# THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF BLOOD QUANTUM IN NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

by

Lyndsey Alexis Young

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

of

Master of Arts

in

Native American Studies

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May 2024

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Native American Studies Department at Montana State University for generously providing the funding for this project. I would like the thank my defense committee, Matt Herman, Jennifer Woodcock-Medicine Horse, and Kristin Ruppel. Thank you for believing in this topic and supporting me in my exploration of it. I would like to give additional thanks to Jennifer for inspiring the title of my thesis and study. Thank you to my mom for supporting me as I undertook this project and encouraging me to continue even when I felt like quitting, and for proofreading all my work. Thank you to my dad for providing the inspiration for this thesis topic, and for encouraging me to go for my master's degree. Thank you to Kaeleigh Cain for helping me with my Dakota and all the support you provided me through your friendship. I would like to thank my brothers, Logan, Landon, and Lukas, for being some of my biggest fans and always supporting me. Finally, I want to thank the rest of my family for their unwavering support, even when it wasn't always clear to them what I was doing. Thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

# LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

# LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

# ABSTRACT

In the United States, many federally recognized tribes use a minimum blood quantum to determine membership. The concept of blood quantum was introduced to Native American tribes by several U.S. federal Indian policies. In recent years, several studies have detailed the impact of blood quantum policies on tribes and offer alternative membership criteria. No studies have analyzed the impact of blood quantum on individual Native Americans. Social decisions like dating, marriage, and family creation are all influenced by minimum blood quantum membership criteria. In this study, survey and interview data from enrolled and non-enrolled descendant Native Americans were used to assess the level of influence blood quantum has on these social decisions. The results of the surveys were statistically analyzed based on gender identity and enrollment status using an independent sample t-test. The study observed no significant difference in how male and female participants felt about the enrollment status of their partners and children. A significant difference in how enrolled and non-enrolled descendant participants felt about their partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was found. The interviews revealed five themes that participants thought were important when considering blood quantum in social decisions. Those themes were: cultural knowledge/inheritance, benefits of enrollment, family involvement in dating, cultural compatibility, and cultural identity. For many tribes, traditional kinship systems and marriage practices require tribal members to marry outside of their kinship groups, sometimes resulting in inter-tribal marriages. One of the biggest issues posed by minimum blood quantum membership criteria is that individuals must look within their own tribe or reservation for a partner to ensure their children will be enrolled. Native American individuals are faced with the decision of either dating within the confines of blood quantum and potentially breaking traditional kinship practices or dating outside the confines of blood quantum and potentially having children who do not meet blood quantum enrollment requirements.

# INTRODUCTION

Haŋ mitakueypi. Wašicu ia Lyndsey Young emakiyapi. Ina waye kiŋ Chandra Young ečiyapi. Até waye kiŋ Richard (RJ) Young ečiyapi. Uŋči waye kiŋ Cathy Madison ečiyapi. Ukana waye kiŋ Doug Madison ečiyapi. Kunshi waye kiŋ Eliza Young ečiyapi. Thunksina waye kiŋ Richard Young ečiyapi. Čhaŋte wašté wówapi ská ye.

Hello, my relatives. My name is Lyndsey Young. My mother is Chandra Young. My father is Richard (RJ) Young. My maternal grandma is Cathy Madison. My maternal grandpa is Doug Madison. My paternal grandma is Eliza Young. My paternal grandpa is Richard Young. I am writing this paper with a good heart. I am an enrolled member of the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes. My heritage is Dakota Sioux, Chippewa, Norwegian, and German.

As a mixed-blood Native American, blood quantum and identity issues have always been interesting to me. Blood quantum on the surface is a simple concept. To many people, blood quantum is simply a pedigree which states how “Indian” a person is. However, blood quantum is a very complex concept, with a long history within colonialism. Blood quantum is a cultural construct based on European cultural ideas of race. There is no scientific way to determine how much “Indian blood” an individual has (TallBear, 2013). There is no identifiable marker that differentiates Indian blood from White blood when put under a microscope (TallBear, 2013).

For many tribes, blood quantum is a criterion for enrollment. Tribes that make use of blood quantum enrollment requirements may soon be faced with the terrifying reality of “functional extinction” and termination of the tribe (Oeser, 2015; Garroutte, 2003; Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). There is a plethora of work which addresses this issue and offers alternative forms of citizenship determination for tribal governments (Oeser, 2015; Goldberg, 2006; Doerfler,

2017; Miller, 2014; Robbins, 2005). The following study does not make any suggestions for possible solutions to blood quantum enrollment issues that tribal nations may face. Instead, it seeks to understand the ways in which blood quantum influences the lives of Native American individuals. Furthermore, this study seeks to determine if gender and enrollment status impact the ways individuals interact with blood quantum. An Indigenous feminist lens was used to analyze the results of the study. Unlike traditional feminism, Indigenous feminism takes into account colonialism and how it has impacted traditional gender politics and gendered social relations in Native American communities (Green, 2017; Deer, 2015).

As of 2021, roughly two-thirds of federally recognized tribes use a minimum blood quantum as part of their enrollment criteria (Native Governance Center, 2023). Tribes are able to set their own tribal enrollment criteria, but it must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior (Indian Reorganization Act, 1934; Goldberg, 2006; Ellinghaus, 2017). This means that for an individual to be enrolled in a federally recognized tribe, their blood quantum must meet the tribe's minimum blood quantum. Blood quantum is determined by adding together an individual's parent's blood quantum and dividing it in half (Garroutte, 2003). The federal government will issue, upon request, a document called a Certificate of Degree of Indian or Alaska Native Blood (CDIB). This document lists the individual's total blood quantum and breaks it down into which tribes, and in what proportion, make up the total blood quantum. Tribal enrollment offices then use the information from the CDIB to determine if an individual meets a tribe's enrollment criteria. It is important to note that tribes set their own enrollment criteria, not the federal government, and that not all tribes use the same criteria for membership (Indian Affairs Office of Indian Services, n.d.). Some tribes, like my own, only look at the tribal

breakdown of an individual's CDIB to ensure that the blood quantum of a specific tribal affiliation is equal to or greater than the tribe's enrollment standard. In some cases, it is possible that an individual with a high aggregate blood quantum is unable to enroll in any tribes of which they are descended. Their tribally specific blood quantum does not meet the enrollment criteria for any of those tribes. Due to high rates of inter-tribal marriage, more and more individuals are facing this issue (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992; Saulny, 2011).

Most of the studies done on blood quantum look at the way it affects tribes as sovereign entities (Miller, 2014; Oeser, 2013; Doerfler, 2017; Robbins, 1992; Goldberg, 2006). Very little work has been done on how blood quantum influences decisions of marriage, dating, and family creation by Native American individuals. I was compelled to do my thesis on this topic because of my own lived experiences as a mixed-blood Native American. Growing up my father made sure I knew who I was and was not related to. At first, this knowledge was just for me to know who my family was, but as I grew older, it evolved into knowing who I could and could not date. My father has always expressed to me the importance of finding a partner who was also Sioux, so that my children could be enrolled at Fort Peck. This is important to consider as my blood quantum is only just above ¼ Sioux, which is the minimum blood quantum to be a fully enrolled member of the Fort Peck Tribes (Fort Peck Tribes Constitution and Bylaws, 1960). So, if I have children with someone who is not Sioux, my children will not be able to be enrolled at Fort Peck. I have had several conversations with other Native women around my age, who have also expressed concern about finding a partner who is 1) not related to them and 2) of appropriate Native American heritage to allow any future children to be enrolled.

The following chapters highlight the ways in which blood quantum has impacted and changed Native American tribes and individuals. Chapter one, Traditional Kinship and Marriage Practices, focuses on traditional kinship and marriage practices of tribes prior to the General Allotment Act of 1887. In many cases, blood quantum has disrupted traditional kinship practices which had governed tribal membership prior to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. Often, blood quantum is not compatible with traditional kinship practices, usually to the detriment of the tribe. Traditional marriage practices often expected marriage matches to be exogamous to avoid incest. Practices of exogamy often resulted in inter-tribal marriages (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). In cases where a tribe uses tribally specific blood quantum, individuals may be forced to ignore traditional exogamy practices if they wish to enroll their children.

Chapter two, A Brief History of Blood Quantum, focuses on the origins of blood quantum in American law and its incorporation into tribal law. This chapter provides a basis of knowledge to better understand how and why this study is necessary. Blood quantum is not a concept that was utilized by Native Americans prior to its introduction by Euro-Americans. Blood quantum was initially used to determine who qualified for land allotments. The use of blood quantum eventually evolved into a tool for deciding if an individual was competent enough to manage their allotment without government oversight. By the 1930s, blood quantum was being used to create an Indian identity. During this time, many tribes included a minimum blood quantum requirement into their tribal constitutions as the preferred method of determining membership. This was done in part by pressure from the Secretary of the Interior, who oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Chapter three, The Social Consequences of Blood Quantum in Native American Communities, focuses on the impacts minimum blood quantum has had on Native American individuals, particularly in the realms of dating, marriage, and family creation. The results from the titular study, The Social Consequences of Blood Quantum in Native American Communities, are summarized in chapter three. This study used a mixed-methods design that utilized both qualitative data, in the form of interviews, and quantitative data, in the form of anonymous surveys. The study was guided by the Native American Studies ethical values of the Four R's: respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility (Kovach, 2021). It was also guided by the principal of relationality, as defined by Windchief et al. (2021). The interviews were semi-structured and inspired by the Yarning method of conducting interviews (Kovach, 2021). The surveys were distributed both in person and online via listservs. The data was analyzed using statistical and content analysis. An Indigenous feminist lens was used during the analysis to determine the way the colonial institution of blood quantum has impacted traditional kinship and marriage practices.

As stated earlier, the purpose of this work is not to offer solutions to the issues created by blood quantum citizenship criteria. The purpose of this study was to begin developing a body of work that centers individual Native American experiences with blood quantum. To me, this is the first step in creating changes in membership requirements. It is my hope that tribal nations use this work as a sign to listen to their members to learn how these policies are impacting their autonomy. Reproductive sovereignty is the freedom and ability to make decisions about your reproductive health (Theobald, 2017). The definition of reproductive sovereignty does not include the right to choose a partner without any restrictions like blood quantum. However, I

contend that the definition of reproductive sovereignty should be expanded to include the right to choose a partner free of restrictions. Blood quantum policies limit reproductive sovereignty by restricting the number of eligible partners an individual can choose from if they wish to enroll their children. Hopefully, in time, tribal nations will make amendments to their constitutions, that remove minimum blood quantum requirements. Until then the social consequences of blood quantum will persist in Native American communities. With the ultimate consequence being cultural genocide.

# CHAPTER ONE

## TRADITIONAL KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE PRACTICES

"For in Dakota society, everyone shared affinal relatives, that is, relatives--through marriage, with his own relatives-through blood." – Ella Deloria, *Speaking of Indians*, pg. 26

Relations and relationality are major factors in American Indian life. In almost every encounter I have had with another Native person, especially those who are older than me, one of the first things they ask is, "where are you from and who are your relatives?" In many cases you and your new acquaintance can come up with a mutual relative or friend after only a couple minutes of meeting. These connections place you within a broader kinship system that stretches throughout North America. The importance of kinship and relationality for Native Americans has remained strong and persisted into the present. Many traditional practices have been altered or stopped completely with the introduction of Euro-Americans to North America and their genocidal and assimilationist agenda towards Native Americans. Blood quantum is only one example of a genocidal practice that has altered the traditional marriage and kinship practices of tribes.

### Traditional Kinship Practices

One of the major applications of blood quantum is to determine membership or citizenship within a specific tribe. Blood quantum creates this idea that a certain fraction can tell a person their identity and create a sense of belonging within a community that wouldn't have been possible otherwise. Blood quantum in a lot of cases has replaced traditional kinship systems. These systems, which previously had been the method that tribes used to determine

membership and belonging, helped to structure tribal society. Kinship is a much more encompassing way to think about tribal membership. Kinship, at least in the Dakota sense, connected everyone in a familial way. The purpose of Dakota kinship ties was to ensure that no matter which band you found yourself in, you would always have at least one relative that would take you in and care for you (Deloria, 1998). Kinship was a means of ensuring the survival and wellbeing of the tribal members by creating familial ties and responsibilities.

The Ella Deloria quote that I use to start off this chapter indicates that kinship ties are not just made in blood but also marriage. Marriage and adoption into tribes were accepted ways to create kinship relations and become a member of the tribe (Deloria, 1998). In traditional Dakota kinship, if a person married outside of the tribe, that spouse would be considered a member by their association to a tribal member (Deloria, 1998). Today, approximately 70% of tribal nations in the United States use some form of blood quantum to determine citizenship (Native Governance Center, 2023). Two types of blood quantum are commonly used for tribal citizenship requirements. The first is total blood quantum, which considers all tribal heritage an individual may possess. Oftentimes, tribes who use total blood quantum also require proof of descendancy or heritage from the tribe (Oeser, 2015). An example of a tribe that utilizes total blood quantum is the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians. The Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas' constitution and bylaws state that membership consists of, "All descendants of persons whose names appear on the roll defined in Section 1(a) of this Article, provided that such descendants possess one-fourth or more Indian blood." Even though the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa take into account all tribal heritages a member might have, a familial connection to the tribe is still required.

The second type of blood quantum is tribally specific blood quantum. Tribally specific blood quantum is an individual's blood specific to a single tribe. Oftentimes, an individual's tribally specific blood quantum is lower than their total blood quantum because they are descendants of several different tribes. The sum of an individual's tribally specific blood quantum is equal to their total blood quantum. An example of a tribe that uses tribally specific blood quantum is the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes. The Fort Peck Tribes requires members to have "one-fourth (1/4) or more Assiniboine and/or Sioux blood" (Fort Peck Tribes Constitution and Bylaws, 1960). Tribal members may have heritage from other tribes that puts their total blood quantum above ¼ but their tribally specific blood quantum must be at least ¼ to be enrolled in the Fort Peck Tribes.

One of the major drawbacks of using blood quantum, especially tribally specific blood quantum, is that there are a finite number of individuals in any tribe who are not related to each other. This means that tribal members can only marry within the tribe for X number of generations before genetic complications in future generations occur (Oeser, 2015). To prevent problematic genetic inheritance, tribal members often look outside of their tribe for partners (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). An additional reason tribal individuals look outside of their tribe for a partner is because of cultural taboos surrounding incest.

Most tribes had strong cultural taboos against incest and placed a high level of importance on knowing who your relatives are to avoid committing acts of incest. The Cheyenne prophet, Sweet Medicine, foretold a future where the Cheyenne people would lose track of their relations and marry from their own families (Stands In Timber & Liberty, 1967). Cultural taboos surrounding incest are still present today. In several of the interviews I participated in, the other

participants brought up that part of their reluctance to date within their own tribe or reservation was due to the fear of accidentally dating a cousin or relative (Participant 2 Interview Part 2; Participant 3 Interview).

To avoid accidental incest, many tribes traditionally practiced exogamy. Exogamy is the practice of marrying outside of your kinship group. This could be someone from a different tribe or clan. Clan systems existed within the social structure of a tribe. A clan does not constitute a separate tribe. Instead, a clan is composed of separate extended family groups within a tribe. Clan affiliation is passed on to children by either their mother's or father's line of descent. Tribes differed on whether they were patrilineal or matrilineal in their clan systems. The Crow, for example, are a matrilineal tribe and children become members of their mother's clan (Theobald, 2019). Inter-clan marriages worked to prevent close relatives from marrying each other.

It should be noted, though, that tribal relatedness is not always defined by blood the same way one might expect European notions of relatedness to be defined. Paula Gunn Allen (1992) illustrates this point in her book, *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*:

> Among many American Indians, family is a matter of clan membership. If clan membership is determined by your mother, and if your father has a number of wives, you are not related to the children of his other wives unless they themselves happen to be related to your mother. So half-siblings in the white way might be unrelated in the Indian way. Or in some tribes, the children of your mother's sister might be considered siblings, while those of your father's brother would be the equivalent of cousins.

This quote illustrates the complexity and nuances of Indigenous kinship systems. It also further stresses the importance of knowing who your relations are in such a complex system.

With the advent of the reservation system and the institution of blood quantum-based enrollment standards, it becomes increasingly difficult for individuals to find a partner on their

reservation that they are not related to in some way. Even more worrisome is the fact that if tribal members do marry within their tribe to maintain their children's blood quantum levels, rates of congenital health problems and genetic abnormalities will increase (Oeser, 2015). Due to this and cultural taboos surrounding incest, many Native Americans are seeking partners outside of their tribe. Another factor that contributes to the increase of inter-tribal marriages is the increased mobility of Native Americans since the end of World War II. Post-war federal relocation policies promoted the migration of Native Americans to urban centers, which resulted in a lot of inter-tribal mixing (TallBear, 2013). By 1970, census data indicated that 45% of the American Indian population lived in urban areas (Stanley & Thomas, 1978).

## Traditional Marriage Practices

The knowledge of kinship systems and the importance of exogamy allows us now to investigate traditional marriage practices in terms of tribal membership. In cases of inter-tribal relationships and marriages that result in the birth of children, determining which tribe to enroll the child in can be a debate. In some cases when the parents' tribes follow strict matrilineal or patrilineal descent patterns, it may be easy to decide which tribe to enroll the child in. This is, of course, assuming the child meets the enrollment requirements of both parents' tribes. On the podcast, *All My Relations*, hosted by Adrienne Keene and Matika Wilbur, in the episode, "Beyond Blood Quantum," the struggles of inter-tribal marriage in relation to blood quantum were discussed. One of the guests for the episode, Professor David E. Wilkins, who is Lumbee, recounted his first marriage to a Navajo woman and how they decided where to enroll their kids (Keene & Wilbur, 2019a, 1:02:34). Since Wilkins' children were descendants of multiple tribes, he and his first wife decided to wait until they were of age to let them choose for themselves

which tribe they wanted to belong to (Keene & Wilbur, 2019a, 1:02:34). Wilkins explains that the Navajo are a matrilineal tribe, and that he married into the Navajo Nation. Due to this, his children all decided to enroll in their mother's tribe (Keene & Wilbur, 2019a, 1:02:34).

Many tribes traditionally practiced arranged marriages. In the Lummi tribe, marriages were arranged by parents of young men (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973). These marriages would be to "good girls" in a nearby village who were not a member of their kinship group (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973; Fay, 1964). The families of both parties had to approve of the marriage before it could take place (Charles, 1973). Further complicating matters, marriages were also arranged along social class lines (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973). Once a match was accepted, the man's family would offer the bride's family a gift in the form of "money, or canoes, or horses, or cows, or whatever they had," in exchange for their daughter's hand in marriage (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973). Many tribes in the same area as the Nooksack had strong patriarchal traditions, including patrilocal residence (Tveskov, 2007). That is, when a couple married, they would live close to the man's family or tribe.

There is evidence from the interview with Nooksack and Lummi women elders of patrilineal descent practices within the Nooksack tribe. One of the elders talks about how she never knew she was not fully Nooksack because she was born and raised in the Nooksack community, but later found out her grandmother's sister was from the Skagit tribe (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973). This suggests that her grandmother was likely also from the Skagit tribe but married into the Nooksack tribe.

Another tribe that practiced arranged marriages is the Algonquin. According to some members of Algonquin, arranged marriages were practiced as late as the 1960s (Anderson,

2011). In addition to arranging marriages, the Algonquin also traditionally practiced common-law and polygamous marriages, which fell out of practice much earlier than arranged marriages (Anderson, 2011). Arranged marriages are often done to strengthen social, political, and economic alliances, as was the case for the Nooksack, Lummi, and Algonquin (Nooksack & Lummi Elders, 1973; Anderson, 2011). Kim Anderson (2011) writes that arranged marriages in the Algonquin tradition "facilitated survival of the family and wellbeing of the community." In the Algonquin community, it was considered a necessity to arrange marriages because there were so few marriageable partners (Anderson, 2011).

For the Algonquin, there is some disagreement over who presided over the matchmaking, whether it be fathers, grandmothers, or other family members (Anderson, 2011). Anderson (2011) makes an argument that matchmaking responsibilities often fell to the older women of the tribe "to ensure there was no mixing of families." In my own personal experience, grandmothers are often the ones involved in matchmaking. They are also often the ones who hold the knowledge of who is related. In their interview with me, Participant 2 recalled being asked out by a boy in middle school and telling her grandma about it ( Interview Part 2, 1:54). Her grandma replied that the boy was a closely related cousin (Participant 2 Interview Part 2, 1:54). I also have similar experiences of asking my grandma about a boy I liked, only for my hopes to be dashed by the unfortunate fact that we were related.

Native American tribes throughout North America have a long tradition of inter-tribal marriage. The idea of "mixed-blood" and "full-blood" come from European concepts of race and ethnicity and are not congruent with Indigenous conceptions of kinship and relatedness. Both examples of traditional marriage practices, illustrate the importance of exogamous marriage to

Native Americans. Intermarriages were and are common amongst Native American people (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). The current enrollment policies employed by a majority of federally recognized tribes stand as a barrier to traditional practices of exogamous relationships. Further, these policies are complicit in aiding the genocide of our people. In chapter three, the results of my study on Native American attitudes towards blood quantum, dating, and family construction show that thoughts towards intermarriage have not changed much since the creation of reservations and the erosion of traditional practices.

# CHAPTER TWO

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF BLOOD QUANTUM

"Many believe that current tribal citizenship practices were intentionally imposed on tribes in an effort to 'breed them out'." – Michael Oeser, "Avoiding Extinction, Preserving Culture," pg. 14.

In the previous chapter, we learned that blood quantum is a colonial institution that has been assimilated into Native cultures to determine citizenship status. Blood quantum policies have eroded and replaced traditional kinship and clan systems, which tribes have used since time immemorial to establish membership and belonging to a tribe. In this chapter we will explore the history of blood quantum and how it grew to dominate tribal citizenship policies. Our history will be broken into three sections: the General Allotment Act of 1887, the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, and current blood quantum trends. These acts have influenced the history of blood, quantum and the nuances of how tribes use it to determine citizenship. This creates a framework of understanding for the ways blood quantum influences marriage, dating, and family creation decisions made by present day Native Americans.

Ideologies based in blood are not a new phenomenon in the United States. The one-drop rule, like blood quantum, is a blood-based racial identification system. However, the one-drop rule works in nearly the exact opposite way from blood quantum. The one drop rule was commonly used to define a person of African descent. Any individual with even one drop of African blood was considered African American. Up until 1970, the state of Louisiana had a law that defined a Black person as "anyone possessing, 'a trace of black ancestry'" (Garroutte, 2003). An amendment to the law later defined "a trace of black ancestry" as possessing 1/32 African ancestry (Garroutte, 2003). Unlike blood quantum, which reduces the number of individuals who

can claim a Native American identity, the one-drop rule is an expansive identity policy (Keene & Wilbur, 2019a). The reason for this difference in policy is due to the United States separate interests in both African Americans and Native Americans. The one-drop rule made it possible for more people to be enslaved (Keene & Wilbur, 2019a). Blood quantum would, in time, eliminate Native Americans, so that their land would free for the taking. Early uses of blood quantum to define who is a Native American can be traced back to colonial America, with the intent of limiting civil and property rights of individuals of non-European descent (Schmidt, 2011). During the Treaty Era (1774-1880), blood quantum was occasionally used to determine who was qualified to receive treaty benefits and annuities (Schmidt, 2011). However, the General Allotment Act of 1887 is widely considered as the starting point for the widespread use of blood quantum to define Indian identity.

## The General Allotment Act of 1887

The General Allotment Act of 1887 is a key piece of Indian legislation with many lasting impacts to tribal sovereignty and cultural continuity. This piece of legislation not only helped to facilitate the reduction of tribal lands, but also introduced the widespread use of blood quantum in Native American communities. The General Allotment Act was initially introduced to assimilate Native Americans on reservations into Euro-American culture. By 1887, most tribes had been forced onto reservations by the U.S. government. This move, particularly for Plains tribes, who were highly mobile, was supposed to help “civilize” Natives by keeping them confined to a much smaller area of land than they were used to. Keeping the land area small, prevented tribes from following the migration of game animals and reduced access to traditional

food plants. However, many tribes continued to live communally and were slow to pick up Euro-American societal habits. Thus, the General Allotment Act was introduced.

The goal of the act was to encourage individual family farming (Schmidt, 2011). To do this, the federal government began to allot reservations into individually held parcels of land. The General Allotment Act is commonly thought of as the introduction of the concept of blood quantum into federal Indian law and policy (Russell, 2005). Interestingly though, the act never defines who an Indian is or even makes mention of blood quantum (Ellinghaus, 2017). So, how then, did blood quantum become so tightly intertwined with the General Allotment Act and, moreover, Indian identity and tribal citizenship?

Originally, allotments were to be held in trust by the federal government for a period of 25 years. During this period, Native Americans were expected to learn to farm and ranch and use the land in a way that was "useful" according to Euro-American agricultural tradition. All the while, the federal government held control over any decisions made about the allotted land, if it could be leased, who it could be leased to, etc. At the end of the trust period, the allottee was determined to be competent enough to manage their own affairs regarding the allotted land. Once an allotment was removed from trust status, it was no longer exempt from property taxes. Allottees often did not know they had to pay property taxes on the land. Due to this, many allottees who had their trust status removed often had their land sold out from under them because the taxes were not paid. Shortly after the General Allotment Act, the federal government passed a statute that allowed Indian agents to determine that those who were competent enough could immediately have their allotments removed from trust status and were able to sell their parcels before the 25-year period was up (Miller, 2014). Competency was often determined by

eugenic principles, which state that the more European blood an individual had, the more civilized, and, by association, more "competent" that individual was. Competency commissions were also established, which used questionnaires with questions like, "Do you live in a house, or do you live in a tipi? Do you wear shoes, or do you wear moccasins? Do you speak English? Can you write?" (Two Rivers Part 1, 26:39-27:02). The blood quantum assigned to competency was typically ½ or less Indian blood (TallBear, 2013).

It is important to note that at this time, 1880-90s, blood quantum was still not associated with tribal membership. Blood quantum during this period was only meant as a means to determine an individual's eligibility for allotment and competency to manage their own affairs. The closest any tribe came to using blood quantum to define who was and who was not a member of their tribe during the Allotment Era was the creation of the Dawes rolls for the Five Civilized Tribes (Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole). When the General Allotment Act (Dawes Act) was first passed, there was a section within the act that specifically excluded a number of different tribes from being allotted (General Allotment Act, 1887). Among those excluded were the Five Civilized Tribes. In 1893, an amendment was made to the General Allotment Act, which extended provisions of the act to the Five Civilized Tribes (National Archives and Records Administration, 2021). The allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes was administered by the Dawes Commission, unlike the allotment of other tribes and reservations, which was done largely by Indian Agents (Russell, 2005). The Dawes Commission compiled a list of individuals whom they deemed eligible to receive an allotment, based on blood. The Dawes Commission based their determinations of who was an Indian by blood on "prior rolls,

sworn testimony, and by eyeballing" (Russell, 2005). Indian Agents assigned to allot reservations were under pressure from the federal government to expedite the process (TallBear, 2013).

In an attempt to expedite the allotment process, blood quantum was arbitrarily assigned to allottees based on subjectively observed traits (TallBear, 2013). Physical appearance played a big role in assigning blood quantum. Darker skinned individuals became full bloods and lighter skinned individuals became mixed bloods, sometime ignoring the fact that the individuals were full siblings (Garroutte, 2003). My grandmother once told me that some of her cousins were enrolled as Sioux and the rest as Assiniboine. They were all siblings with the same parents, and yet they were not all enrolled as the same tribe. The subjective application of blood quantum rules is one that persists and has become a concern for future generations of Native Americans. Depending on if the assigned blood quantum was beneficial, that is a higher blood quantum versus a lower blood quantum, families may not feel the pressures of diminishing blood quantum for several generations.

In the United States, allotments have been further tied to enrollment through tribal ID cards. When an individual enrolls in a federally recognized tribe, they receive a tribal ID card that has their tribal enrollment number. Every reservation in the United States has a unique land code, for Fort Peck it is 206, that comprises the first three numbers of their tribal enrollment number (Two Rivers Interview Part 1, 7:09; "Tribal Land Codes," n.d.). In Montana, each tribe's code is in the 200s, North and South Dakota tribes are in the 300s, and so on (Two Rivers Part 1, 7:09; "Tribal Land Codes," n.d.). In addition to the land code, tribal enrollment numbers also include an alphanumeric character that describes the "type of Indian you are" in terms of allotment status (Two Rivers Part 1, 10:24). An "A" would indicate that that individual was an

original allottee, a “U” indicates an unallotted enrolled member, an “L” is an enrolled life estate owner, “B” is a non-enrolled life estate holder, and “N” is a non-enrolled lineal descendant (Two Rivers Part 1, 10:06). This code makes it easier for probate officers to determine where an individual has land interests and what their enrollment status is.

To make matters even more complicated, there may be instances where an individual is enrolled in one place but inherits land on a different reservation. In those cases, the individual would be issued multiple ID numbers with the corresponding land code and enrollment status (Two Rivers Part 1, 10:37). For every ID number an individual has, they also have an Individual Indian Money (IIM) account (Two Rivers Part 1, 10:37). Neglectful bookkeeping from the federal government failed to realize that some individuals had multiple IIM accounts, and so, when the Cobell v Salazar (2009) case was settled, some individuals were paid twice (Two Rivers Part 1, 10:45).

The purpose of blood quantum was to ensure that the provisions of the General Allotment Act were going to “real” Indians, rather than White Americans who had intermarried or Black Freedman who had been adopted into the tribe (Schmidt, 2011). By tying blood to the land, blood quantum became a way for the United States to dispossess Native Americans more easily from their land (TallBear, 2013; Garroutte, 2003). In addition to the outright theft by the immediate removal of trust status on land owned by competent Indians, tying blood to land has also created an issue called fractionation (Ellinghaus, 2017; Miller, 2015; Two Rivers Part 1, 1:47).

Fractionation of allotted lands occurs when the original owner of the allotment passes away without creating a will. The interest in the land is then divided evenly between the eligible

heirs (children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, siblings, and parents) provided those heirs also meet the legal definition of an Indian as defined by the American Indian Probate Reform Act or are within two degrees of consanguinity (Goetting & Ruppel, 2021; Two Rivers Part 2, 0:30). Two degrees of consanguinity means that an individual is within two generations of an enrolled tribal member (Two Rivers Interview Part 2, 0:35). This process continues every time an heir passes away without a will, until you end up with hundreds of co-owners on one piece of land (Two Rivers Part 1, 2:08). The American Indian Probate Reform Act (AIPRA) of 2006 was passed to help prevent fractionation from occurring by creating a standardized probate process (Indian Affairs Division of Probate Services, n.d.).

In the case of an allotment having several dozen co-owners, the federal government can lease the land without the consent of each individual owner (Two Rivers Part 1, 4:20; Indian Affairs Division of Trust Land Consolidation, n.d.). The revenue generated from the leased land is distributed among the co-owners according to the percent interest they have in the allotment (Indian Affairs Division of Trust Land Consolidation, n.d.). In many cases, the divided income results in some co-owners receiving less than a penny. As part of the federal governments trust responsibility, they oversee IIM accounts and ensure the balance is correct. Cobell vs Salazar (2009), was the largest class action lawsuit in United States history (Gilio-Whitaker, 2017). The case revealed the mismanagement of income generated by allotment leases by the federal government for over a hundred years and resulted in a payout of over three billion dollars (Gilio-Whitaker, 2017).

Fractionation was one of the issues I thought would come up in the interviews as a reason to be mindful of choosing a partner based on their blood quantum. However, besides Two Rivers,

none of the other interview participants brought up fractionation of allotments without prompting. The participants response to my prompting was most often that they had not thought of that before, only how blood quantum affects their children's enrollment status. The reason Two Rivers' interview is included in this section rather than in chapter three was because his story was based on his work experience, which led him to being an expert witness in the Cobell v Salazar (2009) case, rather than his personal experiences with dating, marriage, and family creation.

Through the General Allotment Act of 1887, blood quantum became tied to Indian land and Indian competency. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 took the concept of blood quantum and made it synonymous with Native American identity.

## Indian Reorganization Act

The General Allotment Act set the stage for blood quantum to be incorporated into future legislation regarding Indian citizenship. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was the first piece of Indian legislation that used blood to define who is an Indian (Ellinghaus, 2017). The Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) was prompted by John Collier's *The Problem of Indian Administration*, published in 1928. The IRA brought about the end of the Allotment Era and ushered in a new sort of Indian policy. The IRA was different from previous Indian policies, in that, the federal government became more hands-off in their attempts to assimilate Native Americans. Where the General Allotment Act was overt in its desire to strip Native Americans from their land base and forcibly disrupt communal tribal life, the Indian Reorganization Act was more subtle in how it addressed the United States' "Indian problem."

The IRA was also unique in the fact that tribes had the ability to decide for themselves if they wanted to "accept or reject the IRA" terms (Robbins, 1992). To many tribal members, choosing not to vote was the equivalent of voting no on accepting the terms of the IRA (Robbins, 1992). The federal government, however, counted these abstention votes as votes in favor of the IRA. Additionally, any tribe that did not hold a vote on this piece of legislation "automatically came under the act's provisions" (Robbins, 1992). In the case of the Oglala Lakota on Pine Ridge, there were enough deceased tribal members who were recorded as having voted yes that the IRA was ratified (Robbins, 1992). The reason for the federal government's underhandedness was because the "immediate, outspoken, and sustained" resistance to the IRA by Native American tribes threatened the successfulness of the act (Robbins, 1992).

The IRA provided tribes with a framework to create a tribal government that mirrored the federal government's three branch system (Indian Affairs FAQ, n.d.). The IRA also provided tribes with templates of tribal constitutions that were drafted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) (Robbins, 1992). The imposition of BIA approved constitutions limited the ability of Indian tribes to create a unique governing system that aligned with their traditional forms of government (Robbins, 1992). In this way, the IRA allowed tribal nations the ability to remain semi-autonomous, while quietly replacing traditional tribal governing systems with a more "civilized," Western government system.

The IRA was the first piece of legislation to officially equate Indian blood with identity. The act defined an Indian person as someone meeting one of three requirements:

> All persons of Indian descent who are members of any recognized Indian tribe, […] all persons who are descendants of such members who were, on June 1, 1934, residing within the present boundaries of any Indian reservation, and shall further

> include all other persons of one-half or more Indian blood" (Indian Reorganization Act, 1934).

The IRA's definition of an Indian was not necessarily imposed on tribes. As part of the vested rights preserved by tribal nations, tribes had the ability to determine for themselves membership criteria. In an attempt to remain "authentically Indian," many tribes chose to "define their membership by blood quantum" (Ellinghaus, 2017). All tribes, but IRA tribes in particular, faced pressure from the Secretary of the Interior to use a minimum blood quantum to determine tribal membership (Goldberg, 2006). Presently, all tribal constitutions and constitutional amendments must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any changes can take place (Robbins, 1992; Doerfler, 2017; Miller, 2014). The approval of the Secretary of the Interior is one of the major roadblocks to reforming tribal constitutions to remove blood quantum from membership requirements.

## Modern Blood Quantum Trends

Roughly two-thirds of Native nations use some form of blood quantum as a membership requirement (Garroutte, 2003; Native Governance Center, 2023). In recent years, there has been a push by some tribes to change blood quantum laws to be more inclusive. Tribes who use a minimum blood quantum will eventually be faced with their own extinction if they do not change their membership criteria (Oeser, 2015; TallBear, 2013; Garroutte, 2003). In 2013, the White Earth Anishinaabeg passed a constitutional amendment to change their membership from ¼ Minnesota Chippewa Tribal blood to lineal descent from an enrolled member (Doerfler, 2017). Due to concerns of the financial strain increasing membership would cause, the White Earth

Anishinaabeg tribal council halted the implementation of the constitutional changes (Doerfler, 2017).

There have also been calls by individual tribal citizens to change blood quantum requirements. Adrienne Keene, Cherokee Nation, and Matika Wilbur, Swinomish and Tulalip, host a podcast, *All My Relations*, where they discuss different issues and hot topics around Indian Country. The duo's show has two separate podcast episodes in which they discuss blood quantum. The episode, "Love in the Time of Blood Quantum," looks at the ways in which blood quantum has affected individuals on a personal level, in particular their love lives (Keene & Wilbur, 2019b). There is also a short story, "Featherweight" by Sterling Holywhitemountain (2021), which does not specifically mention blood quantum but does discuss common issues brought up by interview participants, like finding it difficult to date within your reservation for fear of dating a relative. The anthology *Great Vanishing Act,* edited by Norbert S. Hill and Kathleen Ratteree (2017), is a collection of essays, poems, and play scripts which all focus on the ways blood quantum is detrimental to the survival of Native American people. The book contains multiple chapters which explore the ways blood quantum has impacted individuals in terms of marriage and family creation, including "A Fraction of Love" by Reed Bobroff, and a piece by Adrienne Keene, also titled "Love in the Time of Blood Quantum" (Hill & Ratteree, 2017).

These media pieces are centered around how blood quantum interferes with Indigenous individual's lives. This is in contrast to most of the academic work in this are thus far, which focuses on the impact of blood quantum on tribes as sovereign entities rather than individual tribal members. These works provide a basis for this thesis, which is an academic study on how

attitudes towards marriage, dating, and having children are influenced by blood quantum. It is clear from the quantity of personal texts, like those cited above, that the issue of blood quantum in the sphere of dating and family creation are on the minds of Native American individuals. Additionally, these works are by individuals from various tribes throughout the United States. This contributes to the necessity of this study not being tribally specific as this issue is felt across Indian Country. The next chapter will detail the methods and results of the study, The Social Consequences of Blood Quantum in Native American Communities.

# CHAPTER THREE

## THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF BLOOD QUANTUM IN NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

"Collecting data is the gifting of another's story to a researcher." – Margret Kovach, Indigenous Methodologies, 2021

Michael Oeser has identified four major flaws of tribal nations depending solely on blood quantum or lineal descent as determinates for tribal citizenship,

> "(1) either approach will ultimately result in the extinction of tribes, either legally or practically, (2) use of either approach is inconsistent with the historic customs of most tribes, (3) both approaches lack a strong correlation to the subjective qualities that citizenship criteria are ideally designed to identify, and (4) both approaches have been used to justify the extension of state jurisdiction into Indian country by the United States Supreme Court."

Oeser's first flaw provides a solid example of why blood quantum is important to consider when looking for a life partner. Oeser's work shows the need for a study of this nature, which examines the complications of family creation within the framework of blood quantum.

Prior to starting this research, I had several conversations with other Native women about how difficult we found dating and finding a partner that was both Native and not related. Conversations like this, plus my own experiences, and prodding from my dad to be mindful and deliberate when choosing a future partner, have greatly influenced my interest in blood quantum and dating. When determining how best to go about this research, I debated a couple different ways to collect the data that I was interested in. It was important to me to be able to get real opinions, thoughts, and experiences of people navigating the dating scene within the boundaries of blood quantum. However, given the restrictions of writing a graduate thesis and being the only

investigator, I was limited in the number of interviews I was able to conduct. Due to the small number of personal stories that I was able to reasonably collect, I decided to also create a short survey. The surveys were similar to the interviews but with much less detail and personal experiences to support the participants' opinions. The surveys allowed me to collect a lot of data more quickly and from a broader audience than the interviews alone allowed.

Due to the sensitive and personal nature of this research question and the fact that the study population is considered a protected class, this study underwent a full institutional review board hearing with Montana State University. I did not complete any tribal institutional review boards (IRB) for this study. The reason for that is this study is not tribally specific. The study focused mostly on college-aged individuals who identified as Native American, regardless of enrollment status. It was important to me to gather information from a broad range of tribal identities to get a better understanding of how blood quantum impacts Indian Country at large. Additionally, participants did not have to possess any prior knowledge of blood quantum, nor did they have to be from a tribe that uses blood quantum as an enrollment requirement. Interview participants were recruited via flyers posted around the MSU campus and online through my personal Facebook page, as well as by word of mouth (see Appendix A). All interview participants reached out to me to be included in the study. I did not personally attempt to recruit any interview participants. Survey participants were recruited in person at the MSU powwow in March of 2023 and through several Department of Native American Studies email listservs, including the Native American Studies Masters students, American Indian Council, and Native American Studies Minor students. These listservs primarily comprise MSU students who have self-identified as Native American. Additionally, all interview participants also completed a

survey. Interview participants received a $25 Amazon gift card as compensation for their time. The interviews lasted from 30 minutes to an hour. Survey participants did not receive any type of compensation and surveys took 3 to 5 minutes to complete.

## The Surveys

### Paper Surveys

There were two different versions of the survey. The first version was a paper copy that was handed out at the MSU powwow in March of 2023 and to interview participants. The second version was an online survey created with Qualtrics. There were a few small changes between the paper version and the online version of the survey. The biggest change from the paper version to the online version was the question, “Are you an enrolled member or a descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe? If yes, which one(s)?” In the online version of the survey, this question was broken down into several different questions. The survey automatically directed participants to different follow up questions depending on how they answered the first prompt, “Are you an enrolled member of a federally/state recognized tribe?” If the participant answered yes, they were directed to the follow up question, “Which tribe are you enrolled in?” If the participant answered no, the survey directed them to the follow up question, “Are you a descendant of a federally/state recognized tribe?” If participants answered yes to this question, they were directed to this follow up question, “Which tribe(s) are you a descendant of?”. If participants answered no to both the enrollment and descendant question, their responses were disregarded. There were four participants whose answers were disregarded from the online surveys collected. The other small difference between the two versions was the age range. In the paper version participants were given the age ranges 18-20, 21-25. 26-30, 31-35, and 35+ to

choose from. In the online survey, the participants were given the age ranges 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, and 55+ to choose from.

There were 24 total responses to the paper surveys. There were three participants in the age range 18-20, ten in the age range 21-25, two in the age range 26-30, one in the age range 31-35 and eight in the age range 35+. Thirteen participants self-identified as male and eleven as female. Sixteen participants were enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe and eight answered that they were not enrolled. The tribes represented by enrolled participants were Nez Perce, Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux, North Arapaho, Crow, Blackfeet, Ogalala Lakota, Assiniboine, Fort Belknap Indian Community, and Yakama. The tribes represented by non-enrolled descendant participants were Choctaw, Unknown, Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara), Colville Confederated, Kalispell, Karuk, Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux, Cheyenne, Yakama, and Crow. All participants (with the exception of the one who identified as a descendant of an unknown tribe) marked yes to the question, “Does your tribe(s) use blood quantum to determine membership?” All participants answered yes to the question, “Do you know what blood quantum is?”

The key information I was interested in from both versions of the survey was collected by the final question, which was broken into four prompts. Those prompts were: my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, and my child being enrolled in any tribe. This question used a Likert scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not important and 5 being very important. The Likert scale determined the level of importance of the four different prompts to the participant. The purpose of this question was to get a quick baseline idea of whether Native identifying individuals

account for blood quantum when thinking about dating, marriage, and future children. For the paper surveys, the responses to this final question are shown in Table 1 for all participant responses.

Table 1. Paper survey results for all participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 13 |

The results from all participants who filled out the paper version of the survey showed that 45.8% of participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as them was not important. This is compared to 12.5% of participants who felt that it was very important that their life partner is enrolled in the same tribe as them. A total of 41.7% of participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as them was slightly important (16.7%), fairly important (12.5%), and important (12.5%).

This indicates to me that a strong majority of participants do not feel restricted by tribal blood quantum when choosing their life partner. Without further questioning or conducting interviews of the survey participants, it is difficult to say the exact reason participants answered the way they did. One hypothetical situation might be that the participants' tribe utilizes a total

blood quantum membership approach, which considers heritage from other tribes so long as the potential tribal member's blood quantum meets the minimum, similar to the Turtle Mountain Chippewa discussed previously. Another hypothetical is that the participant has a high enough tribally specific blood quantum that their children are able to be enrolled no matter their partner's blood quantum or enrollment status. This, for example, was the case for interview Participant 3. A third hypothetical is that the survey participants' tribe does not use a minimum blood quantum at all and instead membership is based on lineal descent.

Participants' response pattern for the prompt, "my life partner being enrolled in any tribe" were slightly different than the first prompt, "my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me." The biggest difference was that fewer participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in any tribe was not important (33.3%) or slightly important (8.3%). Comparatively, more participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in any tribe was either fairly important (16.7%), important (20.8%) or very important (20.8%).

I think that it is interesting that participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in any tribe was generally more important than their partner being enrolled in the same tribe. Reasons for this shift may be attributed to the enrollment requirements of the participant's specific tribe. Several tribes use a combination of lineal descent and total blood quantum to determine membership. If this is the case, then it is less important for the participant to find a partner within their own tribe. Their future children will be more likely to be able to be enrolled in the participant's tribe, as opposed to if their tribe exclusively used tribally specific blood quantum to determine membership. Using a combination of lineal descent and total blood quantum would allow participants a broader pool of potential partners to choose from.

The results to the prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, were as follows: 16.7% of participants felt that it was not important, 8.3% of participants felt that it was slightly important, 12.5% of participants felt that it was fairly important, 20.8% of participants felt that it was important, and 41.7% of participants felt that it was very important. The results to the prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, were similar to the previous prompt. With 20.8% of participants answering the prompt as not important, 8.3% of participants answering the prompt as slightly important, 4.2% of participants answering the prompt as fairly important, 12.5% of participants answering the prompt as important, and 54.2% of participants answering the prompt as very important.

These results indicate that participants feel that it is more important for their children to be enrolled either in the same tribe or in a different tribe than it is for their partner to be enrolled. This is interesting because, to me at least, it seems illogical to view your child being enrolled as very important but not your partner being enrolled. Logic would indicate that your child has a higher probability of being enrolled if both their parents are enrolled. Again, the specific enrollment requirements for the participant's tribe may influence how they responded. Table 2 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by enrolled participants.

Table 2. Paper survey results for enrolled participants

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 |

Table 2 Continued.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 |

Of the 24 total participants, there were 16 participants who were enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe. I decided to filter responses to this question by enrollment status because I wanted to see if there was a difference in how participants who are enrolled (and presumably have a higher blood quantum) ranked the importance of these four statements versus participants who are not enrolled (presumably because they have a lower blood quantum). Of course there may obviously be exceptions to this. As discussed previously, some individuals may have a high total blood quantum but be unable to be enrolled due to having heritage in several different tribes.

The results for the first prompt, “my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me” showed that 31.3% of participants felt that it was not important, 18.8% of participants felt that it was slightly important, 18.8% of participants felt it was fairly important, 12.5% of participants felt that it was important, and 18.8% of participants felt that it was very important. The results for the second prompt, “my life partner being enrolled in any tribe” showed that 25% of participants ranked it as not important, 6.3% of participants ranked it was slightly important, 12.5% of participants ranked it as fairly important, 16% of participants ranked it as important, and 31.3% of participants ranked it as very important.

When the results are filtered by enrollment status, a larger percentage of participants felt that both their partner being enrolled in the same tribe and their partner being enrolled in any tribe was very important versus the overall total of participants (18.8% and 31.3% vs 12.5% and 20.8%).

The results for the third prompt, “my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me” were as follows: 6.3% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 12.5% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 12.5% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 25% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 43.8% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. The results of the fourth prompt, “my child being enrolled in any tribe” showed that the majority of participants felt that it was very important (56.3%) for their child to be enrolled in any tribe, whereas 18.8% of participants felt that it was not important if their child is enrolled in any tribe and 25.1% of participants felt it was either slightly important (6.3%) or important (18.8%).

Similar to the overall results, enrolled participants viewed their children being enrolled as more important than their partners being enrolled. Again, the participants’ own blood quantum and the enrollment requirements of their tribe may factor into how the participants answered. Table 3 shows the results by unenrolled descendant participants.

Table 3. Paper survey results for non-enrolled participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Table 3 Continued.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Not Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |

Of 24 total participants, there were 8 participants who identified themselves as a non-enrolled descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe. An overwhelming majority of non-enrolled participants felt that it was not important (75%) for their partner to be enrolled in the same tribe as them. One participant (12.5%) felt that it was slightly important that their partner be enrolled in the same tribe, and one participant (12.5%) felt that it was important. No participants that answered the first prompt as fairly important or very important. Half of non-enrolled participants felt that their partner being enrolled in any tribe was not important (50%). 12.5% of participants felt that it was slightly important for their partner to be enrolled in any tribe, 25% of participants felt that it was fairly important for their partner to be enrolled in any tribe and 12.5% of participants felt that it was important. There were no participants who answered the second prompt as very important.

It is interesting to note that none of the non-enrolled participants felt that it was very important for their partner to be enrolled in the same tribe or any tribe. This shows that it is less important for non-enrolled participants to find a partner based on blood quantum than it is for enrolled participants.

The non-enrolled respondents were evenly split in their views on the importance of having their children enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. The participants answered the third prompt as follows: 37.5% of participants felt that it was not important, 12.5% of participants felt that it was fairly important, 12.5% of participants felt that it was important, and 37.5% felt that it was very important. The results for the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, were as follows: 25% of participants ranked the prompt as not important, 12.5% of participants ranked the prompt as slightly important, 12.5% of participants ranked the prompt as fairly important, and 50% of participants ranked the prompt as very important.

There are several factors to consider when determining the importance of finding a life partner that is enrolled. The first factor is whether the individual wants to have kids, and if they want their children to be enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe. If the individual does not want children or does not think that it is important that those children be enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe, then they may be less likely to find it important to find a partner who is enrolled. If an individual who is not enrolled has a child with an enrolled partner, their resulting children may have a blood quantum that is higher than their unenrolled parent's. Future research may expand upon the surveys by adding open ended questions for the participants to explain their reasoning behind their answers. The survey results were also analyzed by gender identity. Table 4 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by male identified participants.

Table 4. Paper survey results for male participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

I decided to filter the results by gender identity because my central research question is gendered differences in navigating blood quantum in social relationships. The participants of the paper surveys self-identified as either male or female. There were 13 male participants. The male participants' responses to the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, are as follows: 46.2% of participants ranked the prompt as not important, 23.1% of participants ranked the prompt as slightly important, 15.4% of participants ranked the prompt as fairly important, 7.7% of participants ranked the prompt as important, and 7.7% of participants ranked the prompts as very important.

The results for the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, showed that male participants felt that it was more important that their partner be enrolled in any tribe than for their partner to be enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. There were 23.1% of participants who answered the prompt as fairly important, 30.8% of participants who answered important, and 15.4% of participants who answered very important. Fewer male participants felt

that their partner being enrolled in any tribe was not important (23.1%) or slightly important (7.7%), in comparison to how the male participants answered the previous prompt.

When the male participants' results are compared to both the overall results and those who identified as enrolled, a smaller percentage of male participants felt that their partner being enrolled in the same tribe or being enrolled in any tribe was very important (7.7% and 15.4%). However, male participants did follow the same trend as the overall total participants and enrolled participants with a higher percentage of participants ranking the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, as very important.

Next are the results of the third prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me. The male participants' results are as follows, 7.7% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 15.4% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 7.7% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 23.1% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 46.1% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. Similar to all other results, a larger percentage of male participants rated their child being enrolled in any tribe as very important (69.2%) than their child being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. The remaining percentage of male participants rated the fourth prompt as not important (15.4%) and slightly important (15.4%). Table 5 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by female identified participants.

Table 5. Paper survey results for female participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |

There were 11 participants who self-identified as female. The female participants answered the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, as follows: 45.5% of participants rated the prompt as not important, 9.1% of participants rated the prompt as slightly important, 9.1% of participants rated the prompt as fairly important, 18.2% of participants rated the prompt as important, and 18.2% of participants rated the prompt as very important. The results of the second prompt were very similar to the results of the first prompt, with the only difference being 9.1% of participants rating the prompt as important and 27.3% of participants rating the prompt as very important.

Female participants were asked about their child being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. The results of the third prompt were as follows: 27.3% of participants felt the prompt was not important, 18.2% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 18.2% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 26.4% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. Again, the results of the fourth prompt were very similar to the results of the

third, with the only differences being 9.1% of participants felt that their child being enrolled in any tribe was fairly important and 27.3% of participants felt it was important.

For the paper survey responses, there were a couple different response trends that were common between all the filtered participant categories. Overall, participants in each category felt that it was more important for their children to be enrolled than their partners to be enrolled. It should also be noted that generally the participants felt that it was more important for their children and partners to be enrolled in any tribe versus their own tribe. This could suggest that tribally specific blood quantum is not as big of an influencing factor in family construction as I had originally hypothesized. This may be due to persisting traditional marriage and kinship practices which often emphasize the importance of exogamy, as discussed in chapter one. Making decisions based on traditional kinship practices may be culturally appropriate but it may risk the eventual extinction of a tribe unless changes are made to enrollment criteria.

Online Surveys

There were 134 participants that completed an online survey. The online survey was created in Qualtrics. The online surveys were distributed through three listservs: the Native American Studies Masters, the Native American Minors, and the American Indian Council. I chose to distribute the online survey through these listservs because they reach a large portion of former and current Native American students at Montana State University. However, there are several non-Native individuals included on the listservs. Due to this, I felt that it was important to create a sort of failsafe within the survey to easily filter out any non-Native American participants' responses. I built in logic to direct respondents who answered no to the question "Are you an enrolled member of a federally/state recognized tribe?" to a follow up question,

"Are you a descendant of a federally/state recognized tribe?" If respondents also answered no to that question, their response was disregarded. There were four survey responses that were disregarded, for a total of 130 responses from self-identified Native American participants. The listservs serve as another layer of security and anonymity for the participants as I do not have access to the participants emails, nor do I know every person on the listservs. The Qualtrics platform has the option to anonymize responses. This option will remove the respondents IP address and location data from their recorded response, further obscuring the participants identities.

The online survey records the same data as the paper surveys. The only difference between the two surveys is the logic built into the questions, "Are you an enrolled member of a federally/state recognized tribe?" and "Are you a descendant of a federally/state recognized tribe?". The results of the Likert scale questions are shown below. I filtered the responses by gender identity and enrollment status. As I said previously, I felt that it was important to determine if there were any differences in how enrolled and non-enrolled Native Americans navigated blood quantum while family planning. Additionally, I felt it was important to determine if there were any gender differences. The reason behind this is in part from my own personal experiences of only having conversations about dating and family creation in the context of blood quantum with other women, excluding conversations with my father. I wanted to know if women were, in fact, more concerned than men about this topic, or if women were perhaps just more vocal about their opinions on the topic. Another reason is because there have been some historical instances of tribe's privileging male intermarriage with non-members while punishing female intermarriage with non-members. I wanted to see if this was a sentiment that

has been carried into the present. I have displayed the data from the Likert scale prompts in six tables below. Table 6 shows all participants' results (minus non-enrolled, non-descendant participants).

Table 6. Online survey results for all participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 75 | 19 | 20 | 6 | 10 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 58 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 21 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 16 | 5 | 34 | 23 | 52 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 21 | 5 | 27 | 27 | 50 |

There were 130 total participants of the online surveys. The results for the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, are as follows: 57.7% of participants felt that the statement was not important, 14.6% of participants felt that the statement was slightly important, 15.4% of participants felt that the statement was fairly important, 4.6% of participants felt that the statement was important, and 7.7% of participants felt that the statement was very important. A larger portion of participants in the online survey answered that it was not important for their partner to be enrolled in the same tribe than participants in the paper survey (57.7% vs 45.8%). Additionally, a smaller percentage of online survey participants felt that the first prompt was very important compared to the paper surveys (7.7% vs 12.5%).

Like the overall total number of participants in the paper surveys, the online survey participants generally felt that their partner being enrolled in any tribe was more important than their partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. The results of the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, are as follows: 44.6% of participants ranked the prompts as not important, 10.8% of participants ranked the prompt as slightly important, 19.2% of participants ranked the prompt as fairly important, 9.2% of participants ranked the prompt as important, and 16.2% of participants ranked the prompt as very important.

The second two prompts ask participants to consider their feelings towards their future children being enrolled. Like the trends seen from the paper survey participants, online participants felt it was more important for their children to be enrolled in the same tribe as themselves than their partner to be enrolled in the same tribe. 40% of participants felt that the third prompt was very important, while 12.3% of participants felt that the third prompt was not important. Only 3.8% of participants felt the third prompt was slightly important. 26.2% of participants felt that the third prompt was fairly important and 17.7% of participants felt that the third prompt was important.

Interestingly, a slightly smaller proportion of participants felt that it was very important for their child to be enrolled in any tribe (38.5%) than for their child to be enrolled in the same tribe as themselves (40%). The results of the fourth prompt were as follows: 16.1% of participants felt the fourth prompt was not important, 3.8% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 20.8% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 20.8% of participants felt the prompt was important, and 38.5% of participants felt that the prompt was very important.

The results of the third and fourth prompts differed between the paper survey participants and the online survey participants. In the paper survey results, more participants felt that the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, was very important versus the third prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me. The results of the online survey showed that more participants felt the third prompt was very important versus the fourth prompt. Table 7 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by enrolled participants.

Table 7. Online survey results for enrolled participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 50 | 14 | 14 | 5 | 10 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 39 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 18 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 6 | 4 | 18 | 17 | 48 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 12 | 3 | 15 | 22 | 41 |

There were 93 online survey participants who identified as being an enrolled member of a federally or state recognized tribe. The results of the first prompt are as follows: 53.8% of participants felt that the first prompt was not important, 15% of participants felt that the first prompt was slightly important, 15% of participants felt that the first prompt was fairly important, 5.4% of participants felt that the first prompt was important, and 10.8% of participants felt that the first prompt was very important. When the results are filtered for just enrolled participants, a larger proportion of participants felt that the first prompt was very important for their partner to

be enrolled in the same tribe as themselves (10.8% vs 7.7%). This follows the same trend as the enrolled paper survey participants compared to the overall paper survey participants.

Again, there is a trend of participants finding it more important for their partner to be enrolled in any tribe than to specifically be enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. Yet, there is still a large percentage of participants who do not feel that it is important for their partner to be enrolled. For the second prompt, participants answered as follows: 41.9% of participants ranked the prompt as not important, 11.8% of participants ranked the prompt as slightly important, 17.2% of participants ranked the prompt as fairly important, 9.7% of participants ranked the prompt as important, 19.4% of participants ranked the prompt as very important.

The enrolled participants' online survey results for the third and fourth prompts followed the same trend as the overall online survey results for the same prompts. The results of the enrolled participants showed that a larger proportion of participants felt that their child being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was very important versus their child being enrolled in any tribe. The enrolled participants' paper survey result showed that a larger percentage of participants felt that their child being enrolled in any tribe was very important versus their child being enrolled in the same tribe as them. The prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, elicited these responses from participants: 6.5% of participants responded that the prompt was not important, 4.3% of participants responded that the prompt was slightly important, 19.4% of participants responded that the prompt was fairly important, 18.2% of participants responded that the prompt was important, and 51.6% of participants responded that the prompt was very important. For the prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, the participants answered as follows: 12.9% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 3.2% of participants felt

that the prompt was slightly important, 16.1% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 23.7% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 44.1% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. Table 8 shows the results by unenrolled descendant participants.

Table 8. Online survey results for non-enrolled participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Fairly Important | 4 Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 25 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 19 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 10 | 1 | 16 | 6 | 4 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 9 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 9 |

There were 37 total non-enrolled descendant participants in the online survey. The non-enrolled participants' results showed that 67.6% of respondents felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe was not important, 13.5% of respondents thought the prompt was slightly important, 16.2% of respondents thought it was fairly important, and 2.7% of respondents felt the prompt was important. There were no non-enrolled participants that felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe was very important. When compared to the enrolled participants' results, a larger proportion of non-enrolled participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as them was not important.

Again, compared to the enrolled participant responses, a larger proportion of non-enrolled participants answered that they felt their life partner being enrolled in any tribe was not important. The results of the prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, were as follows: 51.4% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 8.1% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 24.3% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 8.1% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 8.1% of participants felt that the prompt was very important.

Of the results that we have discussed so far, the non-enrolled online participants were the only group where the largest proportion of participants did not rate the child enrollment prompts as very important. For both of the child enrollment prompts, the largest proportion of non-enrolled participants rated the prompts as important. The non-enrolled participant results for the third prompt were as follows, 27.0% of participants felt that their child being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was not important, 2.7% of participants felt the prompt was slightly important, 43.2% of participants thought the prompt was fairly important, 16.2% of participants felt it was important, and 10.8% of participants answered that the prompt was very important. The results of the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, were as follows: 24.3% of participants rated the prompt as not important, 5.4% of participants rated the prompt as slightly important, 32.4% of participants rated the prompt as fairly important, 13.5% of participants rated the prompt as important, and 24.3% of participants rated the prompt as very important. Table 9 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by male-identified participants (minus non-enrolled and non-descendant participants).

Table 9. Online survey results for male participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Important | 4 Fairly Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 12 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 9 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 13 |

There were 24 self-identified male online survey participants. Of those, 18 participants identified as an enrolled member of a federally or state recognized tribe. The participants answered the first prompt as follows: 50% of male participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as them was not important, 16.7% of participants answered that the prompt was slightly important, 12.5% of participants felt the prompt was fairly important, 8.3% of participants ranked the prompt as important, and 12.5% of participants thought that the prompt was very important. Compared to the overall participant responses for the first prompt, male participants had a larger proportion who felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was very important (12.5% versus 7.7%).

There were slightly fewer male participants who answered that the second prompt was not important than who answered that the first prompt was not important. The number of male participants that answered both the first and second prompts as very important stayed the same. This indicates that the male online survey participants view their life partner being enrolled in

any tribe as more important than their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves. For the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, the male participants answered as follows: 37.5% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 12.5% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 20.8% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 16.7% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 12.5% of participants felt that the prompt was very important.

A smaller proportion of male participants than overall participants felt that their child being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was not important (8.3% vs 12.5%). The results of the prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, are as follows: 8.3% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 8.3% of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 16.7% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. The results of the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, are as follows: 25% of male identifying participants rated the prompt as not important, 4.2% of male participants rated the prompt as slightly important, 8.3% of participants rated the prompt as fairly important, 8.3% of participants rated the prompt as important, and 54.2% of participants rated the prompt as very important. Table 10 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by female identified participants (minus non-enrolled and non-descendant participants).

Table 10. Online survey results for female participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Important | 4 Fairly Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 60 | 15 | 16 | 4 | 7 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe as me | 46 | 11 | 20 | 8 | 17 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in my tribe | 13 | 3 | 26 | 19 | 41 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 14 | 4 | 24 | 24 | 36 |

There were 102 self-identified female participants who took the online survey. Of those, 71 participants identified as an enrolled member of a federally or state recognized tribe. The results of the first prompt were as follows: 58.8% of participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as them was not important, 14.7% of participants rated the prompt as slightly important, 15.7% of participants felt the prompt was fairly important, 3.9% of participants answered that it was important, and 6.9% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. There was a slightly smaller percentage of female participants who felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was very important (6.9%), compared to the percentage of overall participants who felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was very important (7.7%). The percentage of male participants who felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was very important (12.5%) was nearly double the percentage of female participants who answered the first prompt the same way.

The percentage of female participants who answered the prompt as very important was larger than the percentage of male participants who answered this prompt the same way (12.5%). The results of the prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, were as follows: 45.1% of participants answered that the prompt was not important, 10.8% of participants answered that the prompt was slightly important, 19.6% of the participants answered that the prompt was fairly important, 7.8% of the participants answered that the prompt was important, and 16.7% of participants answered that the prompt was very important.

The results of the third prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, were as follows: 12.7% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 2.9%, of participants felt that the prompt was slightly important, 25.5% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, 18.6% of participants felt that the prompt was important, and 40.2% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. The results of the fourth prompt, were as follows: 13.7% of female respondents felt that their child being enrolled in any tribe was not important, 3.9% of female respondents thought the prompt was slightly important, 23.5% of female respondents felt that the prompt was fairly important, 23.5% of female respondents answered that the prompt was important, and 35.3% of female respondents felt that the prompt was very important.

For the prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, 40.2% of female participants and 33.3% of male participants felt that the prompt was very important. These results for male and female participants when compared to the paper survey results for the same prompt are reversed. The paper survey results for the third prompt showed that a larger proportion of male participants (46.1%) than female participants (26.4%) answered the prompt as very important. It is interesting to note that a smaller percentage of female participants answered

the fourth prompt as very important (35.3%) in the online survey, when the percentage of female participants who answered the third and fourth prompts as very important was the same in the paper survey data. When compared to the male participant's answers (54.2%), a smaller proportion of female participants (35.3%) answered the prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, as very important. Table 11 shows the results of the Likert scale question prompts by non-binary, two-spirit, and prefer not to say.

Table 11. Online paper results for non-binary, Two-Spirit, and prefer not to say participants.

| Prompt Number | Prompt | 1 Not Important | 2 Slightly Important | 3 Important | 4 Fairly Important | 5 Very Important |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | My child being enrolled in any tribe | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

There were three participants who self-identified as non-binary, Two-Spirit, or prefer not to say. All three participants were enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe. Since there were so few participants who self-identified as any of these gender identities, I decided to include the results of these participants in the same table. The results of the first prompt are as follows, 66.7% of participants felt that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was not important, and 33.3% of participants felts that their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as themselves was fairly important. The results of the prompt, my life

partner being enrolled in any tribe, were as follows: 66.7% of participants felt that the prompt was not important and 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. The results of the third prompt were as follows: 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, and 66.7% of participants felt that the prompt was very important. For the prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, the results were as follows: 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was not important, 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was fairly important, and 33.3% of participants felt that the prompt was very important.

Statistical Analysis

I spent a lot of time thinking about the best way to analyze the data that participants shared with me. I knew from the beginning of this project that I was interested in knowing if there was a gender difference in how issues of blood quantum and family construction were perceived. As I got further into this project it, occurred to me that it was also probably worth determining if there was a difference based on enrollment status. Looking back now, it seems like an obvious question considering the main topic of this entire project is blood quantum, a tool used for enrollment purposes. So, with these two questions in mind, I wanted a way to know if the results between male and female and enrolled vs non-enrolled participants were significantly different from each other.

My first thought was to do several Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests. The reason for this is because ANOVA tests can compare two or more groups at the same time (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017). My thought was that if I wanted to compare the results by gender, I would need to use an ANOVA simply because there were six different gender identity options for participants to select from the survey. However, the majority of participants self-identified as either male or

female, and only three total participants self-identified as one of the other gender identity options. There simply were not enough cases of the other four gender identities to justify the use of an ANOVA. Instead, I decided to use an independent t-test to compare the results between male and female participants. An independent t-test can only compare the mean differences of two separate groups, which was the reason it was not my first choice in statistical analysis (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017). However, restricting my analysis to just two genders, male and female, made independent t-tests more appealing as a statistical analysis. To compare all of the gender identities, a comparison of means was used. A comparison of means was also used to compare the mean results by age and enrollment status. The survey results by enrollment status were also analyzed by an independent t-test. All statistical analyses were done with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) from IBM. SPSS is a statistical software that is used for quantitative data analysis.

A confidence interval of 95% was used for all statistical analyses. A significance level of .05 was used. This means that any p-value that is less than .05 was considered statistically significant. Additionally, a high t-statistic is considered a good indicator for statistical significance. The degrees of freedom, the number in parentheses after the *t,* for each t-test were calculated by SPSS. The degrees of freedom may vary per t-statistic. Degrees of freedom are used to define the shape of the data distribution to determine statistical significance, the p-value (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017). Statistical significance in this case tells us whether there was a difference of opinions on any of the Likert scale prompts based on gender or enrollment status. Factors that may affect the significance of the t-tests are sample size and variance. The larger a sample is the more likely it is to produce significant results (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017).

However, the more variance there is in a data set the likelihood of producing significant results lowers (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017). Variance refers to how closely distributed the data points are from the mean. So, a larger standard deviation (SD) would indicate larger amounts of variance. Widely distributed data makes it difficult to see trends in the data and determine significance (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017).

The online survey data was recorded and coded in Excel before being transferred into SPSS. Age was coded: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, and 5 = 55+. Gender was coded: 1 = male, 2 = female, 3 = non-binary, 4 = gender fluid, 5 = Two-Spirit, and 6 = prefer not to say. Enrollment status was coded as: 1 = enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe and 2 = not enrolled in a federally or state recognized tribe. Descendant status was coded as: 1 = descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe and 2 = non-descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe. There were 47 individual tribes represented by the participants; for a full code list see Appendix D. For the results of the question, “Do you know what blood quantum is?”, a yes response was coded as 1 and a no response was coded as 2. For the question, “Does your tribe(s) use blood quantum to determine membership?”, a yes response was coded as 1, a no response was coded as 2, and an unsure response was coded as 3. The Likert scale question prompts were coded as prompt 1 = my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, prompt 2 = my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, prompt 3 = my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, and prompt 4 = my child being enrolled in any tribe. The level of importance for each Likert scale question prompt were coded as 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = fairly important, 4 = important, and 5 = very important. In SPSS, the variables were set as Prompt 1, Prompt 2, Prompt 3, Prompt 4, Age, Gender, Enrollment Status, and Descendant. All

variables were typed as numeric and nominally measured. The values of each variable were set according to the response codes assigned to the possible response options, with the prompt variable values set as the coded importance levels.

First, a comparison of means was conducted of the Likert scale question prompts by gender identity, age, and enrollment status. For the Likert scale prompts comparison of means by gender, there were 129 cases analyzed. One case was removed because the participant did not select a gender identity. For the Likert scale prompts comparison of means by age and enrollment status, there were 130 cases analyzed. Four cases were removed prior to the analysis testing for not being an enrolled or descendant member of a federally or state recognized tribe. The results of the comparison of means are shown in Tables 12, 13, and 14 respectively (Appendix E).

The same process was used to statistically analysis the paper survey results. The online surveys and the paper surveys were analyzed separately because the answer options were slightly different for the age and gender and had to be coded differently. Age was coded as 1 = 18-20, 2 = 21-25, 3 = 26-30, 4 = 31-35, and 5 = 35+. Gender was coded, 1 = male, 2 = female, 3 = transgender male, 4 = transgender female, 5 = non-binary, and 6 = other/my gender identity is not listed. The codes for tribal affiliation were also different; the full tribal code list for the paper surveys can be found in Appendix D. Enrollment status, descendancy status, blood quantum knowledge, tribal blood quantum usage, the prompts, and the importance levels were all coded the same as they were for the online surveys. Full code lists for the paper surveys can be found in Appendix C. The results of the paper surveys comparison of means by age, gender identity, and enrollment status are shown in Tables 15, 16, and 17 respectively (Appendix D).

An additional two comparison of means by gender identity and enrollment status were created for the combined survey results. The combined survey results were also analyzed by an independent t-test for gender identity and enrollment status. The combined survey results were not analyzed by the age of the participants because the age ranges differed between the two versions of the survey. There was one case removed from the combined gender analyses due to one participant not answering the gender identity question. The labels for the gender identity analyses were the same labels used in the online survey rather than the ones used in the paper survey because only the online survey had participants who identified as a gender that was not male or female. Prior to combining the survey results, four cases were removed due to the participants not being enrolled and not being a non-enrolled descendant. The results of the comparison of means are shown in Tables 18 and 19 respectively (Appendix D).

Independent t-test by Gender Results for Online Surveys

There was no significant difference, $t(124) = 1.259$, $p = .179$, in how male ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.443$) and female ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 1.231$) participants answered the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me. For the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, there was no significant difference, $t(124) = .485$, $p = .515$, between male ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.446$) and female ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.530$). There was no significant difference, $t(124) = -.508$, $p = .568$, between male ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 1.261$) and female ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.366$) participants for the third prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me. The results of the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, showed that there was no significant difference, $t(124) = -.105$, $p = .025$, between male ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.708$) and female ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.369$) participants. It is interesting to note that for both the first and second

prompt, about an individual's life partner being enrolled, the male participants had a higher mean than the female participants. A higher mean corresponds to a higher level of importance placed on the various prompts. Additionally, female participants had a higher mean for both the third and fourth prompt, which are about children being enrolled.

Independent t-test by Enrollment Status Results for Online Surveys

The results for the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, showed a significant difference, $t(103.287) = 2.490$, $p = .003$, between enrolled ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 1.375$) and non-enrolled ($M = 1.54$, $SD = .869$) participants. There was no significant difference, $t(128) = 1.331$, $p = .098$, between enrolled ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.571$) and non-enrolled ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 1.357$) participants for the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe. For the third prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me, there was no significant difference, $t(128) = 5.104$, $p = .807$, between enrolled ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.215$) and non-enrolled ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.309$) participants. The results of the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, also showed no significant difference, $t(128) = 2.739$, $p = .672$, between enrolled ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.372$) and non-enrolled ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.479$) participants. It is not surprising that enrolled participants had a high mean for all four prompts, as enrolled participants, theoretically, have the most at stake when considering blood quantum during family construction. That is, enrolled participants are assumed to be more involved in their tribe, and therefore, more concerned with its continuance than non-enrolled members.

Independent t-test by Gender for the Paper Surveys

There were 13 male participants and 11 female participants. The respondents for the paper surveys did not choose a gender identity other than male or female. The independent t-test results for the first prompt, your life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as you, were not statistically significant, $t(22) = -.761$, $p = .115$, between male ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 1.320$) and female ($M = 2.55$, $SD = 1.695$) participants. The results were not significant, $t(22) = .665$, $p = .152$, between the male ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.441$) and female ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.804$) participants for the second prompt, your life partner being enrolled in any tribe. Male ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.405$) and female ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.690$) participants' results for the third prompt, your child being enrolled in the same tribe as you, the results were not significant, $t(22) = .764$, $p = .379$. The results were also not significant $t(22) = .672$, $p = .824$, between male ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.706$) and female ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.695$) participants for the fourth prompt, your child being enrolled in any tribe. The sample size for the paper surveys was relatively small, which could have contributed to the lack of significant results. A larger sample size may have provided statistically significant results between male and female participants (Wallnau & Gravetter, 2017). Additionally, there was a large amount of variance between data points, which would affect the statistical significance of the data.

Independent t-test by Enrollment Status for the Paper Surveys

There were 16 enrolled participants and 8 non-enrolled descendant participants. The results for enrolled ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.537$) and non-enrolled descendant ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 1.069$) participants were not significant, $t(22) = 1.952$, $p = .085$, for the prompt, your life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as you. The results of the second prompt, your life partner being

enrolled in any tribe, were also not significant, $t(22) = 2.022$, $p = .189$, for enrolled ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.621$) non-enrolled descendant ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.195$) participants. For the third prompt, your child being enrolled in the same tribe as you, the results were not significant, $t(22) = 1.142$, $p = .084$, between enrolled ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.310$) and non-enrolled ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.885$) participants. The t-test results for the fourth prompt showed that the mean for enrolled participants ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.628$) was higher than that of non-enrolled participants ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.847$) but the results were not statistically significant, $t(22) = .679$, $p = .391$.

Independent t-test by Gender for All Surveys

There were a combined 38 male and 112 female survey participants. The results of the first prompt, my life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me, were not significant, $t(148) = 1.001$, $p = .479$, between male ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.386$) and female ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 1.291$) participants. The results of the t-test for the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, were not significant, $t(148) = 1.107$, $p = .316$, between male ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.446$) and female ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.552$) participants. The results of the third prompt were not significant, $t(148) = -.080$, $p = .615$, between male ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.300$) and female ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.396$) participants. For the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, male ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.691$) participants had a higher mean than female ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.397$) participants; however, the results were not significant, $t(148) = .341$, $p = .012$.

It is interesting that male participants placed a higher level of importance on their partner's blood quantum and enrollment status than female participants. In 1970, male Native Americans had a rate of intermarriage with non-Native individuals of 65%, while female Native Americans had a rate of intermarriage of 62% (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). Additionally, there is a

history in both the United States and Canada, of tribes incentivizing intermarriage for male tribal members but not female tribal members. In the Indian Act, a Canadian Indian policy, Native women had their status removed if they married a non-Native, or non-status man (Eberts, 2017). Status refers to the legal identity of an Indigenous person in Canada. Status is conferred to membership a federally recognized tribes in Canada. The removal of a woman's status denies her the ability to have children who are members of her tribe (Eberts, 2017). Men on the other hand were free to marry non-Native women without losing their status. In fact, the non-Native wives of Native men would be granted status upon their marriage and status would also be conferred to their children upon birth (Green, 2017). So, in fact, women never really had status, they only assumed the status of their father or husband (Green, 2017).

In the United States there are two instances of tribes, disadvantaging women who marry non-Natives. The first is the Turtle Mountain Chippewa, who had a gendered policy of denying enrollment to women who were of ½ degree of Indian blood, if they had married a white man (Ellinghaus, 2017). The policy, however, allowed for men who had married a white woman to be enrolled (Ellinghaus, 2017). The prevailing idea was that a man "imparted this status to his wife and children" (Ellinghaus, 2017). This is the same thought process used by the Canadian government in the Indian Act. The second instance is the Santa Clara Pueblo, who denied enrollment to the children of enrolled women married to non-tribal members (Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 1978). Like the Turtle Mountain Chippewa, the Santa Clara Pueblo allowed for the enrollment of children of enrolled men and non-tribal women (Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 1978). This instance actually became a lawsuit by one tribal member and her daughter, who had been denied enrollment (Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 1978). The case made its way up to the

Supreme Court where it was decided that the Santa Clara Pueblo had the sovereignty to determine membership as they saw fit (Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 1978).

Independent t-test by Enrollment Status for All Surveys

There were 109 participants who were enrolled in a federally recognized tribe and 45 participants who were non-enrolled descendants of a federally recognized tribe. The results of the first prompt were significant, $t(126.45) = 3.183$, $p < .001$, between enrolled ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 1.411$) and non-enrolled ($M = 1.53$, $SD = .894$) participants. The results of the second prompt, my life partner being enrolled in any tribe, were not significant, $t(152) = 1.971$, $p = .017$, between enrolled ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.596$) and non-enrolled ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.318$) participants. The mean of enrolled ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.225$) participants was much higher than the mean of non-enrolled participants ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.408$), for the third prompt; however, the results were not significant, $t(152) = 5.077$, $p = .345$. The results of the fourth prompt, my child being enrolled in any tribe, were not significant, $t(152) = 2.745$, $p = .382$, between enrolled ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.404$) and non-enrolled ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.531$) participants.

Limitations

Unequal sample sizes between demographic groups may have hindered the studies goal of determining a gendered difference in how individuals navigate blood quantum when making social decisions. Having equal sample sizes between male and female participants may produce difference results than those found in this study. Future research may find it beneficial to change data collection methods to ensure equal sample sizes between compared demographic groups. Additionally, the surveys were quite basic and did not collect much meaningful data beyond the Likert scale question prompts. Changes could be made to the survey to allow for more

meaningful data collection, such as participant explanations of their Likert scale ratings. The fact that the surveys relied on self-reported data could have also posed a limitation to the study. It is possible that non-Native individuals took the survey and lied about their tribal affiliation. Beyond answering no to the questions about enrollment and descendancy, there was no way to separate non-Native participant data from Native participant data. Future research may find it beneficial to ask participants for proof of tribal affiliation to prevent non-Native individuals from participating. Time constraints also limited the amount of data I could reasonably collect.

## The Interviews

There were five interview participants. The interview participants were recruited by word of mouth, posters hung around the Montana State University campus, and social media posts (see Appendix A). All interview participants reached out to me to be included in this study, I did not personally recruit any interview participants. The interviews took place in several different locations, including the Dr. Robert Peregoy Collaboration Room in the American Indian Hall at Montana State University, and the private offices and homes of interview participants. The interviews lasted about 30 to 60 minutes.

All interview participants read and signed a consent form prior to being interviewed (see Appendix B). Participants were given the opportunity to provide a pseudonym on the consent form by which they wished to be identified as. Only one interview participant included a pseudonym on their consent form, Two Rivers. However, his interview is not included in this chapter, but can be found in chapter two instead. The remaining interview participants will be referred to as Participant 1, etc. to keep their identities anonymous. The interviews were recorded using a Sony ICD-PX470 Stereo Digital Voice Recorder and transcribed by using Otter AI, a

transcription service. All digital data (transcripts, digitally signed consent forms, survey response data and analysis) are stored on an external hard drive. The paper copies of the consent forms are stored in a locked cabinet.

When I began designing this study, I knew that I wanted to listen to the personal stories of individuals navigating blood quantum while dating and having children. I wanted to hear their lived experience and to be able to share my own with them. In the western educational institution within which I am creating this research and knowledge, interviews are the preferred method by which the information I was seeking could be acquired. However, western interview protocol can be very detached and impersonal. There is no room for the interviewer to share their stories and experiences, or to create a relationship with the interviewee. The traditional question and response format of western interviews felt very colonial to me in the sense that the interview is taking knowledge, information, and stories from the participant without giving anything in return. I wanted the interviews to be reciprocal in nature; I did not want to take without giving my own knowledge, information, and stories in return. In Dakota culture, gift giving is a big part of our culture, and a good Dakota generously gives their possessions away. By thinking of stories as gifts, it follows Dakota cultural customs to offer my own stories to the interview participants (Wilson, A. & Taylor, E., 2005). Additionally, in her foundational work, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*, Margaret Kovach (2021) states, "when we ask others to share stories, it is necessary to share our own."

I began every interview by introducing myself, where I am from, and why I am interested in this research. In many Native American cultures, it is part of the respect protocol to include your relatives when introducing yourself. This is a call back to pre-blood quantum times when

belonging was determined by one's kin and relation to the tribe. In Indigenous research, introductions and self-location statements are part of developing relationality, reciprocity, and respect between the researcher and the participants (Wilson, S., 2008; Windchief et al., 2021; Kovach, 2021). The interview participants were provided with a $25 Amazon gift card at the conclusion of the interview. The funding for this project was generously provided by the Native American Studies Department at Montana State University. The budget and funding breakdown can be seen in Appendix F. Any remaining gift cards were returned to the Native American Studies Department.

While the interviews were meant to be less structured, i.e. not a strict question and answer format that is common for research interviews, a list of interview questions was required by the MSU IRB (see Appendix B). The questions on the list were not necessarily asked in each interview, nor were they asked in the order in which they appear on the list. Instead, the interview questions served as a sort of guide for roughly what topics I was hoping to cover during the interview. In nearly every interview, after I introduced myself and my research interests, the interviewee would take over the conversation and tell me why they were interested in participating in this research and their thoughts and opinions on the matter of blood quantum. Occasionally I would ask clarifying questions, but largely I let the interviewee lead the conversation, allowing the participant, "to tell their own story on their own terms" (Kovach, 2021). During a lull in conversation, I would consult my list of questions to get the interviewee talking again.

There were several clear themes that arose from the interview transcripts. Those themes were cultural knowledge/inheritance, benefits of enrollment, family involvement in dating,

cultural compatibility, and cultural identity. There were several other common themes that came out in the interview transcripts, but I tried to limit the included interview portions to only topics that relate back to dating and family construction. One major theme that I expected to emerge during the interviews was land inheritance. However, only one interview participant spoke about land and allotments in relation to blood quantum and inheritance without being prompted by myself. That interview is not included in this section, but instead it is included in chapter two.

Cultural Knowledge/Inheritance

The importance of cultural knowledge and cultural inheritance being passed down to the next generation was strongly expressed in every interview. The overarching concern of the participants was that if their children or grandchildren were not able to be enrolled that they would not be able to fully participate in their Native American culture. One participant explained that he wanted to be able to share the cultural teachings that he received from his grandfather with his future children (Participant 1 Interview Part 1, 23:32). He did not feel as though he would be able to fully share his cultural knowledge if his children were not able to be enrolled (Participant 1 Interview Part 1, 23:32). Other participants expressed similar sentiments, with one stating that she wants her children to be enrolled because she feels as though it will be easier for them to learn about their culture (Participant 2 Interview Part 1, 22:59-23:11). Another participant worried that tribal elders would not be accepting to her grandchildren if they were culturally involved but not enrolled in the tribe (Participant 3 Interview, 9:13-10:12).

Several of the participants further explained that their interest in this research and in blood quantum issues stemmed from their increased participation in cultural practices. One participant said that he only became interested in knowing his partner's blood quantum after he

became involved in ceremony (Participant 1 Part 1, 6:09-6:34). Similarly, another participant explained that she was starting to be more involved in her culture and felt that her children and grandchildren would not be able to learn about their culture if they did not meet blood quantum requirements to be enrolled (Participant 3 Interview, 7:49-9:13). One participant was at the beginning of his journey of reconnection and strongly expressed his desire for his future children to know about their culture and to be involved in it, even if they were not able to be enrolled (Participant 4 Interview, 16:17-17:07).

Cultural knowledge is a major motivator for individuals to begin thinking about blood quantum and tribal enrollment. In particular, the question of can non-enrolled descendants possess cultural knowledge or be involved in cultural practices weighed heavily on the minds of many of the interview participants. There was a decisive conclusion among the majority of interview participants that enrollment was a necessity for their children and grandchildren to truly be able to share cultural knowledge. Without changing blood quantum enrollment standards, it becomes necessary for these participants to become mindful of who they take as a partner to ensure that their children can be fully accepted into their cultural heritage.

Benefits of Enrollment

While maintaining cultural connectivity is a major reason for considering your partner's blood quantum while dating, another is the benefits of being an enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe. Two interview participants brought up enrollment benefits as one of the reasons they wished for their children and grandchildren to be enrolled. A third interview participant, Participant 1, expressed his wariness of individuals marrying for perceived enrollment benefits.

One participant, who qualifies for enrollment in multiple federally recognized tribes, explained that she chose to relinquish her rights to the tribe she grew up enrolled and culturally involved in to become enrolled in a different tribe, which she is also a descendant of (Participant 2, personal communication, 2023). Her reasoning was that she would receive more higher education scholarship money from one tribe than the other (Participant 2 Interview Part 1, time stamp). If her children were to qualify for multiple tribes, she would enroll them in the tribe that will provide the most benefits to her children, even if they end up enrolled in a different tribe than herself (Participant 2 Part 1, 4:20-4:41). Participant 3, a mother whose children are enrolled but worries her grandchildren will not be able to, explained that part of the reason she hopes her grandchildren will be enrolled is for financial aid benefits (Participant 3 Interview, 11:34-12:34). The tribe in which Participant 3 and her children are enrolled offers a higher education scholarship for members attending college. Additionally, if her children attend a college in-state, they may be eligible for an Indian fee waiver, which would reduce the cost of tuition (Participant 3 Interview, 11:34-12:34). Participant 3 also told me that she saves her daughter's per-cap checks for her to use for college and that she hopes her grandchildren will be able to have the same luxury (Participant 3 Interview, 11:34-12:34).

In contrast, Participant 1 was concerned about individuals marrying for enrollment benefits, in particular, non-Native individuals hoping to gain access to perceived benefits (Participant 1, 18:06-19:16). Participant 1 expressed that while blood quantum has many downfalls, it allowed for some protection of cultural preservation and enrollment benefits, like Indian Health Service (Participant 1 Interview, 15:05-16:16). Participant 1 was concerned that intermarried non-members would not be able to fully grasp the importance of being Native

American, stating, “You can’t be there for the good times. For the benefits. You gotta get to know and understand everything that comes with [being Native], including like the history, including the culture side of things” (Participant 1 Interview, 18:04-19:16).

Family Involvement in Dating

A third topic that came up often in the interviews was the inconvenience of involving family in your dating life. One of the concerns cited by female participants was that not involving an elder family member in their dating decisions would result in accidently dating a relative (Participants 3 & 2 Interviews). Comparatively, the male interview participants did not voice any concerns about accidently dating a relative. Participant 2 articulated that she felt like she could not date anyone from her reservation without having to ask her grandparents if she is related to them first (Participant 2 Interview Part 2, 0:19-4:12). She further went on to explain that if she asked about a crush and they did end up being related to her, her grandparents and other family members would tease her about liking a cousin for the rest of her life (Participant 2 Part 2, timestamp). Similarly, when Participant 3 was looking for a potential partner, she knew she couldn’t date anyone from her reservation because she knew she was related to most families (Participant 3 Interview, 2:59-3:52). Participant 3 knew that her blood quantum was high enough that she was not worried about finding a partner from her reservation so that her children could be enrolled (Participant 3 Interview, 2:59-3:52).

When I asked the male interview participants if they felt any pressure from their families to marry for blood quantum or for their children to be enrolled, they responded that they felt no such pressures. Participant 4 responded to this query by saying that he was not super concerned about his partner’s blood quantum (Participant 4 Interview, time stamp). Participant 1 also stated

that he was not overly concerned about his partner's blood quantum but that his grandfather told him to find an "Indian girl" to marry (Participant 1 Interview, 8:38-8:52).

Cultural Compatibility

Another topic that came out during the interviews was that of cultural compatibility. Several of the interview participants were concerned that marrying a non-Native or marrying a person from a different tribe would be difficult due to the cultural differences. Participant 2 was particularly concerned with cultural differences caused by inter-tribal dating. Specifically, she did not wish to marry an individual from a tribe where they had very different cultural customs and traditions from what she was used to; she used the Navajo as an example (Participant 2 Interview Part 1, 23:16-23:56). Her concern stemmed mostly from not wanting to commit a cross-cultural faux-pas if she were to marry someone from a different tribe (Participant 2 Interview Part 1, 23:16-23:56). Participant 1, in contrast, was more concerned about cultural differences in dating a non-Native individual. He felt that there is a "cultural divide" between Natives and non-Natives that would make marriage difficult (Participant 1 Part 1, 6:44). Participant 1 further explained that Natives and non-Natives have different lifestyles, humor, and family dynamics that would be difficult to overcome in a relationship (Participant 1 Part 1, 7:01-7:25).

Cultural Identity

The last major topic that came out during the interviews was about cultural identity. This topic mainly revolved around the participants wanting their children and grandchildren to be secure in their own cultural identity. There were some conflicting points of view between participants. Participant 1 felt that because he, and his future children, carry the name of a war

chief that it would be difficult to fully embrace their heritage if they were not fully enrolled (Participant 1 Part 1, 23:25-24:16). Participant 1 further explained that he did not want his children to feel confused about their identity by not being enrolled but carrying the name of a war chief (Participant 1 Part 1, 23:25-24:16). Participant 3 also had similar feelings toward her grandchildren being enrolled, stating, "I don't want them to feel lost. I don't want them [to feel like] they don't have a right to know anything about this. Our culture, traditions" (Participant 3 Interview, 8:11-8:27). In contrast, Participant 2 articulated that she did not want her children's blood quantum to influence their cultural identity (Participant 2 Interview, 15:14-16:09). Participant 2 went on to say that blood quantum does not determine the extent of an individual's cultural participation and that those who have a lower blood quantum may be more culturally involved than those who might be considered "full-blood" (Participant 1 Interview, 15:14-16:09).

Using the interviews to analyze the survey results, it becomes clear why nearly all filtered survey responses followed the same pattern of individuals finding their partner's blood quantum not important or only slightly important but their children's blood quantum as fairly or very important. The same sort of pattern emerged from the interview participants' stories. The interview participants expressed greater concern for their children and grandchildren being enrolled than they were concerned about their partner being enrolled. No one wants to feel like they are limited or restricted in their ability to choose a life partner. Both the interview and survey data reflect that sentiment. Participants placing a high level of importance on children and grandchildren being able to enroll in a tribe is also understandable. Native American people have endured and survived genocide. The survival of the tribe is always at the forefront, which is why it is so important for children to be enrolled.

In her historical narrative, *Reproduction on the Reservation*, Briana Theobald discusses reproductive sovereignty, or reproductive autonomy, in relation to Native American women during the 20th century (2019). Reproductive sovereignty refers to an individual's right to make decisions about reproductive health care. Decisions like whether you want to have kids, how many kids you want, and the birthing process are all choices that would fall under the umbrella of reproductive sovereignty (Theobald, 2019). The data shared with me by both the interview and survey participants could expand the definition of reproductive sovereignty to include the right to choose your partner, free of restrictions like blood quantum. Native American's do not like the idea of having to choose a partner based on blood quantum to ensure the future of not only their child and grandchildren but their tribe as well. Blood quantum restricts the reproductive sovereignty of Native Americans. By not placing a high level of importance on their partner's blood quantum or tribal affiliation, Native Americans are reclaiming their own reproductive sovereignty. However, in the process they are further limiting the future generations from having the same freedom. Without tribes changing blood quantum enrollment standards to some other system, it becomes increasingly more difficult to exercise your reproductive sovereignty and still expect your children to be fully enrolled.

# CONCLUSION

I hesitate to call this a conclusion because conclusion sounds very final and complete. While I may be done writing momentarily, this work is far from being complete, and so there is not really a conclusion or an end just yet. This thesis is only the beginning and only scratches the surface of what we may learn about this topic. As I mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the ways in which blood quantum influences the social behaviors of Native Americans is relatively unknown in the academic world. There have been opinionated essays, play scripts, short stories, and blog posts about how blood quantum has impacted the dating lives of many individuals, which have helped to inform my work. These personal stories have shown me that there is a need for this study in the academic space. There are so many ways this study can be expanded upon to get a more complete understanding of how impactful blood quantum is to Native American individuals. I hope that, maybe someday, I can return to this project and build upon it.

My wish is that the information in this thesis reaches other Native American individuals who may also have experienced difficulties reconciling dating with blood quantum and enrollment issues. They should know that they are not alone, and that many other people deal with the same issues. I also hope that this information may be found by tribal government officials. While this paper does not make any claim at having a solution, the information contained within may start conversations of change within tribal communities.

The General Allotment Act of 1887 and the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 were major policies which have significantly impacted Native Americans' way of life. The concept of blood quantum was initially used as a more bureaucratically efficient way to determine the eligibility of individuals to receive an allotment (TallBear, 2013). Oftentimes, an individual's

blood quantum was arbitrarily assigned by Indian Agents who facilitated the allotment process (Russell, 2005; TallBear, 2013). By first linking blood quantum to land, the federal government then made the jump to using blood to define an Indian identity. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was the first piece of legislation to define Indian identity by blood quantum (Ellinghaus, 2017). By including a blood quantum-based definition of identity in the IRA, the federal government had precedent to pressure tribes into writing blood quantum into their constitution (Goldberg, 2006; Ellinghaus, 2017; Robbins 1992; Doerfler, 2017).

Blood quantum emerged from these policies and has contributed to the colonial violence perpetrated against Native Americans. This thesis has sought to build an understanding of how blood quantum has impacted traditional kinship and marriage practices. This thesis studies how important blood quantum is for contemporary Native Americans when considering dating and family creation. Traditional kinship and marriage practices for many tribes emphasized the importance of exogamy to the health of the tribe. The practice of exogamy is still very relevant and still practiced by many Native Americans, as evidenced by the high rates of intermarriage with non-Native individuals (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992). The results from this study's surveys show that in most cases a larger proportion of participants find their partner being enrolled as not being very important to them. Personal stories from interview participants also support the practice of exogamy. Moreover, several participants express concern over dating a relative if they have to find a partner from their reservation or tribe (Participant 2 Interview Part 2; Participant 3 Interview). Despite the fact that blood quantum threatens the eligibility of future generations, many people are still reluctant to date within their tribe.

One way the results of the study were analyzed was based on the participants' gender identity. Female identifying participants made up the majority of the surveys with 112 versus 38 male participants. The combined results of the surveys showed that male participants had a higher mean for their life partner being enrolled and their children being enrolled in any tribe. Female participants only had a higher mean for the prompt, my child being enrolled in the same tribe as me. A higher mean is associated with a higher level of importance placed on the specific prompt. Therefore, the study showed no statistically significant differences in how male and female participants answered the prompts. It does indicate though that both male and female Native Americans think it is important to have children that qualify for enrollment. This creates a contradiction, as many blood quantum-based policies require a minimum blood quantum from a specific tribe. Not finding a partner from the same tribe may reduce the likelihood of having children that are eligible for enrollment.

The results of the study's surveys were also analyzed by the enrollment status of the participants. There were 109 enrolled participants and 49 non-enrolled descendant participants. The prompt about life partners being enrolled in the same tribe was significant between enrolled and non-enrolled participants. Enrolled participants were more likely to place a higher level of importance on their life partner being enrolled in the same tribe than non-enrolled participants. Native Americans who are enrolled are more likely to consider blood quantum when dating.

There were five interview participants. The themes that emerged from the interviews were cultural knowledge/inheritance, benefits of enrollment, family involvement in dating, cultural compatibility, and cultural identity. For several of the interview participants, it was important to them that their children and grandchildren could be enrolled so that they are able to

share their cultural knowledge and teachings. Many interview participants felt that there might be a disconnect if their children and grandchildren were to learn cultural teachings while not being full members of the tribe. Interview participants also mentioned wanting to ensure that their children and grandchildren had access to the benefits of being a fully enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe. Interview participants wanted to secure for their children education benefits, such as higher education scholarships and Indian Fee Waiver. The female interview participants both made comments about the importance of involving an older family member, usually a grandmother, in their dating lives. This was to make sure they did not accidentally date a cousin or relative. This has also led many of the interview participants to look beyond the reservation for a partner to avoid having to involve a family member. Even though the interview participants were searching for partners outside the reservation, many of the participants were concerned about the cultural compatibility of a non-Native partner or a partner from a different tribe. Finally, interview participants were concerned that their children and grandchildren would feel disconnected from their heritage and culture if they were not enrolled.

This study shows that the social consequences of blood quantum have caused many Native American individuals to feel pressured to ensure their children are enrolled. At the same time, individuals find it difficult to find a suitable partner based on blood quantum. The General Allotment Act of 1887 and the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 provide important context into how the present-day blood quantum situation came to be. Studying traditional kinship and marriage practices provides an understanding of how blood quantum has impacted these time-honored systems. The interviews and survey data in this study show that some aspects of these traditional kinship and marriage practices have survived into the present, most notably, notions

of exogamy and taboos surrounding incest. In that, interview participants are concerned that dating or having children with blood quantum requirements will require them to partner with a relative. Additionally, finding a partner from a different tribe does align with some tribes' traditional practices of exogamy.

In conclusion, the results of this study show that blood quantum has caused undue social pressure on tribal members. Blood quantum has limited the reproductive sovereignty tribal members can exert, while still ensuring enrollment for the future generations. This paper is only the beginning of a long conversation on the social impacts blood quantum has had on Native individuals. For real change to happen, this discussion needs to be picked up by tribal governments. This paper may seem silly or inconsequential because it is in large part about dating, but for Native American people, it is about survival. I used this quote to end my prospectus proposal paper, and I will use it again now to close out this chapter of my research career, "We have no intention of disappearing, of being silent, or of quietly acquiescing in our extinction" (Gunn Allen, 1992).

Pidamaya. Thank you.

# REFERENCES CITED

Anderson, K. (2011). *Life stages and Native women: Memory teachings, and story medicine*. University of Manitoba Press, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Charles, Al. (1973). An oral history with Al Charles/Interviewer: Jeffery Wilner. Northwest Tribal Oral History Collection (Box 1, Tape 23 Transcript), Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

*Constitution and bylaws of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians North Dakota.* Turtle Mountain Law Library. (n.d.). https://law.tmchippewa.com/us/nsn/tmchippewa/council/constitution

Deer, S. (2015). *The beginning and end of rape: Confronting sexual violence in Native America*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Deloria, E. (1998). *Speaking of Indians*. University of Nebraska Press.

Doerfler, J. (2017). 'We aren't like dogs' battling blood quantum. *Wasafiri*, 32(2), 41-47.

Eberts, M. (2017). Being an Indigenous woman is a "high-risk lifestyle". In J. Green (Eds.), Making space for Indigenous feminism. (pp. 69-102). Fernwood Publishing, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Ellinghaus, K. (2017). *Blood will tell: Native Americans and assimilation policy.* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.

Fay, G. E. (1964). Cousin-relationship among the Indian tribes of the northwest Pacific coast. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science, 67*(4). 598-612. https://doi.org/10.2307/3626787

*Fort Peck Tribes constitution and by-laws*. (1960). Fort Peck Tribes. https://fortpecktribes.org/government/constitution/

Garroutte, E. M. (2003) *Real Indians: Identity and the survival of Native America.* University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles, CA.

General Allotment Act, 25 U.S.C. § 339, (1887). chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/COMPS-5297/pdf/COMPS-5297.pdf

Gillio-Whitaker, D. (2017, March 17). *How the Cobell case impacted Indian land policies.* ThoughtCo. https://www.thoughtco.com/history-behind-the-cobell-case-4082499#:~:text=Overview,treasurer%20for%20the%20Blackfoot%20tribe.

Goetting, M. A., & Ruppel, K. (2021). *Fact sheet 5: who is eligible to Inherit Your Trust Lands and retain trust status?*. Montana State University: Mountains and Minds. https://www.montana.edu/indianland/documents/factsheets/factsheet5.html

Goldberg, C. (2006). Members only: Designing citizenship requirements for Indian nations. In E. D. Lemont (Eds.), American Indian constitutional reform and the rebuilding of Native nations. (pp.107-143). University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.

Gravetter, F.J. & Wallnau, L.B. (2017). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences (10th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Cengage.

Green, J. (2017). *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Fernwood Publishing, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Gunn Allen, P. (1992). *The sacred hoop: Recovering the feminine in American Indian traditions.* Beacon Press, Boston, MA.

Hill, N., & Ratteree, K. (2017). *The great vanishing act: Blood quantum and the future of Native Nations.* Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO.

Holywhitemountain, S. (2021, April 5). Featherwieght. *The New Yorker, 97*(7). 48. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2021/04/05/featherweight

Indian Affairs Division of Probate Services. (n.d.). *Approved tribal probate codes*. Approved Tribal Probate Codes | Indian Affairs. https://www.bia.gov/bia/ots/dps/approved-tribal-probate-codes

Indian Affairs FAQ. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions*. Frequently Asked Questions | Indian Affairs. https://www.bia.gov/frequently-asked-questions

Indian Affairs Office of Indian Services. (n.d.). *Tracing American Indian and Alaska native ancestry*. Tracing American Indian and Alaska Native Ancestry | Indian Affairs. https://www.bia.gov/guide/tracing-american-indian-and-alaska-native-aian-ancestry

Indian Reorganization Act, 25 U.S.C. § 5129, (1934). chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/COMPS-5299/pdf/COMPS-5299.pdf

Keen, A., & Wilbur, M. (Hosts). (2019a, October 8). Beyond blood quantum (No. 11) [Audio podcast episode]. In *All My Relations.* https://www.allmyrelationspodcast.com/podcast/episode/49fcb76f/beyond-blood-quantum

Keene, A., & Wilbur, M. (Hosts). (2019b, November 8). Love in the time of blood quantum (No. 13) [Audio podcast episode]. In *All My Relations.*

https://www.allmyrelationspodcast.com/podcast/episode/46bd8b84/love-in-the-time-of-blood-quantum

Kovach, M. (2021). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.

Miller, T. (2014). Beyond blood quantum: The legal and political implications of expanding tribal enrollment. *Am. Indian LJ, 3*(1), 323-357.

National Archives and Records Administration. (2021, September 21). *Dawes Act (1887)*. National Archives and Records Administration. https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/dawes-act#:~:text=Also%20known%20as%20the%20General,granted%20allotments%20of%20reservation%20land.

Native Governance Center. (2023, August 21). *Blood quantum and sovereignty: A guide*. Native Governance Center. https://nativegov.org/resources/blood-quantum-and-sovereignty-a-guide/

Nooksack & Lummi Elders. (1973). Interview by Dr. Donald Eklund and Jeffery Wilner. [Tape recording]. Northwest Tribal Oral History Collection (Box 1, Tape 34). Center for Pacific Northwest Studies. Archives & Special Collections. Western Libraries. Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.

Oeser, M. D. (2015). Avoiding extinction, preserving culture: Sustainable, sovereignty-centered tribal citizenship requirements. *North Dakota Law Review, 91*(1). 1-36. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2647111

Robbins, R. L. (1992). Self-determination and subordination: The past, present, and future of American Indian governance. In M. A. Jaimes (Eds.), The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance. (pp. 87-121). South End Press, Boston, MA.

Russell, S. (2005). The racial paradox of tribal citizenship. *American Studies. 46*(3/4). 163-185.

*Santa Clara pueblo v. Martinez, 436 U.S. 49 (1978)*. Justia Law. (n.d.). https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/436/49/

Saulny, S. (2011, Jan 30). Black? White? Asian? More Young Americans Choose All of the Above. New York Times (1923-) https://www.proquest.com/historical-newspapers/black-white-asian-more-young-americans-choose-all/docview/1621342481/se-2

Schmidt, R. W. (2011). American Indian identity and blood quantum in the 21st century: A critical review. *Journal of Anthropology*, 2011.

Stands In Timber, J., & Liberty, M. (1967). *Cheyenne memories.* Yale University Press.

Stanley, S. & Thomas, R. K. (1978). Current demographic and social trends among North American Indians. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 436*, 111-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271627843600111

Stiffarm, L. A., & Lane Jr., P. (1992). The demography of Native North America: A question of American Indian survival. In M. A. Jaimes (Eds.), The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance. (pp. 23-53). South End Press, Boston, MA.

TallBear, K. (2013). *Native American DNA: Tribal belonging and the false promise of genetic science.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Theobald, B. (2019). *Reproduction on the reservation: Pregnancy, childbirth, and colonialism in the long twentieth century.* University of North Carolina Press.

"Tribal land codes." (n.d.). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/loulo/Downloads/TribaLandCodes.pdf

Tveskov, M. A. (2007). Social identity and culture change on the southern northwest coast. *American Anthropologist, 109*(3), 431-441. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2007.109.3.431.

Wilson, A. C. & Taylor, E. (2005). *Remember this! Dakota decolonization and the Eli Taylor narratives*. University of Nebraska Press.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.

Windchief, S., Polacek, C., Munson, M., Ulrich, M., & Cummins, J. D. (2018). In reciprocity: Responses to critiques of Indigenous methodologies. *Qualitative Inquiry, 24*(8), 532-542.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

## RECRUITMENT FLYER

# CALLING FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS FOR

## The Social Consequences of Blood Quantum in Native American Communities

PARTICIPANT QUALIFICATIONS:

- ENROLLED MEMBER OR DESCENDANT OF A FEDERALLY OR STATE RECOGNIZED TRIBE
- IDENTIFY AS NATIVE AMERICAN

PARTICIPATION INVOLVES:

- BEING INTERVIEWED, 1-2 HOURS LONG
- INTERVIEWS CAN BE CONDUCTED IN PERSON OR ON WEBEX/ZOOM

Participants will receive a $25 gift card as compensation

If interested please contact Lyndsey Young at lyndseyy3@gmail.com, American Indian Hall 232

Faculty adviser: Matt Herman, mherman@montana.edu

MSU IRB Protocol #: 2023-661-FCR

# APPENDIX B

## SURVEY AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

**Paper Survey Questions**

1. Select your age range:
    a. 18-25
    b. 26-35
    c. 36-45
    d. 46-55
    e. 55+
2. Select your preferred gender identity:
    a. Male
    b. Female
    c. Transgender male
    d. Transgender female
    e. Non-binary
    f. Gender fluid
    g. Other/my preferred gender identity is not listed
3. Are you an enrolled member or a descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe? If yes, which one(s)?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c.
4. Do you know what blood quantum is?
    a. Yes
    b. No
5. Does your tribe(s) use blood quantum to determine membership?
    a. Yes
    b. No

On a scale of 1-5 please rate the importance of the following statements to you. With 1 being not important and 5 being very important.

1. My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me

2. My life partner being enrolled in any tribe

3. My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me

4. My child being enrolled in any tribe

**Online Survey Questions**

Q1. Select your age range:

18-25

26-35

36-45

46-55

55+

Q2. Select your preferred gender identity:

Male

Female

Non-binary

Gender fluid

Two-Spirit

Prefer not to say

Q3. Are you an enrolled member of a federally/state recognized tribe?

Yes

No

Q4. (if yes to Q3) Which tribe are you enrolled in?

Q5. (if no to Q3) Are you a descendant of a federally/state recognized tribe?

Q6. (if yes to Q5) Which tribe(s) are you a descendant of?

Q7. Do you know what blood quantum is?

Yes

No

Q8. Does your tribe(s) use blood quantum to determine membership?

Yes

No

Unsure

Q9. On a scale of 1-5 please rate the importance of the following statements. With 1 being not important and 5 being very important.

My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me

My life partner being enrolled in any tribe

My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me

My child being enrolled in any tribe

**Interview Questions**

Are you an enrolled member of a federally or state recognized tribe? Which tribe?

Are you a descendant of a federally or state recognized tribe? Which tribe(s)?

What are your thoughts on blood quantum?

Is it important to you that your children or future children are enrolled in the same tribe as you, or that they have the ability to enroll in a tribe? Please share your thoughts.

When you are considering a potential dating/marriage partner, do you take into consideration their blood quantum? Why or why not?

When did you first learn about blood quantum?

Has blood quantum impacted your life? Can you explain?

# APPENDIX C

## CONSENT STATEMENTS

**Montana State University Research Survey Consent Statement**

I am Lyndsey Young, graduate student in the Native American Studies Department. I am an enrolled member of the Fort Peck Sioux. I grew up on the reservation and plan on returning once I have my education. I am conducting this research survey about blood quantum and social relationships (about 5 minute survey) for my MSU graduate thesis.

I am planning on using this feedback in my thesis paper. This paper has the potential to be published in an academic social science journal. The study likely has no immediate benefit to you as the participant but could provide useful information for future generations.

Your participation is completely anonymous and no identifying information will be recorded. There will be no way for anyone (including the researcher) to be able to trace your responses back to you. Your responses will be kept electronically.

Participation is voluntary, and you can choose to not answer any questions you do not want to answer and/or you can stop at any time.

Proceeding with the survey indicates your consent to participate.

Contact info for questions: Student Researcher Lyndsey Young: lyndseyy3@gmail.com

Faculty Advisor Dr. Matthew Herman mherman@montana.edu

MSU IRB irb@montana.edu or 406-994-4706

Protocol #2023-661 APPROVED MSU 11/14/2023 IRB #2023-661

**Subject Consent Form for Participation in Human Research at Montana State University**

Title of study: The Social Consequences of Blood Quantum in Native American Communities

You are being asked to participate in a research study about the social consequences of blood quantum. Blood quantum is commonly used as the enrollment standard for many tribes. In recent years many Native Americans have begun dating and marrying individuals outside of their enrolled tribe. Any resulting children from these unions may not be able to meet blood quantum standards to enroll in a tribe.

You were identified as a possible participant for this study because you self-identify as Native American. This study is voluntary. You can choose to not answer any questions you do not want to answer and/or stop the interview at any time. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in an interview session, lasting 1-2 hours. Audio of the interview will be recorded, to ensure correctness during the transcription process.

Interview questions will include topics about blood quantum, dating, marriage, enrollment, and other related topics. These topics may cause feelings of anger, frustration, hopelessness, embarrassment, or uncomfortableness. In the event that your participation in this research directly results in mental distress to you, referral(s) to MSU's Counseling & Psychological Services, personnel from AI/AN student success center, or calling 911 will be available.

This study will likely have no direct benefit for you. There is no consequence to you if you decline to participate and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. This study is funded through the Native American Studies department. There are no costs to you. You are encouraged to ask any questions that you might have about the study. Only the interviewer will have access to the interview transcripts. Information obtained in this study may be published in

social science journals, but your identity will not be revealed. In the event that you are directly quoted, you have the choice to pick your own pseudonym or remain anonymous. You will be compensated for your participation in this study with a $25 Amazon gift card.

If you have any questions about this study, you can contact Lyndsey Young at 406-768-7686, lyndseyy3@gmail.com. If you have additional questions about the rights of human subjects, you can contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, Mark Quinn, 406-994-4707, mquinn@montana.edu.

AUTHORIZATION: I have read the above and understand the discomforts, inconvenience, and risk of this study. I, _____ (name of subject), agree to participate in this research. I understand that I may later refuse to participate and that I may withdraw from the study at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

Signed: _____

Pseudonym:_____

Investigator: _____

Date: _____

# APPENDIX D

## CODE LISTS

**Gender Code for Online Survey**

1 = male

2 = female

3 = non-binary

4 = gender fluid

5 = two-spirit

6 = prefer not to say

**Age Code for Online Survey**

1 = 18-25

2 = 26-35

3 = 36-45

4 = 46-55

5 = 55+

**Enrollment Status**

1 = enrolled

2 = not enrolled

**Descendant Status**

1 = descendant

2 = non-descendant

**Tribe Affiliation Code for Online Survey**

1 = Blackfeet

2 = Confederated Salish and Kootenai

3 = A'aninin

4 = Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa

5 = Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

6 = Crow

7 = Rosebud Sioux

8 = Oglala Lakota Sioux Tribe

9 = Shoshone-Bannock

10 = Qawalangin

11 = Athabaskin

12 = Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux

13 = Northern Cheyenne

14 = Tulalip Tribe

15 = Northern Ute Tribe

16 = Three Affiliated Tribes (MHA Nation)

17 = Rocky Boy Chippewa Cree Tribes

18 = Gros Ventre

19 = Lower Brule Sioux Tribe

20 = Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma

21 = Cheyenne River Sioux

22 = Kickapoo Tribe of Kansas

23 = Little Shell

24 = Cowlitz

25 = Fort Bidwell Indian Community

26 = Aleut (Bristol Bay Native Corporation)

27 = Redwood Valley Band of Little Pomo Indians

28 = Aleut Community of St. Paul Island

29 = Chickasaw

30 = Koyuk

31 = Navajo Nation

32 = Eastern Shoshone

33 = Quechan

34 = Haida Tribe of Alaska

35 = White Earth Ojibwe

36 = Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

37 = Sisseton Wahpeton

38 = Mi'kmaq

39 = Laguna Pueblo

40 = Cree

41 = Native Village of Unalakleet

42 = Standing Rock Sioux

43 = Jicarilla Apache

44 = Ute

45 = Kenaitze

46 = Shoshone

47 = Salish

**Blood Quantum Knowledge**

1 = yes

2 = no

**Tribal Use of Blood Quantum**

1 = yes

2 = no

3 = unsure

**Importance**

1 = not important

2 = slightly important

3 = important

4 = fairly important

5 = very important

**Gender Code for Paper Survey**

1 = male

2 = female

3 = transgender male

4 = transgender female

5 = non-binary

6 = gender fluid

7 = other

**Age Code for Paper Survey**

1 = 18-20

2 = 21-25

3 = 26-30

4 = 31-35

5 = 35+

**Tribal Affiliation Code for Paper Survey**

1 = Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux

2 = Northern Arapaho

3 = Three Affiliated (MHA)

4 = Unknown

5 = Nez Perce

6 = Choctaw

7 = Colville Confederated

8 = Kalispell

9 = Kuruk

10 = Crow

11 = Blackfeet

12 = Oglala Lakota

13 = Assiniboine

14 = Fort Belknap Indian Community

15 = Yakama

16 = Cheyenne

17 = Little Shell

# APPENDIX E

## TABLES

Table 12. Comparison of means by gender for the online surveys.

| Gender | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Mean | 2.20 | 2.56 | 3.56 | 3.60 |
| | Number | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.443 | 1.446 | 1.261 | 1.708 |
| Female | Mean | 1.84 | 2.40 | 3.71 | 3.63 |
| | Number | 101 | 101 | 101 | 101 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.231 | 1.530 | 1.366 | 1.369 |
| Non-binary | Mean | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Two-Spirit | Mean | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Prefer not to say | Mean | 3.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total | Mean | 1.91 | 2.43 | 3.68 | 3.61 |
| | Number | 129 | 129 | 129 | 129 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.271 | 1.520 | 1.358 | 1.443 |

Table 13. Comparison of means by age for the online surveys.

| Age | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18-25 | Mean | 1.78 | 2.37 | 3.64 | 3.58 |
| | Number | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.056 | 1.369 | 1.299 | 1.372 |
| 26-35 | Mean | 1.80 | 2.27 | 3.60 | 3.83 |
| | Number | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.186 | 1.574 | 1.476 | 1.392 |
| 36-45 | Mean | 2.47 | 2.79 | 3.79 | 3.53 |
| | Number | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.712 | 1.751 | 1.512 | 1.712 |
| 46-55 | Mean | 1.44 | 1.89 | 3.89 | 3.33 |
| | Number | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.33 | 1.453 | 0.928 | 1.581 |
| 55+ | Mean | 2.80 | 3.40 | 4.20 | 3.60 |
| | Number | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.789 | 2.191 | 1.789 | 1.673 |
| Total | Mean | 1.90 | 2.42 | 3.69 | 3.62 |
| | Number | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.269 | 1.519 | 1.357 | 1.48 |

Table 14. Comparison of means by enrollment status for the online surveys.

| Enrollment Status | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrolled | Mean | 2.04 | 2.53 | 4.04 | 3.83 |
| | Number | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.375 | 1.571 | 1.215 | 1.372 |
| Not enrolled (descendant) | Mean | 1.54 | 2.14 | 2.81 | 3.08 |
| | Number | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.869 | 1.357 | 1.309 | 1.479 |
| Total | Mean | 1.90 | 2.42 | 3.69 | 3.62 |
| | Number | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.269 | 1.519 | 1.357 | 1.438 |

Table 15. Comparison of means by age for the paper surveys.

| Age | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18-20 | Mean | 2.67 | 3.67 | 2.67 | 4.00 |
| | Number | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.528 | 2.309 | .577 | 1.000 |
| 21-25 | Mean | 2.20 | 2.50 | 4.20 | 3.60 |
| | Number | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.619 | 1.509 | 1.476 | 1.838 |
| 26-30 | Mean | 3.00 | 2.67 | 3.33 | 3.33 |
| | Number | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.732 | 1.528 | 2.082 | 2.082 |
| 31-35 | Mean | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 35+ | Mean | 1.86 | 3.00 | 3.29 | 3.71 |
| | Number | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.464 | 1.732 | 1.704 | 1.890 |
| Total | Mean | 2.29 | 2.88 | 3.63 | 3.71 |
| | Number | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.488 | 1.597 | 1.527 | 1.681 |

Table 16. Comparison of means by gender identity for the paper surveys.

| Gender | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Mean | 2.08 | 3.08 | 3.85 | 3.92 |
| | Number | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.320 | 1.441 | 1.405 | 1.706 |
| Female | Mean | 2.55 | 2.64 | 3.36 | 3.45 |
| | Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.695 | 1.804 | 1.690 | 1.695 |
| Total | Mean | 2.29 | 2.88 | 3.63 | 3.71 |
| | Number | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.488 | 1.597 | 1.527 | 1.681 |

Table 17. Comparison of means by enrollment status for the paper surveys.

| Enrollment Status | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrolled | Mean | 2.69 | 3.31 | 3.88 | 3.87 |
| | Number | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.537 | 1.621 | 1.310 | 1.628 |
| Not enrolled (descendant) | Mean | 1.50 | 2.00 | 3.13 | 3.38 |
| | Number | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.069 | 1.195 | 1.885 | 1.847 |
| Total | Mean | 2.29 | 2.88 | 3.63 | 3.71 |
| | Number | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.488 | 1.597 | 1.527 | 1.681 |

Table 18. Comparision of mean by gender for all surveys.

| Gender | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Mean | 2.16 | 2.74 | 3.66 | 3.17 |
| | Number | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.386 | 1.446 | 1.300 | 1.691 |
| Female | Mean | 1.91 | 2.42 | 3.68 | 3.62 |
| | Number | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.291 | 1.552 | 1.396 | 1.397 |
| Non-binary | Mean | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Two-Spirit | Mean | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Prefer not to say | Mean | 3.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| | Number | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Standard Deviation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total | Mean | 1.97 | 2.50 | 3.67 | 3.63 |
| | Number | 153 | 153 | 153 | 153 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.310 | 1.535 | 1.380 | 1.477 |

Table 19. Comparison of means by enrollment status for all surveys.

| Enrollment Status | | My life partner being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My life partner being enrolled in any tribe | My child being enrolled in the same tribe as me | My child being enrolled in any tribe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrolled | Mean | 2.14 | 2.64 | 4.02 | 3.83 |
| | Number | 109 | 109 | 109 | 109 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.411 | 1.596 | 1.225 | 1.404 |
| Not enrolled (descendant) | Mean | 1.53 | 2.11 | 2.87 | 3.13 |
| | Number | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| | Standard Deviation | .894 | 1.318 | 1.408 | 1.531 |
| Total | Mean | 1.96 | 2.49 | 3.68 | 3.63 |
| | Number | 154 | 154 | 154 | 154 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.308 | 1.535 | 1.380 | 1.473 |

# APPENDIX F

FUNDING

Table 20. Funding breakdown.

| Item | Purpose | Cost | Quantity | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tape recorder | To audio record interviews | Staples: Sony ICD-PX470 Digital Voice Recorder, $87.29 | 1 | $87.29 |
| microSD card | For extra storage on the tape recorder | Walmart: SanDisk Ultra 32 GB micro SDHC, $13.35 | 1 | $13.35 |
| External hard drive | To store interview transcripts, and survey data | Walmart: SanDisk 1TB Extreme Portable External SSD, $99.99 | 1 | $99.99 |
| Amazon gift card | Compensation for interview participants | $25 per gift card | 15 | $375 |
| | | | | $575.63 |