The Case of the Missing Ethnicity:
Tribal Non-Response among Multiracial American Indians

Carolyn A. Liebler and Meghan Zacher
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota

September 2010

DISCLAIMER: Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed.

Direct comments and questions to Carolyn Liebler, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, 909 Social Science Tower, 267 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55455 or liebler@umn.edu.

The Case of the Missing Ethnicity:
Tribal Non-Response among Multiracial American Indians

Among American Indians, most aspects of ethnicity are tightly associated with the person's tribal origins. Language, history, foods, land, and traditions differ among the hundreds of tribes indigenous to the United States. In the 1990 US Census, about one-tenth of American Indians did not report their tribal affiliations, seemingly due to lack of knowledge of family history and low salience of tribal identity (Liebler 2004). This fraction has recently increased tremendously as multiple race responses have become allowable in federal surveys and censuses (as of 2000) and the size of the enumerated American Indian population has skyrocketed. We use several theoretical perspectives and multivariate logistic regression models to analyze high density restricted-use data about single-race and multiple-race American Indians in Census 2000. Our aim is to understand whether the extensive tribal non-response among multiple-race American Indians is due to the same general causes as tribal non-response among single-race American Indians. This research highlights diversity in the racial and ethnic identities of today's indigenous Americans. We conclude by discussing implications for other race and ethnic groups who are increasingly multiracial and may be becoming more internally varied in terms of members' strength of ethnic attachments.

The Case of the Missing Ethnicity:
Tribal Non-Response among Multiracial American Indians

Introduction

- What is this paper about?
    - Among indigenous Americans, tribal affiliation is essentially equivalent to ethnic identity. Yet a significant fraction of people – especially multiracial American Indians – do not report a tribe when specifically asked on the US Census. Thus they report racial identities but not ethnic identities. In this research, I seek to understand reasons why some American Indians do not report a tribe. To address hypotheses generated using various theories of ethnicity, I specifically explore the similarities and differences between single-race and multiple-race American Indians who omit this bit of information.
- Why is this specific topic interesting?
    - Give definition of ethnicity and race
    - most definitions of ethnicity say that it is held close to the heart, while race is something that is seen by and imposed by outsiders. this group of people (multiracial American Indians who don't report a tribe) offers an interesting chance to explore these definitions and their implications.
    - The number of American Indians counted in 2000 was almost twice as big as the number of American Indians counted in 1990. Much of this tremendous increase was due to the new race question, which allowed multiple race responses in 2000 and drew American Indian responses from multiracial people who were previously forced to choose one race. The strength of racial identity for those who first reported American Indian race in 2000 may be relatively modest, and an even more modest connection is hypothesized for those who do not report their tribe (i.e., their ethnicity). Thus this research is poised to tell us about a particular component of the American Indian population, and about varieties of ethnic attachment more generally.
- What are a few ways of looking at this topic that are broader?
    - this is about ethnicity in general – do some people have racial identities and not ethnic identities? how does this happen?
        - the classic case of a racial identity without an ethnic identity is: American whites. Sometimes we white Americans use our optional ethnicities, but other times we just don't have any ethnicity besides "American."

- some people assume [this is anecdotal…]that you would only add "American Indian" to your race if it's got something to do with getting benefits. Those people who don't know or have a tribal affiliation are definitely not getting benefits. [Cite evidence of this from BIA policy, IHS policy, casinos]
- tribes and federal entities like BIA and IHS use census-generated demographic information about people in their tribes to plan policies [CITE], but these non-tribal people are left off the radar. what are their needs? and who will address those needs?

Literature review and hypotheses

- Has there been any really similar research? (yes, Liebler 2004. anything else?) What did it say (one paragraph at most)?
- what other writing about ethnicity can be seen as relevant? how does it relate to multiracial people? what might I expect to be different for multiracial people than for single-race people
  - *salience* – what makes an ethnicity salient and how might people act differently in real life if they have salient ethnicities than if they do not?
    - there must be a way to argue that multiple race responses (like a Hispanic response) is likely to be correlated with lower salience of AI ethnicity.
  - *symbolic ethnicity* as American Indian: reporting [AI race? Or Tribe? What did Liebler 2004 find?] on the census may be an easy way to "be" AI (found this in Liebler 2004). if you have a salient ethnicity then your ethnicity is very unlikely to be symbolic.
    -
  - *situational ethnicity* is when your identity changes depending on where you are or who is around you (cite Rockquemore and Brunsma here). again, this is unlikely if your identity is salient.
    - multiracial people, especially those with American Indian heritage, are particularly likely to change their responses to questions about race, when asked repeatedly and/or in different contexts [Harris and Sim]
  - *pan-Indian identity* is when they care more about being AI in general than about the details of ethnicity that come with tribal affiliation. usually people have both tribal and pan-Indian identity, but living around Indians from lots of other tribes might make tribal identity less salient/important.
  - people who don't know much about their heritage may see their Indianness as pan-Indian and may use stereotypes to figure out how to create ethnicity (what

can I cite for this??) (Possibly cite Park, Jerry Z. "Second-Generation Asian American Pan-Ethnic Identity: Pluralized Meanings of a Racial Label." *Sociological Perspectives* vol. 51(3): 541-561.)(Maybe Alba 2009)

- *survey non-response* can happen any time and especially when you have to fill in the blank. compare to non-response to ancestry question, PI island of origin, "other" Asian, and "other race". could also compare to other write-ins like place of work.
  - multiple-race people actually read the instructions and did the extra work of marking more than one race. this tells me that they would be *more* likely to write in a tribe if they know what it is.
    - check this idea by looking at the non-response rates for ancestry, Hispanic write in, and other write-ins ::: comparing all single-race people, all single race minorities (because all multiracials are part-minority), and all multiracials.
- *what else???*

Data, Method, Sample Selection, and Measures

Data

Public use microdata from Census 2000 do not provide the level of detail required for these analyses, so I use restricted use data from the newly established Minnesota Census Research Data Center (MNRDC). These files represent the entire US population, allowing for a more extensive sample; they also include tribal responses for all American Indians, even those who identified multiracially. In the restricted Census 2000 long-form data that we are using (a 1-in-6 sample of the US population), there are {unweighted N in the data} single-race American Indians and {unweighted N in the data} multi-racial American Indians.

Sample Selection

The Census 2000 question on race asked "What is person X's race? Mark one or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to be." We start with the group of

individuals (unweighted N in our data = _____) who marked "American Indian or Alaska Native," either alone or in combination with other races. In order to increase the chance that each member of our sample marked his or her own race on the census form, I restrict the sample to heads of households ("householders"). The householder, or the first person listed on the census form, is defined to be "the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented," and if these conditions are not met by anyone, any household member above the age of 15 can qualify as the householder for the purposes of the census.[1] In many households, one person (the "householder") will fill out the census form for each member, and therefore may project his or her own beliefs about racial and tribal identity onto other household members. In non-family arrangements especially, this may affect tribal non-response due to the householder's lack of knowledge about certain individuals' backgrounds. Excluding non-householders also ensures that only one response from any particular household is analyzed; correlations between the responses of people within the same household have been shown to be very high (Liebler 2004). After removing non-householders from the data-set, there were _____ single-race American Indian householders and _____ multiple-race American Indian householders. We then impose a minimum age of 25 for sample membership to guarantee the relevancy of the education and income measures; because of this, _____ single-race American Indian householders and _____ multiple race American Indian householders under 25 are excluded from the dataset. People who neglected to answer the race question or marked "Some other race" were allocated into standard racial categories by the Census Bureau using their write-in responses, household responses, or the information of a

[1] Source: http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/epss/glossary_f.html

previously processed household. We are interested in individuals' personal identifications, not the Census Bureau's interpretation of these. so. we exclude ____ people whose race was imputed by the Census Bureau.

All other American Indians, both those who did and did not report a tribe, were included in this study. Thus we can generalize results to all householders in the US in 2000 who reported American Indian as their race or as one of their races.

Method

This paper builds upon earlier research which examines the tribal non-response rates from the 1990 census; since the 1990 census only accepted one race response, those who identified as single-race American Indians in 2000 are most readily comparable. One of the core questions posed by this paper is whether multiple-race American Indians have different predictors of tribal non-response than do single-race American Indians. In order to best investigate this question, we first divide the Census 2000 sample into two groups: (a) single-race American Indians and (b) multiple-race American Indians. We then use logistic regression analyses to compare characteristics of two subgroups: (i) those who did report their tribe and (ii) those who did not. We include blocks of variables in a sequence of logistic regression models in order to highlight the relative effect of each set of characteristics. This is especially important for variables measuring the salience of tribal heritage, described below.

Dependent Variables: Tribal non-response among single- and multiple-race American Indians

On the Census 2000 form, a write-in box immediately following the bubble for American Indian or Alaska Native race asked people to "Print name of enrolled or principle tribe". The Census Bureau coded up to two tribes if given multiples. In this study, we explore

the personal and contextual factors which may have influenced individual's choices of whether or not to respond to this write-in question. Our dependent variable is thus a binary indicator of whether or not the person wrote any response to the tribal affiliation question. We examine single-race and multiple-race American Indians separately to see how these statuses affect the likelihood of identifying with a specific tribe.

Independent variables

Sex, age, and education

Sex: Responding to the tribal affiliation question requires knowledge of family history. Recent studies have shown that women are significantly more likely than men to note American Indian ancestries on federal surveys, which can be attributed to sex-specific patterns in interest in family history (Liebler and Zacher, forthcoming). Because of their traditional roles as kin-keepers (Bahr 1976; Reiss and Oliveri 1983), women may be more likely to take an interest in family ancestry and therefore may be more likely than men to know and share their family's tribal connections.

Age: Instead of measuring age as a scale variable, I put people into two groups: those over the average age in each group (single-race and multiple-race), and those over age 75. Older people's experience with tribal membership may be drastically different than younger people. For instance, older people may have witnessed dramatic changes in government policies towards their tribe, and thus may feel a special attachment to those who share their collective memory of the tribe's history. Also, partly due to the high rate of intermarriage for American Indians, the increasing multi-racial population (most of whom are young) may not

meet current blood quantum requirements for tribal membership and therefore may choose not to report a tribe.

Education: I created four levels of education: those who have not graduated high school (or equivalency), those who have graduated high school or received a GED, those with some college or an associate's degree, and those with a bachelor's degree or above. The level of education attained by respondents may affect their tribal affiliation (or nonaffiliation) in a few different ways. Those who have earned higher level degrees may have had to move away from their Native contacts during their time at University (and possibly afterwards). This could have the effect of diminishing tribal salience because of decreased contact with tribe members. At the same time, higher education could encourage deep self-reflection and increased tribal salience in order to hold onto ethnic identity in the face of heightened outside influence.

Measures of income

Personal income: I calculated the average personal income separately for the single-race American Indians (mean=x) and the multiple-race American Indians (mean=y) in our sample. I chose to analyze two income groups: those who made more than the mean, and those who reported no positive personal income.

Household income: For this variable, I paralleled the above steps for personal income, except this time at the household level.

Ethnicity

Hispanic origin: Respondents with Hispanic origin have another layer of identity (on top of race) that they must negotiate both in their daily lives and in governmental surveys like the Census.

Ancestry: In addition to the standard race question, the long-form Census 2000 analyzed here, given to approximately 1/6 of households, asked "What is this person's ancestry or ethnic origin?" The Census Bureau coded the first two ancestries given, and additional responses were discarded. I first look at those who responded with an American Indian ancestry in the fill-in ancestry question. Those who respond as racially American Indian as well as ethnically American Indian may be especially likely to identify their tribe because their American Indian background is expressed at both opportunities the census provides, indicating that it is particularly salient in their personal identity. I also examine those who responded with West Indian or Asian Indian ancestries in order to highlight possible respondent and/or coding errors. Additionally, I analyze those who chose not to respond to this question at all.

English ability: Respondents who said that they spoke a non-English language were asked a follow-up question: "How well do you speak English?" Possible answer choices were "Very well", "Well", "Not well", and "Not at all". I recoded the responses into just two possible answers, with the "very wells" and "wells" together, and the "not wells" and "not at alls" in the second group.

Salience:

Coresidence with family members: Those who live alone were placed in one group, those who live with some family in another, and those who live with only nonfamily made up the third group. American Indians who live with family members may be particularly likely to report a tribe because their family may remind them of their origins on a daily basis. Those who live with nonfamily or by themselves may not experience the day-to-day effects of tribal affiliation, and therefore may not feel that it is particularly relevant or salient to their lives.

Coresidence with American Indians: I first found how many people in each household reported American Indian race, and then found how many of these reported a tribe. I created four groups using this data: those who live alone, those who live with only non-American Indians, those who live with at least one other American Indian who does not report a tribe, and those who live with at least one other American Indian who does report a tribe. When people live with others for whom tribal identity is salient, it is possible that they will come to explore how their own tribal affiliation has affected their ethnicity and culture, even if their roommate's tribal identity is different from their own.

American Indian language in home: Households where no one speaks an AI language in the home went into one group, while those where at least one person (other than the householder) was reported to speak an AI language went into another group. When one member of the household has a salient identity, as can be inferred from their use of an American Indian language, other members may adopt similar values, making them more likely to report a tribe.

Personal language use: I created three types of home language use: those who speak only English at home, those who speak a non-English, non-Native language at home, and those who speak an American Indian language at home. Since it is rare to speak an American Indian language, its use at home could signify very close tribal connections for the respondent.

Location: "Indian States" were determined in the 1950 Census as those states with 3,000 or more American Indians (Passel and Berman, 1986). The 19 states included in this definition are AK,AZ, ID, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WI, and WY. American Indians who reside in "Indian States" may view tribal identity as more important

than those who do not. Metropolitan areas could produce different societal pressures for or against tribal identification than rural regions, so I also examine the effect of life in metropolitan areas both separately and in addition to life in Indian States. American Indians of various tribes in metropolitan areas of Indian states may congregate to form pan-tribal identities, thereby decreasing the salience of individual tribal identities in favor of a more overarching racial identity.

I also examined the effect of life in homeland areas, which were defined by the 2000 Census to include designated reservation lands. I anticipate that American Indians in these locations will experience similar effects as those in "Indian States", although the salience of tribal identity may be heightened because these areas represent actual tribal areas and reservations.

Household size: Research has shown that large families exhibit more respondent burden, resulting in inconsistent and/or inaccurate responses for one or more family members (Lieberson and Waters, 1993).

Works Cited

Adachi, Nobuko. 2010. "Vantage Theory Formulations of Ethnicities: The Case of Overseas Japanese." *Language Sciences* 32: 291–314.

Alba, Richard and Tariqul Islam. 2009. "The Case of the Disappearing Mexican Americans: An Ethnic-Identity Mystery" *Population Research and Policy Review* 28(2):109-121.

Alba, Richard. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Altman, Abby N., Arpana G. Inman, Stephanie G. Fine, Hollie A. Ritter, and Erin E. Howard. 2010. "Exploration of Jewish Ethnic Identity." *Journal of Counseling & Development* 88:163-173.

Bahr, H. M. 1976. "The Kinship Role." In F. Nye (Ed.), *Role Structure and Analysis of the Family*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartmann. 1998. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Farley, Reynolds. 1991. "The New Census Question about Ancestry: What Did it Tell Us?" *Demography* 28(3):411-429.

Hout, Michael and Joshua Goldstein. 1994. "How 4.5 Million Irish Immigrants became 40 Million Irish Americans: Demographic and Subjective Aspects of the Ethnic Composition of White Americans." *American Sociological Review* 59(1):64-82.

Ignatiev, N. 1995. *How the Irish became White*. New York: Routledge.

Lee, Sharon and Barry Edmonston. 2006. "Hispanic Intermarriage, Identification, and U.S. Latino Population Change" *Social Science Quarterly* 87(Supplement):1263-79.

Lieberson, Stanley and Mary Waters. 1993. "The Ethnic Responses of Whites: What Causes their Instability, Simplification, and Inconsistency." *Social Forces* 72(2):421-450.

Liebler, Carolyn A. and Meghan Zacher. 2010. "Intertwining the History and Biography of Race in America: American Indians, Whites, Blacks, and Multiracials in the 21st Century." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association.

Lopez, David and Yen Le Espiritu. 1990. “Panethnicity in the United States: A Theoretical Framework.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13(2):198-224.

Martin, Elizabeth, Theresa J. DeMaio, and Pamela C. Campanelli. 1990. “Context Effects for Census Measures of Race and Hispanic Origin.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 54:551-66.

Masuoka, Natalie. 2008. “Defining the Group.” *American Politics Research* 36(1):33-61.

McCrone, David and Frank Bechhofer. 2008. “National Identity and Social Inclusion.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31(7):1245-1266.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. “Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture.” *Social Problems* 41(1):101-126.

Nagel, Joane. 1995. “American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity.” *American Sociological Review* 60:947-965.

Passel, Jeffrey S. and Patricia A. Berman, 1986. “Quality of 1980 Census Data for American Indians.” *Social Biology* 33(3-4): 163-182.

Portes, Alejandro. 1984. “The Rise of Ethnicity: Determinants of Ethnic Perceptions among Cuban Exiles in Miami.” *American Sociological Review* 49:383-397.

Portes, Alejandro and Dag MacLeod. 1996. “What Shall I Call Myself? Hispanic Identity Formation in the Second Generation.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19(3):523-47.

Reiss, D. and M. E. Oliveri. 1983. “The Family's Construction of Social Reality and its Ties to its Kin Network: An Exploration of Causal Direction.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45: 81-91.

Rodriguez, Liliana, Seth J. Schwartz, and Susan Krauss Whitbourne. 2010. “American Identity Revisited: The Relation Between National, Ethnic, and Personal Identity in a Multiethnic Sample of Emerging Adults.” *Journal of Adolescent Research* 25(2):324-349.

Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2001. “The Salience of Pan-National Hispanic and Asian Identities in United States Marriage Markets.” *Demography* 38(2):161-75.

Sala, Emanuela, Justine Dandy, and Mark Rapley. 2009. "'Real Italians and Wogs': The Discursive Construction of Italian Identity among First Generation Italian Immigrants in Western Australia." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 20:110–124.

Snipp, C . Matthew. 1997. "Some Observations about Racial Boundaries and the Experiences of American Indians." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 20:669-689.

Vaquera, Elizabeth and Grace Kao. 2006. "The Implications of Choosing "No Race" on the Salience of Hispanic Identity: How Racial and Ethnic Backgrounds Intersect among Hispanic Adolescents." *The Sociological Quarterly* 47(3):375-396.