dominant culture and commitment to the Indian community is inherently stressful. A third possibility is that some other personal difficulties to which the interview content had no access were responsible for the high stress levels. Marital discord cannot

have accounted entirely for the variance of Psychosomatic Stress, since Marital Satisfaction was virtually uncorrelated with the factor, indicating random scores on this variable for high-Bicultural-Integration subjects, and since marital status was unrelated to Psychosomatic Stress. The trends toward effects of employment status and sex on Psychosomatic Stress did not diminish the trends toward group differences as a function of Bicultural Integration and Rejection. The reason for the high stress level may reside in the lifestyle itself.

While the attitude favouring Rejection of relations with the dominant culture has traditionally been found to be associated with marginality and stress (Berry, 1976), this association did not hold for the low-Bicultural-Integration Rejectors, in their high level of Well-being. Their good adjustment appears to indicate that the preference for separatism underlying their rejecting attitude is adaptive. While the Rejectors did not stridently express a separatist attitude apart from the Rejection measure (on which the separatism interpretation has face validity), some subjects gave the impression that community cohesion was important to them, although few actively expressed this in organizational activities within the community. Separatist sentiments may arise in part due to the negative reception Indians sometimes receive in the non-Indian community. Other subjects in this group had had negative experiences in the non-Indian community. Thus, either community cohesion or reaction may have motivated the rejecting attitude. The

Rejectors' lower level of Overall Assertiveness may be inconsequential, since the trait is presumed to be inappropriate in the Indian social context, and they probably do not have valued relationships in the dominant culture where it is purportedly valued. On the other hand, an incapacity for Assertiveness with Non-Indians may be a factor in the rejecting attitude.

The Rejector Biculturals had the least adequate configuration of Well-being scores overall. The fact that they did not evince cultural loss in terms of the acculturation position indicates that they were not marginal types, but they may be individuals with conflicts. For Biculturals to hold a rejecting attitude toward relations with the dominant culture appeared paradoxical, and this dissonance appeared to have maladaptive effects suggestive of intrapersonal conflict. The significant correlation of Rejection with marital discord may supply an alternative explanation, although, as is clear already, not all Rejectors showed signs of social maladjustment. Possibly this group was primarily responsible for the latter correlation, or perhaps it was especially vulnerable to stressors because of the lifestyle dissonance. In any case, the small n of this group rendered interpretation uncertain.

Summary: While the pattern for Bicultural Integration must be treated tentatively since it is suggested primarily by trends, the highest levels of adjustment were of Rejectors and Biculturals. These two groups were comparable in advantages.

Rejectors' Novelty scores were lower than Biculturals' (as were their Overall Assertiveness scores), but their low level of Psychosomatic Stress may more than compensate for this deficit. Rejected Biculturals had the lowest levels of Well-being and Undifferentiateds were intermediate.

Cultural Assimilation

The Nature of the Factor: The second factor was named "Cultural Assimilation", since all substantial loadings reflected non-traditional orientations, except for the value, Co-operation. (This item refers to sharing beyond the immediate family. Since it also took the direction of tradition on Bicultural Integration it appears to represent a cherished value.) The remaining values variables with substantial loadings, i.e., Non-self-disclosure and Ideal Number of Children, took a non-traditional direction. The high positive loading of Residence History indicates that subjects who scored high on Cultural Assimilation had lived off-reserve considerably more than others. Despite the high loadings of affluence-related variables (such as Education and Occupation) which indicate the capacity for integration, Family Income and Possessions were uncorrelated with the factor. Beyond the obvious fact that subjects were not completely integrated into the dominant culture (living on-reserve), their economic situation indicates that the factor does not represent assimilation in the usual sense of total immersion into the dominant culture; rather, it represents assimilation in the cultural realm.

The factor might also be thought to represent marginality (or deculturation), considering the independence of Income and Possessions. However, the capacity for integration and the demographics (age and sex) of high-scorers on the factor contraindicate this alternative interpretation. Younger subjects and female subjects tended to obtain high scores on the factor; these are sub-groups who have a higher prevalence of lower incomes or economic dependency in most populations. In addition, younger groups have previously been deemed to tend toward assimilation (Berry et al., 1982), having a higher level of education as did this group. Therefore the best interpretation of the factor is that it represents Cultural Assimilation and not marginality.

The correlations between Cultural Assimilation factor scores and scores on EIS variables of attitudes and Ethnic Identity were trivial. Thus, subjects who scored high on the factor resembled the high-Bicultural-Integration subjects in their diversity on these variables.

For convenience, the following names will be used to refer to subjects in the four groups of the analyses. High-Cultural-Assimilation Non-Rejectors will be called "Assimilators". High-Cultural-Assimilation Rejectors will be called "Rejector Assimilators". The low-Cultural-Assimilation Rejectors (many of whom were high on Bicultural Integration) will simply be called "Rejectors", and the low-Cultural-Assimilation Non-Rejectors will be called "Undifferentiateds".

Cultural Assimilation, Rejection and Social Adjustment:

Whether or not Cultural Assimilation was advantageous, favouring Rejection was expected to result in lower adjustment scores. Rejection might be construed as incompatible with a disposition toward emulation of dominant culture patterns so that Rejector Assimilators might have been expected to have lower scores.

The expectation that Rejection would be associated with low scores on Assertiveness was upheld only in part. A significant main effect of Rejection on Overall Assertiveness occurred, such that the means of both Assimilators and Undifferentiateds were higher than those of the two Rejector groups. However, the significant main effect of Cultural Assimilation on Assertiveness With Non-Indians alters the picture, as Assimilators and Rejector Assimilators scored higher. Their self-reported assertive behaviour was selectively displayed with non-Indians more than with family members.

Of the four groups, Rejector Assimilators showed the highest Well-being. They had the highest scores on Social Involvement, followed by the Assimilators, in a trend toward a main effect of Cultural Assimilation. Although Marital Status confounded the apparent difference (with married subjects scoring higher on Social Involvement) between the two Assimilator groups, high-Cultural-Assimilation subjects in general were certainly higher on Social Involvement. The Rejector Assimilators were highest on Overall Well-being, closely followed by the Undifferentiateds. Also remarkable was the Rejector Assimilators' (and the

Undifferentiated') low mean on Psychosomatic Stress. In this significant interaction, the high-stress sub-groups were of Assimilators and Rejectors.

Assimilators were higher than Rejection Assimilators only on Overall Assertiveness, and, to their disadvantage, on Psychosomatic Stress (although these particular means, respectively, were not significantly different or were not contrasted).

While the general expectation that Rejection would be associated with lower Well-being was not upheld for Rejection Assimilators, it was upheld for Rejectors (low on Cultural Assimilation). Rejectors had lower scores on the variables, Social Involvement, Overall Well-being, Overall Assertiveness, and Assertiveness With Non-Indians. They also had one of the higher means on Psychosomatic Stress, but their scores were more variable than others'.

Implications: The best-adapted group was of Rejection Assimilators, followed by Assimilators. Thus, Cultural Assimilation was an effective acculturation position, particularly when accompanied by the attitude of Rejection. Although the small n of the Rejection Assimilators renders inference uncertain, their superior adjustment was clear, so that a partial disconfirmation of the association between Rejection and maladaptation was again tentatively indicated (as it was in relation to Bicultural Integration). Rejectors (many

of whom were high on Bicultural Integration and found to be low on adjustment) did not fare well in comparison to Rejector Assimilators. The establishment of the adaptive value of the attitude of Rejection of relations with the dominant culture might appear to fly in the face of the multiculturalism ideal of integration. However, we can speculate that it constitutes a rational stance in that the skills of some of these subjects (Education and Occupation) are not being used, considering their variable incomes. They may feel that, although they have the necessary skills, they are barred access to economically affluent lifestyles. At the same time, their youth and the prevalence of females in the group must be recalled. The impression that they made was to the effect that they had an authentic preference for their own community, rather than a strident reaction against non-Indian society, but reaction may be a subtle element in the preference. Their higher Assertiveness With Non-Indians will not be explained in terms of aggression, which is known to correlate moderately with Assertiveness (Hollandsworth et al., 1977), since a different explanation (unparsimoniously) would be required for the Assimilators who also scored high on this variable. There is no reason to suppose that the Assimilators are aggressive with non-Indians. The simplest explanation is that both groups are aware of the different styles of behaviour required for efficacy in having their needs met across cultural contexts.

The Assimilators were overall lower in Well-being than the Rejector Assimilators and had a high level of Psychosomatic Stress. The two groups had in common their exposure and adaptation to the dominant culture, but the Assimilators' apparent lack of a high level of commitment to their own community (a form of commitment was evident in the rejecting attitude of the Rejector Assimilators) may have left them vulnerable. As with Biculturals, their more positive attitudes toward the non-Indian community appeared to have some maladaptive consequences.

Summary: Rejector Assimilators appeared best-adapted in terms of Well-being. They also showed selectivity in assertive behaviour, as did Assimilators. Means of Well-being variables for Assimilators were intermediate, but the group was highest on stress symptomatology. Rejectors and Undifferentiateds suffered in all respects.

Economic Integration

The Nature of the Factor: The third factor was named "Economic Integration" since its composition suggested the capacity for economic participation in the dominant culture and actual employment there, combined with a traditional orientation in values. Indices associated with affluence loaded moderately (Possessions and Education) or better (Income and Occupation). Indian Activities loaded positively but marginally, indicating low levels and variability of participation. The only values

variables with substantial loadings (Non-demonstrativeness and Non-self-disclosure) correlated negatively with the factor, indicating a traditional stance. On the other two factors, these values had either near-zero or positive loadings, indicating either variability or non-traditional orientations. Not all subjects who scored high on Economic Integration were employed off-reserve, although their trades or skills rendered them employable in occupations off-reserve. The loading of Space (endorsement of the value of space exploration) on Economic Integration may be due to a practical outlook of subjects who are most able to participate in economic affluence.

Subjects who scored high on Economic Integration were less diverse in demographics and attitude than subjects who scored high on the other factors. Younger subjects and males were more likely to score high. Although the EIS attitude favouring Integration was overwhelmingly endorsed by the sample in general as the ideal mode of relations with the dominant culture, Economic Integration was the only factor which correlated, but at a low level, with EIS-Integration, indicating that high-Economic-Integration subjects in particular tended to favour the attitude. This was also the only factor that resulted in a non-zero, albeit moderate, correlation with Ethnic Identity. Thus, the subjects' stronger endorsements of the ideal of integration and tendencies toward Indian identities reinforced the interpretation of the factor as indicating a strong sense of commitment to ethnic origins, as well as to the value of

economic mobility.

If traditional values are enduring and have been retained by subjects who scored high on Economic Integration, whereas traditional activities have been revived after being lost, then subjects who scored high on Economic Integration may be more essentially "Indian", perhaps in affective style, than those who participate in traditional activities (such as subjects who scored high on Bicultural Integration).

For convenience of discussion, names will again be assigned to the four groups. The high-Economic-Integration Non-Rejectors will be called "Integrators", the high-Economic Integration Rejectors will be called "Rejector Integrators", the low-Economic-Integration Rejectors will be called "Rejectors", and the low-Economic-Integration Non-Rejectors will be called "Undifferentiateds".

Economic Integration, Rejection and Social Adjustment: As usual, the Rejector groups were expected to show lower levels of Well-being and Assertiveness.

The Economic-Integration factor was the least effective discriminator of differences among the indices of Assertiveness and Well-being. On Overall Assertiveness, Rejectors and Rejector Integrators scored lower in a significant main effect of Rejection. Of the indices of Well-being, only Social Contact showed differences as a function of the factor. Integrators and Rejector Integrators tended to have higher numbers of Social

Contacts (in a trend toward a main effect of Economic Integration), but this probably only occurred due to Rejectors having a markedly lower level than the other three groups (in a trend toward an interaction). Economic Integration was negatively and significantly correlated with Marital Satisfaction, indicating that a tendency toward marital discord was frequent for the two groups that scored high on the factor. The other acculturation positions were uncorrelated with Marital Satisfaction.

Implications: The expectation that Rejection would be associated with lower adjustment scores was upheld in the lower scores of both Rejector groups on Overall Assertiveness, but not on the indices of Well-being. Only the low-Economic-Integration Rejectors scored lower on Social Contact.

Economic Integration was not an advantageous acculturation position, despite the higher level of affluence of both high-Economic-Integration groups and their tendency to accept the ideal of integration. Apparently economic access was not a sufficient condition for good adjustment. Possibly these subjects' disengagement from traditional pursuits left them somewhat isolated, although this did not curtail the number of people with whom they had contact. Applying the reasoning used to explain the apparent efficacy of Rejection with respect to the other factors, perhaps the Integrators' positive outlook on inter-ethnic relations did not shield them, since giving up on relations with non-Indian society seemed to make for better

adjustment (among low-Bicultural-Integration Rejectors and Rejector Assimilators). However, the Rejector Integrators also failed to show superiority on Well-being. The analyses to some extent constituted sex difference tests. Whereas subjects who scored high on the other factors were either female or of both sexes, males were somewhat more likely to score high on Economic Integration than females. Hence, males who were high on the factor showed no advantages in comparison to a preponderance of females low on the factor. The only sex difference found was for Psychosomatic Stress (this difference reappeared in the three-way analysis using Sex, Economic Integration and Rejection). The minimal discrimination power of Economic Integration may be in part attributable to this redundancy.

Summary: Rejectors showed a disadvantage on Social Contact relative to the other three groups, and Rejectors and Rejector Integrators showed lower levels of Overall Assertiveness.

An Integrated Perspective on the Acculturation Positions and Rejection

The central finding was that acculturation positions varied within an Indian community. The importance of this result is indicated by the differential relationships between acculturation positions and social adjustment. Although these relationships are tentative, it seems clear that acculturation position is a variable that requires control in research with Canadian Indians.

Knowledge of the individual's attitude toward relations with the dominant culture was useful in illuminating sub-group differences in social adjustment. The attitude of Rejection frequently interacted with acculturation position to produce effects on the social adjustment variables (but produced few main effects). In conjunction with Bicultural Integration, Rejection was maladaptive with respect to social adjustment, whereas, in conjunction with Cultural Assimilation, Rejection was adaptive. In previous research, Rejection has been found to be a maladaptive attitude in its consistent relationship with stress and marginality (Berry & Annis, 1974a; Berry, 1976). To explain the results, reference to both acculturation position and attitude was necessary.

Adaptive Acculturation Positions: The sub-groups which showed the highest levels of Well-being were (Non-Rejector) Biculturals, low-Bicultural-Integration Rejectors, and Rejector Assimilators.

The fact that Rejection was adaptive for (non-Bicultural) Rejectors and for Assimilators appears to indicate that the separatist attitude implied by Rejection may be a more effective stance than a favourable attitude toward relations with non-Indian society, for subjects who emulated the ways of the dominant culture or who were attempting to find a place in it. This "separatism" may consist in a low level of investment in and expectations of the dominant culture which inures against unfavourable reception there. These two groups were remarkably

low on Psychosomatic Stress.

The fact that Non-Rejector Biculturals showed high levels of Well-being implies that their dual involvements and their acceptance of relations with the dominant culture are rewarding. However, this group did have a high level of Psychosomatic Stress ¹, possibly indicating that dual involvements and identifications are inherently difficult yet simultaneously rewarding.

Maladaptive Acculturation Positions: Sub-groups whose acculturation positions were maladaptive in terms of Well-being (excluding "Undifferentiated" groups) comprised Rejector Biculturals, low-Cultural-Assimilation Rejectors, and, less convincingly, low-Economic-Integration Rejectors. In the case of the Rejector Biculturals, the low Well-being may have been due to dissonance between the rejecting attitude and the attempt to either participate in or identify with both the non-Indian and the Indian communities. In the case of low-Cultural-Assimilation Rejectors, the fact that most were high on Bicultural Integration indicates that the dissonance explanation applies.

¹The group differences on Psychosomatic Stress (high scores for both Rejector and Non-Rejector Biculturals and for Non-Rejector Assimilators) were not accounted for by its covariation with sex and employment status. Although these variables showed effects on Psychosomatic Stress with females and employed subjects scoring higher, the effects did not diminish those of Bicultural Integration or of the interactions of Rejection with both Bicultural Integration and Cultural Assimilation. However, the high-stress groups had variable income levels in common, so that an alternative reason for the stress-proneness of some of them might be low economic access. The fact that employed subjects had higher stress levels may indicate that such access does not resolve the problem and may create new problems.

Most low-Economic-Integration Rejectors were either high on Bicultural Integration or Cultural Assimilation, so that, for the Biculturals among them, the considerable involvements with the non-Indian community appeared incompatible with a rejecting attitude.

Rejection and Assertiveness: Rejection was generally associated with lower levels of Overall Assertiveness (except among Rejector Biculturals). This suggests either that the attitude can work against acquisition of assertive behaviour (perhaps due to limited intimate exposure to non-Indian society), or that the incapacity for assertive behaviour is a factor in creating the attitude. On the other hand, the association of Cultural Assimilation and Assertiveness With Non-Indians regardless whether subjects were rejecting, indicates that even when the assertive behaviour is acquired, an attitude of Rejection may be retained. Perhaps a third variable, such as self-confidence with non-Indians, facilitates Assertiveness and is independent of attitude.

Other Implications of Variable Acculturation Position: The existence of different adaptations to Acculturation may hold a potential for factionalism. Rejector Assimilators and low-Bicultural-Integration Rejectors might appear to have little in common with Biculturals who more frequently practice traditional activities and tend to hold attitudes excluding Rejection, or with the more affluent Integrators whose values remain traditional but whose participation in traditional activities is

low. The differences in orientations of these groups imply different goals. The disunity may result in failure of the group to coherently assist individuals who have problems or who are beset by cultural ambivalence. It may also result in conflicting "prescriptions for living" for young people. A number of individuals from the reserve seemed to believe that the social problems of their community might be more pervasive than in some neighbouring communities, which may be more strongly united by common goals. As signs of this, the increasing loss of the Halkomelem language, the reluctance of many people to participate in longhouse ceremonies, and substance abuse were cited.

The complexities of the factors moderating the effects of acculturation as they applied to the present sample rendered speculation as to which were most salient impossible. However, it can be stated that the final outcome differs considerably between individuals.

Measurement Considerations

The Acculturation Scale

The acculturation positions diverged sufficiently to permit the conclusion that authentic differences exist in the community and that the practice of globally assessing acculturation levels of groups is imprecise. However, the acculturation positions found must necessarily be treated tentatively, considering the

nature of the AS. Establishing its reliability and validity required resources beyond those available. However, as a sizeable portion of the AS items required factual responses, reliability concerns are ameliorated to some extent. The potential for distortion is less than for scales requiring entirely evaluative responses. As some items similar to those of the AS were used in previous research and all items concern factors which should reflect cultural orientations, face validity can be asserted. The most indeterminate aspect concerns the relationship of values items to the values which they are intended to represent because these relationships involve a greater inferential leap than the demographic items. While the number of meaningful effects of the factors was not large, there were enough to comprise some evidence for the validity of the acculturation positions, particularly considering that comparisons within this sample should have resulted in greater homogeneity relative to inter-ethnic or inter-community comparisons, and considering that extreme groups were not used. Nevertheless, to assert construct validity of the various acculturation positions categorized by the AS would be premature. At best they may be valid for Salish people who are globally relatively high in acculturation and perhaps also in cultural disintegration.

Standardization of the AS as a generic scale would require samples of more than one ethnic group and, ideally, rural and urban samples of each ethnicity. Global ratings of community

acculturation using standard criteria would serve as external validity criteria. This process would establish whether the principal components found presently are replicable and whether inter-ethnic differences in the nature of acculturation positions are substantial. Although acculturation positions may differ in constitution between groups, similarities in effects of positions that fall within the same theoretical categories would be adequate to establish replicability and validity. Assessment of the reliability of the AS would require test-retest procedures, since the necessary uniqueness of items precludes split-half or alternate forms methods. A validation study of a measure of acculturation such as the AS is necessary to permit control of the variable via measurement in future research.

Social Adjustment Variables

Assertiveness: Assertiveness was useful as a dependent variable, as the total score and the variation respecting object person were well discriminated by the acculturation positions (except Bicultural Integration) and by Rejection. Results for Assertiveness ought to be valid since the scale used had been standardized on Indians. However, the Salish sample more closely resembled the non-Indian standardization sample with their higher scores than the Indian standardization sample (see Table 12). The fact that the standardization sample of LaFromboise (1983) was obtained in a "human service agency" may imply that that situation had deflated the Indian subjects' self-

assessments of Assertiveness. In addition, her self-report format, with its greater assurance of anonymity, may have been less susceptible to score-inflation than the interview format used with the present sample. The interview format may have inflated scores due to social desirability effects and perhaps also to other positive situational effects, e.g., subjects were on their own ground during the interviews. The greater variability in the present sample compared to both others may have resulted from some subjects being more susceptible than others to these confounding effects. Hence, the differences between samples may not be "true" differences, considering these possible artifacts of measurement. In any case, sex and age trends across all samples were comparable, with males scoring higher and Assertiveness increasing with age.

Although Assertiveness training may facilitate biculturalism (LaFromboise, 1983), it does not appear to be more characteristic of individuals who live a bicultural lifestyle than those who do not. In groups who frequent different cultural milieux, the construct validity of Assertiveness (in terms of correlations with related constructs such as aggression) may require further investigation. Although total scores were well discriminated in the analyses, the sub-groups of items, by race of object persons to whom the behaviour is directed, were also discriminated in one of three analyses. This indicates a need for the evaluation of relationships among the scores of Indian subjects with respect to different object persons.

Well-being: The correlational structure of Well-being in the present sample deviated from that discovered by Bradburn (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965; Bradburn, 1969). In his research, Positive and Negative Affect had independent sets of correlates. In the present sample, some of the relationships between social adjustment and affect variables paralleled Bradburn's, e.g., the correlation of Psychosomatic Stress with Negative Affect; but others did not correspond, e.g., the near-zero relationship between Positive Affect and Social Contact. Moreover, these affect variables (which comprised the composite Overall Affect) were inversely related to each other, and were both correlated with the Well-being variables to similar degree but in opposite directions. Rather than independent dimensions of Well-being, in the present sample Positive and Negative Affect were aspects of the same phenomenon, perhaps the more purely affective component of Well-being.

The discrepancy between Positive and Negative Affect (or Overall Affect) was found by Bradburn to correlate with avowed Well-being, or Present Happiness (a three-point index). This relationship maintained in the present sample. Present Happiness was also significantly correlated with several of the adjustment variables, while Past Happiness was not. This confirmed Bradburn's reported efficacy of Present Happiness as a measure of Well-being. To simply ask subjects whether they are "very happy", "pretty happy", or "not too happy", apparently might suffice as an assessment of Well-being as an affective state.

However, Present Happiness was uncorrelated with Psychosomatic Stress and Social Contact in the present sample, and as these were important variables, its utility may be limited for Indian samples.

Despite the intercorrelations among items and their conceptual inter-relatedness, which established construct validity of Well-being, Bradburn (1969) did not use such large groups of items as composites as was presently done. Item analysis was not attempted due to present sample size constraints, but intercorrelations of the composites created were analyzed. The Well-being composites were substantially related to four variables (Overall Affect, Social Contact, Social Involvement, and Marital Satisfaction). However, three of these were either not used or not very useful. The "best" variables for inclusion in a Well-being composite were those which were not well discriminated by acculturation positions and the Rejection attitude. Considering the complexity of the relationships among the theoretical contributors to Well-being, the composite lost precision. Hence, for Indian samples, the use of a Well-being composite would seem premature as it lacks construct validity.

The index of Psychosomatic Stress was as important as the positive variables. All variables, except Overall Affect, were discriminated in one or at most two analyses and no variable emerged as "best" in distinguishing groups. Considering these findings, a broad range of dependent variables may be needed for

research with Indian samples in order to capture group differences which may be unanticipated. The structure of any dependent variables used in Indian samples may require examination.

Directions for Future Research

Doubt has been cast on the veracity of any assumption that acculturation positions are unidimensional within minority groups. Their diversity may be more likely in groups of generally higher acculturation levels, but for the sake of scientific precision it would seem prudent to assess acculturation position at the level of the individual as a rule, rather than at the level of the group. The use of values and activities as different aspects of traditionalism, as well as the use of demographic and behavioural indicators of involvement in the dominant culture in the measure, provided unique information that was essential in permitting this diversity to emerge. However, empirical work to establish whether or not a set of pan-Indian values exists is necessary before values can be confidently employed as indices of acculturation.

The fact that Rejection of relations with the dominant culture was not uniformly associated with maladjustment, and in some cases was advantageous, indicates a need for caution in making assumptions about the factors which contribute to successful integration. Positive attitudes toward the dominant

culture are not necessarily realistic or adaptive. Perhaps when attempts at integration have failed, negative attitudes toward the dominant culture may result and may exert an inuring effect against alienation or racism in the context of the dominant culture.

The use of indices of positive adjustment as opposed to exclusive use of indices of maladjustment was productive. They aided in illuminating the unusual course that the attitude of Rejection took in the present sample.

The present study had two major limitations. The lack of a comparison group precluded relating the position of the sample to other groups in terms of acculturation position and social adjustment. In addition, the lack of information concerning non-Indian perceptions of the group precluded an ecological perspective on inter-group relations. Such a perspective might have shone some light on the motivations underlying attitudes within the Indian community. The research situation was therefore akin to a "disease-model" view, whereby difficulties in social adjustment of individuals may appear to have been interpreted as being endogenous to themselves or to their community. While exogenous sources undoubtedly exist and require investigation, it is still necessary for psychologists to identify factors involved in adaptive and maladaptive states within groups. This will aid in adapting services to the needs of Indians.

REFERENCES

- ✓ Argyle, M. (1982). Inter-cultural communication. In S. Bochner (Ed.), Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction. Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Bachtold, L.M. (1984). Antecedents of caregiver attitudes and social behaviour of Hupa Indian and Anglo-American preschoolers in California. Child Study Journal, 13, 217-233.
- Barger, W.K. (1977). Culture change and psychosocial adjustment. American Ethnologist, 4, 471-495.
- Barnes, G.E., & Vulcano, B.A. (1982). School self-acceptance among Canadian Indian, White and Metis children. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science Review, 14, 60-70.
- Berry, J.W. (1976). Human Ecology and Cognitive Style. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Berry, J.W. (1970). Marginality, stress and ethnic identification in an acculturated Aboriginal community. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1, 239-252.
- ✓ Berry, J.W., & Annis, R.C. (1974a). Acculturative stress: The role of ecology, culture and differentiation. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 5, 382-406.
- Berry, J.W., & Annis, R.C. (1974b). Ecology, culture and psychological differentiation. International Journal of Psychology, 9, 173-193.
- Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Power, S., & Young, M. (1984). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Utah. Queen's University.
- Berry, J.W., Wintrob, R.M., Sindell, P.S., & Mawhinney, T.A. (1982). Psychological adaptation to culture change among the James Bay Cree. Le Naturaliste Canadien, 109, 965-975.
- Bieusheuvel, S. (1969). Methods for the measurement of psychological performance. In International Biological Programme Handbook, (V.10). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blue, A.W., & Blue, M.A. (1983). The trail of stress. White Cloud Journal, 3, 15-22.

- ~~W~~Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction. Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Bowden, E. (1969a). A dimensional model of multilinear sociocultural evolution. American Anthropologist, 71, 864-870.
- Bowden, E. (1969b). An index of sociocultural development applicable to precivilized societies. American Anthropologist, 71, 454-461.
- Boyce, W.T., & Boyce, J.C. (1983). Acculturation and changes in health among Navajo boarding school students. Social Science & Medicine, 17, 219-226.
- Bradburn, N.M. (1969). The Structure of Psychological Well-being. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bradburn, N.M., & Caplovitz, D. (1965). Reports on Happiness: A Pilot Study of Behaviour Related to Mental Health. Chicago: Aldine.
- Brandt, E.A. (1984). The cognitive functioning of American Indian children: A critique of McShane and Plas. School Psychology Review, 13, 74-82.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (1983). Under Attack: In Grassy Narrows. Ideas. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Transcripts.
- Chance, N.A. (1965). Acculturation, self-identity, and personality adjustment. American Anthropologist, 67, 372-393.
- Codere, H. (1961). Kwakiutl. In E.H. Spicer (Ed.), Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.
- Connelly, J.B. (1983). Recategorized WISC-R score patterns of older and younger referred Tlingit Indian children. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 271-275.
- Doob, L.W. (1957). An introduction to the psychology of acculturation. The Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 143-160.
- Drucker, P. (1965). Cultures of the North Pacific Coast. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Evans, W.H. (1976). An investigation of the value orientations of American Indian college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 7904929, 6010-A.

Fisher, R. (1983). Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774-1890. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

French, L. (1976). Social problems among Cherokee females: A study of cultural ambivalence and role identity. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 36, 163-169.

Gay, M.L., Hollandsworth, J.G., & Galassi, J.P. (1975). An assertiveness inventory for adults. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 340-344.

✓ Gordon, M. (1964). Assimilation in American Life. London: Oxford University Press.

Graves, T.D., & Graves, N.B. (1980). Evolving strategies in the study of culture change. In G.D. Spindler (Ed.), The Making of Psychological Anthropology. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hammerschlag, C.A. (1982). American Indian disenfranchisement: Its impact on health and health care. White Cloud Journal, 2, 32-36.

Hammerschlag, C.A., Alderfer, C.P. Berg, D. (1978). Group relation and the expression of aggression among American Indian tribes. Corrective and Social Psychiatry & Journal of Behavioural Technology, 24, 62-76.

Hay, T.H. (1977). the development of some aspects of the Ojibwa self and its behavioural environment. Ethos, 5, 71-89.

Hollandsworth, J.G., Galassi, J.P., & Gay, M.L. (1977). The Adult Self-Expression Scale: Validation using the multitrait-multimethod procedure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 407-515.

Holmgren, C., Fitzgerald, B.J., & Carman, R.S. (1983). Alienation and alcohol use by American Indian and Caucasian high school students. Journal of Social Psychology, 120, 139-140.

Hurlbut, G., Gade, E., & Fuqua, D. (1982). Intercorrelational structure of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire with an alcoholic population. Psychological Reports, 51, 515-520.

- Kahn, M.W. (1982). Cultural clash and psychopathology in three aboriginal cultures. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 4, 553-561.
- Katz, P. (1980). Cultural differences and the work ethic. Adolescent Psychiatry, 8, 100-112.
- Katz, P. (1979). Saulteaux-Ojibway adolescents: The adolescent process amidst a clash of cultures. Psychiatric Journal of the University of Ottawa, 4, 315-321.
- Kew, J.E.M. (1970). Coast Salish Ceremonial Life: Status and Identity in a Modern Village. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms.
- LaFromboise, T.D. (1983). The factorial validity of the Adult Self-Expression Scale with American Indians. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43, 547-555.
- LaFromboise, T.D., & Rowe, W. (1983). Skills training for bicultural competence: Rationale and application. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 589-595.
- Lake, R.G., Jr. (1982). A discussion of Native American health problems, needs, and services, with a focus on northwestern California. White Cloud Journal, 2, 23-31.
- Lane, B.S. (1953). A Comparative and Analytic Study of Some Aspects of Northwest Coast Religion. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms.
- Latus, S.G., & Bauman, E. (1980). Personality and environmental correlates of academic achievement in Ojibwa Indian youth. International Journal of Psychology, 15, 71-82.
- Lefley, H.P. (1976). Acculturation, child-rearing, and self-esteem in two North American Indian tribes. Ethos, 4, 385-401.
- Lieberson, S. (1961). A societal theory of race and ethnic relations. American Sociological Review, 26, 902-910.
- Lockart, B. (1981). Historic distrust and the counseling of American Indians and Alaska Natives. White Cloud Journal, 2, 31-33.
- Luftig, R.L. (1983). Effects of schooling on the self-concept of Native American students. The School Counselor, 251-260.
- Mann, J.W. (1958). Group relations and the marginal man. Human Relations, 11, 77-92.

- McShane, D.A., & Plas, J.M. (1984a). Response to a critique of the McShane and Plas review of American Indian performance on the Wechsler Intelligence Scales. School Psychology Review, 13, 1-73.
- McShane, D.A., & Plas, J.M. (1984b). The cognitive functioning of American Indian children: Moving from the WISC to the WISC-R. School Psychology Review, 13, 61-73.
- Middleton, R. (1963). Alienation, race, and education. American Sociological Review, 28, 973-977.
- Miller, A.G. (1973). Integration and acculturation of cooperative behaviour among Blackfoot Indian and non-Indian Canadian children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 4, 374-380.
- Ministry of Indian and Northern Affairs (1980). Indian Conditions: A Survey. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Myers, J.L. (1979). Fundamentals of Experimental Design, (3rd Ed.). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Parker, S. (1964). Ethnic identity and acculturation in two Eskimo villages. American Anthropologist, 66, 325-340.
- Plas, J.M., & Bellet, W. (1983). Assessment of the value-attitude orientations of American Indian children. Journal of School Psychology, 21, 57-64.
- Pollack, D., & Shore, J.H. (1980). Validity of the MMPI with Native Americans. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 946-950.
- Pourier, J.E.E. (1976). A comparison of values among Indian high school students, Indian drop-outs and non-Indian teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 7624519, 5710-A.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M.J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. American Anthropologist, 38, 149-152.
- Savishinsky, J.S. (1982). Vicarious emotions and cultural restraint. Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology, 5, 115-135.
- Shannon, L. (1975). Development of time perspective in three cultural groups: A cultural difference or an expectancy interpretation. Developmental Psychology, 11, 114-115.
- Shore, J.H. (1974). Psychiatric epidemiology among American Indians. Psychiatric Annals, 4, 56-66.

- Shore, J.H., Kinzie, J.D., Hampson, J.L., & Pattison, E.M. (1973). Psychiatric epidemiology of an Indian village. Psychiatry, 36, 70-81.
- Shore, J.H., & Manson, S.M. (1981). Cross-cultural studies of depression among American Indians and Alaska Natives. White Cloud Journal, 2, 5-12.
- ✓ Siegel, B.J., Vogt, E.Z., Watson, J.B., & Broom, L. (1953). Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. American Anthropologist, 56, 973-1002.
- ✓ Sommerlad, E.A., & Berry, J.W. (1970). The role of ethnic identification in distinguishing between attitudes towards assimilation and integration of a minority racial groups. Human Relations, 23, 23-29.
- Spicer, E.H. (1961). Types of contact and processes of change. In E.H. Spicer (Ed.), Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Spindler, L. (1980). Researching the psychology of culture change and urbanization. In G.D. Spindler (Ed.), The Making of Psychological Anthropology. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sullivan, T. (1983). Native children in treatment: Clinical, social and cultural issues. Journal of Child Care, 3, 75-94.
- Termansen, P.E., & Ryan, J. (1970). Health and disease in a British Columbian Indian community. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 75, 121-127.
- Tyler, J.D., Cohen, K.N., & Clark, J.S. (1982). Providing community consultation in a reservation setting. Journal of Rural Community Psychology, 3, 49-58.
- Waubageshig (1970). The Only Good Indian. Toronto: New Press.
- Withycombe, J.S. (1973). Relationships of self-concept, social status, and self-perceived social status and racial differences of Paiute Indian and White elementary school children. Journal of Social Psychology, 91, 337-338.
- Zentner, H. (1963a). Factors in the social pathology of a North American Indian society. Anthropologica, 5, 119-130.

Zentner, H. (1963b). Value congruence among Indian and non-Indian high school students in Southern Alberta. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 9, 168-178.

PART C
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Acculturation Survey and its Scoring System

PERSONAL HISTORY FORM

I. FAMILY

1. What language(s) did your family speak at home when you were a child?
(a) _____ (b) _____ (c) _____
2. Where have you lived since you were born? (How many years did you stay at each kind of place and how far was it from town?)
ABOUT HOW FAR FROM A TOWN/CITY?
(Circle number)
- | | YEARS | less than
10
miles | about
50
miles | about
100
miles |
|----------------------|-------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| (a) reservation | _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (b) Native community | _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (c) small town | _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (d) larger city | _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
3. Did you go to residential school? ___(yes/no) How many years? ___
4. Parents: If you lived most of the time with people other than your natural parents, please answer about those people who were most like parents to you.
(a) Mother: What kind of job did your mother do? _____
How far did your mother get in school? _____
(b) Father: What kind of job did your father do? _____
How far did your father get in school? _____

II. SELF

1. (a) What languages do you speak? How well do you speak them?
(Circle number)
- | | Very well | Conversational | A little |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|
| (i) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (ii) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (iii) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
- (b) If you have a spouse or mate, what languages does he/she speak? How well? (Circle number)
- | | Very well | Conversational | A little |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|
| (i) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (iii) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| (iii) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
2. Do you leave your home to stay in a town or city sometimes?
_____(yes/no). If yes, how long are you away? ___(months/year)

3. Did you ever stay in the hospital? _____ (yes/no).
 For how long? _____
 If so, what was wrong? _____
4. What is the ethnic group or race of most of your friends?
 (Indian, White, both) _____
5. Did you vote in the last federal election?
 _____ (yes/no)
 Did you vote in the last band council election?
 _____ (yes/no)
6. How much do you think about Native political issues
 (land claims, self-government, education)? (Circle number)
 Very often Often Sometimes Rarely Never
 1 2 3 4 5
7. Do you attend the meetings of any Native organizations
 outside the reserve? (Circle number)
 Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very often
 1 2 3 4 5
8. Do you attend the meetings of Native community organizations?
 Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very often
 1 2 3 4 5
9. How much do you go to or do these things when they are possible?
- | | Very often | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
|------------------------------------|------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Indian socials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Christian church | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Shaker church | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Community work with
Whites | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Fishing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Wearing a suit or
evening dress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Crafts or arts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Hunting/knitting, weaving | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Movies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Going to pubs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Deskwork | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Wearing Indian costume | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Window-shopping	1	2	3	4	5
Canoe races	1	2	3	4	5
Other Indian ceremonies	1	2	3	4	5
Eating in restaurants	1	2	3	4	5
Seeking Indian medicine if sick	1	2	3	4	5
Mechanical work	1	2	3	4	5
Visiting relatives	1	2	3	4	5
Clam digging	1	2	3	4	5
Listening to pop music	1	2	3	4	5
Eating traditional Indian foods	1	2	3	4	5
Seeing a medical doctor if sick	1	2	3	4	5

10. If you take part in Native cultural activities, for how many years have you? ____

11. Where you live, does the house have these things?

	Yes	No	(Check)
(a) electricity	___	___	
(b) refrigerator	___	___	
(c) furnace	___	___	
(d) running water	___	___	
(e) kitchen stove	___	___	
(f) hot water heater	___	___	
(g) carpeting	___	___	
(h) insulation	___	___	

12. What is the highest grade you completed in school? Grade _____

13. Do you own any of the following things?

	Yes	No	(Check)
(a) T.V	___	___	
(b) car	___	___	
(c) truck	___	___	
(d) typewriter	___	___	
(e) freezer	___	___	
(f) radio	___	___	
(g) canning machine	___	___	
(h) stereo	___	___	
(i) furniture	___	___	
(j) video cassette recorder (VCR)	___	___	
(k) boat	___	___	
(l) computer	___	___	
(m) telephone	___	___	

14. What kind of work do you usually do? _____

III. OPINIONS

Please circle the letter or number corresponding to the response that is right for you, or fill in the blank.

1. What is the most important quality of a person who makes the best chief or band councillor?

- (a) high family background
- (b) devotion to the old ways
- (c) popularity
- (d) education and special knowledge
- (e) status as elder

2. If I disagree with someone, I don't tell them about it.

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5
------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------

3. Whatever I have I share with others even if its hard.

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	------------------------

4. What is the most important thing to help Indian people get ahead?

- (a) hard work of the people
- (b) good luck
- (c) good government planning
- (d) God's help

5. I feel free to tell people all about myself.
 Strongly Disagree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5
6. I suggest better things to do to people who aren't doing themselves any good.
 Strongly Disagree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5
7. I like to be calm and not showing my emotions all the time.
 Strongly Disagree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5
8. How useful is the science of space travel and the study of other planets?
 (a) very useful and important
 (b) useful
 (c) somewhat wasteful or unimportant
 (d) entirely wasteful and of no importance
9. Arguing with people is o.k.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
 1 2 3 4 5
10. Do you believe that birth control is a good thing? (Check)
 Yes _____ No _____
11. How many children is it best for a family to have?
 (number) _____
12. If I can look after my own spouse and kids but maybe not others, I am a good person.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
 1 2 3 4 5
13. I do not like to ask people a lot of personal questions.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
 1 2 3 4 5
14. Which interests you most?
 (a) sports
 (b) events in your village
 (c) world events--in other countries
 (d) religion
 (e) news of Native groups across the country

15. I feel better if I express my feelings and talk about them.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

16. If someone is doing something that is not good for them,
I don't try to stop them.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

17. Let this line be the space of time you have lived and will go on
living. Divide it into past, present, and future.

18. If you could be anything you wanted, what would
you be...What kind of person would you like to be?

Scoring System of the Acculturation Survey

- I.
- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. English (well) & 2 Native languages (both well) | 10 |
| English (well) & 2 Native languages (1 well, 1 conv. ¹) | 9 |
| English (well) & 2 Native languages (1 well, 1 little) | 8 |
| English only | 7 |
| English (well) & 2 Native languages (neither well) | 6 |
| English (well) & 1 Native language (little) | 5 |
| English (well) & 1 Native language (conv.) | 4 |
| English (well) & 1 Native language (well) | 3 |
| English (conv.) & 1 Native language (well) | 2 |
| English (little) & 1 Native language (well) | 1 |
| Native language only | 0 |

conv.¹=conversational

2.

		<u>Location Weights</u>			
		Reserve	Reserve		
		50 miles	10 miles	Town	City
		from town	from town		
		-----	-----	-----	-----
		-3	-1	1	3
# Years	Score				
LT ¹ 1	1	-3	-1	1	3
1-5	2	-6	-2	2	6
6-10	3	-9	-3	3	9
GT ² 10	4	-12	-4	4	12

LT¹=less than

GT²=greater than

$$\text{Total score} = (\Sigma \text{Products}) / (\Sigma |\text{Weights}|)$$

3. Number of years

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 4. (a) Professional | 4 |
| Skilled | 3 |
| Vocational ¹ | 2 |
| Unskilled | 1 |
| Seasonal/traditional | 0 |

¹Many vocational occupations available did not require post-secondary education.

(b) Number of years

Scores on (a) and (b) were generated for each parent.

II

1. (a) as for I 1.

(b) as for I 1.

2. Number of months.

3. Yes, GT¹ 2 weeks, not life-threatening 4
 Yes, LT² 2 weeks, not life-threatening 3
 Yes, GT 2 weeks, life-threatening 2
 Yes, LT 2 weeks, life-threatening 1
 No 0

GT¹=greater than; LT²=less than

4. Non-Indians 2
 Some Indians, some non-Indians 1
 Indians 0

5. Question 1 Question 2
 Yes No 3
 Yes Yes 2
 No Yes 1
 No No 0

6. Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often
 4 3 2 1 0

7. Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often
 4 3 2 1 0

8. Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often
 4 3 2 1 0

9. (a) "Indian Activities": 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 12,
 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often
 4 3 2 1 0

(b) "White Activities": 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13,
 16, 18, 21, 23

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often
 0 1 2 3 4

10. Number of years

11. Number yes

12. Number of years

13. Number yes

14. As in 4(a)

III

1. d 4
c 3
b 2
e 1
a 0

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.		0	1	2	3	4
3.		0	1	2	3	4
5.		4	3	2	1	0
6.		4	3	2	1	0
7.		0	1	2	3	4
9.		4	3	2	1	0
12.		4	3	2	1	0
13.		0	1	2	3	4
15.		4	3	2	1	0
16.		0	1	2	3	4
4.	a	3				
	c	2				
	b	1				
	d	0				
8.	a	3				
	b	2				
	c	1				
	d	0				
10.	Yes	1				
	No	0				

11. Number of Children

14. c 4
e 3
a 2
d 1
b 0

17. Length of present divided by length of future

18. Occupation 2
Status--no job 1
Personal qualities 0

Family Income

Good wage or more than one earner 3
Low wage or one earner 2
Dependent on family or additional earnings over welfare 1
Welfare 0

Appendix B: Ethnic Identification Scale and its Scoring System

GROUP RELATIONS

Please put a number beside each statement to indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement.

- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
-
- 1. The Indians should be completely self-sufficient so they do not need to co-operate with the whites in any way.
 - 2. It is better if an Indian marries with one of his/her people rather than with a white.
 - 3. Any Indian who is successful should try to forget that he/she is of Indian descent.
 - 4. It is better for the Indians to stay on their reserves than to come into the city where they encounter difficulties.
 - 5. The Indians should only co-operate with the whites when they have something to gain.
 - 6. Having a National Indians Organization is not really a good idea since it makes the Indians different from other Canadians.
 - 7. There are no aspects of the whites' culture that might be beneficial to the Indians.
 - 8. The Indians should co-operate as little as possible with the whites.
 - 9. The only real way an Indian can become successful is by dissociating him/herself from other Indians.
 - 10. Any Indian living within the white community should try and behave in the same way as those around him/her.
 - 11. The Indians should do all they can to ensure the survival of their people.
 - 12. Although it is alright for Indian parents to maintain their cultural differences within the white community, they should encourage their children to be just like other Canadians.
 - 13. The social activities of the Indians should be restricted to the Indians themselves.
 - 14. If a number of Indians are working on the same job, they should be put in the same section so they are together.

Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
5 4 3 2 1

- ___ 15. Encouraging the Indians to stay as a group is only hindering their acceptance into the community.
- ___ 16. Most of the Indians living in the city today are not really interested in knowing anything about the life or culture of their ancestors.
- ___ 17. The Indians should lead their own way of life, independently of the rest of society.
- ___ 18. So little remains today of the Indian culture that it is not really worth saving.
- ___ 19. Focusing attention on the Indians' traditional way of life is only preventing them from making any progress in society.
- ___ 20. The Indians should seek their friends among other Indians.
- ___ 21. The Indians should act as a separate community in every way within society.
- ___ 22. Indian children should be encouraged to choose other Indians as their playmates.
- ___ 23. If an Indian sets up his/her own business, he/she should try and employ Indians to work for him/her.
- ___ 24. The fact that Canada has only developed since the arrival of the whites clearly shows that the Indians must follow the example of the whites if they themselves are to make any progress.
25. Do you consider yourself as Indian or Canadian?

Scoring of Ethnic Identification Scale

	Assimilation	Integration	Rejection
Positive Items	3,9,10,12	2,11,20,22	1,4,5,7,17
Negative Items	8,13,14,21,23	6,15,16,18,19	24

Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Appendix C: The Adult Self Expression Scale and its Scoring System

THE ADULT SELF EXPRESSION SCALE

The following inventory is designed to provide information about the way in which you express yourself. Please answer the questions by putting a number beside each question to indicate how often you do or don't do these things. Your answer should indicate how you generally express yourself in a variety of situations. If a particular situation does not apply to you, answer as you think you would respond in that situation. Your answer should not reflect how you feel you ought to act or how you would like to act. Do not deliberate over any individual question. Please work quickly. Your first response to the question is probably your most accurate one.

Please answer questions as if situations were with non-Indians as much as is possible.

Almost Always or Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never or Rarely
0	1	2	3	4

1. Do you ignore it when someone pushes in front of you in line?
2. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favour for you?
3. If your boss or supervisor makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, do you have difficulty saying "no"?
4. Are you reluctant to speak to an attractive acquaintance of the opposite sex?
5. Is it difficult for you to refuse unreasonable requests from your parents?
6. Do you find it difficult to accept compliments from your boss or supervisor?
7. Do you express your negative feelings to others when it is appropriate?
8. Do you freely volunteer information or opinions in discussions with people whom you do not know very well?
9. If there was a public figure whom you greatly admired and respected at a large social gathering, would you make an effort to introduce yourself?
10. How often do you openly express justified feelings of anger to your parents?
11. If you have a friend of whom your parents do not approve, do you make an effort to help them get to know one another better?

Almost Always or Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never or Rarely
0	1	2	3	4

12. If you were watching a TV program in which you were very interested and a close relative was disturbing you, would you ask them to be quiet?
13. Do you play an important part in deciding how you and your close friends spend your leisure time together?
14. If you are angry at your spouse/boyfriend or girlfriend, is it difficult for you to tell them?
15. If a friend who is supposed to pick you up for an important engagement calls fifteen minutes before he/she is supposed to be there and says that they cannot make it, do you express your annoyance?
16. If you approve of something your parents do, do you express your approval?
17. If in a rush you stop by a supermarket to pick up a few items, would you ask to go before someone in the check-out line?
18. Do you find it difficult to refuse the requests of others?
19. If your boss or supervisor expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, do you venture to state your own point of view?
20. If you have a close friend whom your spouse/boyfriend or girlfriend dislikes and constantly criticizes, would you inform them that you disagree and tell them of your friend's assets?
21. Do you find it difficult to ask favours of others?
22. If food which is not to your satisfaction was served in a good restaurant, would you bring it to the waiter's attention?
23. Do you tend to drag out your apologies?
24. When necessary, do you find it difficult to ask favours of your parents?
25. Do you insist that others do their fair share of the work?
26. Do you have difficulty saying no to salesmen?
27. Are you reluctant to speak up in a discussion with a small group of friends?
28. Do you express anger or annoyance to your boss or supervisor when it is justified?

Almost Always					Never or
or Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom		Rarely
0	1	2	3		4

29. Do you compliment and praise others?
30. Do you have difficulty asking a close friend to do an important favour even though it will cause them some inconvenience?
31. If a close relative makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request do you have difficulty saying no?
32. If your boss or supervisor makes a statement that you consider untrue, do you question it aloud?
33. If you find yourself becoming fond of a friend, do you have difficulty expressing these feelings to that person?
34. Do you have difficulty exchanging a purchase with which you are dissatisfied?
35. If someone in authority interrupts you in the middle of an important conversation, do you request that the person wait until you have finished?
36. If a person of the opposite sex whom you have been wanting to meet directs attention to you at a party, do you take the initiative in beginning the conversation?
37. Do you hesitate to express resentment to a friend who has unjustifiably criticized you?
38. If your parents wanted you to come home for a weekend visit and you had made important plans, would you change your plans?
39. Are you reluctant to speak up in a discussion or debate?
40. If a friend who has borrowed \$5.00 from you seems to have forgotten about it, is it difficult for you to remind this person?
41. If your boss or supervisor teases you to the point that it is no longer fun, do you have difficulty expressing your displeasure?
42. If your spouse/boyfriend or girlfriend is blatantly unfair, do you find it difficult to say something about it to them?
43. If a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you when you are in a rush, do you call his attention to the matter?
44. If you lived in an apartment and the landlord failed to make certain repairs after it had been brought to his attention, would you insist on it?

Almost Always or Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never or Rarely
0	1	2	3	4

45. Do you find it difficult to ask your boss or supervisor to let you off early?
46. Do you have difficulty verbally expressing love and affection to your spouse/boyfriend or girlfriend?
47. Do you readily express your opinions to others?
48. If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?

Scoring of Adult Self Expression Scale

Positive Items

1 - 6
14
18
21
23 - 24
26 - 27
30 - 31
33 - 34
37 - 42
45 - 46

Negative Items

7 - 13
15 - 17
19 - 20
22
25
28 - 29
32
35 - 36
43 - 44
47 - 48

Almost Always
or Always
0

Usually
1

Sometimes
2

Seldom
3

Never or
Rarely
4

Appendix D: Well-being Scale and its Scoring System

STUDY OF MODERN LIVING

To answer questions, please either fill in the blank or circle the number which corresponds to the answer that is appropriate for you.

SOCIAL

P1. Thinking of visits, telephone calls, or letters, were you in touch with any relatives during the past 2 weeks (not counting any who live with you)?

Yes.....1
No.....x

IF YES: About how many families? ____
How many of those families do you see or visit regularly--say every week or so? ____

P2. Now how about friends other than relatives? During the past few weeks how many times did you get together with friends --to go out together or to visit in each others' homes?

Not at all.....x
Once.....1
Twice.....2
Three times.....3
Four times.....4
Five or more times.....5

About how many different friends did you see for a visit in the past few weeks? ____

P3. Do most of your friends live here in your community or do most of them live further away?

Neighbourhood.....6
Half and half.....7
Further away.....8

P4. On the average during the past few weeks, how many times a day did you chat with friends on the telephone?

None.....0
Less than once a day...1
Once a day.....2
Twice a day.....3
Three times a day.....4
Four or more.....5

P5. In recent months have you made any new friends?

Yes.....1
No.....2

P6. In recent months have you lost any friends or become less friendly with anyone?

Yes.....4
No.....5

- P7. Do most of your friends know each other?
 Yes.....7
 Some do, some don't...8
 No.....9
- P8. Thinking of people including relatives whom you consider really good friends--that is people you feel free to talk with about personal things--about how many such friends would you say you have? ____
- P9. Did you meet any people during the past few weeks, other than those you meet in the course of your work, that you never met before?
 Yes.....1
 No.....x

IF YES, about how many? ____

- P10. During the past few weeks, have you gone any place that you have never been before?
 Yes.....1
 No.....2

- P11. During the past few weeks what was the furthest distance you went from your home other than going to work? (about how many miles one way)

- Did not leave house.....0
 Less than 1 mile.....1
 1 to less than 5 miles.....2
 5 to less than 25 miles.....3
 25 to less than 100 miles...4
 100 to less than 200 miles..5
 200 or more miles.....6

IF YOU WENT 5 OR MORE MILES, how often do you go that far usually?

- Almost every day.....1
 Several times per week.....2
 About once a week.....3
 Several times per month.....4
 About once a month.....5
 Several times per year.....6
 About once per year.....7
 Less than once per year.....8

- P12. On the whole, how happy are you with living here in your neighbourhood?

- Very happy.....1
 Pretty happy.....2
 Not too happy.....3

P13. Do you think of your community as your real home, the place where you really belong, or do you think of it as just a place where you happen to be living?

Really belong.....6
Just a place.....7

P14. Do you have any plans to move within the next year?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Don't know.....3

P15. How many organizations such as church and school groups, labour unions, or social, civic, and fraternal clubs do you belong to?

None.....x
One.....0
Two.....1
Three.....2
Four or more.....3

How many do you take an active part in?

None.....5
One.....6
Two.....7
Three.....8
Four or more.....9

P16. How often have you gone to church or church-sponsored events in the last month? ___(times)

P17. How interested are you in what goes on in the world today? For instance, do you follow the international news...

Very closely.....7
Fairly closely.....8
Not too closely.....9

P18. What about local news--the things that happen here in your community? Do you follow local news...

Very closely.....1
Fairly closely.....2
Not too closely.....3

P19. Do you ever get as worked up by something that happens in the news as you do by something that happens in your personal life?

Yes.....1
No.....x

IF YES, does this happen often or only occasionally?

Often.....4
Occasionally.....5

Section H

- H1. In general, do you worry a lot or not very much?
 A lot.....1
 Not very much.....2
 Never worry.....3
- H2. Would you say you worry more now than you used to or not as much as you used to ?
 More.....6
 About the same.....7
 Not as much.....8
 Never worries.....9
- H3. We are interested in the way people are feeling these days. The following list describes some of the ways people feel at different times. During the past few weeks, did you ever feel...
- | | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| A. Particularly excited or interested in something? | 3 | 2 |
| B. So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair? | 6 | 5 |
| C. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done? | 9 | 8 |
| D. Very lonely or remote from other people? | 3 | 2 |
| E. Pleased about having accomplished something? | 6 | 5 |
| F. Bored? | 9 | 8 |
| G. On top of the world? | 3 | 2 |
| H. Depressed or very unhappy? | 6 | 5 |
| I. That things were going your way? | 9 | 8 |
| J. Upset because someone criticized you? | 3 | 2 |
- H4. Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days--would you say you're...
 Very happy.....1
 Pretty happy.....2
 Not too happy.....3
- H5. Compared with your life today, how were things 4-5 years ago--were you...
 Happier.....7
 Not quite as happy.....8
 About the same.....9

HEALTH

- H6. Were you sick at any time during the past few weeks?
 Yes.....1
 No.....x
- IF YOU WERE SICK, did it cause you to cut down on your usual activities?
 Yes.....3
 No.....4

H7. Do you have any long-standing physical or health trouble?

Yes.....1

No.....x

IF YES, does this keep you from doing any of the things
you might like to do?

Yes.....3

No.....4

H8. Did you have the following troubles or complaints during the
last few weeks?

	Yes	No
A. Common cold or flu?	3	2
B. Dizziness?	6	5
C. General aches and pains?	9	8
D. Hands sweat and feel damp and clammy?	3	2
E. Headaches?	6	5
F. Muscle twitches or trembling?	9	8
G. Nervousness or tenseness?	3	2
H. Rapid heart beat?	6	5
I. Shortness of breath when not exercising?	9	8
J. Skin rashes?	3	2
K. Upset stomach?	6	5

H9. Was the amount of sleep you got during the past few weeks more or
or less than usual?

More.....1

Same.....2

Less.....3

H10. During the past few weeks did you have any trouble getting to
sleep at night?

Yes.....5

No.....6

H11. Did you have any trouble getting up in the morning?

Yes.....8

No.....9

H12. Compared with your normal feelings, would you say that you had
more energy or less energy during the past few weeks?

More.....1

Same.....2

Less.....3

H13. In general, do you have enough energy to do the things that you
would like to do?

Yes.....5

No.....6

H14. Have you ever felt that you were going to have a nervous breakdown?

Yes.....1

No.....x

IF YES, have you felt this way more than once?

Yes.....3

No.....4

H15. Have you ever consulted a doctor, psychiatrist, psychologist, or anyone else in connection with a nervous or emotional problem?

Yes.....6

No.....7

FAMILY

F1. What is your marital status?

Married.....1

Married, spouse absent...2

Separated.....3

Divorced.....4

Widowed.....5

Never married.....6 GO TO F10

IF MARRIED/LIVING TOGETHER,

A. How long together?

Less than 1 year.....0

1 - 2 years.....1

3 - 5 years.....2

6 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

B. Is this your first union or marriage?

First marriage/union.....6

Married or lived with other before...7

IF DIVORCED/SEPARATED/WIDOWED:

C. How long have you been (divorced/separated/widowed)?

Less than 1 year.....0

1 - 2 years.....1

3 - 5 years.....2

6 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

F2. How many children do you have? ____

F3. On the whole, how much time do you spend doing things together with your wife/husband?

Quite a lot.....1

Moderate amount.....2

Little time.....3

F4. Generally speaking, do you tell your wife/husband about what went on during your day?

- Always.....5
- Usually.....6
- About half the time.....7
- Seldom.....8
- Never.....9

F5. What about your wife/husband? Does she/he usually tell you what went on during her/his day?

- Always.....1
- Usually.....2
- About half the time.....3
- Seldom.....4
- Never.....5

F6. These are things about which husbands and wives sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Which ones caused differences of opinion or were problems in your marriage during the past few weeks?

	Yes	No
A. Time spent with friends?	3	2
B. Household expenses?	6	5
C. Being tired?	9	8
D. Being away from home too much?	3	2
E. Disciplining children?	6	5
F. In-laws?	9	8
G. Not showing love?	3	2
H. Your husband's/wife's job?	6	5
I. How to spend leisure time?	9	8
J. Religion?	3	2
K. Irritating personal habits?	6	5

F7. During the past few weeks, have you ever felt that you were not the kind of husband/wife you would like to be?

- Yes.....1
 - No.....x
- IF YES, Did you feel that way often or only once or twice?
- Often.....4
 - Once or twice.....5

F8. Married couples sometimes do these things together. Which ones have you and your husband/wife done together in the past few weeks?

	Yes	No
A. Visited friends together	2	3
B. Gone out together to a movie, bowling, sporting event or some other entertainment	5	6
C. Spent an evening just chatting with each other	8	9
D. Worked on some household project together	2	3
E. Entertained friends in your home	5	6
F. Gone shopping together	8	9
G. Had a good laugh together or shared a joke	2	3

	Yes	No
H. Ate out in a restaurant together	5	6
I. Been affectionate toward each other	8	9
J. Taken a drive or gone for a walk just for pleasure	2	3
K. Did something that the other one particularly appreciated	5	6
L. Helped the other solve some problem	8	9

F9. Taking all things together, how would you describe your marriage?
 Would you say that your marriage was...

- Very happy.....7
- Pretty happy.....8
- Not too happy.....9

FOR CURRENTLY NON-MARRIED:

F10. Would you like to get married (again)?
 IF YES, Do you expect to be married in the next few years?

- Yes.....4
- No.....5
- Don't know.....6

F11. How concerned are you about not being married...

- Very concerned.....1
- Moderately concerned.....2
- A little concerned.....3
- Not at all concerned.....4

WORK

W1. Which statement best describes your employment status?

- Employed.....1
- Self-employed.....2
- Unemployed or laid off.....3
- Retired.....4
- Part-time worker.....5
- Not working and not looking for a job....6
- Working in the home.....7

W2. Answer these questions whatever kind of work you do, a job, housework or casual work, or self-employed occupations.

A. How satisfied are you with your present family earnings?

- Very satisfied.....1
- Somewhat satisfied.....2
- Somewhat dissatisfied.....3
- Very dissatisfied.....4

B. How satisfied are you with the kind of work you do?

- Very satisfied.....1
- Somewhat satisfied.....2
- Somewhat dissatisfied.....3
- Very dissatisfied.....4

C. Taking all things together, how do you feel about the work you do as a whole?

- Very satisfied.....1
- Somewhat satisfied.2
- Somewhat dissatisfied.....3
- Very dissatisfied.....4

D. Do you feel that your present work really uses all your skill or talents?

Yes.....6

No.....7

W3. Some people really enjoy their work and find it a source of great satisfaction; others look on their work as something they have to do in order to make a living. Which way do you feel?

- Enjoy work.....1
- Just a way to make a living.....2
- Other (specify).....3

W4. Sometimes people feel they are not doing as good a job at work as they would like to. During the past few weeks have you ever felt this way?

Yes.....1

No.....x

IF YES, have you felt that way often or only once or twice?

Often.....4

Only once or twice.....5

W5. Answer these questions only if you are unemployed and looking for work.

A. How many weeks during the last year have you been without work because of unemployment or lay-off?

(Write number) ___ weeks

B. Do you feel that any kind of discrimination or unfair practice has kept you from getting a job?

Yes.....1

No.....2

Scoring System of the Well-being Scale

Social Contact Index

- P1a Number of families (square root transformation--reunions)
P1b Number of families
P2b Number of friends
P8 Number of close friends
P9 Number of new people (square root transformation--reunions)

Social Involvement Index

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------|
| P2a | Not at all | 0 |
| | Once | 1 |
| | Twice | 2 |
| | Three times | 3 |
| | Four times | 4 |
| | 5 or more times | 5 |
| P3 | Neighbourhood | 2 |
| | Half and half | 1 |
| | Further away | 0 |
| P4 | None | 0 |
| | less than 1 | 1 |
| | Once | 2 |
| | Twice | 3 |
| | Three times | 4 |
| | Four times | 5 |
| P12 | Very Happy | 2 |
| | Pretty Happy | 1 |
| | Not too happy | 0 |
| P13 | Belong | 1 |
| | Just a place | 0 |
| P14 | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 2 |
| | Don't know | 1 |
| P15 | # Active | Score |
| | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 1 |
| | 2 | 2 |
| | 3 | 3 |
| | 4 or more | 4 |
| P16 | Number | |
| P17 | Very closely (VC) | 2 |
| | Fairly closely (FC) | 1 |
| | Not too closely (NC) | 0 |

P18 VC	2
FC	1
NC	0

P19 Yes often	2
Yes occasionally	1
No	0

Novelty Index

P5 Yes	1
No	0

P6 Yes	1
No	0

P7 Yes	0
Some	1
No	2

P10 Yes	1
No	0

P11a as given on questionnaire

P11b Almost every day	7
Several times/week	6
About once/week	5
Several times/month	4
About once/month	3
Several times/year	2
About once/year	1
Less than once/year	0

Overall Affect Index

H3 Positive	Negative
A	B
C	D
E	F
G	H
I	J

Score=5-Negative+Positive

Present Happiness

H4 Very happy	2
Pretty happy	1
Not too happy	0

Past Happiness

H5	Happier	2
	Not quite as happy	0
	About the same	1

Psychosomatic Stress Index

H1	A lot	2
	Not very much	1
	Never	0

H2	More	3
	About the same	2
	Not as much	1
	Never	0

H6	Sick, cut down	2
	Sick, did not cut down	1
	Not sick	0

H7	Yes, handicap	2
	Yes, no handicap	1
	No	0

H8 Number yes

H9	More	1
	Same	0
	Less	2

H10	Yes	1
	No	0

H11	Yes	1
	No	0

H12 and H13	H12	H13	Score
	More	Yes	0
	More	No	1
	Same	Yes	2
	Same	No	3
	Less	Yes	4
	Less	No	5

H14	Yes more than once	2
	Yes once	1
	No	0

H15	Yes	1
	No	0

Marital Satisfaction Index

F1	Less than 1 year	1
	1 - 2 years	2
	3 - 5 years	3
	6 - 10 years	4
	More than 10 years	5
F3	Quite a lot	2
	Moderate amount	1
	Little time	0
F4	Always	4
	Usually	3
	Half the time	2
	Seldom	1
	Never	0
F5	As for F4	
F6	Number no	
F7	Yes often	0
	Yes occasionally	1
	No	2
F8	Number yes	
F9	Very happy	2
	Pretty happy	1
	Not too happy	0

Overall Well-being

Overall Well-being was the composite of Overall Affect, Social Contact, Social Involvement, Novelty, and Psychosomatic Stress (100 minus the score), equally weighted.

Appendix E: Information Sheet for Subjects

INFORMATION SHEET FOR SUBJECTS

Title of Project: The Effects of Acculturation on the Well-being
and Self-expression of a Canadian Native Group

Contact between different cultures affects people's lives in many ways. Some kinds of change are stressful while others may be beneficial. This research project will explore cultural change and well-being.

To accomplish this, you will be interviewed and some questionnaires will be completed. The first concerns the facts of your personal situation in terms of social and occupational activities, languages spoken, interests, possessions, and education. It also inquires about some of your opinions. Another questionnaire asks for your ideas about the kind of relationship that you see as best for your community to have with the larger society. You will be asked about how you normally express yourself. Finally, you will be asked about your health, the time you spend with other people, how you feel emotionally, and your work.

By providing this information, you will help us to study the kinds of life situations that are associated with well-being. This will help people working in institutions to understand the individual involved in the processes of cultural change. Moreover, the effects of cultural change on your community specifically will be known.

Your reports will be kept strictly confidential. Only a number (no name) will be used for each participant. People who wish to know the results of this research will be informed.

>

Appendix F: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

Note: The University and the person conducting this project subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of subjects. This form and the information it contains are given to you for your own protection and full understanding of the procedures, risks and benefits involved. Your signature on this form will signify that you have received the document described below regarding this project, that you have received adequate opportunity to consider the information in the document, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the project.

Having been asked by Eleanor Cruise of the Psychology Department of Simon Fraser University to participate in a research project, I have read the procedures specified in the document entitled: Information Sheet for Subjects, which concerns the project, The Effects of Acculturation on the Well-being and Self-expression of a Canadian Native Group.

I understand the procedures to be used in this research and also understand that the procedures may be terminated at any time at my request.

I also understand that I may register any complaint I might have about the experiment with Roger Blackman, Chairman of the Psychology Department, Simon Fraser University.

I may obtain a copy of the results of this study, upon its completion, by contacting Eleanor Cruise, Psychology Department, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6.

I agree to participate by completing the questionnaires described in the "Information Sheet for Subjects".

My signature below certifies that I consent to the experimental procedures described in the document stipulated above, to be conducted on the following date:

_____;

in the following place:

_____;

and designated in the following manner:

_____.

DATE _____ NAME _____

SIGNATURE _____

Appendix G: Descriptive Statistics on all items of the Acculturation Survey

Table 13a: Descriptive statistics on all items of the

	n	Mean	Range	SD

AS Items				
I				
1. Childhood Language	44	4.64	1 - 7	1.60
* 2. Residence History	44	-1.10	-3 - 1.5	1.56
3. Years at Residential School	44	0.61	0 - 8	1.75
4. (a)Mother's Occupation	42	1.19	0 - 4	1.04
(b)Mother's Education(years)	34	7.47	0 -14	3.18
(c)Father's Occupation	42	1.21	0 - 3	0.68
(d)Father's Education(years)	33	6.61	0 -14	3.36
II				
1.(a)Languages Spoken-Self	44	5.77	4 - 7	1.03
(b)Languages Spoken-Spouse	30	5.80	3 - 7	1.24
2.Mos./Yr. Away from Reserve	44	2.35	0 -12	4.54
3.Use of Hospital	44	2.93	0 - 4	1.89
4.Race of Friends	44	0.73	0 - 2	0.62
5.Voting Pattern	44	1.39	0 - 3	1.08
6.Indian Politics	44	1.41	0 - 4	1.02
7.Off-Reserve Meetings	44	3.64	1 - 4	0.78
8.On-Reserve Meetings	44	2.80	0 - 4	1.25
* 9.(a)Indian Activities	44	26.27	8 -39	7.22
* (b)White Activities	44	20.14	11 -31	5.08
10.Participation in Culture(yr.)	44	16.43	0 -49	13.09
11.Household Fittings	42	6.55	5 - 7	0.55
*12.Education (years)	44	11.05	6 -15	2.33
*13.Possessions	43	7.84	2 -11	2.40
*14.Occupation	44	1.73	0 - 4	0.85
III				
1.Qualities of Best Chief	44	3.82	0 - 5	1.65
2.Non-Contradiction-2	44	2.05	0 - 4	1.18
3.Co-operation-3	44	0.93	0 - 3	0.66
4.Getting Ahead	41	2.63	1 - 3	0.54
* 5.Non-self-disclosure-5	44	1.36	0 - 4	1.20
6.Non-interference-6	44	2.73	1 - 4	0.85
* 7.Non-demonstrativeness-7	44	1.34	0 - 3	1.01
* 8.Utility of Space Exploration	44	1.55	0 - 3	0.88
* 9.Non-contradiction-9	44	1.68	0 - 3	1.14
10.Value of Birth Control	44	0.80	0 - 1	0.41
*11.Ideal Number of Children	43	3.30	2 - 9	1.30
*12.Co-operation-12	44	1.73	0 - 4	1.09
13.Non-demonstrativeness-13	44	1.16	0 - 4	0.94
14.Worldliness of Major Interest	44	1.71	0 - 4	1.36
15.Non-self-disclosure-15	43	2.79	0 - 4	1.06
*16.Non-interference-16	44	2.43	1 - 4	1.02
17.Time Perspective	40	1.02	0.1-3.5	0.78
18.Ideal Self	44	0.61	0 - 2	0.84
*Family Income	44	1.73	0 - 3	1.09

* Selected for Principal Component Analysis