5-2017

Attitudes and Experiences of Close Interethnic Friendships Among Native Emerging Adults: A Mixed-Methods Investigation

Merrill L. Jones
Utah State University

ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES OF CLOSE INTERETHNIC FRIENDSHIPS

AMONG NATIVE EMERGING ADULTS: A MIXED-

METHODS INVESTIGATION

by

Merrill L. Jones

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

_____   _____
Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D.   Melanie M. Domenech Rodríguez, Ph.D.
Major Professor   Committee Member

_____   _____
Donna Gilbertson, Ph.D.   Gretchen Peacock, Ph.D.
Committee Member   Committee Member

_____   _____
Linda Skogrand, Ph.D.   Mark R. McLellan, Ph.D.
Committee Member   Vice President for Research and
                                           Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2017

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and Experiences of Close Interethnic Friendships Among

Native Emerging Adults: A Mixed-Methods Investigation

by

Merrill L. Jones, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 2017

Major Professor: Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D.
Department: Psychology

This study included 114 Native adults and 6 Native/non-Native pairs of friends

(age 18-25). Experiences and attitudes for close interethnic friendships were investigated.

Friendship patterns and predictors were quantitatively assessed for the 114 Natives, with

qualitative examination of the development and qualities of the six friend pairs.

Results of quantitative analysis revealed that 80% of this sample reported

friendship investment with Whites, and 55% reported friendship investment with same-

tribe members. Over 90% of participants were open to engaging in friendships with

member of any ethnicity or race. Approximately 98% of participants reported being

targeted for racial discrimination, with most reporting some distress, often at a low level.

Significant positive correlates of past and future friendships with Whites included:

household income in childhood, identification with White culture, racial/ethnic

composition of students in college, multicultural experiences, and past support from

parents. Multiple regressions included as significant predictors of past friendships: past parental support ($t = 6.488$, $p < .001$), past multicultural experiences ($t = 3.852$, $p < .001$), racial composition in college ($t = 3.083$, $p = .003$), and diversity climate in high school ($t = 2.468$, $p = .015$). Multiple regressions for future friendships with Whites revealed as significant predictors: past friendships ($t = 5.187$, $p < .001$), and past parental support ($t = 2.507$, $p = .014$).

Qualitative findings revealed authenticity/acceptance, communication, similarity, and trust as aspects of close friendships with non-Natives. Opportunities to share cultural teachings, and shared cultural interests helped friendships develop. Participants' descriptions of their friendships largely coincided with contact/opportunity theories, with propinquity allowing homophily, reciprocation, and disclosure to develop within the friendship. All friendship pairs weathered periods of time during which contact between friends became infrequent, but all participants asserted that they were still close friends during those periods. Findings illuminate the prominence of interethnic friendships in the lives of Native youth, and positive intergroup attitudes expressed within those relationships.

(117 pages)

PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Attitudes and Experiences of Close Interethnic Friendships Among

Native Emerging Adults: A Mixed-Methods Investigation

Merrill L. Jones

Members of small minority groups like Natives, along with other minority groups that are rapidly growing in population are increasingly receiving research focus. With 1 in 3 U.S. residents identifying with racial or ethnic minority groups, close interethnic relationships are likely to increase as well. It will be important to understand processes of close friendship development between racially-different friends, along with the factors that help establish and maintain these close interethnic friendships. This information will be especially important for members of small minority groups, such as Natives.

We investigated Native friendship development and factors of close friendship with non-Native emerging adults. Results for the participants in this sample found that past experiences and relationships seem to be the primary predictors of engagement in interethnic friendships, in addition to diversity climates in high school and racial composition in college student bodies. Additionally, increased opportunities for interethnic contact and interaction tended to be important factors of friendship development between Natives and non-Natives. Aspects of these close friendships that were reported by friendship pairs included: authenticity/acceptance, communication, similarity, and trust. It is important to understand that frequent exposure to racial/cultural diversity before individuals reach adulthood has been found to be much more effective than trying to change attitudes and experiences in adulthood.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Yá'át'ééh! Shik'éí dóó shidine'é

When I received approval for this dissertation to be submitted to the graduate school, I expected to feel more excited and relieved. The reality was that it was simply another box that received its checkmark, and my professional (and personal!) development will include several more steps throughout my career. And yet…completion of this academic pursuit represents nearly half of my adult life, which overlapped practically all of my married life, and my children have known no life without their father as a grad student!

I feel infinite thanks to Renee for supporting me exactly as I needed to fully benefit from my academic experiences. I am also grateful for the example and support I received from Melanie Domenech Rodriguez as I developed as a clinician. Carolyn Barcus's constant presence offered me stable challenge and encouragement, which was always extended to my wife and children. And there are just too many other professors, supervisors, peers, and friends who kept me going when I considered taking other paths. But thank you to all of you who have had a positive impact on my life!

It is obvious to me and those close to me that my parents have given me support that cannot be repaid. My wife also deserves recognition for picking up my slack in the home for so many years and for constantly reminding me that things happen on the timeline that they are supposed to. I am grateful for the Creator's help as I have walked this path (which was frequently paved by The Bro) and for the wisdom that I have gained

on my journey through life.

Ákót'éego Diné nishlíigo naaltsoos áshlaa. Ahé'hee!

Merrill Legrand Jones

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At least 1-in-3 residents living in the U.S. identify as a member of a racial or ethnic minority group, and it is projected that members identifying with minority populations will account for over 50% of the total U.S. population before the year 2043 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). It could be reasonably expected, then, that social interaction and relationships may likely increase between minority and majority groups. Specifically, it is likely that friendships among members of different groups will also increase through positive social interaction across race, culture, and ethnicity. This may be especially relevant for small minorities such as Indigenous groups/tribes of the U.S. (i.e., "Native"). This study investigated interethnic friendship attitudes and experiences among Native emerging adults using a two-study design to obtain quantitative and qualitative data.

It may be necessary to explain my use of the term "Native" in reference to individuals and groups whose ancestry predates European colonization of the Americas. First and foremost, using terms from each Native group's language is the preferred way to address group affiliation (e.g., Diné vs. Navajo or Indian). "American Indian" and "Native American" have both come in and out of favor, but both have their roots in governmental labeling, which has often felt oppressive to Native peoples (Walbert, 2009; Yellow Bird, 1999). Other terms such as indigenous, aboriginal, and first nations/peoples have begun to carry a meaning of worldwide original peoples. Whereas this is clearly a sensitive and controversial topic among many Native individuals, scholars, and elders, and in absence of a more unanimous term, this author identifies as Native, broadly, and

Diné, specifically. I use Native throughout this dissertation to refer to North American original peoples.

A second point on use of language in this study is regarding my choice to emphasize ethnicity over race. Today's societies appear to be accepting greater diversity than the racial categorizations that historically have been overly simplistic and determined by physical markers. Past research has frequently noted racial differences, but rapidly increasing globalization seems to highlight more nuanced variations in cultural differences. Trimble and Dickson (2010) described ethnicity as group belonging based on cultural or national tradition or customs. They also noted that ethnic affiliation can be ascribed from the individual or by others, which seems more empowering and choice-based rather than founded in physical appearance. Multicultural identities seem to be better represented through ethnic affiliations and interethnic social relationships.

Whereas "social relationships are fundamental to human society" (Morimoto & Yang, 2013, p. 99) and are clearly part of most people's everyday lives, the scientific community and lay people alike have given great attention to social relationships, such as close friendships. Close friends provide support and often are trusted confidants, but a significant decline in the number of close confidants has been reported among U.S. adults (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Brashears, 2006). Of this reduced number of confidants, 20% or less were nonfamily (i.e., friends), and 1 in 4 individuals reported having no confidants. This introduction examines how past friendship research may relate to attitudes and experiences of interethnic friendships among Native emerging adults. Benefits for engaging in interethnic relationships/friendships will also be reviewed, with

a focus on better understanding of Native friendships and interethnic interaction.

Friendship Among Native Emerging Adults

Friendship literature is abundant for major populations (e.g., Whites, children, adolescents) and for large minority groups (e.g., Asians, Blacks, and Latino/Hispanic), but there is scant friendship information for small minority groups, like Natives. As such, findings from the larger minority friendship literature body and from studies on romantic relationships among Native emerging adults will also be used to support hypotheses for parallel processes in intimate relationship attitudes and experiences.

Native Identity

Van Styvendale (2008) argued that Native identity development is wrought with unique challenges that other minority and majority youth do not typically encounter. A major barrier that Native emerging adults may face is intergenerational loss of ethnic (tribal) specific culture (Duran, Duran, & Brave Heart, 1998). Cultural loss continues due to politics, peer pressure, and marketing that make it attractive to discard Native traditional ways. Reservation life also impacts Native identity and friendships, as does urban life for approximately 67% of U.S. Natives (Urban Indian Health Institute, 2012). For young urban Natives, friendship opportunities with other Natives may be limited. To create friendship networks, they may *have* to befriend ethnically different peers.

A friendship model by Fehr (1996) included voluntary involvement in the relationship as the foundational element, and friendships are not necessarily determined by social custom or contract. Clearly, Native youth voluntarily befriend non-Natives, and

this may be in part due to low numbers of Native individuals in the general population and in communities that are not located on or near reservations. In addition, higher levels of acculturation into mainstream U.S. culture by Natives living outside of reservation communities may also be a factor of Natives developing friendships with non-Natives.

Some of these phenomena may be related to issues of power and privilege among Natives and their ethnically-different counterparts. Although this is not a primary focus of this study, elements of power and privilege will likely be apparent throughout this document. This idea will be revisited in the final discussion as it pertains to the quantitative results and qualitative findings.

Natives and their Peers

Because of the wide dispersion of the Native population across the U.S., many Native youth do not have opportunities to "hang out" with same-ethnic/race peers, and they engage in peer interactions across ethnicity to experience the benefits of friendship and typical peer socialization. Analyses of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) data indicated that Native girls were more likely to have interethnic relationships than White girls (Joyner & Kao, 2000). Joyner and Kao also found that nearly every Native participant in the Add Health sample reported at least one interethnic friendship, whereas Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians reported dramatically less interethnic friendships. Joyner and Kao controlled for opportunity and found that Native youth were still more likely to have interethnic friendships than Whites and larger minority groups.

Vaquera and Kao (2008) examined the Add Health data for reciprocated best

friends, which was indicated by both friends ranking each other in their first positions. They found that the non-Native first-friends reported by Native girls only reciprocated the Native girls as first friends 59% of the time; whereas, girls from other racial/ethnic groups received much higher reciprocation of friendships. This means that non-Native girls less frequently listed Native girls as their best friends, revealing important differences in how non-Native girls perceive their friendships with Native girls, and vice versa. These limited data represent much of the data on friendships among Native youth, and the findings from this study will add to existing data about how Native emerging adults think about and engage in friendships across ethnicity and race.

Benefits of Interethnic Friendship

Benefits at the Individual Level

Numerous benefits have been found for engaging in interethnic and outgroup relationships (e.g., Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Hoffman, Wallach, & Sanchez, 2010; Troy, Lewis-Smith, & Laurenceau, 2006). Interacting with people of different groups produces benefits such as greater empathic joy and stronger support networks. Regardless whether the effects come from quantity or quality of friendships, individuals enjoy the benefits of interethnic interaction. This was clearly found among individuals who helped outgroup members (Smith, Keating, & Stotland, 1989). Helping is just one feature of friendships that promotes psychological and physical well-being, and friendship has long been associated with happiness (Demir, Ozdemir, & Weitekamp, 2006).

Educational benefits were found for Black graduate students, where friendship

formation among these students seemed to protect them from: feelings of isolation, disconnection from their institutions, and failing to obtain their graduate degrees (Johnson-Bailey, Valentine, Cervero, & Bowles, 2008). Also, reduced prejudice from intergroup relations was associated with more interethnic friendships among first-year college students (Schofield, Hausmann, Ye, & Woods, 2010). Another study that found strong benefits of outgroup friendships was conducted for 5 years with students at UCLA (Levin, Van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003). They found that having more outgroup friendships was related to more positive perceptions of diversity of students on campus and the belief that they were all considered to be members of the same college community.

Additional support for improved perceptions of interethnic relationships was identified by Turner and Feddes (2011). They found that intimate self-disclosure predicted better perceptions of outgroups over time when the individuals reported having a friend from an outgroup. Intergroup anxiety was also reduced within a 6-week period, and mediated the more positive generalized outgroup attitudes. From interviews with friendship pairs of indigenous and nonindigenous friends, Fozdar (2011) found that racial differences were perceived as invisible within the friendship, but there were also opportunities for relationship management and discussion of cultural differences in relation to other interethnic contact. While these differences were reported to be sensitive issues between the friends, participants also were able to develop greater trust with their friends, even though this may not have extended to contact with other racially different individuals. Fozdar's work highlights a greater need for emphasizing and engendering more positive intergroup and interethnic relations, especially for Natives.

Benefits at the Societal Level

Society could obviously benefit from efforts to improve interethnic relationships, and some researchers are working toward making those efforts more successful. One finding was that a sense of community or teamwork is a critical motivator for people to interact more cooperatively with members of mixed groups (Hoffman et al., 2010). By engaging in community activities, members reported a more positive sense of community belonging, and they felt connected in their ethnically diverse communities and school systems (Hoffman, Morales-Knight, & Wallach, 2007). Unfortunately, an "us versus them" mentality remains in many contexts, but this can be reduced by focusing on and working toward mutual goals (Allport, 1954). Indeed, divisive perceptions of difference can be changed. Research found that racial tension and ethnocentrism can be significantly reduced through participation in multiethnic community groups which are service-work oriented (Hoffman, Wallach, Sanchez, & Afkhami 2009).

These reductions in racial tension and ethnocentrism seem to go hand-in-hand with the deconstruction of negative stereotypes as they are disconfirmed through positive and goal-oriented activities with members of other groups (Pettigrew, 1997). It seems likely that at least some friendships develop during these types of activities, and these positive intergroup interactions may not be available for many people unless local organizations, communities, and governments help facilitate them (Hoffman, Espinosa Parker, Sanchez, & Wallach, 2009). These friendships, when they include members of different groups, also benefit individuals and society through improved racial attitudes, less intergroup anxiety, more empathy with outgroups, and decreased negative intergroup

behaviors (for a full review, see Schofield et al., 2010). Turner and Feddes (2011) found that reduction of intergroup anxiety mediated more positive outgroup attitudes, and they sum up the benefits of outgroup friendships with the assertion that intergroup friends seem to foster more harmonious cross-group relations.

Friendship Theories and Factors

Theories on Friendship

Prominent theories about friendship development and maintenance are numerous, but largely they fall into a few broad categories, which are: opportunity, social status, commonality, and progress throughout the lifespan. Opportunity theories date back to 1954, when Allport introduced his contact theory which suggests that more opportunities for exposure and interaction will increase the likelihood of befriending those with whom one makes contact. He added that certain conditions (such as personal interactions with equal status, intergroup cooperation to achieve common goals, and social/legal support) must be met or that contact would likely result in bias, prejudice, and/or stereotype.

A few years later, Blumer (1958) suggested that friendships develop from a desire to gain social status or to escape disadvantaged position based on group membership. In 1961, Newcomb posited a theory based on perceived commonality with others, such as shared interests. This theory also focused on shared enjoyment to achieve balance in life, rather than just on perceived commonality. Later, Tesch (1983) described friendships as a lifespan process with various stages of psychosocial development. This developmental theory states that friendship factors seem to vary in importance and presence in the

evolution of developmental stages. Furthermore, emerging adulthood is seen as a critical time for friendship development because friendships that develop in early adulthood tend to be longer lasting than friendships developed in childhood.

Factors Associated with Friendship Development

Factors associated with friendship development also seem to fall into a few major areas, including homophily, propinquity, friendship reciprocation, and self-disclosure. Homophily is described as a love of sameness, and this was found to be a major predictor of friendship development in multiple studies of Add Health data (Kao & Joyner, 2004, 2006; Morimoto & Yang, 2013). Propinquity is proximal or physical closeness, and it has been researched in ethnically/racially diverse communities and schools (Britton, 2011; Tavares, 2011). Reciprocation of friendship is posited to be a better indicator of intimacy in close-friendships because both friends' reports are factored (Nelson, Thorne, & Shapiro, 2011; Vaquera & Kao, 2008). Disclosure in friendships has been found to be a prominent factor whereas it seems to facilitate the intimacy necessary for connection and bonding to occur in close friendships (Turner & Feddes, 2011). Karbo (2006) stated that disclosure is necessary for successful and close friendships, and it should include both quantity and quality (Altman & Taylor, 1973).

These primary friendship factors seem to overlap with the theories, and there may be fluidity and connection among the theories and factors. The connections among multiple theories and factors seem to be consistent with many Native worldviews that relationships (among all aspects of earth and life) are impacted by many influences and

tend to evolve across time, which goes above and beyond concepts such as homophily.

Related Research on Native Romantic Relationships

Jones (2011) assessed predictors of engagement in romantic relationships among Native emerging adults, and participants reported that family members had the strongest influence on their relationship attitudes, followed by close friends. Jones found that their past experience in educational settings and romantic relationships had the greatest impact on future romantic relationships. A significant predictor of dating outside of their ethnic group was Natives' participation in multicultural activities, which coincides with opportunity theories and propinquity factors. These participants reported significantly more interactions with non-Natives, and particularly with White-Americans, and they reported high openness to engaging in future romantic relationships with non-Natives. This study expected similar quantitative results for close friendships, especially with regard to parental/other family support and past friendships. This study also sought richer qualitative data in terms of close friendship development and maintenance factors.

Summary and Research Questions

Little information specific to Native friendship patterns, especially as it pertains to close friendship attitudes and experiences, is available in current literature. The findings thus far have generally come from analyses of nationwide projects among youth, which typically underrepresent Native perspectives. Jones (2011) surveyed Native emerging adults about their perspectives on interethnic romance. The factors that were identified in

that study were also analyzed in this study, along with other cultural, contextual, and demographic aspects. In addition, a qualitative inquiry was conducted with Native/non-Native dyads to identify themes and patterns within those friendships.

This multiple-paper study analyzed extant quantitative data, along with conducting qualitative interviews, to more fully explore the elements of, functioning, challenges to, and benefits of Native friendships that cross ethnic differences. Paper 1 examines trends in close interethnic friendships among Native emerging adults, and paper 2 investigates themes and qualities between Native/non-Native friendships.

References

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Altman, L., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York, NY: Holt, Rienhart, & Winston.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, 1*, 3-7.

Britton, M. L. (2011). Close together but worlds apart? Residential integration and interethnic friendship in Houston. *City & Community, 10*(2), 182-204.

Demir, M., Ozdemir, M., & Weitekamp, L. A. (2006). Looking to happy tomorrows with friends: Best and close friendships as they predict happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 8*, 243-271.

Duran, B., Duran, E., & Brave Heart, M. Y. H. (1998). Native Americans and the trauma of history. In R. Thornton (Ed.), *Studying Native America*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fozdar, F. (2011). "I've never looked at someone and thought what colour they are": Contact theory and interethnic friendship in New Zealand. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 32*(4), 383-405.

Gijsberts, M., & Dagevos, J. (2007). The socio-cultural integration of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands: Identifying neighbourhood effects on multiple integration outcomes. *Housing Studies, 22*(5), 805-831.

Hoffman, A. J., Espinosa Parker, Sanchez, E., & Wallach, J. (2009). *Unity through community service activities: Strategies to bridge ethnic and cultural divides.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Hoffman, A. J., Morales-Knight, L. F., & Wallach, J. (2007). Gardening activities, education, and self-esteem: Learning outside the classroom. *Urban Education, 42*, 403-411.

Hoffman, A. J., Wallach, J., & Sanchez, E. (2010). Community service work, civic engagement, and 'giving back' to society: Key factors in improving interethnic relationships and achieving 'connectedness' in ethnically diverse communities. *Australian Social Work, 63*(4), 418-430.

Hoffman, A. J., Wallach, J., Sanchez, E., & Afkhami, H. (2009). Improving interpersonal communication through community service. *The Community College Enterprise, 15*(2), 1-12.

Johnson-Bailey, J., Valentine, T. S., Cervero, R. M., & Bowles, T. A. (2008). Lean on me: The support experiences of Black graduate students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 77*, 365-381.

Jones, M. L. (2011). *Attitudinal and experiential factors of interethnic romantic relationships among Native American emerging adults* (Master's thesis). Utah State University, Logan, UT. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/1100

Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2000). School racial composition and adolescent racial homophily. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*(3), 810-825.

Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2004). Do race and ethnicity matter among friends? Activities among interethnic, interethnic, and intraethnic adolescent friends. *The Sociological Quarterly, 45*(3), 557-573.

Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2006). Do Hispanic and Asian adolescents practice panethnicity in friendship choices. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*(5), 972-992.

Karbo, (2006). Friendship: The laws of attraction. *Psychology Today*, *39*, 90-95.

Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 76-92.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Brashears, M. E. (2006). Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review, 71*(3), 353-375.

Morimoto, S. A., & Yang, S. (2013). What friendship entails: An empirical analysis of graduate students' social networks. *Sociological Spectrum, 33*, 99-116, 2013.

Nelson, P. A., Thorne, A., & Shapiro, L. A. (2011). I'm outgoing and she's reserved: The reciprocal dynamics of personality in close friendships in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 79*(5), 1113-1147.

Newcomb T. M. (1961). *The acquaintance process.* New York, NY: Holt, Rienhart & Winstron.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology, 23*, 173-185.

Schofield, J. W., Hausmann, L. R. M., Ye, F., & Woods, R. L. (2010). Intergroup friendships on campus: Predicting close and casual friendships between White and African American first-year college students. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*(5), 585-602.

Smith, K. D., Keating, J. P., & Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effect of denying feedback on a victim's status to empathic witnesses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 641-650.

Tavares, C. D. (2011). Why can't we be friends: The role of religious congregation-based social contact for close interethnic adolescent friendships. *Review of Religious Research, 52*(4), 439-453.

Tesch, S. A. (1983). Review of friendship development across the life span. *Human Development, 26*, 266-276.

Trimble, J. E., & Dickson, R. (2010). *Ethnic identity. Report from Center for Cross-Cultural Research*. Retrieved from http://pandora.cii.wwu.edu/trimble/research_themes/ethnicity_identity.htm

Troy, A. B., Lewis-Smith, J., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2006). Interethnic and intraracial romantic relationships: The search for differences in satisfaction, conflict, and attachment style. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*(1), 65-80.

Turner, R. N., & Feddes, A. R. (2011). How intergroup friendship works: A longitudinal study of friendship effects on outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 914-923.

Urban Indian Health Institute. (2012). *Addressing depression among American Indians and Alaska Natives: A literature review.* Seattle, WA: Author.

U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *Profile of general population and housing characteristics.* Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productv iew.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1&prodType=table

Van Styvendale, N. (2008). The trans/historicity of trauma in Jeannette Armstrong's *Slash* and Sherman Alexie's *Indian Killer*. *Studies in the Novel, 40*(1&2), 203-223.

Vaquera, E., & Kao, G. (2008). Do you like me as much as I like you? Friendship reciprocity and its effects on school outcomes among adolescents. *Social Science Research, 37*, 55-72.

Walbert, K. (2009). American Indian vs. Native American: A note on terminology. *The North Carolina Humanities Council.* Retrieved from http://www.learnnc.org/lp/ed itions/nc-american-indians/5526

Yellow Bird, M. (1999). Indian, American Indian, and Native Americans: Counterfeit identities. *Winds of Change: A Magazine for American Indian Education and Opportunity,* (14), 1. Retrieved from http://www.aistm.org/yellowbirdessay.htm

CHAPTER 2

PREDICTORS OF INTERETHNIC CLOSE FRIENDSHIPS AMONG

NATIVE EMERGING ADULTS: A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Abstract

This study examined the attitudes and experiences of 114 Native emerging adults regarding close friendships with non-Native peers. Extant data was analyzed to identify trends and patterns among these friendships. The results were organized into contextual and cultural correlates of past and future close friendships with non-Natives. Significant predictors of past close friendships with Whites included: cultural - past parental support ($t = 6.488$, $p < .001$); contextual - past multicultural experiences ($t = 3.852$, $p < .001$), racial composition in college student body ($t = 3.083$, $p = .003$), and diversity climate in high school ($t = 2.468$, $p = .015$). Predictors of openness to future friendships with Whites included only cultural factors of past friendships ($t = 5.187$, $p < .001$) and past parental support ($t = 2.507$, $p = .014$). For friendships with members of ethnic minority groups, predictors of past minority friendships included: cultural - past parental support ($t = 3.514$, $p = .001$); contextual - diversity climate in childhood community ($t = -2.230$, $p = .028$) and diversity climate in high school ($t = 2.096$, $p = .039$). Predictors of future minority friendships included: cultural - past friendships ($t = 6.045$, $p < .001$); contextual - time lived on a reservation ($t = -2.966$, $p = .004$). These data seem to provide evidence that Natives may be socialized to be more willing to befriend ethnically-different peers.

Introduction

Individuals develop friendships with others for many reasons, but sometimes how young people make friends cannot be easily explained. This may be particularly difficult to understand for Native emerging adults because Natives are frequently lumped into "other" categories. The "representative" samples in many studies typically include only minute numbers of Native participants (similar to the 1.7% of the U.S. population who identified as Native in the 2010 Census), and the Native voice is regularly ignored due to minimal data. This study sought to give voice to Native experiences by assessing Native emerging adults' attitudes about interethnic friendships and exploring factors associated with interest or willingness to befriend ethnically different peers.

This study first presents the literature base for relevant theories and factors of close friendships, along with friendship development, and later these elements will be organized into the constructs that emerged from preliminary descriptive and correlational analyses. The construct labels of contextual and cultural factors seemed to be the most accurate way to organize the relevant friendship factors, particularly as they seem to relate with common ways of knowing within many Native cultures.

Friendship Theories and Factors

Reviewed here are a few of the many friendship theories, specifically for contact, opportunity, group position, and social exchange. Additionally, factors such as propinquity, equality, homophily, and reciprocity are briefly discussed, as these seem to more closely align with the experiences of Native emerging adults in today's society.

Contact, opportunity, and propinquity. Allport (1954) introduced contact theory as an explanation for how relationships and attitudes develop, and he included a set of conditions that influence the interpretation of this contact. Conditions that facilitate positive relationship development include: participants must have equal status, must be cooperatively working toward common objectives, and must be interacting within accepted societal/legal environments. Pettigrew (1998) added that, in addition to Allport's conditions for positive contact, it should also be frequent and within an intimate context in which understanding, communication, and affection can develop. Allport cautioned that when the contact conditions are not met, prejudice and stereotype can be confirmed along with increased negative contact. However, when the conditions are met, opportunities are created that allow for and foster the development and maintenance of close interethnic friendships.

Britton (2011) explained that positive interaction between groups may be distinguished as one of two types of contact: weak (i.e., dependent on several factors for positive interaction) or strong (i.e., positive interactions may occur independent of specific conditions). Britton found that the strong form of the contact hypothesis was evident among interethnic friends who experienced greater exposure to outgroup members in their residential neighborhoods. However, this was only apparent for members in higher privileged positions who had higher levels of residential exposure with outgroup members, regardless their race or ethnicity. Members in lower privileged positions had fewer interethnic friendships. It would be interesting to investigate whether Allport's (1954) condition of equal status, if applied to Britton's sample, would create

benefits of having more interethnic friendships for those who were in the lower privileged status.

Britton (2011) also reviewed research that supported a theory that is similar to contact theory, called macrostructural theory (Blau, 1977), emphasizing that residential proximity is a necessary precursor for meaningful intergroup contact. In fact, a review of contact literature by Pettigrew (1998) concluded that contact effects can be positive simply from physical proximity, outside of Allport's (1954) specific conditions. Britton's review of macrostructural theory described intergroup relationships outside of the immediate neighborhood context as weaker than relationships developed within immediate neighborhoods. This seems to be the basis for the related opportunity theory by Hallinan and Smith (1985), which focused on the number of opportunities for intergroup contact. They suggested that increased opportunities for intergroup contact is the determinant for more intergroup friendships that are positive and intimate.

Propinquity factors are a primary feature of contact and opportunity theories, and the maintenance of intimate closeness in a friendship seems to need propinquity, which is frequent physical closeness with friends. Several studies with children and adolescents demonstrate that propinquity functions at different levels, with most proximal levels providing the greatest propinquity (e.g., classroom, immediate neighbors, church members) and lessening propinquity as spatial closeness moves toward distal social arenas (e.g., classroom → school → district, or immediate neighbors → city districts → state regions) and more dispersed settings (e.g., elementary homeroom → ability classes in middle schools → specialty classes in high school).

Group position, social exchange, and reciprocity. The group position theory by Blumer (1958) explained that there are dominant societal groups with clear privileges and non-dominant groups with clear disadvantages. This theory stated that prejudice develops as the dominant group works to maintain its dominant position, and contains implicit friendship factors of equality versus inequality, and homophily, which is "the love of the same." It seems that many people are afraid of or threatened by difference, and those in positions of power and privilege work to maintain their status. In contrast, the people who are in disadvantaged or oppressed positions seek equality and are often willing to venture out of their groups to obtain greater status. This frequently means that individuals may have to compromise their values or selves to assimilate to majority values, thereby marginalizing their beliefs and practices. It is easy for those in advantaged positions to demand conformation to their customs, but for members of minority groups, acquiring desired position likely means loss of culture and lifestyle through that social exchange.

Social exchange theory is related to group position, but functions on a cost-benefit paradigm for each friend (Rosenfeld, 2005; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959). The idea is that friendships develop and are maintained when no better alternatives exist. The friendship meets both friends' needs without either friend having to give up more than they receive. This theory seems to operate based on reciprocity, and in the ideal friendship, reciprocity is easily attained. However, it is likely that members of privileged groups, "sacrifice" much less than disadvantaged individuals. Many aspects of culture have been "exchanged" for social commodities that likely have not benefitted less privileged individuals as much as the social commodities would for persons in power. For example,

scholarship money to attend a prestigious academic institution may provide a majority group member a jumpstart to a lucrative career. For reservation Native youth, it may not help them accomplish anything without a strong social support system at the institution and a clear sense of how a prestigious degree can benefit their families and communities.

Theoretical implications for Natives. One of the most important aspects of these theories that needs to be emphasized, is that there are clear power and privilege differences in U.S. society which have a significant impact on the development of intergroup friendships and other relationships. Prejudice and discrimination maintain lower status for ethnic minorities and make it extremely difficult for minorities to overcome financial and social hardship. A report by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2010) reviewed how socioeconomic status (SES) negatively impacts ethnic and racial minorities. Examples that were noted in the report included: Native families were the second poorest in household income (Blacks were the poorest), and Whites earned more than any other group even when education and experience were comparable (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Natives and other minority groups experience these status and power differences in all aspects of daily life, including friendships.

An example of inequitable friendships was found in a study that examined friendship satisfaction in relation to the power between the friends, and friends who felt that the power was unequal in the friendship were significantly less satisfied than friendships in which they rated the power as equal (Veniegas & Peplau, 1997). This sense of equality lends itself as a foundation for more intimate friendship qualities, such as disclosure in the friendship and reciprocity of interest and enjoyment (Karbo, 2006;

Turner & Feddes, 2011; Vaquera & Kao, 2008). Equity among friends often includes

commonalities in values, actions, and ideas, in addition to similarity in status, race, and

ethnicity (González, Herrmann, Kertész, & Vicsek, 2007; Kao & Joyner, 2006).

However, friendships can develop in spite of differences, and the factors related to

homophily may be based on other similarities as well, like religion (Tavares, 2011).

Considerations for Native Interethnic
Friendships

Native youth may face unique challenges when it comes to finding opportunities

for interaction with same-ethnic peers. Given the ubiquity of need for connection and

belonging and the fact that Native populations are small as compared to most minority

groups and majority groups, the only option for many Native emerging adults may be to

seek out belonging and connection with non-Natives. Thus, patterns of connection to

mainstream U.S. culture and traditional Native culture may be extremely relevant in

understanding the friendship choices of Native youth.

One of the probable reasons why Native youth select their friends is opportunity,

and other contextual factors that may contribute, might be: diversity climates in

communities/schools, ethnic/racial makeup of student-bodies and communities, amount

of time living in or visiting areas with high concentration of Natives (e.g., reservations),

and engagement in multicultural activities. These contexts in which Native emerging

adults experience their lives are conceptualized as having at least some impact on their

attitudes about potential friends. Specifically, it was found that community diversity

climates during childhood and participation in multicultural activities were strong

predictors of interethnic romantic relationships among Native emerging adults. These factors were examined in Jones (2011), and despite that study's focus on romantic relationships, there exists non-sexual intimacy in most romantic relationships that is similar to intimacy in close friendships.

Jones (2011) assessed other factors as well, which may be conceptualized as cultural influences on friendship selection, such as: parental and family influences, friend and peer influence, ethnic identity, and previous interethnic relationships. These types of variables are tied to culture inasmuch as family values and identity tend to impact beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. These values are often based on cultural customs, and affect interactions with others (Brown & Bakken, 2011, Chester, Jones, Zalot, & Sterrett, 2007; Uskul, Lalonde, & Cheng, 2007). It seems that most Native emerging adults still feel at least some sense of family obligation, which appears to be closely connected with their Native cultures. Additionally, parental support for all romantic relationships was strongly related to participant investment in those relationships. Interestingly, familial attitudes were not significantly related to involvement in interethnic romances or willingness to engage in future interethnic relationships. Therefore, familial attitudes were not included in this study, but parental support was retained.

In the Jones (2011) study, participants identified with both Native and White culture rather strongly, and these factors were significantly related with their romantic relationships (i.e., stronger Native identity related with more relationships with other Natives, and stronger White-American identity related with more relationships with White-American partners). This study on friendship factors expected results that would

be similar to those found in the research on romantic relationships.

Summary and Research Questions

There is a dearth of research Native emerging adults, especially as it pertains to close friendship involvement and attitudes. The major findings thus far have generally come from analyses of nationwide projects among youth of all ethnicities and races, which have provided little information specific to Native friendship patterns. Variables examined in this study included cultural variables (e.g., identity, familial attitudes, experiences with discrimination), contextual variables (e.g., previous interethnic relationships, community and educational ethnic/racial compositions, diversity climates), and demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, SES). Therefore, the following research questions are the focus of this paper on the experiences and attitudes of interethnic close friendships in a sample of Native emerging adults.

a. What are the reported trends and patterns of interethnic friendships, including the impact of demographic variables on their interethnic friendships?

b. How are contextual factors (e.g., community diversity, reservation activity, multicultural involvement) linked to interethnic friendships?

c. How are cultural factors (e.g., ethnic identity, discrimination experiences, family attitudes) linked to interethnic friendships?

Methods

Participants

Participants included 114 Native young adults, ages 18-25, who were affiliated tribal members, or children of an affiliated member, and they represented over 70 distinct

North American indigenous groups from Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.. See Table 2.1 for

further demographic details.

Procedures

This study was approved by the Utah State University Institutional Review Board.

The extant data were originally collected via an online survey via snowball sampling

Table 2.1

Participant Demographics

Variables	*n*	%
Ethnic identification		
Native only	54	47.4
Native and White-American	42	36.8
Native and other ethnicities	18	15.8
Age		
18-19	25	21.9
20-21	25	21.9
22-23	26	22.8
24-25	38	33.3
Sex		
Women	83	72.8
Men	31	27.2
Education level		
Bachelor's degree or higher	36	31.6
Some post-high school (college, trade, etc.)	63	55.3
High school diploma/G.E.D.	12	10.5
Less than high school completion	3	2.6
Household Income in Childhood		
$100,000 or more	18	15.8
$50,000-99,999	39	34.2
$20,000-49,999	39	34.2
$19,999 or under	18	15.8
Years lived on reservations		
None	57	50.0
2 or less	14	12.3
3 or more	43	37.7
Frequency of visits to reservations		
Less than yearly	43	37.7
More than yearly	71	62.3

occurred through university, community, and social networks. All regions of the U.S. were represented, along with some from Canada and Mexico. Incentive included an option to enter a drawing for one of 11 gift cards to an online store in the amount of $15 (10) or $100 (1). Appendix A includes recruitment materials and informed consent.

Instruments

    Discrimination. Discrimination experiences were measured using the short-form scale of the Daily Racial Microaggressions (DRM; Mercer, Ziegler-Hill, Wallace, & Hayes, 2010). This 14-item self-report survey was found to meaningfully correlate with other race-/ethnicity-related scales. Overall microaggression experiences, two constructs (microinsults and microinvalidations), and seven individual factors are measured. The items are scored on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale, where: 1 = *never happened to me*, 2 = *happened to me, but I was not upset*, 3 = *happened to me and I was slightly upset*, 4 = *happened to me and I was moderately upset*, and 5 = *happened to me and I was extremely upset*. The DRM can be scored dichotomously (are experiences reported: 1= *no*, or 2-5 = *yes*) or continuously (how upset by experiences: 1-5) with internal consistencies that were reported by scale developers at α = .95 and .94, respectively. Reliability in the extant dataset was scored continuously with a Cronbach's alpha of .87 for the total score.

    Cross-ethnic social activity. Exposure to and attitudes about interethnic contact were gathered using the Multicultural Experiences Inventory (MEI; Ramirez, 1998). This 29-item self-report measure assesses multicultural interaction and engagement in multicultural activity among same culture, majority culture, other minority. The items are scored on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale, where: 1 = *almost entirely Native American*, 2 =

mostly Native American with a few minorities from other ethnic groups, 3 = *mixed Anglos/White, Native American, and other minorities about equally*, 4 = *mostly Anglos/White with a few minorities including Native American*, 5 = *almost entirely Anglos/White*. Reliability has been estimated at .86, and the MEI has been correlated with racial attitudes and cultural orientation to majority White culture (Lee, 1999). Reliability in the extant dataset included a Cronbach's alpha of .95 for the experiences total, and .94 and .90 for the past experiences and present experiences, respectively.

Ethnic identity. Ethnic identification was assessed using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). This 12-item self-report inventory was developed to assess ethnic identity exploration and commitment. The items are scored on a Likert-type scale ranging from one (*strongly agree*) to four (*strongly disagree*). The current version has shown reliability alphas ranging from .81 to .89 for 11 different ethnic groups (Roberts et al., 1999) and .90 for college students. Reliability in the extant dataset yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .91 for the total score.

In addition, identification with distinct cultures independent of other cultural identification was measured by the Orthogonal Cultural Identification Scale (OCIS; Oetting & Beauvais, 1991). This six-item self-report inventory asks participants to rate their level of investment and engagement across six ethnic or cultural backgrounds. For this study, scores were included for Native culture and White culture. The OCIS has been shown to have good reliability, above .80 (Oetting & Beauvais, 1991). Reliability in the extant dataset yielded Cronbach's alphas of .92 for both the Native and White cultures.

Attitudes about and experiences in interethnic friendships. Several items were

generated to gather specific data regarding the attitudes about and experiences of Native

emerging adults in close friendships. For each of the questions below that end "with…,"

participants were asked to respond to each of four categories that ranged from most like

me ("members of your tribe") to least like me ("Anglos/Whites"). Previous friendships

and attitudes about engaging in close friendships in the future were measured with

questions like, "How often have you pursued close friendships in the past with..." and

"How likely are you to pursue a close friendship in the future with..." with possible

answers of: 1 (*not very*) to 4 (*very*). Parental support for close friendships were measured

with questions like: "How supported by your parents have you felt (would you feel) with

friends..." with possible answers of: 1 (*not very*) to 4 (*very*). Reasons for not engaging in

close friendships were measured with questions like, "Which reason most accurately

reflects why you have never made friends with..." and "Which reason most accurately

reflects why you would never make friends in the future with..." with six response

options: *a) lack of opportunity b) no interest c) negative family pressure d) negative peer*

pressure e) negative past relationships f) have had (*other___* was an option, but it was

not selected by any participant). Influences on participant attitudes were also measured

by ranking several factors (e.g., past relationships, peers, family) from 1 (*least*) to 10

(*most*). Other family support was measured with questions like, "I have a close family

member who has been (is) involved in a close friendship with a non-Native:" with four

responses that indicated *yes* or *no* and whether the family was supportive. Perceived

diversity climates in community and educational settings measuring climates from

childhood/elementary to adulthood/college were measured with items like: "Thinking

about the overall climate for diversity and equality, [it] was/is..." with possible responses of 1 (*mostly negative*) to 4 (*mostly positive*) for two community environments, and for high school and college settings.

 Demographic information. Participants were asked to report tribal affiliation(s), ethnic identification(s), spiritual/religious affiliation, relationship status, income, gender, and education level attained. Additionally, reservation residence and activity was queried, along with the estimated ethnic compositions of their high schools and university/college environments, as these are likely settings for emerging adult friendships.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

 Frequencies of participants' interethnic close friendship experiences and attitudes are presented in Table 2.2. Table 2.3 presents strength of parental support for friendships across ethnicity. Given the mixed results in the literature and the lack of significant

Table 2.2

Percentages of Close Friendships Experiences by Ethnicity

Close friendship type	n	%
Past friendship involvement with…		
White-Americans	85	74.6
Other ethnic minority members	55	48.2
Native other tribes	45	39.5
Native same tribe	38	33.3
Openness to engage in future friendships with…		
White-Americans	84	73.7
Other ethnic minority members	72	63.2
Native other tribes	66	57.9
Native same tribe	51	44.7

Table 2.3

Means and Standard Deviations of Natives' Parental Support
(min = 1, max = 4)

Close friendship type	M	SD
For past friendships with…		
White-Americans	3.52	.694
Other ethnic minority members	3.43	.752
Native other tribes	3.58	.664
Native same tribe	3.56	.757
For future friendships with…		
White-Americans	3.55	.682
Other ethnic minority members	3.51	.719
Native other tribes	3.62	.643
Native same tribe	3.59	.714

differences between men and women in the Jones (2011) study, in addition to having a

low percentage of men in this sample, no analysis was performed to check for sex

differences on the variables in this study. Other statistics include perceived influence on

their attitudes about intimate relationships; participants rated parents/family as the

strongest of ten influences on their current attitudes and close friends as second. These

were followed by other types of peer, cultural, and societal factors. The reason that was

most reported for not engaging in past or future close friendships with both Natives and

other ethnic minority members was *few available members*. Table 2.4 presents the

independent variables that factored into subsequent regression analyses.

Correlational Statistics

      Table 2.5 presents bivariate correlations among the variables. Past family

socialization and previous interethnic friendships were more strongly correlated with both

Table 2.4

Descriptive Statistics for Correlates of Friendship Experiences

Correlates	*M*	*SD*	min	max
Covariate				
Household Income in Childhood	2.53	.986	1	5
Cultural				
OCIS Native	2.85	.836	1	4
OCIS White	3.10	.770	1	4
MEIM total	3.24	.593	1	4
DRM total	2.47	.847	1	5
Past parental support with other minority friends	3.43	.752	1	4
Past parental support with White/Anglo friends	3.52	.694	1	4
Contextual				
Diversity climate in childhood community	2.83	.915	1	4
Diversity climate in high school setting	2.74	.971	1	4
Student composition in college/university	3.57	.811	1	5
MEI past & present experiences	3.24	.870	1	5
MEI past experiences	3.35	1.044	1	5
Years lived on reservation	2.10	1.358	1	5
Friendship Experiences				
Engagement in past friendships with other minority	2.80	.983	1	4
Engagement in past friendships with White/Anglo	3.21	.964	1	4
Likelihood of future friendship with other minority	3.23	.866	1	4
Likelihood of future friendship with White/Anglo	3.38	.835	1	4

Note. OCIS = Orthogonal Cultural Identity Scale, MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, DRM = Daily Racial Microaggressions Scale, MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory

past engagement in and future intention to engage in relationships with other ethnic

minorities and Whites. Additionally, almost all variables assessing cultural engagement,

previous multicultural experiences, and diversity climates across developmental contexts

were significantly linked to past engagement in and future openness to friendships with

Whites. Interestingly, Native cultural identity was significantly positively related with

openness to future friendships with minority group members. Unexpectedly, experiences

of microaggressions did not significantly relate with interethnic friendships.

Table 2.5

Correlations Between Independent and Dependent Variables

Independent variables	Past close friendships w/minorities	Past close friendships w/ Whites	Likelihood of future close friendships w/ minorities	Likelihood of future close friendships w/ Whites
Covariate				
Household income in childhood	-.054	.221*	.079	.249**
Cultural				
OCIS Native	.102	-.198*	.213*	-.045
OCIS White	-.014	.361**	.027	.320**
MEIM total	.118	-.143	.179	-.050
DRM total	.010	-.177	.070	-.169
Past parental support w/minority friends	.347**	.448**	.379**	.486**
Past parental support w/White friends	.324**	.603**	.318**	.576**
Past friendships w/minority friends		.420**	.580**	.364**
Past friendships w/White friends	.420**		.389**	.692**
Contextual				
Childhood community diversity climate	-.097	-.032	-.189*	-.034
High school diversity climate	.141	.218*	-.208*	.031
College/university student composition	.015	.300*	.056	.205*
MEI past & present experiences	.087	.484**	-.014	.233*
MEI past experiences	.142	.481**	.020	.197*
Time living on reservation	-.196*	-.350**	-.203*	-.184

Note. OCIS = Orthogonal Cultural Identity Scale, MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, DRM = Daily Racial Microaggressions Scale, MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory.

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Multiple Regression

  Cultural correlates. Table 2.6 presents the regression models assessing the cumulative effect of cultural correlates of friendships with Whites. Regressions for friendships with minorities were also performed and are described later in the text. For both groups, step 1 included the covariate related to SES, step 2 introduced the ethnic identity variables, and step 3 added experiential factors. As a predictor of past and future

Table 2.6

Regressions for Cultural Correlates of Past and Future Close Friendships with Whites

Step	Predictors	Adj. R^2	F	p	Beta	t	p
	Past close friendships with Whites						
1		.038	5.348	.023			
	Household income in childhood				.217	2.313	.023
2		.115	4.531	.002			
	Household income in childhood				.164	1.780	.078
	OCIS Native				-.121	-.931	.354
	OCIS White				.234	2.384	.019
	MEIM total				-.044	-.352	.726
3		.367	11.510	<.001			
	Household income in childhood				.090	1.139	.257
	OCIS Native				-.145	-1.303	.196
	OCIS White				.114	1.336	.184
	MEIM Total				.075	.680	.498
	DRM Total				-.104	-1.182	.240
	Past parental support of White friends				.520	6.488	<.001
	Future close friendships with Whites						
1		.050	6.740	.011			
	Household income in childhood				.242	2.596	.011
2		.070	3.038	.021			
	Household income in childhood				.201	2.122	.036
	OCIS Native				.046	.342	.733
	OCIS White				.215	2.134	.035
	MEIM total				.046	.342	.634
3		.479	15.311	.000			
	Household income in childhood				.081	1.129	.262
	OCIS Native				.119	1.162	.248
	OCIS White				.038	.486	.628
	MEIM total				.044	.445	.657
	DRM total				-.146	-1.822	.071
	Past parental support of White Friends				.216	2.507	.014
	Past friendships with Whites				.520	5.187	<.001

Note. OCIS = Orthogonal Cultural Identity Scale, MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, DRM = Daily Racial Microaggressions Scale, MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory

friendships with Whites, household income in childhood was a significant predictor by itself, but did not remain so in step 3. Identity variables included White cultural identity as a significant predictor of past and present friendships with Whites as it appeared in step 2, but it was no longer significant in step 3. In step 3, when parental support of White friends was added to the model for past friendships with Whites, it dominated as the only significant predictor with all variables in the model. Parental support was also significant for future friendships with Whites, but past relationship with Whites was clearly the strongest predictor of future relationships with Whites. Interestingly, when all variables for future friendships with Whites were in the model, experiences of microaggressions approached significance at the .05 level.

Regression analyses predicting friendships with other ethnic minorities included no significant predictors of past friendships in steps 1-2, but when parental support of minority friends was added in step 3, it was a strong predictor ($t = 3.514$, $p = .001$). For uture friendships with Minorities, again no significant predictors were found in steps 1-2, but step 3 included past friendships with minorities as a strong predictor ($t = 6.045$, $p < .001$), and past parental support of minority friends approached significance.

Contextual correlates. Table 2.7 presents the regression models of contextual correlates of friendships with Whites. Regressions for friendships with minority group members were also performed and are described later in the text. For both groups, step 1 included all variables related to diversity contexts. Interestingly, three of the five variables significantly predicted past friendships with Whites, with past engagement in multicultural activity as the strongest. This was followed by ethnic/racial composition of

Table 2.7

Regression for Contextual Correlates of Past and Future Close Friendships with Whites

Predictors	Adj. R^2	F	p	Beta	t	p
Past close friendships with Whites	.301	9.785	<.001			
Time living on reservation				.037	.308	.759
Childhood community diversity climate				-.161	-1.543	.126
High school diversity climate				.258	2.468	.015
College/university student composition				.259	3.083	.003
MEI past experiences				.458	3.852	<.001
Future close friendships with Whites	.048	2.026	.082			
Time living on reservation				-.040	-.321	.749
Childhood community diversity climate				-.073	-.601	.549
High school diversity climate				.053	.434	.666
College/university student composition				.182	1.850	.067
MEI past & present experiences				.185	1.505	.136

Note. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory.

students in college/university settings, and then diversity climate in high school.

Surprisingly, for future friendships with Whites, no contextual factors were significant.

Friendships with members of other minorities included two diversity/equality climates as

significant predictors of past friendships: community climate in childhood (t = -2.230, p =

.028) and school climate in high school (t = 2.096, p = .039). For future friendships with

other minorities, the only significant predictor was number of years living on a

reservation, in the negative direction (t = -2.966, p = .004), and past/present multicultural

activity was approaching significance.

Summary of Results

Most Native emerging adult participants in this sample reported investment in

close friendships with White-Americans and ethnic minority individuals. Most

participants reported parental support of past and future interethnic friendships.

Participants felt that parents/family had the strongest influence on their friendship attitudes, with close friends as the next strongest. Participants reported that they had not engaged in close friendships with members of their tribes and other tribes primarily due to lack of available members.

Significant positive correlations for past and future interethnic friendships were strongest for past friendships, parental support, past multicultural activity, and stronger White identity. The strongest negative correlations for past and future friendships were amount of time living on a reservation, stronger Native identity, and diversity climates in childhood and adolescence.

In the regressions, past interethnic friendships and parental support of past interethnic friendships were the only significant cultural predictors of openness to future interethnic friendships. Among the contextual predictors for past friendships with Whites, multicultural activity, ethnic student composition in college, and childhood community diversity climate were significant. No contextual correlates were significant predictors for future friendships with Whites. For friendships with minorities, community diversity climates during childhood and in high school were significant predictors of past friendships, and the only significant predictor of future friendships was number of years living on a reservation (less reservation years correlated to greater openness to future friendships with other minorities).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the reported

attitudes and experiences with interethnic friends among Native emerging adults.

Specifically, we wanted to identify trends of interethnic close friendships and to assess

how these trends might relate to demographic, contextual, and cultural aspects. The

results of this investigation are discussed with a focus on how to better support elements

of close friendship within schools, communities, and other levels of society to promote

greater interethnic relationship acceptance and engagement, especially with Native youth.

Connecting Results with the Literature
Review

This study's results largely follow the old adage that: the best predictor of future

behavior is past behavior. It was not surprising that the Natives in this sample reported

past friendships and parental support of those friendships as strong cultural predictors of

having future interethnic friendships. It is somewhat surprising, however, that contextual

factors for future interethnic friendships (i.e., diversity climates, ethnic compositions of

educational contexts, and past multicultural experiences) were not significant predictors

of friendships with White-Americans. It is also somewhat surprising that the amount of

time living on a reservation was the only significant contextual predictor for friendships

with other ethnic minorities. Although, it is not surprising that more time living on a

reservation predicted less likelihood of having future friendships with them.

For predictors of past relationships, again it is not surprising that parental support

of interethnic friendships was the strongest cultural predictor of friendships with White-

Americans, along with contextual predictors of multicultural experiences, ethnic

composition in college/university, and high school diversity climate. Similarly, for past

friendships with other ethnic minorities, parental support was the strongest cultural predictor and contextual predictors were diversity climate in childhood community and the diversity climate during high school. In general, these findings are consistent with those for other minority groups (Goforth, 2002; Joyner & Kao, 2000; Khmelkov & Hallinan, 1999; Quillian & Campbell, 2003).

Examination of the differences between Native/White-American friendships versus Native/minority friendships for past and future friendships reveals qualitative differences between them. These differences were not unexpected, and it highlights consideration that there are likely qualitative differences between friendships within and across Native tribes. Given the focus of this study and the greater prevalence of Native/White-American versus Native/minority close friendships in this sample, the remainder of this discussion will highlight Native/White-American friendships.

Connections with theories. Support for propinquity factors of contact and opportunity was rather strong. Respondents reported as a main reason for not having intraethnic friendships was the lack of availability, versus no lack of potential White-American friends. In fact, the majority of the respondents felt that their communities and schools were mostly White-American, so most of their cross-cultural interaction occurred with White-Americans (see Jones, 2011). It is probable that respondents who did not see their communities and schools as mostly White-American were part of the nearly one-third of respondents who lived a significant amount of their childhood/adolescent time on a reservation. These experiences seem to punctuate the concept of propinquity for Native respondents who most frequently interacted with Whites-Americans.

There also seems to be some support for group position and social exchange given the identity profiles of the respondents. It is not surprising that with so much interaction with White-Americans and mainstream American culture, the respondents, on average, reported strong connection with White-American identity. Notwithstanding a large portion of respondents reporting White-American identity, they also reported fairly strong Native identity, which may indicate at least some understanding that society tolerates their presence while sending clear messages that, as Natives, they are different.

The Native respondents may have reported strong White-American identity not only because the majority grew up in mostly White-American settings, but also because they may be trying to change their group position to some degree. It is possible that some of them have sacrificed some (or all) of their Native culture and customs in exchange for more desirable social status. This could also be response to being identified as different by their peers, as is evident in 96% of respondents reporting that they were the targets of racial microaggressions during their lifetime (Jones & Galliher, 2015). Although the level of reported discomfort from racial discriminations against the respondents was not very high on average, the fact that nearly all of them recognized that they were targeted because of their race is a clear example of group positions and may give impetus for a desire to engage in social exchange to improve some aspect of their lives.

Connections with factors. Propinquity was briefly addressed previously, but deserves another mention because there seems to be such a strong relationship between past multicultural activity/experiences, especially with White-Americans. Given the close proximity to White-Americans, it is not surprising that the vast majority of respondents

were the victims of racial discrimination. This phenomenon speaks to the problem of inequality between Natives and their potential White-American friends. Despite this imbalance of power and privilege, most Natives find a way to create meaningful friendships with White-Americans, cultivating other aspects of their friendships.

Although this study did not assess the specific aspects that helped the respondents to overcome the inequalities in their friendships with White-Americans, these results corroborate findings about Native friendships from Joyner and Kao's (2000) investigation of adolescent relationships. The Native respondents in that study reported more interethnic friendships than same-ethnic friendships, and this may be due to something in addition to propinquity. As Wilson, McIntosh, and Insana (2007) reported, individuals who actively engage in close relationships with other-ethnic members differ significantly from people who are simply tolerant of cross-ethnic relationships, particularly in terms of their personal characteristics. They based their position on findings from a dating survey in which Black-American respondents were more willing to date other-ethnic partners when the respondents were younger, male, and were interested in having children. Although Native friendships with White-Americans may not follow the same patterns, it is likely that a set of some personal characteristics of Natives would be associated with greater willingness to invest in close friendships with White-Americans.

Another factor that may account for Natives engaging in interethnic friendships is precollege socialization. Whereas most Natives in this study reported that they attended mostly White-American high schools, it is likely that they had already been socialized to interact with White-Americans regardless their personal choice. Kim, Park, and Koo

(2015) found that precollege and college socialization contributed to their interethnic interactions and friendship among over 3,500 college students. These interethnic contexts were investigated separately in terms of their relationship with racial diversity in academic settings (Bowman & Park, 2014). Their data also revealed that among White-Americans and large minority groups (Hispanics/Latinos, Blacks, and Asians), high school ethnic diversity had a significant impact on interethnic interaction in college. They also found that ethnic diversity in college had an even greater impact on interethnic interaction, especially for White-Americans. Similar findings emerged for interethnic friendships among White-Americans, but not for the minority groups. These trends were similar to the finding in the present study, with racial diversity in college emerging as one of the strongest predictors of past close friendships with White-Americans.

Despite similarities with the findings from the aforementioned analyses (Bowman & Park, 2014; Kim et al., 2015), there are some obvious demographic variables that likely had a strong impact on findings. For example, the analyses used samples that had roughly similar sized groups of White-Americans and three large minority groups. If a similar sized group of Natives (and/or Pacific Islanders) could have been included, it would likely reveal discrepancies between the small minorities and the large minorities. The findings for Natives may be complicated further given the differences between urban versus rural/reservation contexts. Natives from these two contexts appear to have distinct socialization experiences with non-Natives, so the effects of cumulative socialization experiences (see Saenz, 2010) before they began college would likely have a significant impact on their interethnic friendship development, particularly with White-Americans.

Limitations and Future Directions

There were some limitations with this study, as there are with any study. Despite

the sample's representation of numerous Native groups across North America, at least

500 groups were not represented, nor could a few respondents represent their Native

groups. Additionally, urban versus rural/reservation status was not assessed as well as

desired, which would be important to clarify in future investigations. After analysis of the

data began, it became apparent that some of the items did not clearly distinguish certain

friendship aspects from each other, and some items that may have been more useful in

establishing trends and patterns were not included. Also, differences between women and

men were not examined, and this could be of interest in future studies. A final note on

limitations of this study, is the presentation of the data as a set of "pan-Indian" results,

which obviously limits a direct application for individual tribes and groups.

Summary

In general, past interethnic friendships and parental support of them are strong

predictors that Native emerging adults will engage in future interethnic close friendships.

Other factors included multicultural activity, diverse college student composition, and

diversity climates in childhood community and high school. The lack of available

members limited Natives' opportunities for close friendship with members of their own

ethnicity, but there was ample opportunity for making friends with Whites. Natives

engaged in close friendships with Whites at high rates and also with greater frequency

than other minority group members or Natives, and their parents overwhelming supported

the interethnic friendships. These findings seem to clearly echo and can be summed up in

the following statement: "Friendship is shaped by more than personal preference; …

socialization in different types of environments also matte." (Kim et al., 2015, p. 75).

References

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethnic and racial minorities & socioeconomic status*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/public ations/factsheet-erm.aspx

Blau, P. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, 1*, 3-7.

Bowman, N. A., & Park, J. J. (2014). Interethnic contact on college campuses: Comparing and contrasting predictors of cross-racial interaction and interethnic friendship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(5), 660-690.

Britton, M. L. (2011). Close together but worlds apart? Residential integration and interethnic friendship in Houston. *City & Community, 10*(2), 182-204.

Brown, B. B., & Bakken, J. P. (2011). Parenting and peer relationships: Reinvigorating research on family-peer linkages in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(1), 153-165.

Chester, C., Jones, D. J., Zalot, A., & Sterrett, E. (2007). The psychosocial adjustment of African American youth from single mother homes: The relative contribution of parents and peers. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 36,* 356-366.

Goforth, N. R. (2002). *Attitudes and behaviors of college students towards interethnic dating*. Retrieved from http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/390 .php

González, M. C., Herrmann, H. J., Kertész, J., & Vicsek, T. (2007). Community structure and ethnic preferences in school friendship networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 379*, 307-316.

Hallinan, M. T., & Smith, S. S. (1985). The effects of classroom racial composition on students' interethnic friendliness. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48*, 3-16.

Jones, M. L. (2011). *Attitudinal and experiential factors of interethnic romantic relationships among Native American emerging adults* (Master's thesis). Utah State University, Logan, UT. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/1100

Jones, M. L., & Galliher, R. V. (2015). Daily racial microaggressions and ethnic identification among Native American young adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *21*, 1-9. doi:10.1037/a0037537

Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2000). School racial composition and adolescent racial homophily. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*, 810-825.

Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2006). Do Hispanic and Asian adolescents practice panethnicity in friendship choices. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*(5), 972-992.

Karbo, K. (2006). Friendship: The laws of attraction. *Psychology Today*, *39*, 90-95.

Khmelkov, V. T., & Hallinan, M. T. (1999). Organizational effects on race relations in schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 627-645.

Kim, Y. K., Park, J. J., & Koo, K. K. (2015). Testing self-segregation: Multiple-group structural modeling of college students' interethnic friendship by race. *Research in Higher Education, 56*, 57-77.

Lee, R. M. (1999). *The multicultural climate at the University of Texas at Austin*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Mercer, S. H., Ziegler-Hill, V., Wallace, M., & Hayes, D. M. (2010, March). *Development and preliminary investigation of the Daily Racial Microaggressions Scale*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, Philadelphia, PA.

Oetting, E. R., & Beauvais, F. (1991). Orthogonal cultural identification theory: The cultural identification of minority adolescents. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 25,* 655-685.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact: Theory, research, and new perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

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

Quillian, L., & Campbell, M. E. (2003). Beyond black and white: The present and future of multiracial friendship segregation. *American Sociological Review, 68*, 540-566.

Ramirez, M., III. (1998). *Multicultural/multiracial psychology: Mestizo perspectives in personality and mental health.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 301-322.

Rosenfeld, M. J. (2005). A critique of exchange theory in mate selection. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*, 1284-1325.

Saenz, V. (2010). Breaking the segregation cycle: Examining students' precollege racial environments and college diversity experiences. *The Review of Higher Education, 34*(1), 1-37.

Tavares, C. D. (2011). Why can't we be friends: The role of religious congregation-based social contact for close interethnic adolescent friendships. *Review of Religious Research, 52*(4), 439-453.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Turner, R. N., & Feddes, A. R. (2011). How intergroup friendship works: A longitudinal study of friendship effects on outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 914-923.

Uskul, A. K., Lalonde, R. N., & Cheng, L. (2007). Views on interethnic dating among Chinese and European Canadians: The roles of culture, gender, and mainstream cultural identity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(6), 819-835.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Profile of general population and housing characteristics.* Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1&prodType=table

Vaquera, E., & Kao, G. (2008). Do you like me as much as I like you? Friendship reciprocity and its effects on school outcomes among adolescents. *Social Science Research, 37*, 55-72.

Veniegas, R. C., & Peplau, L. A. (1997). Power and the quality of same-sex friendships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(2), 279-297.

Wilson, S. B., McIntosh, W. D., & Insana, S. P. II (2007). Dating across race: An examination of African American internet personal advertisements. *Journal of Black Studies, 37*(6), 964-982.

CHAPTER 3

NATIVE EMERGING ADULTS AND THEIR NON-NATIVE CLOSE FRIENDS: A QUALITATIVE INQUIRY INTO FRIENDSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

Abstract

This study investigated the aspects of close friendship development between Native emerging adults and their non-Native friends. Six Native/non-Native friendship pairs participated in a semi-structured interview. Friends shared that authenticity/ acceptance, communication, similarity, and trust were themes that were important in their close friendships. Opportunity for frequent contact and regular exposure to interethnic diversity were identified as integral to friendship development. These findings correspond to existing literature, where close friendship development seems to occur according to contact/ opportunity theories, and the identified themes seem to fit with friendship factors of reciprocation, disclosure, and homophily. Propinquity was identified in the literature as a separate factor, yet in this study propinquity acted more as an avenue through which the other factors were able to operate, and propinquity was largely related to the theoretical framework of contact and opportunity. In addition to the associations with existing literature, cultural sharing and teaching was important in establishing and maintaining these close interethnic friendships, and this occurred primarily in the Native to non-Native direction. Another process observation of note was that non-Native friends tended to respond first and talk more in terms of quantity than their Native counterparts.

Introduction

K'éznízin (*One must think as a relative. One must behave with compassion*.)

The Diné proverb above is a common way of talking about the intimacy of interpersonal relationships and interactions between living beings. It goes far beyond the English words that describe friendships and family relationships, and refers to the character of the individual. Many Native languages contain terms that are very similar in concept. The relationships that Diné people create are viewed as deeply important and held with as much respect as would be expected with one's mother or other relatives. K'éznízin is one of the closest concepts in Diné culture for friendship, and it relates well with the notions of intimacy and closeness investigated in this study as part of interethnic friendship development and quality factors among Native emerging adults.

Close friendships provide many benefits for the friends and society. In one study of college persistence among young Natives, close friends reported that a common social bond was very important in their college choice, and the friends enjoyed the community aspect that the college fostered (Saggio, 2001). However, students also cautioned non-Natives to be more accepting of cultural differences, such as not demanding direct eye-contact during conversations and active listening versus talking over each other. Another qualitative study identified a few factors of Native youth well-being that seem relevant to close friendship qualities, which include: resources, interdependence, and tribal identity (Long, Downs, Gillette, Kills in Sight, & Iron-Cloud Konen, 2006). McMahon, Kenyon, and Carter (2013) interviewed 95 high school students who reported that family and friends were the top themes when responding to what they loved about their lives.

Theories and Factors of Close Interethnic Friendships

A large literature exists related to friendship development and quality, and several common themes have emerged as important features of friendship development generally. Four factors seem to consistently be necessary for friendship formation: homophily, propinquity, reciprocated endorsement of friendship, and disclosure.

Friendship development theories. Newcomb's (1961) cognitive consistency theory suggested that friendships help individuals work for balance in life. Balance is approached when people make friends with those who share similar interests, attitudes, and beliefs, which are aspects of homophily. Newcomb found that college students were more likely to befriend others who shared their attitudes and who liked similar people. Reinforcement theory of friendships (Lott & Lott, 1974) also posits that shared interests and beliefs are important, but in lieu of balance as the goal, the reward of having similar enjoyment is desired. Support for this theory includes findings that children who were in a group that received candy as a reward were more likely to select a group member to go on vacation with their family than children who did not receive the reward (Lott & Lott, 1961). Further research found that it was not the actual reward that promoted friendship, but rather the perception of commonality. College students rated higher friendship satisfaction with greater similarity of beliefs with friends (Morry, 2003). Friendships have been found to follow a progression of development from acquaintanceship, to buildup, to continuation (Fehr, 1996, 2000). These theories appear to apply equally to intraracial and interethnic friendships, with many pathways to interethnic friendships.

Homophily. Similar personal characteristics are consistently found as strong

predictors of friendship formation, often including racial and ethnic homophily (Quillian & Campbell, 2003). In an analysis of Add Health data, friendship preference was stronger for ethnicity than race. Kao and Joyner (2006) found that Hispanic and Asian adolescents reported significantly more friendships with same-ethnic peers versus their friendships with other-ethnic-but-same-race and other-race peers. Another study found that best friends are most likely to be from the same ethnic group (Kao & Joyner, 2004).

Racial homophily is still a strong factor in friendship development, however, and there are significant differences in opportunities for intraracial friendships (Joyner & Kao, 2000). They also found that racial homophily becomes less of a factor in individuals' friendship choices as same-race population decreases. Members of small groups, such as Native tribes, likely have less opportunity in highly diverse populations to make same-race friends, thus they may make more interethnic friends.

Conversely, a "tipping-effect" may occur, which is fewer outgroup relationships as local population diversity increases (Korgen, Mahon, & Wang, 2003). They found that college students who lived among large groups of same-race individuals reported fewer interethnic friendships and dating experiences than students who lived among a more racially diverse population. Evidence from Add Health data showed that teens among large numbers of same-race peers reported more racial homophily in their friendship nominations (González, Herrmann, Kertész, & Vicsek, 2007). A related phenomenon, the "intensification effect" was explained by Quillian and Campbell (2003) as a preference by adolescents who are members of small racial minorities to seek out own-race friends, but in many cases same-race members may not be available, such as for Native youth.

Homophily for other characteristics (e.g., sex, age, status, ability grouping) has also been found, such as shared activities. Indeed, best friends are more likely to report high engagement in shared activities, and ethnic minority group members reported more shared activities with their interethnic friends than did Whites (Kao & Joyner, 2004). Shared interest in religion was found to engender close interethnic adolescent friendships in multiracial congregations (Tavares, 2011). Interest homophily relates to the idea of functional similarities as described by Khmelkov and Hallinan (1999). These contexts seem to promote interethnic friendships outside of ethnic and racial homophily.

Propinquity. Frequent contact with others is another important factor of friendships (Allport, 1954). There is clear evidence for a link between simple contact or mere exposure to racially different students and increased cross-race friendships, and the prevalence of these friendships was greatly accounted for by school racial composition (Joyner & Kao, 2000; Khmelkov & Hallinan, 1999; Quillian & Campbell 2003). Given this evidence, it is reasonable that Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown (2000, pp. 222-223) suggested cross-group relations would improve with "official attention to racial behavior and a willingness by citizens to relinquish at least some personal choice for the greater good." Korgen et al. (2003) clarified this statement by asserting that social engineering can assist in the development of cross-group friendships as they occur in school systems.

Neighborhood racial/ethnic composition was also found to have connections to outgroup friendships in the past, and a recent study found that propinquity within the community fostered more intergroup contact on the simple basis of random opportunity (Tavares, 2011). Greater opportunity for even casual contact (e.g., in neighborhoods)

relates to increased interethnic friendships (Britton, 2011), and frequency of interactions due to propinquity was the strongest predictor of cross-ethnic dating (Fujino, 1997).

Reciprocity in friendship endorsement and self-disclosure. Some friendships are superficial and others are very close, and "Friend" often fails to express closeness among friends. Many studies do not use reciprocated friendships from actual friendships, which demonstrate more intimacy than one-sided friend nominations, and close friends qualitatively differ from casual friends (Gottman & Mettetal, 1986; Howes & Wu, 1990; Vaquera & Kao, 2008). In a study on friendship dynamics, closeness was measured using ratings from both friends finding that most of the friends in their study felt that they were quite close, with an average closeness rating of 4 on a 5-point scale (Nelson, Thorne, & Shapiro, 2011). Among children, ethnic minority children were significantly more likely to have reciprocated interethnic friendships than Whites (Howes & Wu, 1990). In teens, reciprocated interethnic friendships were reported less than same-race friendships, but Whites were most likely to report reciprocated friendships (Vaquera & Kao, 2008). Only 46% of Black males and 59% of Native females had reciprocated friendships.

Self-disclosure is the voluntary sharing of personal information to another person (Miller, 2002), and it is considered a basic factor for friendship formation (Kudo & Simkin, 2003). Additionally, disclosure is prominently featured in many friendship theories (Turner & Feddes, 2011), and reciprocated disclosure and intimacy is necessary for successful and close friendships (Karbo, 2006). Altman and Taylor (1973) posited that when friends increase their disclosure (quantity) and its intimacy (quality), close relationships are more easily established and better maintained. Hartup (1996) stated that

intimate friendships must include mutual disclosure for well-balanced and functioning friendships. Furthermore, the reciprocal process of disclosure was described as an excellent measure of friendship intimacy (Turner & Feddes, 2011).

Fehr (2000) also found that disclosure aids in the development of intimacy and other common factors of close friendship, such as: trust, loyalty, support, and affection. Disclosure, then, is important in interethnic friendships alongside reciprocity, and seems consistent with common Native ways of knowing and transmitting important information.

Summary

Some theories and factors of friendship development/quality appear to coincide with many Native perspectives, and Native/non-Native friendships among emerging adults might be explained using these ideas. It is also important to obtain perspectives from Natives who are in actual interethnic close friendships to better understand their attitudes about and experiences in these relationships. This paper utilized a qualitative research design to examine these friendships from this Native researcher's worldview. The research question was: How do close emerging adult friends in Native/non-Native dyads describe the development, challenges, and benefits of their interethnic friendships?

Methods

Participants

The participants included six Natives (age 20-25) and their non-Native platonic friend (ages19-28), with four female pairs and two male pairs. Natives reported five distinct tribal affiliations in four regions. Two non-Natives reported Latino ethnicity and

five identified as White-Americans. Five of the six Natives reported household incomes

in childhood of $20,000-50,000 and one reported under $20,000. Three non-Natives

reported household incomes in childhood of $20,000-50,000, and three reported over

$50,000. Table 3.1 presents this information along with religious/spiritual affiliation.

Inclusion criteria included the Native participant aged 18-25, nominations from both

friends as a "close friend," and the friendships had to be at least three months old.

Friendships that included any romantic aspects were excluded to focus on platonic

relationship factors. Three Native women volunteered to participate with a romantic

friend, with two withdrawing and the third recruiting a non-romantic friend.

Procedures

This study was approved by the Utah State Institutional Review Board.

Recruitment materials were sent to students via a Native student club listserv at a

Table 3.1

Participant Information

Pseudonym	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Household income in childhood	Religious/spiritual Affiliation
Atacama	20	Female	Native-Southwest	20-49K	LDS
Chantel	19	Female	White	50-100K	LDS
Delaware	21	Male	Native-Southwest	20-49K	Christian
Ezekiel	21	Male	White/Latino-Central American	20-49K	LDS/Agnostic
Inuit	25	Male	Native-Mountain West	20-49K	Traditional/Christian
Josef	28	Male	White	20-49K	LDS
Maya	22	Female	Native-West Coast	Under 20K	Traditional
Nikkee	28	Female	White	50-100K	Atheist
Quechua	23	Female	Native-Southwest	20-49K	none reported
Rylee	23	Female	White	100-250K	none reported
Zuni	25	Female	Native-Southwest/Plains	20-49K	NAC/Catholic
Victoria	25	Female	Latina-Mexican	20-49K	Roman Catholic

Note. .LDS = The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, NAC = Native American Church.

mountain-west university and distributed at the club's weekly meetings. Additional recruitment took place via word-of-mouth. In-person interviews with the participants were conducted by the author at their convenience. Informed consent was obtained at the beginning of the interview. Interviews were digitally recorded and took 45-60 minutes. Each participant was compensated for participating with $15 ($30 per pair). Interviews were transcribed from recordings to written transcripts. All participants were asked to review transcripts of the interview to verify accuracy of their statements and responses.

Instruments

A semi-structured interview included questions and prompts that were created based on friendship factors that were identified in this review and data from the Jones (2011) study. This set of questions and prompts was reviewed by three female Native elders, one male Native elder, one White elder, and a middle-aged Native male, none of whom were involved in the design of this study. Minor changes were made to the interview based on the reviewers' comments, including wording questions and prompts in a less leading and linear matter to better encourage storytelling and narratives by the participants. Each participant completed a demographic questionnaire after the interview. All materials for this study are included in Appendix B.

Analyses

The interviews were transcribed and field notes were applied to the transcriptions. Several ideas consistently emerged in the first three interviews, and by the fifth interview, only minor details added to the set of ideas and concepts. Saturation was achieved after

the last interview because no new information was added to the organizational set. The transcriptions were then sent to the interviewees for member checking. Some participants responded that the transcriptions were accurate and they did not request any changes or suggest any additions after reviewing their conversations. The transcriptions were then independently coded by the two investigators (Glasne, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Madison, 2005). This coding included a search for emergent themes and factors of close friendships in the Native/non-Native dyads. More complex coding schemes developed independently by the investigators, and then analytic coding was conducted jointly to connect the participant data into an organizational framework for the thematic findings.

Findings

The coding process identified three major themes and several subthemes. First, typical friendship scripts that concur with major findings from the friendship literature were observed in each interview. Second, there was evidence of shared cultural contexts that were relevant to the friendships, such as shared interests/ideas and cultural sharing or teaching. Finally, there were clear process and content interactions in the interviews that demonstrated personal differences, which seemed to map onto cultural differences.

Friendship Scripts

Several subthemes coincided strongly with the factors that have been identified in the broader, general friendship literature as critical conditions for friendship development. Four concepts surfaced as these scripts were reviewed: authenticity and acceptance, similarity, trust, and communication.

Authenticity and acceptance. The concept of being real and genuine within the relationship was expressed in several ways by most of the participants. Atacama made several references to feeling comfortable with each other, and both she and Chantel affirmed that it felt natural to be with each other and there was no need to put on a show. Zuni stated that she appreciated Victoria's directness and straightforwardness, and they liked the "fun" they had with each other and "no stress." Ezekiel shared a similar observation that "we don't really demand all that much from each other," and Delaware commented that "there's not really any expectation to put forth any effort." These friendships are not forced and there is no pressure in their interactions. Quechua was conversing with Rylee and wondered: "I'm trying to think of what, like, events brought us closer together." And Rylee added: "What gave *us* a life." They frequently commented on their "fun" and "bubbly" personalities, which is their "strongest connection." Rylee said of Quechua: "She makes me feel more grounded." This sentiment seems to lead into Nikkee's statement about relationships: "I do believe you meet the people you do for a reason. People are drawn to you for a reason." And Maya was drawn to Nikkee because "there's that, like, genuine side. Nikkee, she's not fake, and that's what I like. I liked that she helped out with us [at the powwow], just wanting to volunteer […] that's what makes it a closer friendship than others." Inuit and Josef often commented that they also appreciate directness with each other and will not tolerate hypocrisy in their friendships. In contrast, they are person-focused and have a real bond, which is exemplified in Josef's comments: "He's just been accepting of *me*. […] There's so much of a relationship here that I worry about disappointing him. […] He's made me grow as a person, just to be able

to be comfortable being me." These examples of authenticity and acceptance appear to extend beyond simple appreciation of this quality in their friends, but also that it inspires the other friend to become more authentic in return, a reciprocation of values.

      Communication. One element of the communication styles that appeared in multiple interviews was that sharing was more important than questioning. For example, Maya said: "I think that we kind of shared that, not so much through asking, but, like, we've just shared it throughout the friendship." Nikkee added: "Yeah, we don't really poke at each other with questions." Another element of communication style was their use of humor and joking with each other. All six pairs both demonstrated their humor with each other during the interview, as well as commenting on it as being an integral part of their friendships. Inuit and Josef were talking about their differing opinions about a sport team, and Inuit mentioned his sympathy for the team, to which Josef replied: "You see? this is the time in the friendship when he says it and I don't hear that." Other aspects of the communication that were identified include respect, openness, alternative perspectives, and story-sharing. All the friendship pairs used narratives to present details about the friendship's development and qualities. The story-telling from the Native friends seemed to be more about teaching a concept or feeling, rather than simply presenting facts. For example, in response to a prompt to talk about ethnic differences, Delaware shared how he explained to Ezekiel about an ethnic ritual by telling the history of the ritual and the story that teaches why the ritual is culturally important. For Zuni and Victoria, sharing stories about their childhoods and families is what "really brought us closer together." Communication was also described as important for coping and

problem-solving. Victoria said: "Just talking and communicating is really what would help," and Zuni said that "just talking to her, it relieves. It felt like it took a load off of me and I was able to refocus."

Similarity. Interviewees shared several examples of perceived similarities that helped their friendships move from acquaintanceships to close friendships. Victoria's statement about this concept frames this theme well: "We were all in the same situation; we have similar stories, so we got really close.… The connection grew really quick." Zuni addressed how they tended to feel similarly, even in social situations: "No, I want to go home, and then Victoria would be like 'Yeah, me too'. So, you know, it would kind of be like symbiotic in that way." These similarities seem to be related to situations and feelings more than interests or activities, and this is also evident in the conversation between Delaware and Ezekiel. They seemed to interpret circumstances in very similar ways, which also was apparent with Inuit and Josef. For the other three this came up, but when they talked about this theme, it was more frequently regarding interests and activities. Quechua and Rylee talked about dancing and socializing as being an important similarity in activities, and Atacama and Chantel shared similar interest in arts and crafts. Maya and Nikkee expressed similar ideologies about political and religious positions, and both also experienced broken legs on the same side, which they related as being a point of connection. They talked about these similarities in terms of disclosure, empathy, and validation, which aided in their friendships becoming more intimate.

Trust. "I can talk to her about anything that I might not talk to other people about." – Atacama. This sense of trust and intimacy in the friendship was universal

among all the friends. It seemed to allow for personal disclosure, such as when Delaware

and Ezekiel were talking about negative stereotypes about Natives, and Delaware said: "I

always talk about [it] from my own experience, and I mean it's real for me." Another

example was found with Josef's description of how Inuit intervened when Josef was sick:

> It was a scary situation; I don't remember anything. I woke up at my parents, and
> I'm like "Why am I here?" Because Inuit called my parents, and I never had a
> friend do that when I was in trouble.… I almost died, you know…and to see Inuit
> with that, just, I could see the worry. I was like, "I don't know this kid that well;
> why's he so worried about me?" But then, that just brought us even more close; I
> could see this kid really cares, you know.… I earned that trust and it brought us
> close, and you know, he just trusts me, and I trust him.

Josef also mentioned how he and Inuit have struggled with similar issues such as abuse in

childhood, so they trust each other to keep each other's stories in confidence and for real

understanding. Quechua and Rylee talked about the trust they have in the perspectives

that they share with each other about their romantic and family relationships. Quechua

said about Rylee: "We're there for each other.… She can give me advice about the

relationships she's been through and advice about mine, and um, that's what helped us

getting through things as far as our relationships." A similar sentiment was shared by

Victoria regarding Zuni when Victoria is discussing a problem with her: "She'll be really

honest about it, which I really appreciate. I would see a different side of her and, uh,

consider other options." They explained that they trusted the advice that they received

from each other because they knew that it came from a place of concern and caring.

Maya's and Nikkee's statements strongly demonstrate this quality:

> Maya: I don't think I open up to anybody, but I feel comfortable telling Nikkee
> stuff. She's one of the ones that I would trust.

> Nikkee: That trust, yeah. That's the main thing, the trust, …the more you trust a

person, the more you feel like you can have a better friendship with the person.

Contexts of Cultural Interaction

Shared aspects of connection. There emerged in each of the interviews a running theme which varied among pairs, but still remained a constant aspect of friendship development. The conversations for two friendship pairs continuously referenced LDS beliefs, practices, and values. Another two pairs conversed in ways that kept coming back to individual independence, and the final two pairs framed most of their dialogue within the academic track/program environment. Five of the friendships reported extensive connection to the Native club at their institutions, and the other pair discussed involvement in the broader multicultural club. Five of the friendship pairs also made important connections with their families and the support they felt for their friends. This was also salient regarding their upbringings, which typically were quite similar within the friendship. In moving out to the next level of social networks that were in their schools and communities, the frequency and quality of their contact was a major factor in the development of their friendships. In spite of close frequent contact for some of the friendships, five pairs stated that their friendship took several months to become "close." The other friendship met during an intensive summer program, and they considered themselves close friends after approximately one week. One of the most remarkable aspects of their connections was a sense of balancing each other. This is exemplified in the following amusing exchange:

Quechua: We're Yin and Yang!

Rylee: And then [we] turn into each other.

Quechua: And then we equalize each other, and now we're…

Rylee: Now we're the same!

Cultural teaching. The sharing of cultural knowledge and/or activities was apparent in all of the friendship pairs. Chantel frequently referred to admiring Atacama's arts and crafts, and Atacama felt that she gifted handmade objects to Chantel and taught Chantel to make several Native items, such as dreamcatchers, Indian Tacos, beaded jewelry, and traditional dolls. Delaware and Ezekiel were able to have frank discussions about racism against Natives, prejudice, and discrimination. Delaware shared examples of educating Ezekiel about many aspects of reservation life and about language differences. Josef expressed sincere gratitude for learning so much about the history of Inuit's Native group, specifically, and Native history in America, broadly. Maya was impressed with Nikkee's sincere interest in Native culture and willingness to immerse herself into Native activities. Quechua stated that it was helpful for her own exploration of Native identity to try to explain the meanings of events and customs of Native culture. Zuni said that her understanding of her Native culture became clearer whenever she talked about the similarities and differences with Mexican culture. All friendship pairs referenced powwows, dances, and foods that are associated with Native culture as they talked about cultural sharing and teaching.

**Observations of Conversational Process
and Content**

One of the most obvious observations that evidenced itself throughout the interviews, was that the Native friends tended to permit the non-Native friends to respond

first, and more. This was less pronounced with Quechua and Rylee, but it was still more common for Rylee to take the opportunity to answer before Quechua and provide longer responses. There was an obvious difference between Quechua and the other Natives, which was that she more strongly identified with a majority-like upbringing in nearly all-White communities and student bodies. Another observation that presented itself throughout the interviews was that White friends tended to talk about more concrete aspects of the friendship (such as activities and events), whereas Native friends tended to speak more to feelings and perceptions of the friendship itself. This seemed most pronounced between Atacama and Chantel, who happened to be the youngest pair of friends in the study. An example of this was during an exchange about some distance that they experienced while Chantel was distracted from her friendships due to a romantic interest. Chantel described the situation in detailed facts, whereas Atacama explained her experience: "I don't think I really understood what was going on with Chantel, so I got irritated with her and kind of hung out with other friends."

In general, most friends struggled to identify any conflict in the friendship, or they were hesitant to discuss challenges to the relationship, and White friends appeared more uncomfortable than their Native friends. When a conflict was identified, it frequently involved one of the friends having a challenge outside of the friendship. Interestingly, they became more excited as they talked about helping each other through the challenge.

With the exception of Atacama and Chantel, whose friendship began in 7th grade and was six years long, the friendships began in their first year of college. The other five friendships were at least three years long, with two that were longer than 5 years, one of

which carried on through master's programs at geographically distant institutions. Additionally, most of the friendships included a stagnant phase due to one friend spending most of her or his free time involved in romantic relationships, but they all asserted that they never stopped being friends during these times.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand the development of close friendships between Natives and their non-Native friends, along with the qualities that tend to be found within these relationships. The narratives of these 12 friends were analyzed, with several important factors of close friendship emerging that were related to theoretical friendship development pathways. Specifically, the qualities in the friendship scripts seem to relate very closely to the factors identified in the literature review. Additionally, theoretical considerations from reinforcement theory, cognitive consistency theory, and developmental friendship theory seem to be a good fit with some of the experiences that were shared by the participants.

Connecting Findings and Literature Review

Factors. The friendship factor of propinquity was not directly addressed by any of the participants as being a salient quality of their relationships, but it seemed to be the obvious mechanism or environment in which the other qualities were able to develop. Zuni's and Victoria's experience of being a part of an intensive summer program appears to best exemplify how the frequent and close interactions, as presented by Allport (1954),

that were designed into the structure of the program facilitated connection and

relationship development. Propinquity also appeared to be a mechanism for the pairs who

were roommates. The other side of this factor is that even casual contacts provided

propinquity effects in other friendships, such as with Atacama and Chantel. They lived in

the same town but not the same neighborhood, and sometimes they interacted at larger

level church activities. They also went to the same school where their opportunities for

crossing paths was much higher, and through several classes over several months their

friendship began to develop. Propinquity then seems to be most important in the early

development of the friendship, but it remains important for continued close friendship. It

also appeared in the findings of this study to be an important avenue upon which the

other friendship qualities and factors move in consideration of natural development of

intimacy or closeness in the relationship. Propinquity may then be thought of as the

central theme in the present findings.

The friendship qualities that emerged in this study's findings appear to closely

relate to the existing salient friendship factors. While all identified qualities in this study

may not have direct friendship factor correlates, the concept of "similarity" articulated by

the participants appears to be a synonym for homophily. Additionally, communication

and disclosure also seem very closely related, and yet, disclosure also seems indirectly

related to authenticity. Acceptance and trust appear to have a reciprocal association, and a

more comprehensive model of these relationships between factors and reported qualities

would likely appear more dynamic and interactive rather than linear or circular. It is also

difficult to rank order (and is not the purpose of this study) the factors/qualities in terms

of salience in the close friendship because their importance seemed to fluctuate given the circumstances or situations. However, it might be safe to say that homophily is more important in the beginning of friendship development, and though still important throughout the friendship, it seems to become much less important once the relationship is solidly established. For the participants in this study, observing and becoming aware of their perceived similarities seemed to come through casual communication, before reciprocal self-disclosure became a strong factor in their friendships.

Theories. The theories that were presented in the literature review emphasize different aspects of the development of close friendships, and therefore, different themes derived from the data map onto the theories in different ways. For example, most of the friends discussed how they seem to balance each other, which was based on their perceptions of compensating or matching interests and skills or knowledge. This balance could be described as the primary agent in cognitive consistency theory and facilitated by self-disclosure and reciprocation. Quechua and Rylee talked about how they came together like yin and yang, or like opposites attracting to each other, which seems to fit with this theory. In contrast, Quechua and Rylee go further to state that they became each other, and this seems to indicate a perception of commonality, which is the foundation of reinforcement theory. Perhaps we extend this example further to developmental theory in that Quechua's and Rylee's acquaintanceship developed as they identified homophilous similarities, and the friendship moved into buildup as they shared with each other before they paired off outside of their peer group. Continuation of the friendship occurred as they maintained their contact and increased reciprocal self-disclosure.

Observations of cultural exchange. One observation about the communications between friends that is worth discussing is the gendered nature of the friendship descriptions. Generally, the males' verbal expression of the intimacy in their friendships appeared to defy the stereotype of men not talking about their need for and appreciation of interpersonal connection. Both male pairs in this study addressed the affection that they felt for each other, and how the companionship was a significant benefit in their personal wellness and growth. One of the pairs discussed in detail how the non-Native's use of the phrase "I love you" was uncomfortable for the Native friend in the beginning of their friendship. Inuit described how he came to comprehend that Josef was sincere when he said it, and the phrase had no romantic tone, but rather it was a communication of the care and connection that Josef felt towards Inuit. In contrast to these examples among the male friends, none of the female friends talked about whether they use "I love you" with each other or if they talk at all about their deeper affections for each other.

Another observation to address is the process of teaching cultural differences between friends. The friends connected on similarities and despite differences, but all friends were interested in the experience of their counterparts to invest themselves into a friendship with them. Some cultural aspects of religious ideas and practices were shared between friends, in addition to some aspects of culture related to socioeconomic status, but most of the exchange was related to Native culture. Not surprisingly, the majority of the cultural exchange followed a "one-way" path from Native friends teaching their non-Native friends about customs, traditions, beliefs, and other racial/ethnic experiences such as discrimination, economic challenges, and social differences. It was also apparent,

though not directly addressed, that the Native friends were navigating "two worlds" whether they recognized it or not. Their lived experiences differentiated them from their non-Native counterparts, which likely enhanced their friendship interactions. Regardless whether these exchanges were sensitive, humorous, or otherwise, both friends in all pairs recognized that they learned and felt more connected through these interactions.

The growth and openness to cultural exchange experienced by these friends may be due to many factors. One of these factors might be associated to some degree with the intellectual and social patterns that seem to engender greater openness to diversity among students who attend university or college (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996). Antonio (2001) found that on diverse college campuses, students generally engaged in more interethnic friendships, despite perceptions of segregation between minority groups. These perceptions have sometimes been attributed to personal characteristics that facilitate greater acceptance of others, thereby fostering openness and combating other-race effects. These other-race effects have been linked to the contact hypothesis (Furl, Phillips, & O'Toole, 2002), where greater propinquity is related to more openness. In the present study, it was largely evident among the non-Native friends, that they already had interest in Native culture and openness to ethnic differences. Whether this was due to innate personality characteristics or was socialized through effects of propinquity, it is beyond the scope of this inquiry. However, better understanding of personal and social influences would be interesting to study.

Limitations and Future Directions

It would be valuable to obtain greater insight into interethnic friendships among

Natives and non-Natives based on a larger sample and possibly within different tribal groups. Also, this study did not closely follow any of the few indigenous methodologies for conducting qualitative research. Deeper qualitative inquiry of Native friendships driven from a model that is based in Native epistemologies is lacking. Such an approach may allow the findings to unfold by themselves through natural story-telling and sharing, versus being elicited and extracted. Another limitation could be that that all participants in this study were current college students in relatively diverse university settings as opposed to less-diverse community environments. A study that includes a broader sample of Native/non-Native friendships (e.g., not college students, younger teenagers, urban and rural/reservation) would certainly provide greater detail about friendship development and qualities for this type of close-friendship.

Summary

In addition to the overlap within and between the theories and factors, there appears to be fluidity about how the factors appear within the different theories. Homophily, disclosure and reciprocation, and propinquity were evident within the theories of cognitive consistency, reinforcement, and developmental friendships. As a point of emphasis, propinquity seemed to be the core element of theory and factors in the development of closeness and intimacy among Native/non-Native friends. Whereas propinquity is closely linked to contact and opportunity theories, when the friends were not interacting frequently or regularly, the friendships became less intimate. Propinquity, then, may be a strong factor of friendship development and maintenance throughout the stages of friendship, and it may also be reflective of the quality of the relationship. The

interethnic friendship experiences and attitudes of the participants in this study

demonstrate that opportunities for casual and intimate propinquity is the central feature of

healthy and intimate friendships between the Native and non-Native friends.

References

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Altman, L., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York, NY: Holt, Rienhart, & Winston.

Antonio, A. L. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*(1), 63-89.

Britton, M. L. (2011). Close together but worlds apart? Residential integration and interethnic friendship in Houston. *City & Community, 10*(2), 182-204.

Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fehr, B. (2000). Friendship. In A. Kazdans (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of psychology* (vol. 3, pp. 403-407). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fujino, D. C. (1997). The rates, patterns and reasons for forming heterosexual interethnic dating relationships among Asian Americans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14*, 809-828.

Furl, N., Phillips, P. J., & O'Toole, A. J. (2002). Face recognition algorithms and the other-race effect: Computational mechanisms for a developmental contact hypothesis. *Cognitive Science, 26*(6), 797-815.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

González, M. C., Herrmann, H. J., Kertész, J., & Vicsek, T. (2007). Community structure and ethnic preferences in school friendship networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 379*, 307-316.

Gottman, J. M., & Mettetal, G. (1986). Speculations about affective development: Friendship and acquaintanceship through adolescence. In J. Gottman & J. Parker (Eds.), *Conversations of friends: Speculations on affective development* (pp. 192-237). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendship and their developmental significance. *Child Development, 67*, 1-13.

Howes, C., & Wu, F. (1990). Peer interactions and friendships in an ethnically diverse school setting. *Child Development, 61*, 537-541.

Jones, M. L. (2011). *Attitudinal and experiential factors of interethnic romantic relationships among Native American emerging adults* (Master's thesis). Utah State University, Logan, UT. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/ etd/1100

Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2000). School racial composition and adolescent racial homophily. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*(3), 810-825.

Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2004). Do race and ethnicity matter among friends? Activities among interethnic, interethnic, and intraethnic adolescent friends. *The Sociological Quarterly, 45*(3), 557-573.

Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2006). Do Hispanic and Asian adolescents practice panethnicity in friendship choices. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*(5), 972-992.

Karbo, (2006). Friendship: The laws of attraction. *Psychology Today*, 39, 90-95.

Khmelkov, V. T., & Hallinan, M. T. (1999). Organizational effects on race relations in schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(4), 627-645.

Korgen, K. O., Mahon, J., & Wang, G. (2003). Diversity on college campuses today: The growing need to foster campus environments capable of countering a possible 'Tipping Effect'. *College Student Journal, 37,* 16-26.

Kudo, K., & Simkin, K. A. (2003). Intercultural friendship formation: The case for Japanese students at an Australian university. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 24*, 91-114.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Long, C., Downs, A. C., Gillette, B., Kills in Sight, L., & Iron-Cloud Konen, E. (2006). Assessing cultural life skills of American Indian youth. *Child Youth Care Forum, 35*, 289-304.

Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E., (1961). Group cohesiveness, communication level, and conformity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*, 408-412.

Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. (1974). The role of reward in the formation of positive interpersonal attitudes. In T. Huston (Ed.), *Foundations of interpersonal attraction* (pp. 171-192). New York, NY: Academic.

Madison, S. (2005). *Critical ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McMahon, T. R., Kenyon, D. B., & Carter, J. S. (2013). "My culture, my family, my school, me": Identifying strengths and challenges in the lives and communities of American Indian youth. *Journal of Child & Family Studies. 22*(5), 694-706.

Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the promise of contact theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 387-410.

Morry, M. (2003). Perceived locus of control and satisfaction in same-sex friendships. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 495-509.

Nelson, P. A., Thorne, A., & Shapiro L. A. (2011). I'm outgoing and she's reserved: The reciprocal dynamics of personality in close friendships in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 79*(5), 1113-1147.

Newcomb T. M. (1961). *The acquaintance process.* New York, NY: Holt, Rienhart & Winstron.

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 174-195.

Quillian, L., & Campbell, M. E. (2003). Beyond black and white: The present and future of multiracial friendship segregation. *American Sociological Review, 68*, 540-566.

Saggio, J. J. (2001, February). *The influence of institutional culture on institutional choice and post-freshman persistence of American Indian/Alaska Native students at a bible college*. Paper presented to the Annual Graduate Student Conference on American Indian Research, Phoenix, AZ.

Steinhorn, L., & Diggs-Brown, B. (2000). *By the colour of our skin: The illusion of integration and the reality of race.* New York, NY: Plume.

Tavares, C. D. (2011). Why can't we be friends: The role of religious congregation-based social contact for close interethnic adolescent friendships. *Review of Religious Research, 52*(4), 439-453.

Turner, R. N., & Feddes, A. R. (2011). How intergroup friendship works: A longitudinal study of friendship effects on outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 914-923.

Vaquera, E., & Kao, G. (2008). Do you like me as much as I like you? Friendship reciprocity and its effects on school outcomes among adolescents. *Social Science Research, 37*, 55-72.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to gather information about how Native emerging adults report, describe, and engage in close friendships with individuals who are not Native. Reported trends and patterns were obtained through analysis of an extant dataset, which included a sample of 114 Native respondents who identified with 70 different Native tribes and groups throughout North America. Additionally, more in-depth information was acquired through semistructured interviews with six Native/non-Native friendship pairs. This study aimed to understand the reports of these participants in terms of some of the more prevalent theories on friendship development, along with the factors and qualities of the friendship that have been identified as consistent markers of intimacy or closeness within friendships.

Native Identity and Culture

One of the best examples of identity among Native adolescents and young adults is presented in Sherman Alexie's (2007a) Native character, Arnold Spirit, Jr., from Alexie's book: *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. Arnold is essentially forced to leave the reservation on which was raised to attend high school in an all-White high school. Arnold then struggles to find himself in both his reservation Native world and being Native in the White world, which is a phenomenon that most Native youth likely experience. Alexie commented that Arnold is left feeling that "he doesn't belong in either place. So he's nothing" (Alexie, 2007b), and this is at the heart of the concern for

young Natives today. Natives do not have the luxury of choosing to live in their "borderlands" (see Anzaldúa, 1987), nor do they have the opportunity to escape either of their two worlds; and yet, they cease to belong in either place. The cultural resources available to young Natives have largely been taken away; the community support and strength that emerges out of collectivistic living have been critically weakened. Weakened, but not destroyed. This study seeks to help begin to restore resources in the form of knowledge and awareness of Native identity and Native friendships that cross racial boundaries.

The Natives who responded to the survey portion of this study identified with their Native cultures, and they reported stronger identity with White culture. With 47.4% of the sample reporting Native Only race, and the remainder reporting Native and White or other race, Native identity is the key identity, but respondents reported slightly stronger White identity. This result likely reflects efforts to find belonging in the White world while remaining connected with Native identity. This idea may be particularly salient for young men, whose ancestral role in providing for/protecting the community has largely been stripped from their cultural customs.

The Native interview participants appeared to be moving toward greater identification with their Native cultures, which is an exciting prospect for the potential effects of attending higher education. All of the Native interviewees were very active in their universities' Native student organizations, which likely had low memberships compared to other ethnic student organizations. Participation in the Native organizations may have helped Natives increase their Native identification, and low numbers of

members in the Native organizations would likely prompt friend-seeking with non-Natives. This finding is similar to the finding in Kim, Park, and Koo (2015) that peer interaction in ethnic organizations does not discourage close friendships with other-race members, and it, in fact, facilitated more interethnic friendships among Latinos.

Specific to Native friendships, the benefits are even more important as peer social support is widely considered a protective factor against youth suicide attempts (Mackin, Perkins, & Furrer, 2012). Suicidal behavior has long been a problem for Native youth. If Native youth can feel belonging among their peers, they may be more likely to avoid suicide and use adaptive behaviors. In fact, in terms of resilience among Native teens, social support from friends was found as the strongest predictor by Stumblingbear-Riddle and Romans (2012). They also found enculturation and family support as significant predictors of resilience, but friendships accounted for the most unique variance.

Additional findings for Native friendships came from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) data, from which Rees, Freng, and Winfree (2014) found that Native youth had less social ties at school which was indicated by fewer reciprocated friendships, less in-school friends, and personal networks that were less cohesive. This corroborates the findings by Vaquera and Kao (2008) regarding rates of friendship reciprocation among Native and other races. Rees et al. also found that Native youth nominated more friends than members of other minority groups, but again, reciprocation of these nominations was much lower than reciprocated friendships among the other ethnic groups. Friendship reciprocation was not a focus of the quantitative aspect of this study, but it was a requirement for the qualitative inquiry and it was evident

in the friendships of the interviewees. Notably, the findings by Rees et al. seem to illustrate the disadvantages that Native youth face when it comes to strength of peer networks and opportunities for close friendships, especially when based on peer networks that develop within school environments.

A note on power and privilege issues is included here, whereas the Native experience is directly impacted by the colonizing efforts to "kill the Indian in him, and save the man" (Pratt, 1892). This ideology arose in the late 1800s after roughly 400 years of genocidal actions toward Natives, through disease, theft, relocation, neglect, and military action. The survivors of these atrocities passed on historical traumas from generation to generation, and Natives today carry over 500 years of oppression with them along with the burden of countless physical and psychological injuries. It is no wonder that widespread Native/non-Native friendship is still difficult to attain. The findings in this study that diversity climates in schools and communities, ethnic integration in various social contexts, and cultural sharing have great need to be accepted and encouraged by governing bodies and through social policies.

Even as I write this, Natives are met with violence and legal action against them as they advocate for their treaty rights and ancestral ways of living. It is hoped that this study and those like it will be used to help bridge the divides, improve social conditions, and better promote more positive Native/non-Native interactions. This is especially important for today's young adults and youth who will be shaping future generations.

Friendship Factors and Theories

Given the identity exploration and individuation (Erikson, 1950) during emerging adulthood, it should be a time of personal discovery and the development of intimate relationships (Tanner, Arnett, & Leis, 2009). In addition to the learning that comes from experimentation with romantic relationships, close interethnic friendships and cross-race peer networks may have even greater benefits for Native emerging adults (for reviews of benefits of cross-race friendships, see: Bagci, Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014; Graham, Munniksma, & Juvonen, 2014). In consideration of the two-worlds identities that many Natives experience, it is likely much more adaptive for them to have close friendships within both worlds (i.e., intraethnic and interethnic). It is therefore paramount that we understand which factors within close friendships that cross racial boundaries are necessary for development and maintenance.

Factors of close friendships that emerged in the quantitative analyses broadly included parental support, past friendship experiences, and multicultural activity or opportunity (in the form of diversity climates and racial diversity in student composition). In spite of some strong correlations between interethnic friendships among Natives and measures of identity and SES, these failed to predict likelihood of future relationships with non-Natives as strongly as the three broad factors previously listed.

These findings seem to relate most closely with contact theories, and the qualities identified in the qualitative inquiry closely relate with propinquity, homophily, and self-disclosure. The qualitative findings included themes of authenticity/acceptance, trust, and communication which seemed to relate with aspects of self-disclosure. Homophily was

evidenced by the theme of similarity as being a core element of their friendships. Propinquity was evidenced through the participants' activities and social engagement. All in all, the findings in this study are rather similar to the findings of a qualitative study of culturally diverse college students (Sias et al., 2008). Finally, given the structural influence of diversity climates and student racial compositions, Native emerging adults generally experience less opportunity to develop close friendships with members of their tribe, and seem to engage in interethnic friendships more frequently than other races.

Intimacy in Friendships

This study reported qualitative findings that largely correspond with the literature body. Indeed, the themes of authenticity, communication, and trust were nearly identical to the themes that were identified by Haayen (2014). In Haayen's sample, authenticity, honesty, and trust were the themes identified by the Mexican American emerging adults. Furthermore, friendships were described and organized by Haayen's participants, as: close, place-based, or acquaintances. These descriptions are similar to the structure in this study, along with the ideas that close friendships are characterized by such behaviors as: intimacy in language ("bromance" and "couples counseling"), feeling comfortable in the presence of each other's families, noting a specific "point" in the friendship when it changed from "just friends" to "close friends," and stories that demonstrate an ebb and flow to the closeness of the relationship. In contrast to Haayen's findings, the participants in the qualitative portion of this study broadly indicated that they never considered themselves *not* close friends and it would likely take much more than a single incident to

deconstruct their friendships. Participants in Haayen were generally much younger, which may be related to their reports of impulsive terminations of close friendships. Participants in this study may simply have had more relationship experience overall, or more mature perceptions about intimate relationships, or something about their college experience may have influenced their attitudes about close friendship.

Precursors of Interethnic and Close Friendships

This study found that prior multicultural experiences and activity were associated with greater interethnic friendships. Several recent studies found similar results among various racially-different groups of emerging adults (Bowman & Denson, 2012; Bowman & Park, 2015; Schofield, Hausmann, Ye, & Woods, 2010). In general, greater willingness to engage in interethnic friendships as adults is developed in childhood and adolescence through structural components of schools and communities. For younger adolescents, school diversity was also found to promote positive intergroup attitudes (Knifsend & Juvonen, 2014). Again, this seems to reflect strong connection to contact and opportunity theories, which seem to employ propinquity as a primary factor. Haayen's (2014) findings again validate findings in this study, where structural or contextual forces impact the development of friendships, along with personal attitudes and behaviors (see also Sias et al., 2008). Specifically, perceived similarity was mentioned by most of Haayen's participants as it was in this study. A contrast between the two studies comes in the form of communications, where the younger Latino participants indicated that drama ensues after the initial superficial interactions, but the older participants in this study seemed to

have moved past those types of communications. More particularly, the communications within the Native/non-Native friendships were described almost universally as "easy-going" and "straight-forward," and the friendships were experienced as non-pressured.

Implications and Future Directions

The findings from the projects in this study, along with the evidence from recent literature, could greatly enhance the promotion and effective implementation of school and community interventions to improve interethnic relationships. Given much of the recent research findings, the attitudes and experiences reported by all emerging adults seem to be largely formed prior to beginning college. These are trends that school districts and state legislators need to attend to if they are truly interested in engendering more positive intergroup contact and attitudes. Denis (2015) reported perspectives from 82 First Nations members and 78 non-indigenous members about "bridges" that helped to facilitate positive interactions between the two groups. Most of the bridges were related to community activities/events and integrated social organizations such as schools and churches. In spite of these findings, there was still a considerable amount of "laissez-faire racism" that seemed to be related to "small-town" dynamics and historical stereotypes. Denis warned of systems that continue to function on a sense of "White superiority" or unequal group position. Denis also highlighted the internalized racism that perpetuates negative stereotypes of Native/indigenous people, and strongly asserted that these types of problems need institutional recognition and support for organizational change.

Not only does this change need to occur at the local community levels, but also on

national and international levels. Bowman and Park (2015) reviewed studies that found

inhibited interethnic friendship development among White university students who were

active in Greek life. This does not mean that Greek life promotes racial segregation, but

the classist mentality and competitive nature may unintentionally foster racial

discrimination. Other findings suggest that this may simply be a residual from lack of

diversity promotion during pre-college experiences (Bowman & Denson, 2012). These

findings also highlighted the benefits of greater exposure to racial/ethnic diversity prior to

beginning college, which included better emotional well-being and race-related

perceptions that were more accepting and sensitive. The literature and findings from this

study appear to punctuate the need for increased diversity promotion in public systems

that serve children and adolescents.

   The exploratory nature of this study may be the overarching aspect of limitations

to this study, some of which could be addressed in future research. The survey's items

could be better developed to more specifically elicit attitudes and reported experiences

for Native emerging adults who actively engage in interethnic friendships. The challenge

in recruiting a larger sample size for both the quantitative and qualitative parts of this

study was also a limitation that could be the focus of future research. It would also likely

be useful for future relationship research among Native emerging adults to investigate

directly the differences in friendship patterns between Natives who grew up on a

reservation and urban Natives. It seems obvious that some Native groups may have

differences from other Native groups, and this might also prove to be valuable

information when considering how to enhance positive intergroup contact.

References

Alexie, S. (2007a). *The absolutely true diary of a part-time Indian.* New York, NY: Little, Brown Books for Young Readers.

Alexie, S. (2007b). *Author Sherman Alexie targets young readers*. Transcript of NPR interview on September 21, 2007.

Anzaldúa, G. E. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza.* San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Bagci, S. C., Rutland, A., Kumashiro, M., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. (2014). Are minority status children's cross-ethnic friendships beneficial in a multicultural context? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*, 107-115.

Bowman N. A. & Denson, N. (2012). What's past is prologue: How precollege exposure to racial diversity shapes the impact of college interethnic interactions. *Research in Higher Education, 53,* 406-425.

Bowman, N. A., & Park, J. J. (2015). Not all diversity interactions are created equal: Cross-racial interaction, close interethnic friendship, and college student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 56,* 601-621.

Denis, J. S. (2015). Contact theory in a small-town settler-colonial context: The reproduction of laissez-faire racism in indigenous-White Canadian relations. *American Sociological Review, 80*(1), 218-242.

Eriksen, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: Norton.

Graham, S., Munniksma, A., & Juvonen, J. (2014). Psychosocial benefits of cross-ethnic friendships in urban middle schools. *Child Development, 85*(2), 469-483.

Haayen, L. (2014). *My friends make me who I am: An exploration of the role of friendship among second-generation Mexican youth in a diverse Dallas neighborhood* (Doctoral dissertation). Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX. Retrieved from http://gradworks.proquest.com/36/33/3633872.html

Kim, Y., Park, J., & Koo, K. (2015). Testing self-segregation: Multiple-Group Structural Modeling of College Students' Interethnic Friendship by Race. *Research in Higher Education*, *56*(1), 57-77.

Knifsend, C. A., & Juvonen, J. (2014). Social identity complexity, cross-ethnic friendships, and intergroup attitudes in urban middle schools. *Child Development, 85*(2), 709-721.

Mackin, J., Perkins, T., & Furrer, C. (2012). The power of protection: A population-based comparison of Native and non-Native youth suicide attempters. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research: The Journal of the National Center, 19*(2), 20-54.

Pratt, R. H. (1892). Official report of the nineteenth annual conference of charities and correction (pp. 46-59). Reprinted in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880-1900, 260-271.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1973).

Rees, C., Freng, A., & Winfree, L. T., Jr. (2014). The Native American adolescent: Social network structure and perceptions of alcohol induced social problems. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 43*, 405-425.

Sias, P. M., Drzewiecka, J. A., Meares, M., Bent, R., Konomi, Y., Ortega, M., & White, C. (2008). Intercultural friendship development. *Communication Reports, 21*(1), 1-13.

Schofield, J. W., Hausmann, L. R. M., Ye, F., & Woods, R. L. (2010). Intergroup friendships on campus: Predicting close and casual friendships between White and African American first-year college students. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*(5), 585-602.

Stumblingbear-Riddle, G., & Romans, J. S. C. (2012). Resilience among urban American Indian adolescents: Exploration into the role of culture, self-esteem, subjective well-being, and social support. *American Indian & Alaska Native Mental Health Research: The Journal of the National Center, 19*(2), 1-19.

Tanner, J. L., Arnett, J. J., & Leis, J. A. (2009). Emerging adulthood: Learning and development during the first stage of adulthood. In M. C. Smith & N. DeFrates-Densch (Eds.), *Handbook of research on adult learning and development* (pp. 34-67). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Vaquera, E., & Kao, G. (2008). Do you like me as much as I like you? Friendship reciprocity and its effects on school outcomes among adolescents. *Social Science Research, 37*, 55-72.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Quantitative Study Materials

Recruitment Email

Why am I getting this email?

Hello! My name is Merrill Jones and I am a Ph.D. student at Utah State University. I am working with Dr. Renee Galliher, psychology professor at USU, and we would like to **invite you to participate in a research study** designed to explore the experiences and attitudes of Native American young adults about close relationships across ethnic differences. We are both sensitive to and interested in promoting appropriate research among young Native Americans. I am a member of the Navajo (Diné) tribe, and I have a strong desire to find out about other young Natives' relationship attitudes. The goal of our research is to develop a better understanding of the relationship experiences of Native adolescents and young adults to provide information to future young Natives and to those who work with them. We invite you to participate in our study if you are age 18-25 and you OR one of your parents affiliates with at least one tribe.

What would I have to do?

Your participation would involve completing an anonymous online survey about your cross-ethnic attitudes and experiences. This may take you **between 20 and 30 minutes**. All survey responses will be anonymous and completely confidential.

What is in it for me?

You may choose to submit your email address to be entered into a **drawing for one of ten $15 and one $100 gift certificates** given away after data collection ends. Email addresses for the drawing will be held in a separate database, so survey responses will not be traceable to specific email addresses. In addition, you may request a summary of the study results by email.

If you have any questions about the research, please do not hesitate to contact me, Merrill Jones at merrill.jones@aggiemail.usu.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D. at Renee.Galliher@usu.edu or (435) 797-3391.

Thanks!
To participate, please follow the link below to reach the survey:

Letter of Information and Informed Consent

Introduction/Purpose: Dr. Renee Galliher and Merrill Jones in the Department of Psychology at Utah State University are conducting a study on the experiences and attitudes about interethnic relationships among Native American emerging adults. You have been asked to participate in this study because you are a Native American between the ages 18-25 years, and you and/or your parents are affiliated members of your tribe. We expect approximately 100 participants.

Procedure: If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey. You will be asked questions about your past and current experiences regarding close cross-ethnic relationships, as well as your attitudes about dating partners or friends who are not Native American. The questionnaire may take about 20-30 minutes.

Risks: There are minimal anticipated risks to this study. If you feel uncomfortable answering a question you may skip the question(s) and proceed with the questionnaire.

Benefits: If the findings of this study are meaningful, the results may help service professionals to more effectively create safer and more supportive environments for Native American emerging adults in areas such as mental health, education, community involvement, etc.

Explanation & offer to answer questions: If you have any questions, complaints, or research-related problems please contact Merrill Jones by email: merrill.jones@aggiemail.usu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Renee Galliher at: Renee.Galliher@usu.edu, or by phone at (435) 797-3391.

Payment/Compensation: Upon completion of the survey, you may choose to follow another link to submit your email address for a chance to win one of ten $15 gift certificates and one $100 gift certificate to Amazon. In no way will your personal information be connected with your survey responses.

Voluntary nature of participation and right to withdraw without consequence: Participation in research is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without consequence.

Confidentiality: All survey responses are confidential, and it will not be possible to identify your computer, as the survey uses a Secure Survey Environment. Email addresses entered for the chance to receive a gift certificate will be held in a separate database, and will not be linked to survey responses in any way. Research records will be kept confidential, consistent with federal and state regulations. Only the investigators will have access to the data, which will be downloaded from the survey provider's secure database, and stored on a password-protected computer. All email addresses will be

disposed of after the results of the study have been distributed by email

IRB Approval Statement: The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human participants at USU has reviewed and approved this research study. If you have any pertinent questions or concerns about your rights or think the research may have harmed you, you may contact the IRB Administrator at (435) 797-0567 or email: irb@usu.edu. If you have a concern or complaint about the research and you would like to contact someone other than the research team, you may contact the IRB Administrator to obtain information or to offer input.

Copy of Consent: Please print a copy of this informed consent for your files.

PI & Student Researcher (Co-PI):

Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Merrill L. Jones, Student Researcher (Co-PI)

Participant Consent: If you have read and understand the above statements, please click on the "CONTINUE" button below. This indicates your consent to participate in this study.

Thank you very much for your participation! Your assistance is truly appreciated.

Daily Racial Microaggressions scale – Short Form

Please rate the items below according to the following scale:
1 = This has never happened to me
2 = This has happened to me but I was not upset
3 = This happened to me and I was slightly upset
4 = This happened to me and I was moderately upset
5 = This happened to me and I was extremely upset

1. Someone was surprised at my skills or intelligence because they believed people of my racial/ethnic background are typically not that smart.

2. I was made to feel that my achievements were primarily due to preferential treatment based on my racial/ethnic background.

3. I was treated like I was of inferior status because of my racial/ethnic background.

4. Someone assumed I was a service worker or laborer because of my race/ethnicity.

5. I was treated as if I was a potential criminal because of my racial/ethnic background.

6. I was followed in a store due to my race/ethnicity.

7. I was made to feel as if the cultural values of another race/ethnic group were better than my own.

8. Someone reacted negatively to the way I dress because of my racial/ethnic background.

9. Someone told me that I am not like other people of my racial/ethnic background.

10. Someone asked my opinion as a representative of my race/ethnicity.

11. Someone made a statement to me that they are not racist or prejudiced because they have friends from different racial/ethnic backgrounds.

12. Someone told me that they are not racist or prejudiced even though their behavior suggests that they might be.

13. Someone did not take me seriously when I attempted to discuss issues related to my racial/ethnic background in a school or work setting.

14. Someone suggested that my racial/ethnic background has not had much of an influence on my life experiences.

The Multicultural Experience Inventory

Next to each item, circle the number of the response that best describes your past and present behavior. (Type A items)

1 = almost entirely Native American
2 = mostly Native American with a few minorities from other ethnic groups
3 = mixed Anglos/White, Native American, and other minorities about equally
4 = mostly Anglos/White with a few minorities including Native American
5 = almost entirely Anglos/White

1. The ethnic composition of the neighborhoods in which I lived
1 2 3 4 5   a) before I started attending school
1 2 3 4 5   b) while I attended elementary school
1 2 3 4 5   c) while I attended middle school
1 2 3 4 5   d) while I attended high school
1 2 3 4 5   2. My childhood friends who visited me and related well to my parents were…
1 2 3 4 5   3. Teachers and counselors with whom I had the closest relationships have been…
1 2 3 4 5   4. The people who have most influenced me in my education have been…
1 2 3 4 5   5. In high school my close friends were…
1 2 3 4 5   6. The ethnic backgrounds of the people I have dated have been…
1 2 3 4 5   7. In past jobs I have had, my close friends were …
1 2 3 4 5   8. People that I have established close, meaningful relationships with have been…
1 2 3 4 5   9. At present, my close friends are…
1 2 3 4 5   10. My close friends at work now are…
1 2 3 4 5   11. I enjoy going to gatherings at which the people are…
1 2 3 4 5   12. When I study/work on a project with others, I am usually with persons who are…
1 2 3 4 5   13. When I am involved in group discussions where I am expected to participate, I prefer a group of people who are…
1 2 3 4 5   14. I am active in organizations or social groups in which the majority of the members are…
1 2 3 4 5   15. When I am with my friends, I usually attend functions where the people are…
1 2 3 4 5   16. When I discuss personal problems/issues, I discuss them with people who are…
1 2 3 4 5   17. I most often spend time with people who are…

Next to each item below, circle the response that best describes you: (Type B Items)
1 = Extensively 2 = Frequently 3 = Occasionally 4 = Seldom 5 = Never

1 2 3 4 5   18. I attend functions that are predominantly Anglo/White in nature.
1 2 3 4 5   19. I attend functions that are predominantly of minority groups other than my own.
1 2 3 4 5   20. I attend functions that are predominantly Native American in nature.
1 2 3 4 5   21. I visit the homes of Anglos/Whites.
1 2 3 4 5   22. I invite Anglos/Whites to my home.
1 2 3 4 5   23. I visit the homes of Native Americans (other than relatives).
1 2 3 4 5   24. I invite Native Americans (other than relatives) to my home.
1 2 3 4 5   25. I visit the homes of minorities (other than Native American).
1 2 3 4 5   26. I invite persons of minorities (other than Native American) to my home.

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

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

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

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

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.

3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.

4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.

5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.

6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.

7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.

8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.

9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.

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

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

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

Orthogonal Cultural Identification Scale

The following questions ask how close you are to different cultures. When answering the questions about "family," think about the family that is most important to you <u>now</u>. How would you define that family? You can include your current family, your family of origin, or both. Answer questions with that definition in mind. You may identify with more than one culture, so please mark all responses that apply to you.

1. Some families have special activities or traditions that take place every year at particular times (such as holiday parties, special meals, religious activities, trips or visits). How many of these special activities or traditions does your family have that are based on…

	A lot	Some	A few	None
White American or Anglo culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Asian or Asian American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Mexican American or Spanish culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Black or African American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Native American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. In the future, with your own family, will you do special things together or have special traditions, which are based on…

	A lot	Some	A few	None
Mexican American or Spanish culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Asian or Asian American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
White American or Anglo culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Black or African American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Native American culture	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

3. Does your family live by or follow the…

	A lot	Some	Not much	None
Native American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
White American or Anglo way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Mexican American or Spanish way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Black or African American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Asian or Asian American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

4. Do you live by or follow the…

	A lot	Some	Not much	None
Asian or Asian American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
White American or Anglo way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Mexican American or Spanish way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Black or African American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Native American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

5. Is your family a success in the…

	A lot	Some	Not much	None
Black or African American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Mexican American or Spanish way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Native American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
White American or Anglo way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Asian or Asian American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. Are you a success in the…

	A lot	Some	Not much	None
Native American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Asian or Asian American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Mexican American or Spanish way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Black or African American way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
White American or Anglo way of life	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other culture	( )	( )	( )	( )

Items Generated for This Study

<u>Close Friendships Experiences and Attitudes</u>

1. How many years have you lived on a reservation?
___None /never did ___Less than 2 ___2-7 ___8 or more

2. In which age range were you when you last lived on a reservation?
___Currently ___18+ ___17-15 ___14-12 ___11-6 ___5- ___Never

3. How often do you visit a reservation to spend time with close-friends or family?
___ 12+ times/year ___11-4 times/year ___3-1 times/year ___Less than once/year

4. The students in my high school were/are:
___ mostly from my tribe   ___ mostly other ethnic minorities, but non-Native
___ mostly Natives, but not my tribe   ___ mostly Whites/Anglos

5. The students in my college or university were/are:
___ mostly from my tribe   ___ mostly other ethnic minorities, but non-Native
___ mostly Natives, but not my tribe   ___ mostly Whites/Anglos

6. Thinking about the overall climate for diversity and equality (acceptance and validation of differences by faculty and students, teaching approaches, discipline methods, incorporation of local and national cultures, etc.), in the following environments the climate was/is:

Community I grew up in	mostly +, somewhat +, somewhat -, mostly -
High School	mostly +, somewhat +, somewhat -, mostly -
College or University	mostly +, somewhat +, somewhat -, mostly -
Community I now live in	mostly +, somewhat +, somewhat -, mostly -

7. Rate each item from 1 (little) to 10 (much) how much you think your current relationship attitudes are influenced by…
___your exposure to Native lifestyle while growing up?
___your past relationship experiences?
___your experiences with discrimination?
___your educational experiences?
___your non-Native peers?
___your Native peers?
___your close friends?
___your parents or other family?
___White American culture?
___popular media (tv, movies, music, etc)?

How much have you invested yourself into close-friendships in the past with…

members of your tribe?	Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very
Natives, but from a different tribe?	Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very
ethnic minority members, but non-Native?	Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very
Anglos/Whites?	Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

How likely are you to invest yourself into a close-friendship in the future with…

    members of your tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Native Americans, but from a different tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    ethnic minority members, but non-Native?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Anglos/Whites?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

How supported by your parent(s) have you felt with your close-friends who were…

    members of your tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Native Americans, but from a different tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    ethnic minority members, but non-Native?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Anglos/Whites?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

How supported by your parent(s) would you feel with future close-friends who are…

    members of your tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Native Americans, but from a different tribe?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    ethnic minority members, but non-Native?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

    Anglos/Whites?   Very Fairly Somewhat Not Very

Which reason most accurately reflects why you have never made close-friends with…

    members of your tribe? ___

    Native Americans, but from a different tribe? ___

    ethnic minority members, but non-Native? ___

    Anglos/Whites? ___

        a. lack of opportunity   e. negative past relationships

        b. no interest   f. other:_____

        c. negative family pressure   g. have had

        d. negative peer pressure

Which reason most accurately reflects why you would never make close-friends in the future…

    with members of your tribe? ___

    with Native Americans, but from a different tribe? ___

    with ethnic minority members, but non-Native? ___

    with Anglos/Whites? ___

        a. lack of opportunity   e. negative past relationships

        b. no interest   f. other:_____

        c. negative family pressure   g. have had

        d. negative peer pressure

I have close family members who have been involved in past close-friendships with non-Natives:

___Yes, and the majority of my family supported the intimate relationships

___Yes, but the majority of my family did not support the intimate relationships

___No, because the rest of my family would not have supported the relationships

___No, but the rest of my family would have supported the relationships

I have a close family member who is currently involved in a close-friendship with a non-Native:

___Yes, and the majority of my family supports the friendship

___Yes, but the majority of my family does not support the friendship

___No, because the rest of my family would not support the friendship

___No, but the rest of my family would support the friendship

Appendix B

Qualitative Study Materials

Recruitment Email

<u>Why am I getting this email?</u>

Hello! My name is Merrill Jones and I am a Ph.D. student at Utah State University. I am working with Dr. Renee Galliher, psychology professor at USU, and we would like to **invite you to participate in a research study** designed to explore the experiences and attitudes of Native American young adults about close friendships between ethnically-different friends. We are both sensitive to and interested in promoting appropriate research among Native Americans. I am Diné (Navajo), and I have a strong desire to find out about other young Natives' friendship attitudes. The goal of our research is to develop a better understanding of the friendship experiences of Native young adults to provide information to future Native young adults and to those who work with them. We invite you to participate in our study if you are age 18-25 and you OR one of your parents affiliates with at least one tribe.

<u>What would I have to do?</u>

Your participation would involve you selecting a close non-Native friend (between whom there is no romantic interest) who would be willing to participate in an interview with you and me in person. The interview would last approximately **45-60 minutes**. All interview data will remain completely confidential and be presented anonymously.

<u>What is in it for me?</u>

You and your friend each will receive $15 cash for an hour or less of your time for the interview. After the interview is transcribed, we will ask you to read it to ensure that we typed your responses accurately. In addition, you may request a summary of the study results by email.

To participate, simply email me (contact information is below) to arrange a time and place for the interview. If you have any questions about the research, please do not hesitate to contact me at **merrill.jones@aggiemail.usu.edu** (preferred) or 435-590-6673. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D., at Renee.Galliher@usu.edu or (435) 797-3391.

Thanks!
Merrill Jones, M.S.
Doctoral Student in Psychology
Utah State University

Letter of Information and Informed Consent

Introduction/Purpose: Dr. Renee Galliher and Merrill Jones in the Department of Psychology at Utah State University are conducting a study on the experiences and attitudes about interethnic relationships among Native American emerging adults. You have been asked to participate in this study because you are a Native American between the ages 18-25 years, and you and/or your parents are a(n) affiliated member(s) of your tribe.

Procedure: If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview with the student researcher, along with your friend. You will be asked questions about your past and current experiences regarding close cross-ethnic relationships, as well as your attitudes about friends. The interview is expected to take 45-60 minutes.

Risks: Participation in this research study may involve some minimal risks or discomforts. Some people may not want to be audio recorded or share personal information. You will have the opportunity to decline to answer the interviewer's questions if desired. Additionally, it is possible that your personal information might be inadvertently seen by others during email transmission. However, we will work closely with you to best ensure your privacy throughout the study. Utah law requires researchers to report certain information to the authorities. This includes threat of harm to self or others, or abuse of a minor by an adult, or ongoing current witnessing of domestic violence by a minor.

Benefits: If the findings of this study are meaningful, the results may help service professionals to more effectively create safer and more supportive environments for cross-ethnic relationships among Native American and non-Native individuals. This information may also help service providers in areas such as mental health, education, community involvement, etc.

Explanation & offer to answer questions: If you have any questions, complaints, or research-related problems please contact Merrill Jones by email: merrill.jones@aggiemail.usu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Renee Galliher: Renee.Galliher@usu.edu, or by phone at (435) 797-3391.

Payment/Compensation: Upon termination of the interview, you will receive $15 as a token of our appreciation.

Voluntary nature of participation and right to withdraw: Participation in all research is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty.

Confidentiality: All research records will be kept confidential, consistent with federal and state regulations. Only the research team will have access to the data, which will be

stored on a password-protected computer. The audio recordings will be destroyed after the transcripts are reviewed by the participant and returned to the research team. Any email addresses, phone numbers, or other contact information will be disposed of after the results of the study have been distributed.

IRB Approval Statement: The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human participants at USU has reviewed and approved this research study. If you have any pertinent questions or concerns about your rights or think the research may have harmed you, you may contact the IRB Administrator at (435) 797-0567 or email irb@usu.edu. If you have a concern or complaint about the research and you would like to contact someone other than the research team, you may contact the IRB Administrator to obtain information or to offer input.

Copy of Consent: Please retain this copy of informed consent for your files.

PI & Student Researcher (Co-PI):

Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Merrill L. Jones, Student Researcher (Co-PI)

Participant Consent: If you have read and understand the above statements, please sign below to indicate your consent to participate in this study.

Thank you very much for your participation! Your assistance is truly appreciated.

Demographic Information

1. Which tribe(s) do you identify with? (*list all*)_____

2. What is your ethnicity? (*mark all that apply)*   ___ Native American/Alaskan Native
    ___White American/Anglo   ___ Latino/Hispanic
    ___ Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander   ___ Asian American/Asian Descent
    ___ Black American/African Descent   ___Other: (*describe*)_____

3. What is your religious affiliation/spiritual identification? (*describe*)_____

4. What is your current relationship status?
    ___Single not dating   ___Married/committed partnership
    ___Single and dating   ___Divorced, separated, or widowed

5. Who do you currently live with? (*mark all that apply)*
    ___Parents and/or siblings   ___Roommates   ___Grandparents
    ___Partner and/or children   ___Alone   ___Aunties, uncles, cousins

6. What is your personal yearly income? ___$10K or less ___$10K-20K ___$20K-50K ___Over $50K

7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
    ___Some high school or less   ___Bachelor's degree
    ___High School Diploma/G.E.D.   ___Graduate or professional school
    ___Some college/trade/technical school   ___Other: (*describe*)_____
    ___Associate degree/technical certification   ___No formal schooling

8. What is the highest level of education each of your **primary** parent figures (mother/father, grandmother/ grandfather, auntie/uncle, etc.) has completed?

Mother	Father
___Some high school or less	___Some high school or less
___High School Diploma/G.E.D.	___High School Diploma/G.E.D.
___Some college/trade/technical school	___Some college/trade/technical school
___Associate degree/technical certification	___Associate degree/technical certification
___Bachelor's degree	___Bachelor's degree
___Graduate or professional school	___Graduate or professional school
___Other: (*describe*)_____	___Other: (*describe*)_____
___No formal schooling	___No formal schooling
___No mother figure while growing up	___No father figure while growing up

10. Which ethnicity are your primary parent figures? (*mark all that apply*)

Mother	Father
___Native American/Alaskan Native	___Native American/Alaskan Native
___White American/Anglo	___White American/Anglo
___Latino/Hispanic	___Latino/Hispanic
___ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	___ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
___Asian American	___Asian American

___Black American   ___Black American
___Other: (*describe*)_____   ___Other: (*describe*)_____
___ No mother figure while growing up   ___ No father figure while growing up

11. What is the current relationship status of your primary parent figures?
___Married/committed partnership ___Divorced or separated ___Widowed ___ Never married

12. What was the average yearly income for the household that you were raised in?
___Less than $20K ___$20-49K ___$50-100K ___$100-250K ___Over $250K

13. What is your age?
___18-19 ___20-21 ___22-23 ___24-25

14. What is your gender?
___Female ___Male

Interview Items

1. Both of you agreed to come today because you would describe your friendship as close. Please help me understand what it is about your friendship that makes it close.

   - Some research about Native relationships has found several aspects of relationships that are important to Natives. These include things like respect, communication, cultural values/activities, spirituality, emotionality, and others. How have these types of ideas or any others showed up in this friendship?

2. I'd like to hear the story about how the two of you became friends.

   - How did you meet? (when, where, what was going on)
   - What interested you in becoming friends with the other person?
   - Describe the process of moving from acquaintances to friends. (How long did it take, was anyone else involved, did you attend similar activities, how did you feel about it?)

3. Please share with me any past experiences you have had with each other or others (including family) that may have influenced or impacted this relationship in any way.

   - For example, one of the aspects of your friendship that interests me is that you have different ethnic backgrounds, unique personal & cultural histories, and attitudes & experiences that probably have an effect on this friendship in some way. Things like school, neighborhoods, and media frequently influences socializing among friends. So I guess I'm wondering how any of these types of things have any effect on the friendship?

4. I'd appreciate it if you could tell me about a time or provide me with examples from your friendship that demonstrate any challenges that you have experienced together.

   - Please explain to me how you have processed (felt and thought about) difficult situations/events within this friendship.

5. Aside from what you have already talked about, I'm very interested in the benefits, positive aspects, things that you have enjoyed, etc. that have come about because of your friendship.

   - Several studies have found that friendships help improve overall well-being, sense of connection, and better adaptation to problems. What things have you noticed as being better since this friendship began, and how so?
   - How have your views on ethnic and cultural differences changed because of your friendship?

CURRICULUM VITAE

MERRILL L. JONES

merrilljones@suu.edu   (435) 865-8621

EDUCATION

Ph.D. 2017   **Combined Clinical/Counseling/School Psychology** (APA accredited)
Utah State University, Logan, UT
Dissertation: Attitudes and experiences of close interethnic friendships among Native emerging adults: A mixed-methods investigation
Chair: Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D.

M.S. 2011   **Combined Clinical/Counseling/School Psychology**
Utah State University, Logan, UT
Thesis: Attitudinal and experiential factors of romantic interethnic relationships among Native American emerging adults
Chair: Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D.

B.A. 2007   **Psychology major, Spanish minor**
Southern Utah University, Cedar City, UT
Magna Cum Laude

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

08/16 –   **Staff Psychologist**, *SUU Counseling & Psychological Services, Cedar City,*
Present   *UT*
Performs counseling and clinical services to university students for a variety of presenting concerns. Services provided include individual and group therapy, psychological assessments, and outreach coordination and presentations.
Supervisor: Curtis Hill, Ph.D.

11/15 – 07/16   **Counselor**, *Encompass Health Services, Page, AZ*
Provided counseling for clients for a variety of presenting concerns. Clients included Native individuals, White-Americans, and Spanish-speakers.
Steve Johnson, LMFT

09/14 – 08/15   **Psychology Intern**, *Indian Health Care Resource Center of Tulsa, OK*
Northeastern Oklahoma Psychology Internship Program (APA accredited)
Conducted intake interviews, individual/group/couples therapy, and comprehensive psychological evaluations for various issues, such as autism spectrum disorders, behavior problems, academic performance, memory and executive functioning, and social security disability; interdisciplinary collaboration. Provided supervision to graduate student clinicians. Clients included Native individuals, from toddlers to older adults.
Supervisors: Jason Menting, Psy.D.; Joanna Shadlow, Ph.D.; Rachele Floyd, Psy.D.

08/13 – 05/14, **Graduate Assistant Therapist**, *USU Counseling and Psychological Services*
08/09 – 05/10 Conducted brief & full intake interviews, individual therapy, co-facilitator of multicultural support group; involvement with veteran's support group; outreach presentations, lead clinical skills and psychology topic presentations/ trainings; provided individual supervision to student mentor. Clients included traditional young adult and non-traditional adult students from diverse and multicultural populations with various health and/or academic problems.
Supervisor: David Bush, Ph.D., Thomas Berry, Ph.D., LuAnn Helms, Ph.D.

08/11 – 05/13 **Graduate Assistant Clinician**, *USU Center for Persons with Disabilities*
Conducted intake interviews and comprehensive evaluations for autism spectrum disorders, psychological, behavioral, academic, and social security disability; administration of numerous assessments; consultation with schools; interdisciplinary team member. Clients included toddlers to older adults of various ethnicities and cultures, who are self-referred or by other sources.
Supervisor: Martin J. Toohill, Ph.D.

06/12 – 05/13 **Graduate Student Therapist**, *Utah State University*
"Multicultural Practicum." Provided pro-bono, home-based counseling for Spanish-speaking clients, including an individual, a couple, and a family for family discord and parenting issues.
Supervisor: Melanie Domenech Rodríguez, Ph.D.

08/11 – 03/12 **Clinical Research Assistant**, *Utah State University*
"Healthy Sexuality." Co-led group interventions regarding human sexual anatomy, human sexual response, and how to create and maintain healthy sexual behavior/relationships. Participants included young adult individuals of diverse backgrounds, including ethnic, religious, and sexual minorities.
Supervisor: Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D., Brenna M. Wernersbach, M.S.

01/08 – 01/12 **Graduate Student Therapist**, *USU Psychology Community Clinic*
Conducted intake interviews and diagnostic evaluations, assessments, report writing, co-therapy, individual, family, and long-term therapy. Clients included English- and Spanish-speaking preschool age children to adults.
Supervisors: Susan Crowley, Ph.D., Melanie Domenech Rodríguez, Ph.D., Kyle Hancock, Ph.D., Gretchen Peacock, Ph.D.

08/08 – 04/11 **Graduate Assistant Therapist**, *Bear River Head Start, Logan, UT*
Conducted intake interviews, individual, couple, and family therapy; performed classroom observations and functional behavioral assessments; led family development presentations and staff training presentations. Clients included English- and Spanish-speaking preschool age children, and their family members from diverse and multicultural populations with various health issues.
Supervisor: David Stein, Ph.D., Melanie Domenech Rodríguez, Ph.D.

01/09 – 05/09, **Clinical Research Assistant**, *Utah State University*
01/08 – 05/08 "Latino Families Interventions in Parenting Study." Investigated several aspects of parenting practices among Latino/Hispanic families and response to intervention. Practiced parenting interventions with children of parents in intervention, and co-facilitated parenting interventions with parents in Spanish.
Supervisor: Melanie Domenech Rodríguez, Ph.D.

01/08 – 05/08   **Graduate Research Assistant**, *Utah State University*
"Romantic Relationships Among Latino Adolescents." Investigated several aspects of adolescent romantic relationships and Latino/Hispanic ethnic identity by collaborating with supervisor and other research assistants, creating video instructions, use of video & audio recording equipment, simple computer programming, data collection, transcription, data entry. Conducted semi-structured interviews with participants in English and Spanish.
Supervisor: Renee V. Galliher, Ph.D.

TEACHING, LEADERSHIP, & PARAPROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

08/11 – 05/12   **Graduate Teaching Assistant**, *Utah State University*
Planned, taught, and managed several Psychology 1010 lab sections and discussion groups on-campus and online; graded tests and written assignments; collaborated with professor and other teaching assistants; lectured in professors' absence; provided for other student needs.
Supervisors: Scott Bates, Ph.D., Jennifer Grewe, Ph.D., Joseph Baker, M.S.

05/10 – 05/11   **Graduate Student Representative**, *Utah State University*
Elected by peers to attend faculty meetings and provide liaison between student body and faculty members; coordinated/managed several meetings and activities, including several aspects of new applicant interviews; managed guest presenters, and presented on several topics in student meetings.
Faculty Liaison: Susan Crowley, Ph.D.

08/06 – 05/07   **Adolescent Peer Mentor**, *Mountain Springs Prep. Academy, Cedar City, UT*
Monitored students; utilized principles of behavior and modeled adaptive socialization to help at-risk youth; substitute taught several subjects; co-facilitated group discussions; organized and led on-campus activities.
Supervisor: Desiree Little, B.A.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

05/06   **Research Assistant**, *Northern Arizona University*
"PBS Reading Between the Lions Interventions." Investigated aspects of the efficacy of reading interventions among children in Navajo Head Start programs. Conducted standardized reading assessments with preschool-age children.
Supervisor: Irene B. Jones, M.Ed.

03/04   **Research Assistant**, *Utah State University*
"Psychosocial Adjustment of Navajo Adolescents." Investigated effects of ethnic identity and experiences of discrimination on Navajo youth adaptation to social contexts. Assisted with data collection and organization.
Supervisor: Matthew D. Jones, M.S.

08/02 – 04/03   **Co-Investigator**, *Southern Utah University*
"Clubhouse Effectiveness in Improving Participants' Daily Living Skills." Investigated clubhouse model of assisted living for persons with disabilities. Aided in design, data collection and analysis, and interpretation of the results.
Supervisor: Steve T. Barney, Ph.D.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING

11/16   *Critical Role of Families in Preventing Risk and Promoting Well-Being for LGBTQ Students* by Caitlyn Ryan, Ph.D., ACSW (5.5 hrs)
          Sponsored by Utah University and College Counseling Centers; Salt Lake City, UT

8/15   *Non-Medication Treatments for ADHD* by Stephanie M. Sarkis, Ph.D., LMHC (6 hrs)
          Sponsored by PESI, Austin, TX

3/15   *Ethics of Supervision with Psychology Trainees* by Joanna Shadlow, Ph.D (3 hrs)
          Sponsored by Northeastern Oklahoma Psychology Internship Program, Tulsa, OK

9/14   *Motivational Interviewing: A Resource for Helping Professionals* by Berg-Smith (12 hrs)
          Sponsored by Indian Health Care Resource Center, Tulsa, OK

4/14   *Understanding and Treatment of Psychological Trauma: "Trauma and the Brain"* by van der Kolk, Ph.D. (6 hrs)
          Sponsored by USU Counseling and Psychological Services; Logan, UT

3/13   *Toward a New View of Intergenerational Trauma* by Eduardo Duran, Ph.D. (*8 hrs*)
          Sponsored by Portland Community College, Cross Cultural Counseling and Consulting, Inc., Chemawa Indian School, Oregon Psychological Association; Portland, OR

6/12   *ADOS-2 Training Workshop* by Marietta Veeder, Ph.D. (*6 hrs*)
          Sponsored by Clinical Services of Center for Persons with Disabilities; Logan, UT

4/10   *An Integrated Approach to Complex Psychological Trauma* by John Briere, Ph.D. (*6 hrs*)
          Sponsored by USU Counseling and Psychological Services; Logan, UT

6/09   *Legal and Ethical Aspects of Supervision* by Stephen H. Behnke, Ph.D. (*6 hrs*)
          Sponsored by Utah Psychological Association and USU; Logan, UT

4/09   *Introduction to Acceptance and Commitment Therapy* by Steven Hayes, Ph.D. (*6.5 hrs*)
          Sponsored by USU Counseling and Psychological Services; Logan, UT

10/08   *Acceptance- and Values-Based Multicultural Training* by Melanie Domenech Rodriguez, Ph.D., Michael Twohig, Ph.D., and Angela Enno, doctoral student (*3 hrs*)
          Sponsored by USU Department of Psychology; Logan, UT

10/08   *WAIS-IV Training Workshop* (*6 hrs*)
          Sponsored by Utah Psychological Association; Salt Lake City, UT

9/08   *Becoming an Ally for Individuals with Same-Sex Attraction* (*3 hrs*)
          Sponsored by USU Allies on Campus; Logan, UT

4/08   *Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy* by Mark Lau (*7 hrs*)
          Sponsored by USU Counseling and Psychological Services; Logan, UT

2/08   *Multicultural Counseling Workshop* by Madonna Constantine (*3 hrs)*
          Sponsored by Utah Psychological Association; Salt Lake City, UT

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS & PUBLICATIONS

Jones, M. L., & Galliher, R. V. (2014). Daily racial microaggressions and ethnic identification among Native American young adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*(1).

Jones, M. L., & Galliher, R. V. (2014, March). *Native American adults' interethnic friendships: A qualitative analysis of development, challenges, and benefits.* Poster presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, Austin, TX.

Jones, M. L., & Galliher, R. V. (2012, March). *Daily racial microaggressions and ethnic identification among Native American late adolescents and young adults.* Poster presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, Vancouver, Canada.

Jones, M. L., & Galliher, R. V. (2012, March). *Factors of interethnic romantic relationships among Native American late adolescents and young adults.* Poster presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, Vancouver, Canada.

Jones, I. B., & **Jones, M. L.** (2008, October). *Great expectations in Native American contexts.* Lecture presented at the annual conference of the National Indian Education Association, Seattle, WA.

Jones, I. B., Jones, M. D., & **Jones, M. L.** (2006, October). *Demystifying advice narratives for Native students.* Lecture presented at the annual conference of the National Indian Education Association, Anchorage, AK.

Jones, I. B., & **Jones, M. L.** (2005, January). *Navajo culture exchange.* Lecture presented at the annual meeting of the Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, HI.

Jones, M. L., Hodges, A., & Peacock, J. (2004, April) *Peninsular Spanish literature: Connecting classical Spanish writings with modern life in Spain.* Lecture presented at the annual Symposium of Southern Utah University Faculty and Students, Cedar City, UT.

Dansie, E., Gurr, M., & **Jones, M. L.** (2003, April). *Effectiveness of clubhouse model assisted-living centers for persons with disabilities.* Lecture presented at the annual conference of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Denver, CO.

INVITED WORKSHOPS AND TRAININGS

2014 – 2008   Multiple presentations, trainings, and workshops for staff/clients of USU Counseling and Psychological Services. Topics included: helping international college students and minority students to access mental health resources on campus, learning styles and coping styles, managing stress/anxiety, healthy sexuality, multicultural considerations for working with Natives in the Southwest, clinical implications of Spanish-speaking diversity issues on a predominantly White college campus.

2011 – 2009   Multiple presentations, trainings, and workshops for staff and clients of Bear River Head Start in Logan, UT. Topics included: learning styles and parenting styles, father/male involvement, exposure to the mental health process, identifying stress/anxiety, premenstrual dysphoric disorder, strategies for parenting teenagers, collaborating with schools for children with ADHD, ADHD myths and facts.

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Society of Indian/Indigenous Psychologists
APA Div-45, Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity, & Race, Student Member
APA Div-19, Society for Military Psychology, Student Member
Society for Research on Emerging Adulthood, Student Member
Society for Research on Adolescence, Student Member
Utah Psychological Association, Student Member
Psi Chi National Honor Society in Psychology
Golden Key International Honour Society

MEMBERSHIP IN ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Allies on Campus, LGBT Support Group at Southern Utah University
Care and Support Team at Southern Utah University
Veterans of Foreign Wars

HONORS AND AWARDS

2012-2013   Carolyn Barcus Diversity Scholarship ($1,000), USU, Department of Psychology
2008-2013   Krantz Research Awards ($2,322), USU, Department of Psychology
2007-2011   Tribal Scholarships ($16,500), Navajo Nation Scholarship & Financial Aid
2009, 2012   Department of Psychology Travel Awards ($600), Utah State University
2009, 2011   Graduate Student Senate Travel Awards ($600), Utah State University
2007-2008   Presidential Fellowship ($12,000), Utah State University, President's Office
2002-2006   Chief Manuelito Scholar ($7,500), Navajo Nation Scholarship & Financial Aid
2004-2005   Spencer W. Kimball Endowment Scholarship ($300), Southern Utah University
2004   American Indian Services Scholarship ($650), Southern Utah University