7-29-2002

A Study of Native American Philanthropy: Charitable Giving Patterns

Concepcion Guerrero
University of San Francisco

A Study of Native American Philanthropy: Charitable Giving Patterns

A THESIS SUBMITTED

by

Concepción Guerrero

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Masters of

Nonprofit Administration

The University of San Francisco

July 29, 2002

A Study of Native American Philanthropy

Charitable Giving Patterns

A thesis written by

Concepción Guerrero

This Thesis written under the guidelines of the Faculty Advisory Committee, and approved by all its members, has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Nonprofit Administration

At the

University of San Francisco

Research Committee

Bradford Smith
Chairperson

Rolando Nuñez
Second Reader

Michael Cortés 6 Sept. 2002
Program Director Date

Thomas Mudd Sept. 6, 2002
Dean Date

COPY EDITING APPROVAL

Master of Nonprofit Administration
College of Professional Studies
University of San Francisco

The thesis

A Study of Native American Philanthropy

Charitable Giving Patterns

by Concepción Guerrero

has been reviewed and is given copy-editing approval by

Jack Ellis
Copy Editor

August 21st, 2002

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

This study examines the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of 22 Native Americans (11 women and 11 men) living off the reservation in the Austin and San Antonio, Texas, areas in regard to their philanthropy. Giving among Native American cultures has been greatly overshadowed by negative stereotypes and cultural misunderstandings. Often members of the Native American community are seen as recipients rather than givers. Although Native Americans are people of considerable variety, there are some commonalities shared among their communities that can be helpful in understanding their philanthropy.

Two issues were outside the scope of this research: (1) this study did not attempt to represent the large diversity within the Native American population as a whole and (2) the study included a purposeful sample, which turned out to be a highly educated and generous group of Native Americans. For these reasons and because of the small sample size, this study is suggestive only and should not be used to represent Native American groups.

Data collected from this study included responses from structured, open-ended interviews. In order to better understand and to gain insight into Native American philanthropy, this researcher attended three events as a participant/observer: (a) the Four Directions Conference, (b) a powwow, and (3) the Native Women's Gathering. The design of the study included

audio-taped interviews, which were transcribed, reduced, and tabulated into relevant nomothetic themes.

The findings revealed that while Native philanthropy may look a little different from that practiced by professional fundraisers, nevertheless philanthropy for Native Americans is a daily way of life. This was supported by a very high level of giving on average (18% of their annual household income) and an extremely high rate of average time volunteered (87 hours per month). Native Americans recognized the importance of fulfilling the basic needs of every individual. Native Americans commonly give gifts such as sage, feathers, regalia, bags of food, rides, horses, and cars. They also give in the form of deeds: prayers, songs, drumming, and dance. Native Americans commonly give other types of gift. They fix the home or car of someone they know, offer someone a place to stay, care for the elders, or raise a child when the parents or family are, for whatever reason, unable.

It becomes apparent that for many Native Americans the practicalities of mainstream philanthropy raise obstacles to the implementation of the process within their communities. The obstacles could be lack of cash or fear that philanthropy might interfere with their traditions. Therefore two major conclusions can be drawn from the findings: (a) Native Americans need to be approached differently in regard to philanthropy, and (b) Native American groups can provide philanthropic resources other than money.

Vita Auctoris

Name:	Concepción Guerrero
Date of Birth:	January 25, 1945
High School:	A. S. Johnston High
	Austin, Texas
Graduated:	1965
Baccalaureate Degree	Bachelor of Science
College:	University of California
	Berkeley, California
Graduated:	1993

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge that over the last year and a half while working on the thesis requirement for an MN.A, there are many who assisted, encouraged, and supported me throughout. In particular I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Bradford Smith, for his countless hours in review of my manuscript and in meetings, e-mails, and phone calls; despite his busy schedule he assumed the Chairpersonship of my committee. Special thanks to my second reader, Dr. Melinda Micco, who from the beginning offered me her support. Thanks for always believing in me and saying, "You can do it!" Virginia Rangel's willingness to listen to my ideas and concerns was greatly appreciated. Also thanks to my father, Rufino Guerrero, who provided me the sitio in which to write. ¡Se lo aprecio! My daughters Carol, Tammy, and Cipriana and my son-in-law Duane and grandchildren Ian, Eli, and Christina Jo for their patience, love, and support, my sisters Julia and Bebe and husbands Jim and Jacinto who offered encouragement as best they could. My brother Alfredo who encouraged me and offered his full support, may he rest in peace. My good friends and prayer warriors, whose sense of humor and concern for my well-being provided much relief. With such great people behind and around me, I was well on my way to completing my thesis.

List of Tables

List of Tables (continued)

List of Appendices

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

> Friends make gifts and gifts make friends. More than just sealing a friendship, gifts established social ties that bound two parties together in a fictive or ritualized kin relationship. (La Vere, 1993, p. 323)
>
> To many Euro-Americans, especially Anglo-Americans, giving gifts to establish a relationship seemed like bad business. It reeked of bribery and many Euro-Americans refused to take part in it. If gifts were not proffered, the ritualized bond could not be made and negative reciprocity developed. The two parties remained strangers or non-kin and violence and "theft" could ensue. (La Vere, 1993, p. 335)

Gift giving has long been a ceremony central to Native American communities. Historically, much of the bloodshed between Native and white Americans can be attributed to a mutual lack of understanding of the place and importance of gifts in their respective cultures. Native Americans were the first philanthropists in the Americas. No borders existed before colonization. Historical records are filled with accounts of Native American generosity, giveaways, Wapani, and potlatches (Deloria, 1970; McLuhan, 1971). The giveaway was established mainly among Plains people; most of these tribes have institutionalized the pre-reservation value of generosity and its accompanying behavior patterns into a ritualized distribution of goods (Weist, 1973). The general purpose of the giveaway is to devalue the material aspects of life while exalting the spiritual values of giving (Keen, 1964). The objective of the Wapani is simply to give something away (Hyde, 1983). The recipient can be anyone:

someone the giver does not know, a relative, or a friend (Hyde, 1983). Perhaps the giver will experience the highest form of giveaway to provide forgiveness, (i.e., to forgive an enemy or a rival). Maybe the giver will give away love to someone they consider unlovable. In a material sense, the giver may give away something he values highly, such as a sacred pipe (Adamson, 2000). The giveaway rests upon the principle of reciprocity, that is, the moral obligation to return in equal or increased quantity or quality what has been received (Weist, 1973). "The giveaway, at least in the minds of the Cheyennes, therefore plays a central role in determining their rank within a larger number of tribes" (Weist, p. 98). Those who give the most thus achieve a greater status. "The social role of today's giveaway not only draws people into a critical network, but it also serves as a true identity marker in that it separates what is considered 'Indian' today from the surrounding non-Indian society" (Grobsmith, 1981, 76).

The potlatch practice, in which one village invites another village to watch some dancing and to accept gifts (Wells, 1999), is celebrated in Alaska and the Northwest Coast. From 1884 to 1951, the potlatch was banned and went underground (Blackman, 1986), stigmatized as being a Native American disdain for material goods as compared with European standards. The potlatch was a religious, political, and theatrical demonstration of one of the essentials of Native American culture. In an effort to assimilate Native peoples, the Church and government joined forces. The federal government prohibited the potlatch; punishment entailed two months in prison for first offenders and three months for second offenders (Blackman). Despite opposition from the Church and others,

the potlatch tradition remained robust. A host could easily be bankrupted by throwing a potlatch, but if it raised the prestige for himself and his clan, it was considered worth the price and effort (Simeone, 1995). Native Americans accepted much of what traders, missionaries, and the government had to offer, including trade goods, religion, and laws, but they refused to give up the potlatch and in doing so resisted the basic, more profound changes sought by the non-Natives (Simeone). In effect, Native Americans resisted all that the traders and missionaries understood to be "natural," meaning personal accumulation, thrift, and investment (Simeone).

Within tribes, affluence or wealth is measured in terms not only of net worth but also of human, spiritual, and natural resource capital, including the birth of children, blessings, and healing abilities (Adamson, 2000). In inquiring how a particular ethnic group may approach an identified activity, it is very important to examine the group's cultural, political, and social values to determine their impact. Because of inherent differences, such groups tend to set agendas. This is especially true for subsets within an ethnic group, such as Native Americans.

Books on the post-conquest period are filled with stories of benevolent Indians. For instance, in the 1520s, when Hernan Cortez arrived, the Aztecs greeted him with open arms (Herzog, 1988). In ancient Aztec mythology, Quetzalcoatl was the god of the air. He presided over commerce, and was said to have predicted the coming of the Spaniards. In the early 1600s, adventurer John Smith spent his first winter with the Powhatan Nation, during which he was treated very generously. Later, Sacajawea, a Native woman who served as a

guide for Lewis and Clark, contributed much to the success of their journey (Lazarus, 1991). The national holiday of Thanksgiving has its origin in Native American philanthropy (Adamson, 1999).

In the dominant culture, philanthropy entails the idea of a large check written by the very wealthy. The word "philanthropy," however, comes from the Greek and is defined as (a) the love of mankind, usually expressed in acts to enhance the well-being of humanity through personal acts of practical kindness, and (b) any effort to foster the preservation of values through gifts, service, or volunteer activity (Levey & Cherry, 1996). While in Native American communities no one word encapsulates the cultural value of giving, service, and community responsibility, this definition of philanthropy pertains more to Native American philanthropy than to mainstream culture. Native American entry into formal philanthropy is a history of both wealth and poverty. Native-inhabited lands would later generate wealth for the Carnegies and Fords (Adamson, 1999). Natives then and now did not measure their wealth in this way, but rather in terms of community standing. The need for a closer look at culture-based giving becomes essential when seeking to understand Native American philanthropy.

This research draws on the study by Spindler and Spindler (1990). Their work establishes a set of parameters within which to analyze the data collected in this study, which relies on the framework of their cross-cultural analyses involving Menominee, Chicano, and African American communities. In inquiring into prior elements affecting Native American philanthropy, Spindler and Spindler have identified certain barriers including, but not limited to, (a)

language/communication problems, (b) economic survival of the family, clan, or tribe, (c) cultural differences among Native communities, and (d) arrogance among grant-making foundations (Wells, 1999). In this study, therefore, this researcher examined factors that have contributed to, and barriers that have been surmounted by, Native Americans living off the reservation who have incorporated philanthropy into their daily living. This exploratory study was conducted in the urban and suburban areas of Austin and San Antonio, Texas.

It is the positive connotation attributed to the recognition of Native American generosity that may encourage present and future generations of Native Americans to be more willing to recognize, rather than deny, their own ethnic affiliations.

Background of the Issue

Significant changes in Native American philanthropy marked the period following European colonization in 1492. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, the Native American population in the Americas is estimated at between 60 and 100 million (Dobyns, 1983). In North America, the estimated Native population was 19 million. This figure was reduced to less than 1 million by 1800 (Dobyns). According to Ewen and Wollock (1996), of the 1.9 million Native Americans of today, over three-fourths live off the reservations in urban and suburban areas. These data comes from the 1990 census.

Since 1778, when the United States began striking treaties with various tribes, making them virtual wards of the state, the image of generosity has been clouded and Indians have been stereotyped as lazy, undependable people

waiting for the next government handout (Keen, 1964). The social structures of tribal societies were destroyed, the bonds of family and kinship were altered, and a new psychology of dependence was introduced that changed their economic and political systems (Joseph, 1995). This paternalistic attitude was used to explain why Native Americans should give up tribal life and land and enter into the mainstream. An economic standard based on specific and separate individualistic success was the new ideology for Native Americans. What once was reflected in tribal terms took on a pan-Indian character as many Natives settled in cities and towns (Joseph). According to Joseph, in an attempt to stay connected to their roots and to help those in need, Natives developed their own voluntary and self-help associations, which were very similar to those of the majority population living in these communities. Some Indians assimilated and aligned themselves with the Euro-American culture (Joseph).

Traditional Native American culture directly opposes mainstream culture in matters of material possession. "When you look at the origins of giving, the way it was explained to me by the elders, there was always the concept of share the deer, there was no custom of accumulating thing (Don Coyhis [Mohican], quoted by Wells, 1999, p. 23). Native American philanthropy, as understood by mainstream Americans, is a relatively recent phenomenon and has generated very little research. Great social pressure was brought to bear on any who began to acquire too many material goods. "Tribal chieftainship, the highest position among the Cheyenne, was characterized by an even-tempered good nature, energy, wisdom, kindliness, concern for the well-being of others, courage,

generosity, and altruism" (Hoebel, 1960, p. 37). Jeanette Armstrong (Okanagan) states, "The role of the chief council person, as the highest and most respected person in the community, is continuously to be able to give material offering of food and clothing and sustenance to the community" (Wells, 1999, p. 17). Young Bear's (Lakota) interpretation: "The traditional way of thinking tells us that when you have material possessions, the best thing you can do with them is to give them away" (Wells, p. 65). Coyhis's point is that after contact with the white man and as the tribes acculturated, Native Americans encountered a different way of distribution in the model of giving on birthdays and holidays. The giveaway custom (giving on birthdays and holidays) was adapting the old ways to the acculturation that was taking place (Wells, p. 24). Coyhis explains, "With regards to Native Americans giving it is that which they most value" (Wells, p. 25). Wells quotes Norbert Hill (Oneida): "Throughout the country, I find Indian people very generous. They may not have much, but they will share whatever they have. It's not just generosity with regard to things, it's generosity of spirit" (p. 18).

In mainstream culture, a person's rank in the community is almost directly proportionate to the possessions he has acquired (Keen, 1964, p. 273). In Native American culture, it varies with each tribe: Among the Dakota, a person's status is determined in accordance with what they have given away (Keen). Sometimes when someone is honored with a gift at a powwow, that person might feel it such an honor that she turns around and gives it to someone else with a comment such as, "It was such a great honor to receive the gift, I just had to honor someone else by passing it on." The giveaway serves as a system of individual

reciprocity and as a multi-functional Native ceremony through which family obligations to honor certain members of the community are fulfilled (Weist, 1973).

In Keen (1964), the dominant idea is that, though the encroachment of Euro-American culture has made many inroads into Indian life, some areas have not changed. Their willingness and often eagerness to part with possessions is abundantly evident. Giveaway feasts and potlatches provided a means for leveling possessions (Keen. Those who attend Native American powwows and celebrations often witness the giving away of headdresses, buckskin coats, beaded articles, and star quilts, as well as large quantities of food. To non-Natives there is often the sense of a contest to see who gives away the best and most articles. Folks who catch on to the idea of the giveaway, though, understand that the giver is simply an intermediary in distributing goods for the Creator. Keen notes that Native Americans acquire prestige by giving, and the presentation of gifts is often accompanied by a desire to be respected. Each tribe has some sort of giveaway, whether at funerals, weddings, or powwows; it is widespread and practiced in many areas of the United States as a practically universal gesture.

Even today, many Native Americans do not fully participate in mainstream culture. One reason for this is that they do not necessarily share the ideology itself, or if they do, it is in some sense a secondary vision—secondary to a larger set of concerns (Cornell, 1987). The interesting point, argues Cornell, is not that Native Americans have rejected this particular way of life; many have embraced it. It has, however, seldom been the main point of Native American relations with

the larger society. These drastic cultural changes inspired lack of trust and resentment among groups (various Native tribes and colonists) that had at one time coexisted as allies, and altered the reciprocal relationship of sharing, exchange, and collaboration (Berry, Winters, Ramos, Chao, & Newman, 1999).

The relationship of sharing and exchange becomes one of superior/subordinate. Between 1789 and 1850 alone, the United States negotiated and ratified 245 treaties (The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School [TAPYLS], 1996). Many were good faith treaties and were never ratified. About one-third of the 370 treaties were peace treaties (TAPYLS), and two-thirds were land cessions. Through 245 ratified treaties, Native Americans ceded some 450 millions acres with compensation amounting to less than 20 cents an acre. In some cases, the United States government agreed to recognize the strictly defined new boundaries of Native American lands in exchange for their giving up the land. Wells (1999) quotes Winona LaDuke (Anishinabeg): "Indigenous, land-based societies fundamentally understand that all life is accountable to natural law: cycles are natural, and reciprocity—the balance of taking and giving—is essential to maintaining the equilibrium of the humans with the environment."

As time passed and societal pressures changed, Native Americans became familiar and comfortable with support as laid down by government laws and entitlements. This was caused in part by Native American ideology: "Being a recipient of help has nothing undignified about it; there is no sense of loss of dignity by receiving help" (Darrell Kipp, quoted in Wells, 1999, 38). The mutual exchange that had existed in the beginning changed to a relationship of superior

to subordinate. Native Americans' desire for independence and self-help was deeply imbedded in the culture of the tribe as well as in the psyche of the individual, and the strong dependence on government, not of their own choosing, was at odds with the aspirations, inclinations, and civic traditions of their community (Joseph, 1995). Within this group of Native Americans exists a group that has been regarded by the mainstream culture as a drain on the economic, social, and educational areas of American society. Increasingly, Native Americans have progressed from victim to active planner and player in their own destiny, though they remain at the bottom of the economic ladder. These cultural misunderstandings, which to some degree still exist, have contributed to fundraisers that overlook Native Americans philanthropy altogether.

Few scholarly efforts have been made to understand the nature and development of the Native American population in the crucial area of philanthropy. From 1986 through 1999, several significant studies (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1986; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1994; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999) were conducted, none of which represented ethnicity and cultural differences as central variables. If Native Americans are to be a positive factor in the growth and welfare of the United States, then a serious effort must be made to examine and highlight their existing strengths and weaknesses with regards to philanthropy.

According to Adamson (1999), the more than 200 Native American languages have no word that directly corresponds to the Greek-based word, "philanthropy," which literally translates as "love of humans." Instead, argues

Adamson (1999), Native languages express the concept through many words, such as "sharing," "exchange," "reciprocity," "helping," "being noble," "mutual respect," "community," "sponsoring," "partnering," "collaborating," and terms that relate to ritual and ceremony, such as "potlatch," "giveaway", "offerings," and "feasts." Other terms include "honoring," "giving," and "receiving" (Adamson, 1999). This information would help developers in imaging today's donors, who are of different cultural and social backgrounds, and who seek to improve the lives of others. Cultural groups tend to share areas of common concern, achievements, and obstacles, yet it is the ways and means by which Native Americans may approach their own agenda and define and manage their philanthropic achievements that require a more thorough examination.

The nation as a whole is experiencing rapid growth among minority populations, especially in areas of racially ethnic concentration. According to the Bureau of the Census (1992), the immigration trends and high birthrates indicate that the Native American population—the youngest group, with median age of 27.4—will continue to grow well into this millennium. Many of the inequities suffered by Native Americans, whether through stereotyping or omission, can be attributed to a failure of the mainstream culture to recognize, or accept, the various cultures or subgroups of the Native American population. A single generic Native American culture does not exist. Although today Native Americans are forced to celebrate distinction in order to overcome the stereotypes that suggest they are all the same, there are many similarities shared by historical experiences, rituals, and ceremonies. Pejorative portrayals and perceptions of

Indians can cause devastating effects on Native American donors' dignity and self-image, which could effect the charitable behavior of individuals and communities in formal philanthropy.

The aversion of individual Native Americans toward the failure to recognize these inherent differences among the varied Native American groups is illustrated by Wells (1999). Each participant has had extensive experience in working with and for Native and non-Native organizations and constituencies. All of them have had to walk in two worlds and live with the tension that exists between the two traditions. As the demographic population changes, this will surely be felt by businesses, foundations, social planners, politicians, health providers, and most certainly fundraisers. Although these data have been available, only a handful of studies on racial and ethnic philanthropy have been conducted (Carson, 1991; Berry, Winters, Ramos, Chao & Newman, 1999; Smith, Shue, Vest & Villarreal, 1999).

In the Smith, Shue, Vest, and Villarreal (1999) study, the group takes a two-year innovative step in research on communities of color and philanthropy. Theirs is an ethnographic, cross-cultural study of giving conducted in eight communities of color (specifically from the African American, Mexican, Guatemalan, Salvadoran, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean communities) in the San Francisco Bay Area in California. In this groundbreaking study, Native Americans, however, are not included. The present study will be a partial supplement to the Smith et al. (1999) study in an effort to include Native American philanthropy.

Increasingly, Native Americans have been developing a more open, expectant, and pride-filled perspective of their own cultural history and future. Traditionally, little notice has been taken of the fact that, for the Native American community, giving is a "lifeway" (Grim, 1998). There is, however, little formal education on philanthropy within the Native American community. The researcher hopes this study will result in an increased understanding and appreciation of Native American values and traditions of giving by people both outside and within those communities, and ultimately work to the benefit of Native people.

Although there has been some attempt by mainstream culture to understand Native American philanthropy, there has been little information to assist the Native American community in creating cultural development programs. According to Grim (1998), much of this generosity stemmed from the communal way of life, which acted as a kind of social safety net. When a hunter brought back a buffalo, it went not only to his immediate family, but was shared with everyone within the circle (Keen, 1964). Thus, when the hunter returned empty handed, his family would not go hungry so long as there were other kills (Keen). These factors have to be considered in assessing giving patterns in Native American communities.

According to Thorpe (1989), Native Americans are unique among minorities in that they seek to maintain the integrity of their nation's social, cultural, governmental, religious, and economic systems and sovereignty. Their lives are governed by literally thousands of federal laws. Their languages are

rooted in the pre-existence of the United States, and their rights to lands, resources, fishing, and gathering are derived from their heritage within the United States before the Constitution (Thorpe, 1989). At the same time that the federal government promotes dependency, tribes are viewed as sovereign nations, and are recognized as independent entities. Federal law recognizes the right of Indian tribes to enact civil and criminal law as well as to charter and regulate corporations and nonprofit organizations (Berry et al., 1999).

This exploratory research provides Native American nonprofit organization leaders and fundraisers with data and a basic understanding from which to measure Native American thoughts, feelings, and behaviors with regards to Native American philanthropy. The purpose is to develop a better understanding of the complex connection of giving, the situations that influence Native American philanthropy, and whether significant relationships exist between these factors and charitable giving. Native Americans are greatly impacted by family, kinship, and community experiences that shape giving patterns and compassion for others (Thorpe, 1989). Therefore, the motivation for philanthropy can be as variable and individualized as the number of men and women who give each year.

The study by Smith, Shue, Vest, and Villarreal (1999) argues that there is a tendency to measure philanthropy from the prospective of the dominant culture. Philanthropy is generally associated with wealthy people giving large amounts of money to charity for people they do not personally know. Giving is then measured by the donor's social status or the size of the gift; this sets the

standard for evaluating the effectiveness of the charitable giving mode (Smith et al., 1999). In Wells (1999), Stevert Young Bear argues that in the Native American communities a person's social status is determined by how much that person gives away, and leaders are chosen for their ability to take care of their community.

Mary Brave Bird writes about the many years she spent with Leonard Crow Dog, the medicine man of the American Indian Movement, who, because of his position, would give everything away if someone showed up in need; that was the way that he believed in following. Sometimes leaving his own family with very little, he never turned anyone down (Brave Bird & Erdoes, 1993). In specific behavior, this means that a tribal chief gives constantly to the poor. "Whatever you ask of a chief, he gives it to you. If someone wants to borrow something of a chief, he gives it to that person outright" (Hoebel, 1960, p. 37). The principal idea is that giving is perfectly natural, especially in traditional Native communities.

Today, Native people still want to reduce or eliminate human suffering and improve the quality of life for others; however, they also want to be assured that their time, energy, and money are being spent in the way they intended. Norbert Hill states, "This new generation of Indian leadership is the first generation of people that have been relatively successful" (Wells, 1999, p. 53). "Significant opportunities await organizations that wish to further the philanthropic experience; if it wants to be effective, it has to get in and work at the grass roots. It has to locate the firestarters—the people who can influence the community" (Don Coyhis" in Wells, 1999, p. 57).

Statement of the Issue

Giving in the Native American culture has been greatly overshadowed by the proliferation of negative stereotypes. Though some scholars (Bremner, 1988; Grim, 1998) credit Native Americans with being the first philanthropists in the Americas, members of the Native American community are often regarded as recipients rather than givers. Most scholarship portrays Native American communities as living in poverty, dependent on government handouts, and ignores their importance in philanthropic traditions (Grim, 1998; Wells, 1999). Native American giving has always provided strong structural support for the Native American community (Adamson, 1999). Despite their inaccuracies, negative perceptions persist about the willingness to give and the collective philanthropic interests of Native Americans. Negative stereotyping and assumptions of dependency on government handouts have, in many cases, affected the ability and interest of Natives Americans to participate in formal philanthropy. Recently addressing these misconceptions, Wells (1999) draws on interviews he conducted with high-profile Native Americans who were executives or board members at nonprofit organizations, or who had other experience at charitable organizations. Wells argues that it is inherent for Native Americans to be givers and receivers; this dualistic trait is received from ancestors as a genetic transmission, literally predisposing Natives to the tradition. Both the gift giver and the receiver are honored; it is a mutual exchange relationship. Wells (1999) writes of the "circle giving" that defines generosity in Native Americans. The gift moves constantly, and it moves in a circle. Understanding that the gift has worth,

not market value, "when the gift is used, it is not used up....the gift that is passed along remains abundant" (Hyde, 1983, p. 41).

Most recently, in an effort to expand diversity in philanthropy, the Council on Foundations, working in close collaboration with organizations that represent affluent donors in the African American, Asian American, Latino, and Native American communities, put together an extensive report (Berry et al., 1999). In this study, central to each chosen foundation was their group's ideology about giving: how they select the organizations they support and how they go about setting up endowments (Berry et al.). Although these studies take into account giving in communities of color, the lack of research on Native Americans as a whole cannot be ignored.

Grantmakers like Ford, W.K. Kellogg, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundations have been the mainstream pace-setters in defining philanthropy for the dominant culture (Campoamor, Diaz, & Ramos, 1999). On the other hand, for the last few years these same grantmakers, along with the Council on Foundations, have displayed a commitment in actively supporting efforts to expand diversity in philanthropy (Berry et al., 1999). Among the many reasons for exploring and supporting ethnic-based funds were demographic issues: in order to ensure the stability of philanthropy in the decades ahead, Kellogg has argued, new donors will need to come from communities of color (Campoamor et al., 1999). These foundations along with the major charities lack information on Native American donors. For example, they do not have information on what motivating factors, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors are important to Native

Americans, and to what extent Native Americans give to Native charities, their average gift size, and if there are barriers that interfere with their cultural giving behaviors. This information informs grantmakers on how best to support and expand the resources of communities of color. Native Americans do not represent a homogeneous group. According to recent literature on racial and ethnic philanthropy (Berry et al., 1999; Campoamor et al., 1999; Smith et al., 1999), minorities give differently as groups depending on cultural traditions, community, and beliefs not shared outside the culture. Racial and ethnic groups studied by Smith et al. varied in the amount they gave and in how they made their gifts depending on their economic status, religious background, and values and philanthropic interests. This study examines whether such a trend accurately reflects Native American philanthropy.

Harmon (1996) examines the cultural and structural underpinnings of the American fundraising process, and then contrasts it with the social and economic norms of Native American communities. He asserts that American fundraising is a product of, and dependent on, the cultural norms of the dominant culture, and that these norms create obstacles for many Native American communities. He goes on to argue that some Native communities lack cash flow and must accommodate immediate needs, whereas others have traditional social systems that may interfere with long-term collective fundraising. According to Harmon, American fundraising emphasizes organization, information, causes, cases, campaigns, participation, legal obligations, and ethics, whereas Native

Americans focus on honor, sharing, ritualized reciprocity, community, and responsibility toward future generations.

The problem of Native Americans being conspicuous by their absence in the giving arena has been highlighted by researchers on the giving of minorities in studies done by Smith et al. (1999) and Carson (1991). Despite the importance of this research, it does not describe the contributions of Native Americans. If research is to validate the contributions of minorities in general, then the American Indian population also needs to be included. This problem is exacerbated by a failure to accurately define and identify the different Native American subgroups. The differences, says Thorpe in Wells (1999), can be found in the ways of giving, which differ depending on what is within the land of the people in question. A person who makes tools might give a tool to another village; some of the Plains Indians give tipis. In the Northwest coastal region, canoes, dishes, and blankets are given at potlatch ceremonies. Some common threads within the Native American view of giving are universal (Wells, 1999). More extensive research is needed on the patterns, styles, and motivations for giving, fundraising, and endowment building in specific segments of the Native community (Berry et al., 1999). The data that emerge will assist in identifying pertinent, intrinsic characteristics that have often been difficult to obtain.

This study will research the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of urban Native Americans (who live off of the reservation) with regard to their philanthropy. The importance of the issue is twofold: "Native Americans continue to be negatively regarded by a large portion of mainstream United States society,

which might produce feelings of defeat and self-limitations; and ...great potential exists to stimulate giving among individuals, organizations and Indian tribes" (Berry et al., 1999, p. 87).

The study would demand a reexamination of the individuals' values and intrinsic motivators because motives tend to be constructed differently for different individuals at different states of their lives, and usually have multiple reasons for coming into being (Cross, 1988). Such examination would accept the theory of multiple perceptions, as suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1994). Multiple perceptions support the claim that it is the life-stories, whether spoken or written, that illustrate occurrences of a cultural group. The multiple perceptions shift between past and present, and personal experience reveals certain psychological and social aspects that have not been addressed through traditional research. In this theory, Guba and Lincoln propose that individuals' own perceived needs are the prime motivators. To examine such needs, Lincoln and Guba's (1985) grounded theory provided interpretations to the respondents' feelings, perspectives, and voids of their experiences. Grounded theory follows from data rather than preceding them (as in conventional inquiry), and is a necessary consequence of the naturalistic paradigm that posits multiple realities and makes transferability dependent on local contextual factors (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Research Questions

The following questions were the focus of this study:

1. What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy?

2. What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy?

3. In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give?

Definition of Major Concepts

Allotment: In 1887, Congress passed the Dawes General Allotment Act in an effort to assimilate Indians into white society. Reservation lands were shifted from tribal ownership to parceled sections for individual tribal members for farming or livestock. Private ownership conflicted with native beliefs, and negated the sovereignty of tribal governments (Lazarus, 1991).

Acculturation: Contact between two differing societies that elicits attitudinal and behavioral changes not requiring the adapting person to give up his or her native identity (Gutierrez, 1995).

Assimilation: The loss of one's original ethnic identity, customs, and culture as he or she become absorbed into the dominant, or mainstream, host culture (Dawson, 1996).

Circle Giving: The idea that when one gives, it will come back, maybe not immediately, but sometime in the future; it is a mutual exchange relationship: the receiver will not necessarily reciprocate to the original giver, but eventually to someone in need, and so on (Wells, 1999).

Clan: A multigenerational group (kinship) that has in common their identity, organization, and property, and that claims descent from a common ancestor (Mish, 1989). Because clan members consider themselves closely related, marriage within the clan is strictly prohibited.

Culture: Ideas, customs, and art of a people's present; thus, it is not static, but rather dynamic (Beswick, 1990).

Dominant culture: This term is used alternatively with "mainstream," or "Anglo," to refer to non-Hispanic, European Americans.

Giveaways: The general purpose of the giveaway is to devalue the material aspects of life, while at the same time exalting the spiritual values of giving (Keen, 1964).

Federally recognized tribes: Only tribes that maintain a legal relationship to the U.S. government through binding treaties, acts of Congress, executive acts of Congress, executive orders, etc., are officially "recognized" by the federal government. There are currently more than 550 federally recognized tribes in the United States, including some 200 village groups in Alaska; however, there are still hundreds of tribes undergoing the lengthy and tedious process of federal recognition (Native American Rights Fund [NARF], 2000).

Lifeway: A term used to suggest the close interaction of worldview and economy in small-scale societies ("cosmology-economy" societies). Contemporary reservation communities, as well as Indian urban communities, mirror amazing varieties of lifeway practice. Native groups, while inextricably dependent on the American and global marketplace, still preserve core

experiences of lifeways, which enable individual communities to imagine themselves in traditional cosmological ways. Such ceremonial acts as giveaways, potlatches, and social structures built on clan reciprocity often refect these core experiences. Rather than having been lost or completely subverted by dominant American market values, these core experiences have been transmitted in changed settings and reinterpreted by creative communities (Hyde, 1983).

Minority groups: Groups of people who have often been denied accessibility to those benefits and opportunities afforded to mainstream Americans; a group within larger society, often subjected to discrimination (Glazier, 1997).

Nation: A tribe or federation of tribes of American Indians. For example, the Cherokee nation consists of a number of tribes situated throughout the southern United States (Raff, 1999).

Native American: The term "Native American" came into usage in the 1960s out of respect to American Indians. In this paper the term is used alternatively with "Indian" and "American Indian," or "Native," referring to people indigenous to the Americas (Mish, 1989). As a general principle an Indian is a person who is recognized as an Indian by a tribe/village and/or the United States (NARF, 2000). For its own purposes, the Bureau of the Census counts anyone an Indian who declares to be such (NARF). There exists no universally accepted rule for establishing a person's identity as an Indian (NARF). For the purposes of this paper, a person who declares himself an Indian will be counted as an Indian.

Native giving: Sharing and reciprocity, rather than charity, are what characterize Native philanthropy. In accepting a gift, the recipient validates and honors the giver's responsibility to give. The giver receives a blessing for giving, and the recipient is part of the blessing by receiving in an honorable way (Wells, 1999).

Philanthropy: This is defined as (a) the love of mankind, usually expressed in acts to enhance the well-being of humanity through personal acts of practical kindness, and (b) any effort to foster the preservation of values through gifts, service, or volunteer activity (Levey & Cherry, 1996).

Potlatches: The word comes from the Indian word pat shotl, which means "giving" (Wells, 1999). Practiced along the Northern coast as a ritual to celebrate a naming, death of a chief, or puberty, potlatches lasted four days and visitors came from all over. The more the host gave away, the higher his status in society verifying that he could afford to part with such wealth. Accepting a gift was the guest's method of validating the host's right to the honor (Simeone, 1995).

Reciprocity: Defined as "transactions that are putatively altruistic, transactions on the line of assistance given, and if necessary, assistance returned" (Sahlins, 1965, p. 147).

Relocation: In 1956, Congress passed Public Law 959, which would use economic incentives to promote assimilation and urbanization in Indian country. It provided funds for institutional and on-the-job training for Indians. None of these programs were on the reservation, but only in urban areas, and Indians were no

longer eligible for federal services. More than 35,000 individuals relocated off the reservations (Lazarus, 1991).

Reservation: In the U.S., there are two kinds of reserved lands that are well known, military and Indian. An Indian reservation is a land-base that a tribe once reserved in exchange for relinquishing its other land areas to the U.S. through treaties. More recently, Congressional acts, executive orders, and administrative acts have created reservations. Some reservations today have non-Indian residents and land owners (NARF, 2000).

Termination: From 1953 until the mid-1960s, House concurrent Resolution 108 had a resolution to terminate the historical trust relationship between the U.S. government and Indian tribes. All federal funding for existing service programs to tribes ended and tribes were considered a disadvantaged minority group. This ended governmental oversight of tribes. Over 100 tribes lost government recognition status (Lazarus, 1991).

Tribe: A social group comprised of numerous families, clans, or generations that share the same language, customs, beliefs, and traditions (Raff, 1999). In the eyes of the U.S. government, a body of people as described above must be officially recognized to be considered a tribe (NARF, 2000).

Tribal sovereignty: The right of federally recognized tribes to govern themselves, and the existence of a government-to-government relationship with the United States. Thus, a tribe is not a ward of the government, but an independent nation with the right to form its own government, adjudicate legal cases within its borders, levy taxes within its borders, establish its membership,

and decide its own future fate. The federal government has a trust responsibility to protect tribal lands, assets, resources, and treaty rights (NARF, 2000).

Value: An attitude shared by a large portion of persons of a particular culture/ethnic group that has been transmitted via the socialization and acculturation process; a criterion, touchstone, or perspective one often brings into play in making choices (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Wapani: The object of the wapani is to give something away. You may give to anyone—someone you don't know, a relative, a friend. It could be forgiveness, or love to someone the giver considers unlovable (Hyde, 1983).

Importance of the Study

Treating all Native Americans as a single generic group (Adamson, 2000) has had its effects both inside and outside the community. The absence of scholarly interest in Native American philanthropy has helped to promote the myth that Indians are not engaged in efforts to help themselves (Joseph, 1995), that they have no philanthropic traditions worthy of study, and that their participation in the nonprofit sector is negligible. Pejorative portrayals and perceptions of Indians can cause devastating effects on Native American donors' dignity and self-image, which could affect the charitable behavior of individuals and communities. This study's importance lies in its focus on those Native Americans who live off the reservation. They presently comprise slightly more than three-fourths of the entire Native American population that resides in urban and suburban areas. In 1990, there were 1,959,000 individuals living off the reservations (Ewen & Wollock, 1996). In identifying particular philanthropic

characteristics resulting in informal and formal philanthropy, Native Americans will be better prepared to become active participants and decision-makers in issues directly affecting them and their community.

This study provides information that will increase the philanthropic community's knowledge and awareness that can be used to understand the barriers encountered by the Native American communities with regards to formal philanthropy. Unless more Native Americans are seen as donors, this ethnic minority group will not be equitably represented in the boardrooms and foundations that mandate a different range of experiences (Wells, 1999).

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organized into the following sections: (a) Introduction, (b) Historical Context of Philanthropy in Native American Communities, (c) Philanthropy Among Minorities, (d) Philanthropy Among Native Americans, and (e) Barriers to Native American Philanthropy.

Introduction

In the absence of complete data on Native American formal and informal giving and volunteering, it is important to facilitate consideration of the informal interpersonal networks through which the bulk of Native American giving is done. This exploratory study attempts to present a picture of giving by urban and suburban Native Americans in the Austin, Texas and San Antonio areas and focuses on the Native approaches to philanthropy. The researcher found that while there is no lack of literature (Odendahl, 1990; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1986; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999; Yankelovich, Skelly, & White, 1985) on mainstream American charitable giving characteristics and cultural norms, there is very little literature about minority giving, especially for Native Americans. Only a few studies (Berry et al., 1999; Wells, 1999; Salway Black, Chao, Collier-Thomas, Conley, & Cortés, 2001) have examined Native American philanthropy. Those resources available for examination by this researcher mostly tended to focus on visible Native Americans such as Rebecca Adamson, Wilma Mankiller, Donna Chavis, and Dagmar Thorpe (Wells). Berry et al. researched organizations such as the American Indian College Fund, Alaska Federation of Natives, and American Indian Higher Education Consortium, which have an

established or wealthy donor base. The donors qualified for the study if they gave $10,000 or more a year to charity (Berry et al.).

According to Yankelovich, Skelly, and White (1985), the accepted profile of the traditional donor is a white educated male, with a high, disposable income, widowed or married, Protestant, between 50 and 64 years old. The authors argue that these donors are among the most generous givers to charities and religious organizations. In these studies, respondents varied by education, income, sex, marital status, occupation, and age. In order to identify commonalties present as success factors, this research will focus on Native Americans living off the reservations and their philanthropy.

Both of the studies—Yankelovich, Skelly, and White (1985) and Hodgkins and Weitzman (1988)—found that for white males, donations increase with the donor's level of education. Those who donate more tend to have a college education. These types of studies usually include minorities, but rarely Native Americans. These studies set the precedent for how a donor is defined by the dominant culture. There is no reason to doubt that the same relationship exists for Native Americans.

The study that initially prompted this research topic was that of Smith et al. (1999). They included eight communities of color in their study of ethnic philanthropy in the San Francisco area. This study was of special interest to this researcher because Native Americans were not included, although other ethnic groups were. This study also uses the framework of Cortés (1995), Carson (1991), and Lee (1990); these authors have done extensive investigations on

Latino, African American, and Asian American philanthropy. Yet in any cultural study, boundaries must be established. In using the structure of these three researchers, who question whether a mainstream holistic approach to minority philanthropy is appropriate, it becomes evident that for many Native Americans such an approach raises serious obstacles. The work of these three researchers exemplifies scholars who are beginning to realize that minorities, as sub-cultures of the United States dominant society, may need a different approach. The view here is much too broad and comprehensive for this study, but it is a reminder that even mainstream culture is the product of and subject to many other cultural forces and that its boundaries are permeable and shifting.

The distinction between sharing and charity is critically important in understanding Native American giving, just as it is important in understanding the Native American culture. The data in the 1998 "Census Bureau Facts for Features" noted that of the 2.4 million Native Americans (they include Eskimo and Aleut populations), about one fourth live on reservations or Trust Lands. The Native American way of giving is unique, according to Joseph (1995), because it is a form of sharing rather than charity. Giving and volunteering should not be limited to race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, lifestyle, geography, age, wealth, or station in life. Historically, Anglo society has had a pattern of giving that goes beyond all cultural, economic, and social boundaries. Whereas the American dream is a dream of individual achievement and success, most Native Americans think in collective terms as a community (Cornell, 1987). Also in agreement,

Joseph (1995,) notes that for Native Americans, the good of the community takes precedence over that of the individual.

Historical Context of Philanthropy in Native American Communities

To better understand the philanthropic motivating factors of a specific group, a brief review of its history, background, and cultural perspectives is necessary (Acton & Walker, 1986). The reason this is important to philanthropy is that Native Americans are greatly impacted by their history of family, kinship, and community experiences. It is their lifeways that shape giving patterns and compassion for others (Thorpe, 1989). The honor of giving and the honor of receiving have been pervasive in the Native American community (Wells, 1999). Throughout their history, giving and receiving were understood not as formal pronouncements but as natural blessings through rituals, ceremonies, spiritual events, and familial activities, as well as governance systems, political processes, and other means of engagement (Berry et al., 1999). Native Americans did not immigrate to this nation; they were already established here. The understanding of the honor of giving remains today as Native communities have evolved through periods of transition and segregation, which made the Native American people strangers in their own lands. As Europeans settled, they brought with them a philosophy of giving steeped in religion and economics that differed greatly from that of the indigenous peoples already here (Joseph, 1995). A great divide opened between indigenous giving practices and those of the settlers. According to Joseph (1995), American Indians and European settlers had very different cognitive maps: the cultural disposition of Native Americans

was much more subjective, more influenced by individual experiences with nature, the spirits, and the "power being" that inhabits the natural world. Another change, which occurred during reservation times, was a decrease in the importance of communities as major centers of social life and thus as centers of celebration activities and the public distribution of goods (Weist, 1973).

Each period of transition, allotment, termination, and relocation posed new challenges to the philanthropic culture of the different indigenous communities. In 1887, Congress passed the Dawes General Allotment Act in an effort to assimilate Indians into Anglo society. Reservation lands were shifted from tribal ownership to allotted or parceled sections designated for individual tribal members for the purpose of farming or raising livestock. Culturally, politically, and economically, the allotment process proved disastrous for many tribes. Private ownership conflicted with communal beliefs of the giveaway that devalued the material aspects of life. Private ownership also eroded the role and sovereignty of tribal governments, and brought further poverty and loss of land to tribes. Joseph (1995, p. 25) states, "The early Indian tribe was by its very nature a benevolent community in which sharing was a primary virtue....In the Native American tradition, wealth is generated for its distribution, not its accumulation." An important issue for this study, for most Native Americans, is that the community and its cultural survival are central and beyond compromise. In some tribes, families and individuals are obligated by tribal law to give continuously from everything they gain in terms of sustenance or material wealth or good luck (Wells, 1999). By 1934, the Indian Reorganization Act ended allotment, but by

that time the federal government had allotted more than 100 reservations and tribes more than two-thirds of the land they held in 1887 (Native American Rights Fund [NARF], 1996).

In 1953, Congress passed a resolution to terminate the historical trust relationship between the U.S. government and Native American tribes. Federal funding for all existing service programs to tribes was curtailed, and Native Americans were to be considered a disadvantaged minority group. Tribes were no longer to be recognized as government units. The termination policy was in effect until the 1960s (Native American Rights Fund [NARF], 1995). Also in the 1950s, Congress passed Public Law 959, which used economic incentives to promote assimilation and urbanization in Indian country. It provided funds for institutional and on-the-job training for the Native Americans. It promised jobs, opportunities, a chance to succeed and be self-sufficient. It did not, however, make these opportunities available on the reservations. Native Americans had to relocate to urban areas. Once relocated, they were no longer eligible for federal services. Over 64 percent of the total Native American population lived off the reservation, due to either the promise of the federal government's Relocation Program of the 1950s, designed to assimilate Indians into mainstream culture, or the necessity of finding work to support their families on the reservation (Carr, 1996). For these Pan-Indians, the Inter-tribal Indian Centers in their cities, offering powwows and cultural events, were the only connection to other Native Americans and traditions (Carr). The powwows are inter-tribal and made up of many elements, such as dancing, singing, drumming, and giveaways.

Participants have their own tribal identity (Weist, 1973). Although the communities themselves no longer derive prestige from the giveaway, the tribe as a whole does (Weist). The dominant idea in Weist is that the history of the giveaway reflects three significant changes: (a) the change from male to female involvement, (b) a decrease in community involvement and an increase in individual or family acquisition of prestige, and (c) the expansion from a primarily intra-tribal system of exchange to one that includes inter-tribal exchanges.

Events in the 1950s and '60s forced many Americans to realize that for many of their fellow citizens, the American dream had been a living nightmare. Out of the civil rights movement, "a phoenix-like rise of cultural nationalism and political militancy within the Native American...communities occurred" (De la Garza, Kruszewski, & Arciniega, 1973, p. 2). Much of the more formal giving in and among Native communities' resources, such as the Ford and MacArthur Foundations and individual donors, initially focused support on Native American claims of land, sovereignty, and natural resources (Berry et al., 1999). Later funding was expanded to Native self-sufficiency and sustainability, children and families, the environment, and eventually to the revitalization of Native lifeways (Berry et al.).

During the 1970s, some Native communities experienced a degree of autonomy through the creation of commercial centers and the leasing of mineral and oil rights, thus indicating support for the general welfare of each community (Adamson, 1999). This provided new sources of revenue for their communities for land claims, lawsuits, charitable purposes, educational scholarships, and

special needs in the community. Through bust-and-boom years, and despite colonization, acculturation, and periodic relocation to urban and other rural areas, Native people always believed in and practiced their own form of philanthropy (Adamson, 2000).

By the beginning of the 1980s, it was clear that the events of the past decades, while meaning well, had yielded mixed results. Some major legislative and legal battles had been won, but the actual long-range results of these victories are still unclear. In the mid-1980s, prompted by need, argues Joseph (1995), several Native-initiated and -controlled philanthropic vehicles were launched. These included organizations such as the First Nations Development Institute, the Hope Foundation, the Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development, and the American Indian College Fund. As Native communities have become more involved in institutional philanthropy, they embraced it with unique cultural adaptations, and emphasized their independence and self-identity by continuing their community and culture (Joseph, 1995).

Since the late 1980s and the initiations of gaming and other commercial enterprises, many entrepreneurial activities were initiated in Native American country. Some tribes achieved economic success through these ventures, particularly gaming (Berry et al., 1999). Contrary to popular belief, however, only 1 tribe in 10 produces significant revenues from gaming. Still, Indian gaming provides a means to self-sufficiency for many Native Americans by creating jobs and boosting the economy (Adamson, 1999).

This understanding remains today as Native communities have evolved through periods of acculturation, colonization, and discrimination (Berry et al., 1999). According to Keen (1964), although the encroachment of the Euro-American culture has made many inroads on Native Americans' life, their willingness and often eagerness to part with possessions is abundantly evident. Those who attend Indian powwows and celebrations will often witness the giving away of headdresses, buckskin coats, beaded articles, and star quilts, as well as large quantities of food. There is often the sense of a contest to see who gives away the best and most articles. Natives acquire prestige by giving, and the presentation of gifts is often accompanied by a desire to be respected (Keen, 1964).

Philanthropy Among Minorities

Native American giving, through giveaways and the distribution of personal wealth, has been observed for centuries by ethnographers. Although there has been some mention of this custom, it has gone mostly without explanation or examination. In establishing boundaries for this study, as mentioned previously, the researcher relies heavily on the Smith et al. (1999) study. This ethnographic study provides a wealth of detail on the ethnic philanthropic traditions and cultural practices that complement national and regional qualitative survey research on this topic. The report is based on a cross-cultural ethnography. It identifies and describes the customs of sharing and giving money, goods, and services to individuals and organizations outside of the nuclear family in the African American, Mexican, Guatemalan, Salvadoran,

Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. The authors define ethnic philanthropy as sharing and helping within communities of color. In their interviews, they focus on specific customs, practices, and terms used within each group to describe the giving of money, goods, and services to others.

A summary of their principal findings—that giving-related customs are similar across the groups studied, and very little ethnic philanthropy is directed toward mainstream charitable organizations other than churches—is provided early in the study, followed by individual chapters devoted to each group, in which its basic philanthropic tenets are explained, analyzed, and summarized. This ethnic research effort provides this study with a set of parameters within which to analyze the unique and critical area of Native American philanthropy.

In this study there is also, using the framework of the Cortés (1995) article, in which he examines the philanthropic behavior of Latinos in the United States, an examination of population trends, history, and the limited research that exists in this area. Cortés explores the community traditions that predispose Latinos to give, the effects that mainstream society and its core foundations have on Latino giving, and also the new institutional political and community practices that might help facilitate increased Latino giving. Cortés identifies three key centers of Latino giving: family, church, and mutual assistance associations. Similarly, as the themes emerge from this research, the researcher hopes to identify the key centers of Native American philanthropy.

In his study, Carson (1991), a path-breaker in black philanthropy, dispels the myth that blacks are less likely than whites to make charitable contributions. Carson argues that African Americans are actively involved in supporting African American organizations and that the giving patterns and attitudes toward philanthropy are somewhat similar to those of whites. Carson examines a range of questions about African American philanthropy, using the 1988 Joint Center Annual Survey conducted by the Gallup Organizations. The survey included written responses to detailed questions and responses to face-to-face interviews on the charitable behavior of a nationally representative sample of 643 African Americans and 695 white Americans. The study considered the socioeconomic characteristics of African Americans who engage in giving, including how much they give, their attitudes, and their interest in giving. Carson argues that as more blacks join the ranks of America's wealthy, this will increase the opportunities for African Americans to concentrate their philanthropic resources to benefit their own community (Carson, 1991). Likewise, Adamson (2000) argues that as Native Americans are becoming more self-sufficient they are using their resources to benefit their own communities.

Philanthropy within the black community has been constant for more than 200 years through mutual aid organizations and clubs, black churches, socio-political leagues, and community organizations (Carson, 1995). When financial resources were not available, time and talent were, leading to the growth of a community in which giving of oneself was as important as giving of one's money (Smith et al., 1999). Currently, time and talent remain valued commodities, but

economic and educational changes have made monetary gifts more feasible. The last two decades, in particular, have witnessed major growth in black-owned business and high school and college graduation rates. The advent and triumph of tribal self-determination over the past 30 years has justified the Native Americans' faith. Profound changes affected Native philanthropy, as well as other areas of Native life, through development of new strategies for economic development, education, and entrepreneurship.

The basis for the Robert Lee (1990) book were 40 well-connected individuals in the Chinese American community of the San Francisco Bay Area; Lee disputes the mainstream stereotypical perception that Chinese Americans are frugal individuals who lack a spirit of giving and therefore do not engage in philanthropic activities. Lee examines factors that contribute to the giving behaviors of Chinese Americans. Lee dispels misconceptions about Chinese Americans, their wealth, their giving, and the foundations that emerge from their communities. He argues that Asian historical traditions go back to Confucius, who stressed benevolence, wisdom, universal order and peace, and service to others—customs and beliefs, including the activities of family and village associations, and special holidays and major life events that early immigrants brought with them. Lee explains that among other things, much of the Asian origins of wealth are due to successful small businesses and real estate ventures. Similarly, Adamson (2000) states that Native Americans are presently acquiring new wealth though gaming and small businesses, and are only beginning to explore investments strategies, including charitable investment.

Native Americans can be expected to develop highly innovative and creative uses of their wealth (Adamson). In exploring the use of philanthropy as a means of developing a sense of community among ethnic groups with varying backgrounds and ideologies, a few scholars are beginning to question the use of private sector planning and organizations representing such communities (Baum, 1994).

One study that looked mostly at white women as fundraisers and donors—and the effect of this on the prospective communities—argues that women entering their professions, climbing the executive ladder, or going into business for themselves results in the building of fortunes and developing financial skills for some (Shaw & Taylor, 1995). Women are also in a position to come into significant amounts of money through inheritance or divorces and are increasingly willing to give to charity (Shaw & Taylor). In communities of color women already give generously. They simply give in ways that are not traditional and are often not recognized by mainstream America and the federal government as tax benefits (Abbe, 2000). Although not (at least yet) to the extent of women in general, racially ethnic women are emerging as leaders in the philanthropic community, often in new roles and with new challenges (Campoamor et al., 1999). There are no such studies on Native women, but in the Muller (1998) study, the author argues that the future role of women managers could be modeled by the experiences of Native women. A deeper understanding of these skills and techniques may assist others to be effective in multicultural organizations and in the global economy (Muller, 1998).

Rosalyn Miyoko Tonai's (1988) study states that, generally, as socioeconomic status and age increased, so did overall giving. Compared with national figures, the sample showed an unusually high ratio of charitable giving to income. On average, Tonai's research suggests that a larger number of Asian Americans are well educated and are, in fact, the most generous of minority groups. Taking into consideration the history of giving in the Native American community and the recent strides made in education and socioeconomic status, there is no reason to believe that the same will not hold true for Native Americans.

Hispanics, like Native Americans, show a great diversity within the community itself, while a large part of philanthropy is done informally. According to the Smith et al. (1999) study, the investigators found significant differences in the philanthropic attitudes and behaviors among Mexicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans. Most tribes differ in their giving; for example, the Crow give money trees, the Hidatsa-Mandan of North Dakota give star quilts; the Chippewa-Cree give tipis; and the Cheyenne give tables. Each gift indicates tribal identity.

Abbe (2000) states that many Latinos see education as the great equalizer and the main road out of poverty. Abbe also argues that education is changing the role of women in the Hispanic community, which traditionally left all the decision-making to men. According to Abbe, while the Church plays a prominent role in the lives and giving patterns of the Hispanic community, recent trends tend to indicate the primary importance is education. While they remain supportive of the men in their lives, Latinas now earn almost as much as

Hispanic men, making this cultural shift even more important. If they want to make a gift, they make it (Abbe). It is now to a great extent the women who are acquiring prestige for their families by organizing and leading the giveaways (Weist, 1973).

Native American Philanthropy

Reliable research on Native Americans and philanthropy is slim, especially on the amounts of giving done by Native Americans, who they give to, and their motivations for or barriers to giving. Two sources are a quarterly publication that contains news on Native American grantmaking, people, and projects by the First Nations Development Institute (FNDI; 1999-2001), and Ewen and Wollock (1996), a report about foundations and grantmaking organizations operated by Native Americans. These are creative resources for institutional funders and individual donors in responding to the issues and concerns of Native Americans.

As stated earlier, Native American groups cannot be placed within a single category. According to a report by Hodgkinson (1992), any description of Native Americans must begin with a reminder of a historical condition that continues to shape Native American communities even today. American Indians originally made up the entire population of the Americas. As such, they developed many languages and cultural traditions. Even today, according to the 1990 Census, Natives make up less than 1% of the United States total population, yet they represent half of the nation's languages and cultures. This diversity within such a small population must always be kept in mind (Hodgkinson). Hodgkinson states, "While they represent less than 1% of the U.S. population, they have as much

diversity as 99% put together" (Hodgkinson, 1999, p. 1). This point helps to clarify the differences between tribes in giving practices.

This study seeks to provide a base of information on Native American donors while acknowledging the limitations of generalizing about a population. Native Americans, like Hispanics and Asians, are a very diverse group in North America alone. There are approximately 530 different tribes. Of these, according to the survey done by Ewen and Wollock (1996), 314 reside on federal Indian reservations in the United States. This accounts for about 440,000 individuals, or slightly less than one-fourth of the Native American population. The study cites the United States Census in 1990, in which the total was 1,959,000 (Ewen & Wollock). Reservation tribes differ among themselves in customs, language, and family structure. In addition, Native Americans in general differ greatly in their degree of acculturation, which has to do with whether or not they live on reservations (Sue & Sue, 1990) or in urban areas. Adamson (1999) writes a four-segment article discussing in a series the issues surrounding Native American philanthropic efforts. She draws on reports and on recent findings and speculates on possible pathways for Native American philanthropy in the coming years. In the absence of complete data on Native American giving, the bulk of unreported, informal giving is most notably not tracked (Adamson, 1999). While marketing firms such as Yankelovich Monitor are targeting minorities, Native Americans have been left out of marketing reports. Even though the Native American rising economy is a trendy topic, there are no data yet that compare the Native American market segment with the rest of the market segments. Native

Americans commonly have been regarded as America's poorest segment of society. Adamson (2000) notes that some Native American communities are recently experiencing increased economic levels, in part as a result of commercial enterprises and entrepreneurial activities. The success of these tribes has increased their buying power. Berry (1999) says, "Native Americans now contribute in terms of consumer dollars, spending an estimated $10 billion in 1997" (p. 35). These are important indicators. In extrapolating data from the U. S. Census Bureau (the 1990 figures are all that is available until the results of the 2000 census are published in the next year or two), it is evident there are about 46,000 Native Americans living in the New York/Long Island/New Jersey/Connecticut Combined Metro Area (CMA); 87,000 in the Los Angeles CMA; 15,000 in the Chicago CMA; and 40,000 in the San Francisco CMA. These cities have the highest concentrated populations (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998).

There is an absence of material on Native Americans and religious affiliations. While some claim to be Protestant or Catholic, there is a massive resurgence of a return to Native spirituality. Some of the Catholic and Protestant churches in largely Native-populated areas combine Native spiritual ways with their religions (Keen, 1964). According to Berry et al. (1999) and Smith et al. (1999), the church is the most significant beneficiary of African American charity; and the most significant portion of Latino institutional giving is targeted to religious groups. Giving to religious or spiritual activities by Native Americans is very individual and informal (Berry et al.). The Independent Sector (IS) commissions the Gallup Organization to conduct biennial surveys on the

characteristics of donors and volunteers to charity. Among its significant findings is the fact that religious involvement is highly correlated with giving and volunteering (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999). Does this mean that the Native population appears to be less likely than other minorities to have organized religion as a central variable of philanthropic giving?

Native Americans are most likely to live in midwestern and western states. In July 1997, according to population estimates of the 1990 census, the 10 states with the largest American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut populations were California, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Alaska, North Carolina, Texas, New York, and Michigan. In July 1998, according to projections, 74% of the nation's Native American, Eskimo, and Aleut households consisted of families (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998). Of these families, two parents with offspring constituted 65%, mothers plus offspring present 26%, and fathers plus offspring 9% (U.S. Census Bureau). The percentage of female-headed households is comparatively larger than the national 17% (U.S. Census Bureau). The typical American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut family was made up of 3.6 people, larger than the average of 3.1 for families of all races (U.S. Census Bureau). This can be in part attributed to the Native American population being young. According to an August 1998 Census Bureau report, the estimated median age was 27.4 years. This is about 8 years younger than the median for the population as a whole (U.S. Census Bureau). Other significant factors highly correlated with giving and volunteering detected by the IS survey include marital status and the fact that adults 45-65 were most likely to volunteer (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999).

In the area of broad demographic categories of employment and occupation, reports from the 1990 census indicate that most Native Americans work in employment fields centering around technical jobs, sales, and support; second most frequent were operators, fabricators, and laborers, followed by service occupations forestry, gaming, fishing (*USA Today*, 1994, p. 5A). According to Hodgkinson & Weitzman (1999), among the significant findings, full-time employment and household income strongly influence giving and volunteering. Unfortunately, there are limitations to the data presented by the U.S. Census because data are not reported separately for American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleut. Also, even the most recent data published, while useful, are based on the 1990 census.

From the Bureau's Public Information Office, in the fall semester of 1995, 131,000 non-Hispanic Native Americans (up from 84,000 in 1980) were attending school (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998). Nearly 6 in 10 of these students were women, more than 8 in 10 attended public schools, and more than 9 in 10 were undergraduates (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998). During the 1993-94 school year, more than 13,000 of the nation's American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut students received an associate's, bachelor's, master's, doctoral, or professional degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998). Another strong indicator of giving and volunteering listed by the IS was higher education.

Muller (1998) cites the Glass Ceiling Commission report stating Native American women hold about half of all of the total workforce positions held by Native Americans and they occupy 50.8% of all managerial positions held by

American Indians. The proportion of Native American women employed in executive, administrative, and managerial positions is proportionately greater than white women, who hold 41.2% of all such positions held by whites (Muller). As part of tribal self-determination, some American Indians advanced with the help of the federal American Indian policy, affecting the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, among others, to promote Native Americans to posts previously held by whites (Muller). As Native women gain positions of leadership they tend to donate time and money to issues that rise above individual interests to consider what is best for the community as a whole (Muller).

Income levels for Native Americans in the United States are well below those of all Americans (Paisano, 1993). The poverty rate of 25% for urban Indians is almost double the 13% rate for the rest of the American population (Ewen & Wollock,1996). Yet, there is no information that separates specifically Native American giving from that of other minority groups. If Native Americans make less than the population as a whole, is the mean amount of Native American giving less than that of other minorities? Perhaps future research will answer this question.

What is the level of giving to Native American organizations by Native Americans? Of the $7 billion contributed by all foundations to charitable causes, only a small portion ($41 million) goes to Native American organizations. A survey done in 1996 by Native Americans in Philanthropy of the 100 foundations that made contributions to Native American causes in the United States totaling

$41 million, the Native foundations gave 2.75 million, or 9% of the total (Ewen & Wollock, 1996). What is not found in the literature is what percent of Native Americans contribute money to national Native American organizations. One of the main areas not discussed in detail in any of the literature on Native American philanthropy is the question to which organizations Native Americans give. About Native Americans in general, Berry (1999) states that donors tend to be response-oriented, culturally driven, and concerned about broad issues that affect local activities. They generally support Native-initiated or -controlled efforts but also support non-Native organizations that focus on or influence indigenous issues (Berry et al.).

Thus, Native Americans support many non-Indian causes that impact their lives, such as Native and tribal rights, the environment, education, medical facilities construction, and the arts. As some tribes and individuals experience economic success, they tend to share their good fortune through formal philanthropy and help surrounding communities.

According to Adamson (2000) American Indian donors commonly show an interest in certain fields of philanthropy that reflect strong attachments to community: education (scholarships, internships, etc.), cultural preservation, economic development, youths, elderly care, arts, health issues, and rehabilitation services. Berry (1999) and Adamson (2000) agree that Native Americans support both Native-controlled efforts and non-Native organizations that focus or influence indigenous concerns. They also agree that reservation-

based Indians tend to give to the family and the community, whereas urban Indians tend to give to inter-tribal networks or pan-Indian activities (Adamson).

In the Native American community, the need for self-determination and self-reliance is rising. The people in these communities, says Adamson (1999), have always survived while maintaining hope and belief in their culture and traditions. This, states Adamson, is a result of an increase in Native American individual and community enterprising ventures—finding new ways to make and save money. Data cited by Berry (1999) show that Native Americans strongly support self-determination. Native Americans, unlike other minorities, are recognized as sovereign nations; thus they are more concerned than other racial ethnic groups about self-determination, and desire for the rest of the population to understand their motivations. In the framework of Adamson (2000), this is marked by a strong need for understanding the historical boom and bust, driven by local economic conditions and by shifting government policies. Pasquaretta (1994) states while many tribes do have traditional gambling practices, these have generally been used to redistribute resources within a classless society, or to promote giveaways meant to teach the dangers of materialism. For some, traditionalist casino gambling fosters materialism, acquisition, and self-interest—the opposite of group interest—and some fear this will lead to assimilation (Pasquaretta). Joseph (1995) notes that some Native Americans consider gaming a source of cash that permits tribes to do for themselves what neither the federal government nor tribal neighbors have been willing to do. Contrary to

popular belief, only a small percentage of the tribes have made significant profits. Still, gaming helps some tribes with jobs and the reduction of poverty.

Most of the reports stress that Native Americans feel their personal values and points of view are not shared by most of the U.S. population. In urban areas, there is a great desire to associate with those who share pan-Indian identification. Both traditional and urban Indians have a strong need to associate with their own ethnic and tribal groups.

Studies done by researchers Wells (1999) and Berry (1999) agree that most of the interviewed Native Americans feel the need to maintain some sort of allegiance to people with ethnic roots similar to their own. If Native Americans want a strong association with people like themselves, will the data then indicate that Native Americans give more to Native-specific charities than to broader Native issues? This exploratory study hopes to answer such questions.

Joseph (1995) argues that Native Americans' desire for independence and self-help are deeply rooted in the culture of the tribe, and forced dependence on the U.S. government has wreaked havoc in their communities and their system of philanthropy. The thread running through most of the data is the Native American desire for self-sufficiency. Most tribal members feel a need to create more independence in their lives and communities. If Native Americans seek self-determination and self-reliance, is there an increasing number of Native American philanthropic entrepreneurs? It falls outside the scope of this study to address this issue, but it is the hope of the researcher that future research will do so.

Barriers to Native American Philanthropy

All racial ethnic groups face barriers in a patriarchal culture and, like other minorities, Native Americans face issues of financial unfamiliarity, fear of the future, lack of knowledge about the ownership of wealth, lack of culture-specific philanthropic models, modesty, and anonymity. It is scarcely new for Native Americans to share and exchange, but it is new for them to institutionalize and standardize such activities (Adamson, 1999). Smith et al. (1999) found that for many racial ethnic communities, it is a matter of family or cultural honor not to draw attention to oneself. Native Americans have additional reasons for not calling attention to themselves; as Adamson points out, many tribes with gaming enterprises are also fearful of governmental reprisals (federal or state legislation and regulation) resulting from publicizing their wealth through charitable donations. California is one of many states in which charges of government threats to tribal gaming and sovereignty have been publicized (Berry et al., 1999).

The literature on ethnic philanthropy demonstrates that anonymity is a barrier. The Berry (1999) report states that "publications such as Fortune or Forbes make little mention of Native benevolence, and ethnic-specific business sources, such as Black Enterprise, Hispanic Business, A Magazine, and others, are virtually nonexistent in the Native community" (Berry et al., 1999, p. 54). According to Dagmar Thorpe (1997), identifying broad numbers of Native Americans as potential donors is difficult because so many live on more traditional reservations. Individual donors often give anonymously or secretively

because giving is seen as a broad reciprocity: not for prestige or altruism, but as a relationship to the Creator and to the community. Within Native communities, affluence or wealth is not measured by net worth (Berry et al.). Some Native Americans face additional barriers when considering their own philanthropic behaviors. Muller (1998) quotes: "Work responsibility, and need to feed their families is important....They got responsibility to the reservation....They have to be at both places....Sometime it means losing their jobs" (p. 10). "In some cases, their superiors are unaware of such tribal commitments because the women choose not to reveal them...they use work vacation time for their tribal activities" (Muller, 1998, p. 10). Both reservation and urban Indians contribute time, even when they do not give money. Wilma Mankiller states, "We Native people have a sense of interconnectedness with, and a sense of responsibility for, one another" (Wells 1999, 10).

Although family philanthropic tradition is a lifeway for Native Americans, it may not be considered philanthropy by the dominant culture. A key difference between the mainstream and Native Americans is that most Native Americans do not have old money or accumulated wealth, and even if it occurs, the ultimate goal is to redistribute it to the community (Keen, 1964). Another difference that goes unrecognized in Native American philanthropy is giving by those Native Americans, particularly in the large urban areas, who have assimilated into the dominant culture and pass for white. In addition, no data currently exists on Native Americans who were adopted and reared outside their culture who have inherited wealth. Neither of these situations has been discussed in the literature

on philanthropy (Berry et al., 1999; Campoamor et al., 1999; Salway Black et al., 2001).

As mentioned earlier, Native Americans have had cycles of boom and bust. One stress factor, argues Van Biema (1995), that most American Indians experience is financial concerns; for example, cashing in on casinos has occurred for some, but most facilities provide little extra income. Harmon (1996) writes that those who leave the reservation in search of work mostly find themselves another economic underclass, with additional problems associated with alienation, discrimination, and the break in cultural and community norms and support. Adamson (1999) argues that for the Native community, money, jobs, community, family relationships, and future generations are all sources of concern. In all categories, Native donors tend to structure their funds or giving to affirm tribal cultures, build self-esteem and not dependence, and ensure that Indian people control decision-making (Adamson, 2000). There seem to be negative implications for philanthropy among Native Americans where there are elevated stress levels and increased uncertainty about the future.

In the literature on philanthropy and fundraising, common themes have emerged. There are points of division among the dominant culture and most racial ethnic giving, the types of charities they give to, and between other minorities and Native Americans communities. The current literature (Hodgkinson & Witzman, 1994; Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999) on U.S. philanthropy points out racial ethnic differences. Racial ethnic group donors give to different charities than those of traditional white male donors. Racial ethnic

groups bring different core values and motivations to philanthropy: commitment to family, community retribution, obligation, uplifting the race, tradition and protecting the family name, and in many cases money gifts are sent to extended family members outside the United States. Ethnic philanthropy consists primarily of people sharing modest wealth with other people, most of whom they know well (Smith et al., 1999). Minorities face different barriers than those confronting white men. Some of the barriers racial ethnic donors face are unfamiliarity with economic success, fear of financial insecurity, and not having control over their own money. Also Native Americans as a population place higher emphasis on self-determination, sovereignty, and self-reliance. Native Americans, like members of other groups, tend to interact collectively with others like themselves (Berry et al., 1999).

Currently, there is little information on Native Americans as a significant donor population. There is no information on who they give to or the amount of their giving. The growing wealth of scholarly material on ethnic-based giving does not differentiate between the giving patterns of Native Americans and those of more integrated sub-populations within the US. Not only do we need to challenge assumptions about racial ethnics and philanthropy, but also assumptions about Native Americans and philanthropy.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

An examination of the current literature (Rose, 1998; Yankelovich et al., 1985) reveals a reliance on generalized identity development models and characteristics for describing extremely diverse experiences and realities. In order to develop a clear understanding of individual processes of identity development unimpeded by existing conceptualizations, this study was designed as a product of the phenomenological paradigm (Patton, 1990), which calls for naturalistic methods to develop an understanding of the Native American experience of their philanthropy. The phenomenological paradigm is usually supported by a qualitative methodology. This qualitative study used the procedures and methods of Patton (1987), Guba and Lincoln (1994), and Lincoln and Guba (1985). The researcher, in particular, drew both inspiration and insight from the aforementioned researchers, and the methodology included the following sections: (a) Nature of and Rationale for Qualitative Methodologies, (b) Subjects/respondents, (c) Research Design, (d) Instrumentation, (e) Procedures for Data Collection, (f) Definition of Relevant Theme Categories, (g) Operational Definition of Relevant Variables, (h) Treatment of the Data, (i) Limitations of the Study and (j) Pre and Post Interviews.

Nature of and Rationale for Qualitative Methodologies

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), qualitative evaluation data begin as raw, descriptive information about people. Failure to collect raw descriptive data might result in attempts to question the respondents' human activities, which in turn might produce preconceived methodologies that would tend to produce

"cracks...in science's magnificent edifice...that old paradigms cannot explain" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 7). The researcher used qualitative methods, one of which is naturalistic inquiry. Naturalistic inquiry provides a strong means by which to acquire different interpretations, feelings, impressions, and perspectives regarding human nature and activities, so that rather than merely studying people, the researcher was able to learn from people, their experiences, and perceptions (Patton, 1987).

In choosing a methodology for this research, I found that Patton (1987), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Guba and Lincoln (1994) offer excellent guidelines. According to Patton, the intent is to reveal the respondents' levels of emotion, the way in which they have organized their world, thoughts about what is happening, experiences, and their basic perceptions. Taking into account these one-of-a-kind experiences and the backgrounds of individuals enabled the researcher to see an aspect of a quandary that may not have been noticed before. The nature of this qualitative research allows the respondents to structure the account of the situation, thus letting the respondents introduce, to a considerable extent, their notions of what they regard as relevant instead of relying upon the investigator's notion of relevance (Dexter, 1970, cited by Patton, 1990). The phenomenological paradigm and naturalistic inquiry adhere to the assumption that "the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit" (Patton, 278). A purpose of interviewing is to explore others' perspectives by obtaining "here and now constructions and "reconstructions" of persons, events, activities, organizations, feelings, motivations, claims, concerns,

and other entities" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 268). Likewise, the characteristics governing the respondents self-identified as Native American, between 30 and 65 years of age, and the respondents' resulting thoughts, feelings, and behavior in regard to Native American philanthropy, will be made explicit through interviews. Also, a qualitative researcher allows for emergent themes "because it is inconceivable that enough could be known ahead of time about the many multiple realities to devise the design adequately," and because the diverse perspectives and values systems of researcher and informant "interact in unpredictable ways to influence the outcome" of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 41).

Thus, an organic connection among the phenomena being researched, the respondents involved, and their personal experiences, actions, impressions, feelings, and motives allows the researcher to quote the informants' view in the research. Using a multicultural ideal of appreciating and respecting individual experiences and voices is crucial to a study regarding such individual and personal issues as thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. To address the essence and context of lived experience regarding Native American philanthropy, and to understand and appreciate these as individualized experiences and voices, a paradigm more consistent with the ideals of multiculturalism is in order.

Phenomenology

In using qualitative methodology, the phenomenological paradigm employs naturalistic inquiry "to inductively and holistically understand human experience in a context-specific setting" (Patton, 1990, 37). This

phenomenological paradigm allows for and appreciates the study of phenomena within their natural setting, insisting that the research interaction take place with the entity in context for fullest understanding (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It recognizes the researcher as the instrument, taking into account the experiences and perspectives of the researcher as valuable and meaningful to the study (Lincoln & Guba). It relies on qualitative methods, which capture a more complete picture of individually lived experiences, instead of a narrow perspective of generalization (Lincoln & Guba). It employs inductive data analysis to provide more understanding of the interaction of "mutually shaping influences" and to explicate the interacting realities and experiences of research and respondents (Lincoln & Guba). In summary, the phenomenological paradigm is more consistent with studying and understanding the feelings, experiences, and perspectives of a small sample of the experience-rich respondents of this study.

During collection of data, interviewing allows the researcher to be involved with the respondents' phenomena. To perform qualitative inquiries, the researcher must have personal experience with, and intense interest in, the phenomenon under study (Patton, 1990). In this study, the shared intensity of experience involves the phenomena of Native American identity and cultural participation in philanthropy. Through the participants' shared reflection regarding their experiences of the phenomena in question, the researcher worked to understand and to identify the respondents' developmental process of feeling, thoughts, and behavior. A particular strength of the study is that the interviews were conducted by a researcher from the same ethnic group as the interviewees;

for this reason, the researcher possessed insights about the cultural community that may not have been readily apparent to others.

Naturalistic Inquiry

Lincoln and Guba (1985) present a convincing argument for the use of naturalistic inquiry based on the explanation that it is an open-ended approach, in which theory flows from the data rather than preceding them. Glaser and Strauss (1967), generally credited with having coined the term "grounded theory," insist that in order for theories to be valid, they have to be qualitatively grounded. Grounded theory is a method constructed for creating theory. The theory grows out of extensive direct observation in a natural or non-experimental setting (Vogt, 1999).

Therefore, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1987), one can argue that in order for research inquiry to be judged for its quality, the respondent's own social, political, cultural, ethnic, and gender antecedents have to be presented. The conditions for learning from the respondents for the most part overlap, and the rich descriptions that can be produced from their personal histories are essential to the researcher's qualitative methodology because this is what shapes the outcomes of the inquiry. This is mostly verified through "thick description." Agreeing with Geertz (1973) and Lincoln and Guba (1985), Denzin (1989) argues, "thick description...does more than record what a person is doing" (83). It goes beyond mere fact and surface appearances. It presents detail, context, emotion, and the webs of social relationships that join persons to one

another. Thick description evokes emotionality and self-feelings. It inserts history into experience (Denzin, 83).

Patton (1987) has 20 guiding questions for determining criteria when qualitative methods are appropriate. Of these, this researcher uses the following seven:

1. Does the program emphasize individualized outcomes? That is, are different participants expected to be affected in qualitatively different ways? And is there a need or desire to describe and evaluate these individualized client outcomes?

2. Is detailed, in-depth information needed about certain client cases or program sites, for example, particularly successful cases, unusual failures, or critically important cases for programmatic, financial, or political reasons?

3. Is there interest in focusing on the diversity among, idiosyncrasies of, and unique qualities exhibited by individual clients and programs (as opposed to comparing all clients or programs on standardized, uniform measures)?

4. Are legislators or other decision makers or funders interested in having evaluators conduct program site visits so that the evaluators can be the surrogate eyes and ears for decision makers who are too busy to make such site visits themselves, and who lack the observing and listening skills of trained evaluators?

5. Is the obtrusiveness of evaluation a concern? Will the administration of standardized measuring instruments (questionnaires and tests) be overly obtrusive in contrast to data gathering through natural observation and open-

ended interviews? Will the collection of qualitative data generate less reactivity among participants than the collection of quantitative data? Is there a need for unobtrusive observations?

6. Is there a possibility that the program may be affecting clients or participants in unanticipated ways or having unexpected side effects, indicating the need for a method of inquiry that can discover effects beyond those formally stated as desirable by program staff (again, an indication of the need for some form of goal-fee evaluation)?

7. Is there a need to add depth, detail, and meaning to statistical findings or survey generalizations?

Patton's aforementioned criteria were adapted, and the corresponding applicability was accomplished in the following ways:

1. Individualized outcomes were to be emphasized for a more personal, humanistic insight into the particular factors that impact this study's participants' philanthropic participation.

2. Detailed, in-depth data regarding the respondents' own experiences with regards to Native American giving were to be identified.

3. Because of the individual personalities involved, there was to be a particular interest in delving into the diverse experiences of, and barriers in the way of, Native American formal philanthropy.

4. There was to be recognition of the interest of stakeholders (participants, fundraisers, Native American nonprofit organizations, community foundations,

philanthropic organizations) in whatever detailed data emerged regarding the respondents' assisting-factors that influence Native American philanthropy.

5. Because of the uniqueness of each of the individuals to be researched, open-ended, unstructured, qualitative interviews were to be the main procedures for data gathering.

6. Because there was a strong possibility that Native American philanthropy could occur though unanticipated ways and means, open-ended qualitative methods based on discovery were to be required.

7. Since it was possible that statistical numbers from surveys possibly might not allow for recognizing individual gray areas present in individuals' lives, there was a need to allow for undiscovered depth, detail, and personal meanings that affected the respondents' giving practices.

Providing another lens through which to view the cultural aspects of data gathering is important. Patton (1990) contends that language, norm, and value differences strongly influence the success of valid, reliable, and meaningful research in a cross-cultural setting.

Patton's (1987) use of qualitative methodology also considers the respondent's own value systems, which lend strength and depth when looking for detailed data that deal with a small number of people and cases. This is meaningful in this particular research. By using the respondents' own perspectives, unanticipated data might be captured because it was not locked into a priori concepts and variables (Rendon, 1999). According to Rendon, such an approach will then be guided not by pre-determined hypotheses, but by

questions, issues, and research into patterns that have been experienced by the respondents. Patton's (1987) approach had earlier held that studying human beings was quite different from the hard sciences because of the human factors of emotions, purposes, perceptions, interpretations, values, and behaviors.

Naturalistic inquiry as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) attempts to present slices of life-incidents documented through natural language and corresponding as closely as possible to how people feel, what they know, and what their concerns, beliefs, perceptions, and understandings are. Because a reliance on the researcher's own construction of this study could constrain the nature of the interactions of the diverse experiences and perspectives of the participants and researcher, and thus, the data, it was crucial to allow the research design to emerge around the parameters discussed below.

This naturalistic inquirer contacted participants who were purposefully sampled, having been defined as being a small number of individuals representative of the diverse characteristics of the studied population (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). Patton states that there are no rules for sample size in qualitative research, the emphasis of purposive sampling being on information-rich cases. Sampling is based on informational, not statistical considerations; such sampling can be credibly used to research sensitive issues, for example, possible factors that influence Native American philanthropy. Purposive sampling allows the researcher the flexibility and fluidity (Lincoln & Guba) to decide beforehand which respondents will better fit the study and choose those to be included in the data collection.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), there is no one definition for naturalism, but it can be defined by what it implies. Lincoln and Guba offer the two most important tenets: "First, no manipulation on the part of the inquirer is implied, and, second, the inquirer imposes no a priori units on the outcome" (Lincoln & Guba, p. 8). Naturalistic investigation is what the naturalistic investigator does, and "these two tenets are the prime directives" (Lincoln & Guba, p. 8). It is not about extracting data from speech events specifically arranged for a phenomenological analysis. It is about recording what actually is said or happens in a given situation without direct manipulation or involvement from the researcher, and analyzing that data as it emerges. Spradley (1980) goes further and states that rather than studying people, ethnography entails learning from people.

The researcher took every precaution to avoid manipulating or imposing a priori conditions on the persons involved or the events being researched. Still, the fact that a particular area for inquiry was chosen speaks of an interest in a subject and also certain values on the part of the researcher. Lincoln and Guba (1985) caution that the researcher must not assert that his or her findings be regarded as absolute exemplars of natural laws. At best, the meanings and implications of both the researcher's and the respondents' actions and value systems with respect to Native American philanthropy have to be sorted out during this naturalistic inquiry so that this research is effectively and fairly conducted. Morgan and Smiricich (1980) argue that failure to do so detracts from the active roles played by human beings as they respond to their social world.

In an effort to conduct an impartial inquiry, it is crucial that the researcher's bias not act as a shroud that will distort the need for fairness. It is with this need for fairness and thick description that Mellon (1990) asserts that naturalistic researchers should systematically acknowledge and document their biases rather than striving to rise above them. The researcher acknowledges personal biases that include the following: (a) Native Americans feel it is part of their culture to give money, time, goods, and spiritual gifts, (b) Native Americans give substantially even if they are not formally asked to by philanthropic organizations, and (c) Native Americans feel disrespected because they are not asked for donations or seen as givers by formal philanthropy. It remains an important part of the researcher's responsibility, however, to acknowledge and separate bias from the research process in order to uphold the validity of the study.

Because the human element acts as an essential factor in naturalistic inquiry, Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe this human instrument as one possessing the characteristics necessary to cope with undefined situations. Certainly the respondents in this research who agreed to be interviewed are involved in charitable, or more precisely the giving-and-receiving, relationships in Native American communities. It is this, the events of this very personal human involvement, that will detail the many individual factors. From this data the bases of the emergent design were generated. Emphases on an emergent design and researcher flexibility characterized this naturalistic approach. Idiographic interpretation focuses on the individual case rather than generalizations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For that reason, the narrative sets of data in this study were

analyzed independently, "in terms of the particulars of the case" (Lincoln & Guba, p. 42).

Patton (1987) stresses the use of naturalistic inquiry in qualitative designs for those researchers who wish to study human activities as they naturally occur, without manipulation by the researcher. Inevitably, important differences may occur from site to site and within the personal experiences of each of the respondents (Rendon, 1999). For this reason the researcher paid attention to the idiosyncratic as well as the pervasive, seeking the uniqueness of each case. A holistic approach was followed by the researcher, as Patton advocates: "Assume that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts" (Patton, 17) and "avoid creating a...monster of isolated, unrelated and out of-context-parts" (Patton, 18). According to Patton, the primary interest of the naturalistic researcher is describing and understanding these dynamics and processes, and their holistic effects on participants. Guba and Lincoln (1994) argue that the research done by naturalistic inquirers should be very much related to the social values of the respondents, while the realization of social values is the purpose of research. Agreeing with Guba and Lincoln, Lonner and Berry (1986) state that the diversity of human behavior in the world is the link between individual behavior and the cultural context in which it occurs. They explain that such variations and differences could well have been due to the respondents' own cultural experiences, economic bases, and ethnicity identification within the population in which they had been raised (Lonner & Berry).

Patton (1987) states that these circumstances illustrate both the importance of the participants' own experiences and how their priorities, goals, resources, and personalities might influence the activity being researched. This creates the necessity for the researchers of multi-cultural issues to be conscious of the need for respondents to be allowed to explain their experiences and conditions in the personal and intimate light in which they occurred. This is especially true when researching intercultural or cross-cultural individuals like the Native Americans in this research. Haddox (1973, 63) states, "The researcher must emphasize once more the fact of tribal cultural diversity. This means that some of the elements of a ...[Native Americans] life are characteristic of certain tribes and not of others, but there are a substantial number of shared values."

According to Guba and Lincoln (1994), naturalistic inquiry entails researching the participants' value system because it was essential in shaping events and the outcome of this inquiry. This provided a better research of the participants' individual emic constructions (Guba & Lincoln). Emic construction is the (internal) point of view assisting in determining meanings and purposes ascribed to one's own actions (Guba & Lincoln). As mentioned earlier, this allows the researcher to learn from his respondents rather than just studying them. In this way, the researcher was better enabled to provide the audience with findings that uncover assumptions that at a future date might persuade others' decisions regarding their prospective philanthropic activities. This characteristic became a strong arguing point for the use of qualitative inquiry in this research because it is

a process geared at the uncovering of many idiosyncratic, but nonetheless important, stories told by real people about real events in real and natural ways.

The researcher used qualitative inquiry in the form of unstructured interviews to better listen and more fairly understand the complex behaviors and choices that the respondents made and under what particular contexts the participants' events occurred. In this way, a greater rapport and human-to-human relations were established between the respondents and the researcher who seeks to understand rather than just explain the experiences, impressions, and actions regarding the respondents' giving practices (Spradley, 1980). The researcher sought to establish and maintain rapport with the respondents, with the understanding that even through knowing the culture, one person cannot feel the rich, in-depth information related to the respondents' charitable practices.

Utilizing the primary literature surveyed—Patton (1987), Guba and Lincoln (1994), and Lincoln and Guba (1985)—the researcher probed into the respondents' personal, individual experiences. This allowed the researcher to elicit thick descriptions (Lincoln & Guba) of the experiences of the respondents' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors with regards to Native American philanthropy in their own words, thus capturing valuable oral traditions of a marginalized group in which different traditions influence giving style separates Native and non-Native approaches to formalized philanthropy (Adamson, 1999).

In order to enable others wanting to apply the findings of this phenomenological study to their own research to make an informed decision about whether to do so, thick description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the

experiences and identity development of the participants provided a basis of information to make this judgment. In trying to establish an amount of transferability, the research attempted to link time and contextual descriptions that might have applied at a particular time and under particular circumstances. Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that the situatedness is recognizing that even members of the same cultural group will have findings not equally applicable to all individuals. The researcher made every effort to understand the situatedness of qualitative methods.

Subjects/ Respondents

In selecting the respondents, the researcher contacted community members and various Native American organizations in the Austin and San Antonio urban and suburban area by sending an announcement inviting participants to participate. A list of individuals was compiled and those individuals were phoned, in keeping with the personal contact as suggested by Falicov (1982), so that the criteria could be established; the following two key qualifying questions were asked.

1. Do you categorize yourself as Native American?

(The researcher relied on the respondents' self-understanding of the term "Native American" using the definition of major concepts in chapter one. There exists no universally accepted rule for establishing a person's identity as an Indian (NARF, 1995). For the purposes of this paper, a person who identifies himself or herself as Native American was counted as an Indian.)

2. Do you live off the reservation?

Only those individuals who answered in the affirmative to both questions were invited to participate in this research. In order to ensure that the respondents would see this research through to its conclusion, two requirements were outlined and explained with each prospective respondent before the final selections were made:

1. One taped interview would be required, no more than 1 hour in duration, so as to obtain the respondent's own story.

2. After reviewing interview transcriptions so as to ensure the accuracy of what had been discussed, a follow-up call might be needed.

Research Design

The design for this research followed the phenomenological methodology. It attempted to discover attitudes, specific behaviors, and amounts of gifts of Native Americans through interviews of individuals and observation at conferences and ceremonies. The researcher interviewed 22 participants and observed participants at the following: 3-day Four Directions Conference, the 10th Annual Austin Independent School District Powwow, and a 3-day Native Women's Gathering. The procedure for the selection of respondents was purposeful sampling. The researcher exercised care to not over-generalize from purposeful samples, while learning a great deal about issues of central importance to the purposes of the research. Taking full advantages of in-depth, purposeful sampling did much to alleviate concerns about small sample size. The purposeful sample of respondents in the present study were well educated (all were high school graduates and 91% have had 2 to 4 years of college, or held

graduate or post-graduate degrees). This sample is most likely not a representative sample of Native Americans in the Austin and San Antonio area.

Instrumentation

An open-ended interview guide and protocol (see Appendix C), was constructed in order to collect descriptive data to gauge whether the data would show common elements that affect or influence the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of Native Americans living off the reservation in regard to their own philanthropy. The questions for the interview were developed by using and adapting questions that had been previously gleaned by this researcher from various studies on Native American philanthropy (Wells, 1999; Berry et al., 1999) as well as a study on Ethnic philanthropy (Smith et al., 1999; existing literature specifically targeting Native American philanthropy being rare). Interviews are the most common method of data collection using this research methodology (Merriam, 1988). To this end, the researcher was immersed in effective interview strategies, interview schedules, recording, and evaluation of interview data. This study however, was unstructured, given the nature of the research problem, and therefore the interviews in question were also unstructured and open-ended. The reason for this is that it is assumed that the "individual respondents define the world in unique ways" (Merriam, 73). The primary aim of the interviews was to understand what the participants see as the role of the Native American donor, not the researcher's understanding of the role.

Procedures for Data Collection

The following protocol was used for all respondents:

1. Prospective respondents were phoned to have the nature of this research explained to them and to qualify them for possible inclusion in the study by asking the qualifying questions.

2. The prospective respondents received a packet with an Informed Consent Introductory Letter (to be kept as the participant's copy of informed consent); the interested respondents signed, dated, and returned to the researcher, in a stamped, self-addressed envelope, the following document (see Appendix C) as required and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

3. Respondents who signed and returned the Informed Consent were then called to schedule the interviews at mutually agreeable places and times.

The interviews were conducted and taped-recorded with the respondents' permission. This type of focus required qualitative approaches in order to inductively and holistically understand the Native American experience within their context-specific settings (Patton, 1990). In order to hear each participant's voice, the methods of inquiry were interpretive and relied primarily on interviews, field notes, and participant observation. As a qualitative study, this inquiry took place within the natural setting of the Native community because of the belief that "the phenomena of study take their meaning as much from their contexts as they do from themselves" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Definitions of Relevant Theme Categories

Interviews

In qualitative research, an unstructured interview is any in which the interviewee can stress his or her definition of the situation, is encouraged to

structure the account of the situation, and is allowed to introduce his or her notions of what they regard as relevant (Dexter, 1970). Unlike a structured interview, the qualitative interview is concerned with the unique, the idiosyncratic, and the wholly individual viewpoint (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, the unstructured interview might reveal the following important human characteristics governing the participants: control of self-determination, more self-reliance, resiliency, and maximum independence (Adamson, 1999). Researchers,Berry (1999) and Wells (1999) have previously used interviews as a data collection methodology for research on Native Americans and philanthropy.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1990) state that information and responses from interviews depend in large part on the interviewing skills of the researcher. In 1992, the researcher participated in an oral history project, later compiled into a report, with a team of student researchers on indigenous Guatemalan women at U.C. Berkeley. In 1993, the researcher developed, under the supervision of Professor Evelyn Nakano-Glen, a course on "How to Write an Oral History"; the researcher taught this course later the same year to 20 students in El Colegio De Las Viscainas in Mexico City. In this research, interviewing greatly assisted the researcher in exploring points of view and foci of interest. Stake (1991) urges that the focus be placed on how participants might view their own particular programs and initiatives. In this way, their individual concerns, successes, and barriers might better be obtained.

Interviewing is a most valuable strategy by which a researcher can briefly step into the individual's constructed world (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The

purpose of the interview was to allow the researcher to gather descriptive data in the subject's own words and to access the unobservable—to live in their head, so to speak. This enables the inquirer to develop insights into how the participants interpret and make meaning of the world. Whereas Bogdan and Biklen (1982) consider field notes and observation as the mainstay of qualitative research, Guba and Lincoln (1981) describe interviewing as the backbone. Using the Lincoln and Guba (1985) guidelines, unstructured interviews allowed the accessing of the thick description that has been deemed extremely valuable in qualitative, naturalistic inquiry.

Field notes

Several supplemental strategies and techniques were used to gather additional data. These techniques enhanced the collection and interpretation of the data. The use of field notes, tape recording, and non-verbal cues are described as follows. The primary purpose of recording field notes was to make a written account of observations, conversations, experiences, and descriptions of the participants and the events that will directly or indirectly affect philanthropic attitudes and behaviors of the Native American participants. The field notes served the purpose of recording follow-up phone interview sessions that needed to be scheduled with the participants. The researcher kept the field notes in a journal divided into two sections; one section was used for descriptions of the interview setting because insights and subtleties noted during interviewing provide descriptive information. A separate section was used to record direct field observations, such as semi-participant observations during conferences,

gatherings, and ceremonies, and observations made during the taped interviews with the participants. Following each observation of events or interview, the researcher transcribed field notes and placed them into a separate file on the computer. Written as soon as possible after the interview, such a description required careful and thorough coding of observations in the form of field notes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

A micro-cassette tape recorder taped interviews with the participants. The researcher reviewed and corrected transcriptions and made copies for use in the final analysis.

The researcher used non-verbal communication techniques to obtain information through nonlinguistic signs. These included movements, spatial relationships, and voice inflectional patterns (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). What is important in a qualitative study of this nature is the documentation of inconsistencies between nonverbal behaviors and verbal communication. Instances of nonverbal communication were documented during the observations and interviews when observed. If it contributed to the understanding of the participants' personalities, the researcher also documented perspectives that the participants held in a natural environment and the nonverbal communication behaviors that eventually lead to giving. During observation periods, the researcher took notes consisting of key phrases, quotes, and words. These jotted notes were used as soon as possible after the interview or event to write full field notes containing a chronological description of the events, people, conversation, and setting. Field notes were coded on a regular basis.

Qualitative research, because of its emphasis on probing into human-constructed stories, is multi-method in scope and therefore relies on interpretive, naturalistic ways and means. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) argue that this secures an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question and the breadth and depth in any investigation.

To counter the possibility of categories, themes, and patterns being discerned as the data emerges, and to better weigh and evaluate the accuracy, three activities were utilized.

The first of these activities was the unstructured interview, used to acquire the thick descriptions Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommend. The respondent provided the content of the interview as well as the structure and definition of their stories.

Secondly, audio-taping ensured the accuracy of what had been said, as required for credibility.

Thirdly, because participant observation involves immersion within the culture under study, the researcher kept a journal for field notes and attended ceremonies, special events, and conferences.

Each of these interviews utilized the general interview guide approach (Patton, 1990) as the primary method of data collection. The interview guide served as a basic checklist to make sure that this researcher covered the topics considered most relevant to the interview. The guide obligated this researcher to judge how to best use the time available for each interview and focus the

interviews, while still allowing for the individual perspectives to emerge naturally. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed for analysis.

Observations

The classic form of data collection in naturalistic or field research is observation of participants in the context of a natural scene. There are several observation strategies available: non-participant, semi-participant, and participant. In some cases it may be possible and desirable for the researcher to watch from outside, without being observed (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Semi-participant observations are those wherein the researcher interacts to a certain degree with the participant in order to begin to experience the reality of the participant, for example, during interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). In participant-observation, the researcher is acknowledged as a part of the social setting, either as a researcher or as a more directly involved actor (e.g., Aztec dancer, committee member, and community member). Observational data are used for the purpose of description—of settings, activities, people, and the meanings of what is observed from the perspective of the participants. Observation can lead to deeper understandings than interviews alone, because it provides a knowledge of the context in which events occur, and may enable the researcher to see things that participants themselves are not aware of or that they are unwilling to discuss (Patton, 1990).

This "in the field" strategy allows the researcher to be open, discovery-oriented and inductive in approach (Patton, 1990). In this study, the researcher was both a non-participant and a participant observer on a regular basis in the

events, ceremonies, and conferences. This study uses observation to describe as many dimensions of the project as possible, including the setting, activities, participants, and any interaction of these variables. Such a description required careful and thorough recording of observations in the form of a field notes journal. Contact was made as part of this researcher's participation in the Native American community. Because the researcher is a member of the community and known by several gatekeepers and community members, the dual observer-participant role allowed access to natural, candid social interactions among other participants in the settings. The researcher observed and participated in a 3-day Native American conference, a 3-day Native women gathering, and one powwow. This observational time allowed the researcher to gain a deeper understanding and check the validity of the context and culture base on other conversations.

The unobtrusive observations took place in each of the events during normal activities; the participants were observed in areas that provided open access to areas of eating, dancing, guest speakers, conversation, discussions, and preparing for events or ceremony. These observations allowed the researcher to witness contextual settings and social interactions from a distance, as well as the behavior of the participants.

The researcher occupies a unique position as a member of the Native American community. This researcher's perspective adds another way of looking at the world. With her attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and history, the researcher

brings her biases and values into the situation. During this research, the researcher attempted to look at the situation from the participants' viewpoint.

Operational Definition of Relevant Variables

"The operational definition of the concept—a definition that spells out precisely how the concept will be measured. Strictly speaking, an operational definition is a description of the 'operations' that will be undertaken in measuring a concept" (Babbie, 1995, 116).

Community involvement: answer to the interview question of "How do you remain active in the Native Community?"

Demographic characteristics: answers to the following interview questions: "What is your age?" "What is your level of education (highest grade completed)?" "What is your Tribe?"

Gender: respondents who identify themselves as either male or female when asked during the interview, "What is your gender?"

Income: answer to the interview question, "What was your total household income for the past year?"

Important motivators: answer to the interview question, "What are your motivations when you give?" In other words, "Why do you give (or not give) money?" or "Why do you volunteer (or not volunteer) your time?"

Level of giving: answer to the interview question, "How much money did you give to non-family members last year?"

Level of income: answer to the interview question, "What will be your total household income for the year 2001?"

Native American: Respondents who answer, "Yes" when asked the qualifying question, "Do you categorize yourself as a Native American?"

Level of philanthropic activities: answers to the following research questions: "What percent of your household income do you give to non-family members and organizations?" "How many hours per month do you give to those in need?" "Other than time and money, what other gifts do you give?"

Specific philanthropic behaviors: answers to the following research interview questions: "To whom do you give?" "What did your family practice in the way of volunteering time and giving money?" "If a family or extended family member is in need, how do you respond?"

Urban Indian: participants who identify themselves as such to the interview guide question, "Do you live off the reservation?"

Variables of attitudes toward philanthropy: the answers to the following interview questions: "What habits of giving do you believe are universal to all Native Americans?" "What are your giving preferences as a Native American donor?" "What are your motivations when you give?" "What do you see as a Native American that is different from the dominant culture in the way of giving?"

Treatment of the Data

A combination of methods developed by Lincoln & Guba (1985), Stones (1981), and Giorgi (1985) was used to analyze the data. Giorgi states that this is "usually referred to as the structure of the experience...[which] can be expressed at a number of levels" (10). Stones argues that it is essential that any form of phenomenological research fulfill at least the following criteria: (a) the interview

situation should entail a description of the experience or phenomenon in the world of being; (b) essential themes should be extracted by their varying manifestations; (c) explanation of the protocols should be concerned with the meaning of the data from the interviewee's perspective; (d) the phenomenological approach should reflect an understanding of the human condition to ensure that a rational connection among approach, method, and content is maintained.

With this in mind, the analysis will progress with the following procedures.

Procedure 1: The assimilation and data analysis began with the transcription of the tape-recorded interviews. In order to check for accuracy, each transcript was read while simultaneously listening to the recording. The researcher made an effort to bracket personal speculation and judgments. "Bracketing" means that a researcher temporarily puts aside her or his past knowledge of the phenomenon being studied. The researcher's approach should be atheoretical and should not be influenced by arbitrary assumptions or personal biographical experiences. Giorgi (1985) argues that his approach is based on being objective about the subjectivity expressed in the data.

Procedure 2: The transcripts were reread, identifying the information related to the phenomena under study and looking for connections between the various categories that might reflect a pattern (Seidman, 1991). This involved identifying the data as naturally occurring units or "Natural Meaning Units" (NMU) (Stones, 1981, 128). These NMUs included the participants' spontaneously expressed attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and perceptions. This process helps

break through the biases and assumptions brought to the research by the researcher as well as those that develop during the research process. The objective was to be persistent, creative, and sensitive in order to make meaningful contributions to the study of giving within the Native American community (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that these units of information will later serve as the basis for defining categories.

Procedure 3: The researcher identified and circled all NMUs, eliminating units that were clearly irrelevant to the research. This was based on the concept of "selective coding" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990), aimed at removing those categories that did not bear significantly on the three research questions of the study. The remaining units were considered relevant descriptive statements and grouped into categories (Seidman, 1991). Each of these categories consists of NMUs that express similar ideas by capturing the unique aspects of each participant's experience. According to Strauss and Corbin, to generate a rich, tightly woven explanation of the phenomena, the attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and perceptions conveyed by each NMU will then be stated as briefly and accurately as possible. The categories so formed represent idiographic themes. "Idiographic theme" is the term used to describe research dealing with the individual singular, unique, or concrete (Vogt, 1999). By definition, idiographic themes pertain to singular or unique characteristics whose research-based findings pertain only to individuals. Even when several people are studied in this way, individual differences are emphasized. The researcher looks at the unique

characteristics and qualities of individuals with respect to the particular phenomenon the researcher is studying.

Procedure 4: After repeating the above three procedures for each of the interviews the researcher made comparisons (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and then combined like categories across all participants, developing generalized Nomothetic Themes (NT). Nomothetic Themes are those themes that appear to be general, universal, abstract principles or laws (Vogt, 1999). These Nomothetic Themes were arranged from highest to lowest ranking in a hierarchical manner with the highest being "1." Number 1 has the highest frequency. The frequency is a number used to indicate how sure the researcher is that a statement about a population is correct given data about a sample.

Procedure 5: Finally, the researcher summarized the material into a document providing developmental information on Native American philanthropy that can be shared with and used by other researchers, fundraisers, and nonprofit organizations (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Limitations of the Study

In qualitative research, limitations exist, particularly where validity and interpretation of research findings are concerned. Any theoretical, interpretation, and description validity concerns were addressed through the research and methodology.

The decision to study 22 members of the Native American community, while allowing for an in-depth look at a few Native American donors and their

giving patterns, presents some limitations in generalizing to the entire population of Native Americans in the United States.

Purposeful samples are limited due to the small sample size and the concern of over-generalizing.

Another possible limitation is that Native Americans have no single word that unambiguously means philanthropy. The following words (Berry et al., 1999) refer to some aspect of generosity in several indigenous cultures:

Aa ni tse ba kees (Navajo)

Ah da ne hi (Eastern Cherokee)

Baawaailuuo (Crow)

Gondowwe (Onelda of Wisconsin)

Hotoehaestse (Cheyenne)

Likimmapi'ii (Blackfeet)

Maw-Maw/Weyah-Skah-sit/Mah-che-toe (Menominee)

Wancantognaka (Lakota)

The Native languages express the concept through many words. The words above translate to sharing, exchange, reciprocity, helping, being noble, mutual respect, community, sponsoring, partnering, collaborating, honoring, giving, and receiving; they are also terms relating to ritual and ceremony, such as potlatch giveaways, offerings, or feasts.

There is the question of some biases, but this was overcome through the use of a carefully prepared interview guide and field notes. In spite of these

limitations, the researcher believed the findings were valuable in opening up possibilities for further research in a largely overlooked area.

The respondents interviewed reflected their own untapped resources, contracts, commitments, perceptions, feelings, impressions, and obstacles with regard to their feelings of their own philanthropic endeavors, especially in the giving arena.

Pre and Post Interviews

Since the researcher is Native American and it is a cultural tradition to give a gift when you ask someone for something—a prayer, a ceremony, or advice—this researcher felt the need to present the participants with a gift of respect for honoring the researcher with the interviews. The gifts were sometimes tomatoes from the garden, herbs, watermelons, tamales, incense, and copal – a much honored and sacred resin from Mexico. In return, in the cases in which it was the researcher's first time in a person's home or place of business, the researcher also was given a gift. The researcher received food, drinks, sage, a CD from one of the artists, cards painted by the artist, and prayers for the thesis.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Data reduction refers to the process of identifying information related to the phenomena under study and selecting, focusing, simplifying, and transforming the raw data into Natural Meaning Units (NMUs). NMUs are the words or quotations of each participant. For example, the statement, "I enjoy giving" is an NMU. An NMU is given an Idiographic Theme name, such as "enjoys giving," by the researcher. Natural Meaning Units, according to Stake (1994), use the respondent's own words to study multiple realities present in naturalistic inquiry. The labeling of a particular NMU as an instance of an Idiographic Theme is the first level of interpretation of the data. Idiographic Themes as defined by Vogt (1999) pertain to singular or unique characteristics whose research-based finding pertains only to individuals. Therefore, NMUs that are labeled Idiographic Themes are what an individual has said; one individual may have many idiographic themes that are unique. While labeling the data, the researcher could distinguish between instances in which a respondent repeated an illustration or gave different illustrations of the same point. The data are separated into groups of common themes by moving similar labels together. The numbers of Idiographic Themes are counted when two or more subjects are judged to have the same Idiographic Themes. If two or more subjects are found to have the same Idiographic Themes (e.g., "enjoys giving" and "find pleasure in giving"), a "Nomothetic Theme" is then created (e.g., "enjoys giving"). A "Nomothetic Theme" is two or more instances of an Idiographic Theme and the second level of interpretation of the data. For example, when Laura says

something that has the same meaning as Jose (e.g., the two NMUs "I enjoy giving" and "I find pleasure in giving"), their individual Idiographic Themes (e.g., "enjoys giving") become a Nomothetic Theme (e.g., "enjoys giving"). Vogt (1999) states that "nomothetic" pertains to research attempting to establish general, universal, and abstract principles or laws. Any Nomothetic Theme has a frequency of two or more; the higher the frequency, the higher the possibility that it may be more universal and general. A Nomothetic Theme with a low frequency tends to be less universal than a Nomothetic Theme with a higher frequency. The higher the frequency, the more certain a researcher is that a statement about a population is correct given data about a sample. The research is presented in four sections: (a) Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents, (b) Findings of the Study, (c) Interpretation of the Findings, and (d) Unanticipated Findings of Importance.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The sample comprised 22 respondents, of which 11 were female and 11 were male. All were Native Americans and lived off the reservation. All of the subjects were recruited from a pool of respondents from the Native community and various Native American organizations and gatherings. While participation in this study was voluntary, all respondents met the requirement by answering affirmatively to the two qualifying questions:

1. Do you categorize yourself as Native American?
2. Do you live off the reservation?

In examining the respondents' data, the researcher assessed each respondent and gave him or her a number and a code name as detailed below. The female respondents were given female names and the male respondents were given male names:

1. Laura, 2. Carlos, 3. Isabel, 4. Frances, 5. Jose, 6. Lydia, 7. Ricardo, 8. Melinda, 9. Shawne Rae, 10. Lipsha, 11. Lyman, 12. Louise, 13. Pedro, 14. Russell, 15. Nector, 16. June, 17. Fleur, 18. Humberto, 19. Tatro, 20. Gerry, 21. Marsha, 22. Albertine.

Ages ranged from 31 to 60 years, with a mean age of 46. Seventy-three percent of respondents were between the ages of 36 and 55 years old. Each of the respondents lived in the greater Austin and San Antonio, Texas area. Seventy-seven percent were married, 14% were single, and 9% were divorced.

Nine percent of respondents went no further than completing high school, 27% completed 2 to 4 years of college, but did not obtain a degree. Sixty-four percent of the respondents had college degrees: 32% completed a Bachelor's degree, 23% completed a Master's degree, and 9% completed doctoral degrees. One respondent had two Bachelor's degrees, one respondent with a Master's Degree was writing his dissertation for a Ph.D., and one respondent completed two years of college and was pursuing his Bachelor's degree.

Forty-five percent were professional/management or administrators, 14% were artists, 9% were students, 5% were self-employed, 5% were laborers, 5% were sales/service/clerks, 5% were housewives/mothers, 5% were retired, and 9% were unemployed professionals. Almost two-thirds of the respondents had an

annual household income between $18,000 and $50,000; 5% of the respondents had an annual household income between $10,000 and $17,000; 27% had an annual household income in the range of $18,000 to $25,000; over one-third (36%) had an annual household income in the range of $26,000 to $50,000; almost one-third (29%) had an annual household income of $51,000 to $125,000. The annual income level of 5% of the respondents is unknown. The median income was $30,000. Excluding unknown income the mean annual household income was $49,857. The median annual household gift to non-family members was $2,000; the mean was $3,182.

Sixty-eight percent were active in Native American spirituality or practice: 27% are members or attend the Native American Church, 23% said they attend or were members of an organized religion Church, and 9% were not members of a church or spiritual community. There was an overlap of those who attended churches of organized religion and those who also attended the Native American Church or who practiced Native American spirituality. All of the respondents were active in the Native American community: 82% of respondents said they were very involved and 18% said they were somewhat involved. See Appendix D. Table 1 displays the number of respondents and percentages for selected demographics.

Part 2: Findings Related to the Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to phenomenologically explore the life experiences, feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of Native Americans living off the reservation in the greater Austin and San Antonio areas with regard to their

philanthropy. The Native American men and women were interviewed and asked to tell their stories.

The central question was, "What are the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of Native Americans living off the reservation in the Austin and San Antonio urban and suburban areas with regard to their philanthropy?" This led to three research questions:

R1: What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy?

R2: What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy?

R3: In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give?

These research questions are listed with the appropriate Nomothetic Themes.

Research Question # 1

To address the first research question—What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy?—information from each respondent was combined into themes and Nomothetic Themes. The themes are ranked from highest frequency to lowest frequency in a hierarchical manner with the highest being "1." The same will be done for research questions two and three.

The findings related to the first research question, "What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy?" are considered in the following Nomothetic Themes. Tables 2 through 11 present qualitative data using as a guide the questions and responses from the interview/protocol. The tables give

positive or negative responses about the respondents' attitudes toward philanthropy. The respondents were asked, "As a Native American, what are your views of giving and receiving?" Table 2 represents what the researcher has broken down into the respondents' responses. All of the respondents felt positive about giving and receiving (see Table 2). Over two thirds of the respondents said that giving was very important; almost two thirds said that giving and receiving characterized the Native American way of life; and almost half believed that, faced with a crisis, others would give to them. Over one fourth of the respondents said they always gave anonymously. This is supported by other ethnic groups in Smith et al. (1999: in particular, Guatemalan and Salvadorian populations also gave anonymously). In the Rose (1998) study on lesbian philanthropy, the respondents had no preference to remain anonymous when making a contribution.

Table 2
Views of Native Americans with Respect to Giving and Receiving (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1.	Giving is very important	15	68%
2.	Giving and receiving is Native American way of life, culture/tradition	14	64
3.	Believes others will give when she/he needs help	10	45
4.	Need to give back to community	7	32
5.	Always give anonymously	6	27
6.	Spiritual Responsibility to give	6	27
7.	Giving and receiving is not just money	6	27
8.	Native Americans are generous	5	23
9.	Giving and receiving part of cultural identity	5	23
10.	More important to give than to receive	5	23
11.	When gives expects nothing in return	4	18
12.	Shameful to boast about giving	4	18
13.	Giving necessary things for good of community	3	14
14.	We are all interconnected	3	14
15.	Giving is a gift	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

The respondents were also asked, "What various types of giving do Native Americans that you know practice?" (see Table 3). Over two thirds of the respondents said giving of food; almost two thirds said sharing as a Nation (tribe/community). Close to 60% said teaching of Native American traditions and almost 60% said participation in a ceremony. One explanation of the high frequency of these four Nomothetic Themes is that even in urban life there is an intertribal sense of tradition demonstrated by sharing food, clothing, and gifts among family and friends and through special ceremonies and preparing food. Food and the sharing of food are a blessing. Everyone who consumes the food receives a blessing.

Table 3
Various Forms of Native American Giving and Receiving (N = 22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1. Giving of food	15	68%
2. Sharing as a Nation (tribe/community)	14	64
3. Teaching traditions including Native American dance	13	59
4. Participation in Ceremony	13	59
5. Sharing gifts you have with the community	12	55
6. Contribute to ceremonies including use of home and land	12	55
7. Giving of time	12	55
8. Giving of money	11	50
9. Giving of spiritual/personal support	11	50
10. Preparing of food	11	50
11. Giving of blankets	10	45
12. Sharing of knowledge	10	45
13. Giving of prayers	10	45
14. Practice of giveaway	9	41
15. Community presentations	8	36
16. Volunteer for Nonprofit	8	36
17. Giving of a place to stay	8	36

Table 3 Continued
Various Forms of Native American Giving and Receiving (N=22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
18. Caring for the elderly's basic needs and utilities	7	32
19. Even in hard times Native Americans still share	7	32
20. Sharing of vocation/jobs	7	32
21. Giving of transportation	7	32
22. Help with expenses of person traveling to do ceremony	6	27
23. Attending ceremony	6	27
24. Giving clothes and regalia	6	27
25. Blanket collections	6	27
26. Counseling or listening	6	27
27. Helping youths	5	23
28. Practicing circle giving	4	18
29. Giving songs	4	18
30. Writing grants	3	14
31. Honoring the earth	3	14
32. Fixing houses	3	14
33. Fixing cars	3	14

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "What is the governing principle that you see among Native Americans in reciprocity and giving?" (see Table 4). More than three fourths of the respondents said that giving goes in a circle; over two thirds said that when giving, one knows that one will be helped later on. One half said it was an Indian tradition to receive a gift and pass it on. Over one fourth answered giving is from the heart; 9% said it is an honor to give. One explanation for this low response of the last two Nomothetic Themes might be that urban Indians are more acculturated and although most believe Native Americans give from the heart and it is an honor to give, they do not use the same language as a more traditional Native American.

Table 4
Governing Principles in Reciprocity and Giving (N=22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1. Giving goes in a circle	17	77%
2. When giving one knows that one will be helped later on	15	68
3. Indian tradition to receive and pass it on	11	50
4. There are two parts: giving and Receiving	10	45
5. Giving is from the heart	6	27
6. Giving is way of life	5	23
7. It is a honor to give	2	9
8. Don't keep track of what you give	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "What are your giving preferences as a Native American donor?" Almost three quarters said immediate need; almost two thirds said children and the elderly; and almost two thirds said community/tribal and individual fundraisers (see Table 5). Children and elders are especially cared for in the Native community because children are the future and elders hold the wisdom and educate the children. Harmon (1996) explains that traditional Native American giving is for current needs, not for future, unforeseen possibilities and this appears also to be true for urban Native Americans.

Table 5
Giving Preference of Native Americans (N=22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1. Immediate need	16	73%
2. Children and the elderly	14	64
3. Community/Tribal and individual fundraisers	14	64
4. Human rights and social change	10	45
6. Giving to ceremony	9	41
7. Giving of food	9	41
8. Native American Resource Center	8	36
9. Native American organizations.	7	32
10. Native American College Fund	6	27
11. Native American colleges	6	27
12. Cultural arts	5	23
13. Native American church	5	23
14. Giving to Community Action	3	14
15. Non-monetary giving	2	9
16. Native American Legal Defense Fund	2	9
17. Providing a meeting place	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "What fundraising strategies and messages are most effective in (and unique to) the Native community?" Almost three fourths said word of mouth; over two thirds said powwows, food booths, and T-shirts; and almost two thirds said community, individual, and education fundraisers (see Table 6). Harmon (1996) argues that even if Native Americans participate in a modern money economy, basic mainstream fundraising principles may make no sense to a community lacking a social structure capable of sustained, collective action.

Table 6
Native American Most Effective Fundraisers (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. By word of mouth	16	73%
2. Powwows, food booths, and T-shirts	15	68
3. Community/Individual and education Fundraisers	13	59
4. Community responsibility and donations	13	59
5. People help with what needs to be done	9	41
6. People know and show up to support	8	36
7. Community obligation for ceremony	6	27
9. Art auctions/raffles	5	23
10. Cultural and education presentations	5	23
11. Foundation grants	3	14

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Berry et al. (1999) suggest that, compared to other groups in general, Native Americans place a different significance on important motivators that influence their charitable giving. Participants were asked, "What are your motivations when you give?" On numerous occasions, to better elicit a response the researcher asked these supportive questions: "Why do you give (or not give) money?" "Why do you volunteer (or not volunteer) your time?" Over two thirds of respondents said giving was a way of life; over two thirds were motivated by people in need; and half said families in need (see Table 7). Almost two thirds said they gave/volunteered to help others; close to two thirds said giving back to the community. Giving back to the community was often stated as a reason for giving in the Smith et al. (1999) study. Fifty-nine percent said it was responsibility and commitment to community, and 41% said "something I believe in." In the Rose (1998) study, 72% gave to something they believed in and 57% to their lesbian/gay community.

Table 7
Motivations for Giving and Volunteering (N=22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Giving is way of life	15	68%
2.	People in need	15	68
3.	To help others	14	64
4.	Give back to community	13	59
5.	Responsibility and commitment to community	13	59
6.	People in need	11	50
7.	Something I believe in	9	41
8.	Happy to give	8	36
9.	It is important	6	27
10.	Believes if ever needs help others will help her/him	4	18

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were also asked, "What do you see, as a Native American, that is different from the dominant culture in the way of giving?" (see Table 8). Half of the respondents said the dominant culture expects something in return; almost half said that since Native Americans see family, neighbors, and community as extended family, giving is community based. Over one third said that Native Americans give as a community for the good of the community. Salway Black (2001) argues that in the dominant culture individualism tends to take priority over community, whereas the opposite is true for Native Americans; sometimes at the sacrifice of personal needs. Smith et al. (1999) noted that Latinos also have a strong sense of community.

Table 8
Native American Fundraising Versus Dominant Culture (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Dominant culture expects something in Return	11	50%
2.	Native Americans see family, neighbors, and community as extended family; giving is community based	10	45
3.	Native Americans give for good of community as a community	9	41
4.	Dominant culture has judged Indians unfairly	8	36
5.	Native Americans give from the heart	8	36
6.	Native Americans give to meet needs, not to accumulate	7	32
7.	Native American way is opposite to dominant culture: respect comes with the more you give away and the more you help the community	7	32
8.	In dominant culture everything given has monetary value: business, tax deduction, or handout	6	27
9.	With Native Americans, it is an honor to give and mostly anonymously	6	27
10.	Dominant culture respect comes for what you have accumulated and size of the gift	5	23
11.	Dominant culture gives conditionally	3	14
12.	Dominant culture does not value what Native Americans value	3	14

Table 8 Continued
Native American Fundraising Versus Dominant Culture (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
13.	Dominant culture does not give as a community	2	9
14.	Dominant culture gives to high profile causes	2	9
15.	Dominant culture gives to people it does not know	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "Who do you believe should be taking care of the needy and poor?" (see Table 9). Over two thirds said everyone should care for the needy; over one third said that the community should; and almost one third said that the government ought to be taking care of the needy and poor. For many Native Americans, giving is viewed as a means of helping one another through hard socio-economic conditions rather than a means for assisting the deserving needy and poor (Joseph, 1995).

Table 9
Native Americans Caring for the Needy (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Everyone should care for the needy	15	68%
2. The community should	8	36
3. The government	7	32
4. The family should	6	27

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked to "Please describe worthwhile causes you would give to" (see Table 10). Almost three quarters nominated community/individual, need-based fundraisers; almost two thirds said education and Native American schools. One half said they contributed for ceremonies. Almost half said they supported Native American self-sufficiency and social change programs. According to Adamson (2000), urban Native Americans consider the following important causes to support: 1. fundraisers, 2. education (scholarships, internships, etc.), 3. pan-Indian activities (ceremonies, cultural events, etc.), 4. social change, 5. the young, 6. the elderly, and 7. the arts.

Table 10
Giving Patterns of Respondents (N=22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Community/Individual, need-based fundraisers	16	73%
2.	Education and Native American schools	14	64
3.	For ceremonies	11	50
4.	Native American self-sufficiency and social change	10	45
5.	Human rights	9	41
6.	Native American rights	9	41
7.	Health issues	9	41
8.	Families in need	8	36
9.	Organizations that help women and other minorities	8	36
10.	Elderly services centers or elders in need	7	32
11.	Organizations that help youths and children	7	32
12.	Causes I believe in	7	32
13.	Organizations that teach traditional ways	6	27
14.	Native American Scholarship Fund	6	27
15.	Scholarship fund	6	27
16.	Native American organizations	5	23
17.	Native American art	4	18

Table 10 Continued
Giving Patterns of Respondents (N = 22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
18. Major charities	4	18
19. Natural water sources and environmental organizations	4	18
20. Native American church	4	18
21. Cultural centers	3	14

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

The current data on Native American philanthropy Berry et al. (1999) studied wealthy donors as well as Native American Foundations, and Wells (1999) studied high profile Native Americans who worked, or had worked, in the nonprofit sector. This study asked the question, "Can Native American values toward giving be extended outside the Indian community? How?" The Berry et al. and Wells studies did not ask this question and therefore no direct comparison could be made (see Table 11). In response to the question, over three quarters said Yes; when asked "How?" almost two thirds said by allowing non-Natives to attend gatherings and teachings. Over one half said cultural awareness would extend Native American values beyond the Native community. The data indicate that by preserving and truly affirming the values that are used in the Native community, philanthropic giving could be extended outside the community like an expanding circle.

Table 11
Values and Attitude Results (N = 22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Yes	17	77%
2. No	2	9
3. Only superficially	2	9
4. Not sure, does not know	1	5
5. How? Allowing non-Natives to attend gatherings/teachings	13	59
6. Cultural awareness	12	55
7. Breaking down differences	10	45
8. Cultural familiarization	10	45
9. Attending powwows	9	41
10. They already are	7	32
11. Non-Natives becoming part of extended family	6	27

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Research Question # 2

The findings related to the second research question—"What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy?"—are considered in the following Nomothetic Themes in Tables 12 through 24. The respondents were asked, "What habits of giving do you believe are universal to all Native American tribes indigenous to the North American continent?" (see Table 12). Over two thirds said Native Americans take care of each other, particularly within the same group/tribe; almost two thirds said Native Americans always offer food; and over half said ceremonies or gatherings with some sort of giveaway afterward. When a person goes into an Indian home, that person is always given a cup of coffee or something to eat. There is an understanding around the ceremony of sharing food that has to do with Native American manners (Wells, 1999). Within Native communities there still is a tremendous amount of giving taking place; at present-day events, one sees examples of such sharing.

Table 12
Habits of Giving Universal to Native Americans (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1.	Native Americans take care of each other, especially within same group/tribe	15	68%
2.	Native Americans always offer food	14	64
3.	Ceremonies or gatherings and some sort of giveaway afterward	12	55
4.	Native Americans share what they have	11	50
5.	Making sure people, especially elders, have basic needs met	11	50
6.	Giving money or materials and travel for ceremony	11	50
7.	Playing or making of instruments for ceremony	9	41
8.	Native Americans believe we are all related	8	36
9.	Sharing as a community	8	36
10.	Community events are to help community and people in the community	7	32
11.	Preparing of food	7	32
12.	Caring for the children and respecting the elders	7	32
13.	Native Americans are generous	6	27
14.	Willingness to give from the heart	6	27
15.	Natural healing, herbs, massage, prayer	6	27
16.	Sharing of knowledge	6	27

Table 12 Continued
Habits of Giving Universal to Native Americans (N = 22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
17. Native Americans give in circle; this brings balance	5	23
18. Connection with Mother Earth	5	23
19. Passing on the traditions	5	23
20. A place to stay	5	23
21. Elders are always cared for, especially basic needs	3	14
22. Community more important than individual	3	14
23. Native Americans are grateful	2	9
24. Gift of cars	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "To whom do you give? " Eighty-two percent said they gave to the Native American community; over three fourths said they gave to family; and almost three fourths said they gave to ceremonies (see Table 13). This is different from the Joseph (1995) study, in which he argues that whether socialization occurs in urban communities or the reservation makes a difference in motivations for giving. He argues that reservation-based Indians tend to give to family and to the community whereas urban Indians tend to give to intertribal networks or pan-Indian activities. One explanation for the discrepancy could be that the respondents in this study practice a combination of traditional and urban Indian giving. The Smith et al. (1999) findings report that the more recent the immigrants, the more likely they are to give directly to individuals and families within their own communities. Though Native Americans are not immigrants, in general, they feel similarly about giving to their community.

Table 13
Most Common Motivations for Giving of Urban Native Americans (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. I give to Native community	18	82%
2. I give to family	17	77
3. I give to ceremonies	16	73
4. To people in need	14	64
5. Youth groups and the elderly	11	50
6. To education	11	50
7. Native American Resource Center	11	50
8. To spiritual family circle	10	45
9. As many people as I can	9	41
10. Tribal group	8	36
11. Cultural artist	7	32
12. People passing though needing a place to stay	6	27
13. I give to Zapatistas	4	18
14. Social justice and social change	4	18
15. Emergency need and disaster	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "What did your family practice in the way of volunteering time and giving money?" (Table 14). Almost three quarters said their family prepared food for events, fed people, and gave groceries to those in need; over two thirds said they helped with community/cultural activities; and almost two thirds said community involvement. As in the Smith et al. (1999) study, respondents were taught by parents to give as a family tradition. In a couple of cases in which the parents were not able to teach the tradition of giving and volunteering, it was taught by a family member or elder in the community. All of the respondents had been taught to share. The results in the Rose (1998) study included the finding that only 4% of lesbian/gay respondents said making a contribution was important because it was a family tradition.

Table 14
Family Practices of Volunteering Time and Giving Money (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Prepared food for events, fed people, and gave groceries to those in need	16	73%
2. Helped with community/cultural activities	15	68
3. Community involvement	14	64
4. Gave of their time and money	14	64
5. Took care of each other, especially within same group	14	64
6. Family gave to church and church activities	12	55
7. Gave to those in need	11	50
8. Helped sick neighbors	6	27
9. Offered professional skill	5	23
10. Helped with fundraisers	5	23
11. Volunteered in school	3	14
12. Involved in political activism	3	14
13. Gave people place to stay	3	14
14. Gave spiritual gifts	3	14
15. Gave car parts and labor	3	14
16. Being grateful	2	9
17. What goes around comes around	2	9
18. Took in kids	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "Which practices do you continue to follow?" (see Table 15). Over three quarters said giving to meet the needs of the community; over two thirds said cultural-type giving (the Indian way); and almost two thirds said giving back to the community. Nine percent said they continue to give to the church with in-kind donations. The Smith et al. (1999) study indicated that a significant amount of giving of ethnic groups continued to be through the church. One explanation for the discrepancy could be the resurgence of Native American spirituality among urban Indians; Native American spirituality is a way of life, not a denomination or organized institution (Berry et al., 1999).

Table 15
Native American Family Practices of Giving and Volunteering (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Giving to meet need in community	18	82%
2.	Cultural-type giving the Indian way	15	68
3.	Giving back to community	14	64
4.	Dance/play instruments/ceremony	12	55
5.	Community presentation	11	50
6.	The consciousness to help people who need help	11	50
7.	Professional skills with newsletter, Websites, and meetings.	9	41
8.	Participate in community fundraisers	9	41
9.	Give food to those in need	9	41
10.	Enjoy helping others	8	36
11.	Always give place to stay	6	27
12.	Social issues and social justice	6	27
13.	Give money for ceremony	5	23
14.	Counseling friends	4	18
15.	Taking in kids to raise	4	18
16.	Give to church in-kind donations	2	9

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "Will you continue to practice culture-type giving and teach it to your children and others? (If yes) How will you do this?" (see Table 16). All 22 respondents answered yes to the first part of the question. Over 80% said they would pass it on by teaching by example and over two thirds said they would teaching through their participation. Culture also plays an important role in Native American philanthropy. Similarly, in Smith et al. (1999) participants were taught by example and through participation while growing up as children in their communities.

Table 16
Native American Practice of Cultural-Type Giving (N22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Yes	22	100%
2.	Teaching by example	18	82
3.	Through their participation	17	77
4.	Have children live in community to experience it and learn to give	12	55
5.	Presentation and performance	12	55
6.	Teach about traditional giving and receiving	11	50
7.	Will teach children about their culture and traditions	9	41
8.	By mentoring	7	32
9.	Through Native dance	7	32
10	Through collective giving	7	32

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "If a family or extended-family member is in need, how do you respond?" (see Table 17). Over three quarters said they would do whatever needs to be done; over half said they would put resources together; and half said they would organize efforts to help. Native communities tend to rely on circular relationships, beginning with the individual and expanding to family, clan, tribe, the larger Native population, and beyond. Each layer of the circle is interdependent with the next for all forms of support. This is very similar to the group membership diagram in the Smith et al. (1999) study. The circle goes outward: in some ways it is like a concentric circle and in some ways like a spiral, starting in the center and circling outward; in the concentric circle, one has more or less separate entities. Yet through the family they are continually connected to the rest of the community, in an outward-spiraling network of responsibility to and for others (Wells, 1999).

Table 17
Native American Response to Family Need (N = 22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Whatever needs to be done	18	82%
2. Put resources together	12	55
3. Organize efforts to help	11	50
4. Help immediately	10	45
6. Offer a place to stay	4	18

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked to estimate their annual range of giving by answering the question, "How much money did you give to non-family members last year?" Almost one third of the respondents gave $200 to $1,000; over one fourth gave $2,000 to $2,999; and over one fourth gave $3,000 to $7,000. This study focused on Native American donors. In this study the median was $2,000; the mean was $3,182 per household; in the Rose (1998) study, the categories were broken down and included all charitable contributions, for which the median was $765; the mean was $2,124, and while no direct comparison can be made, the median and the mean for the Native American respondents is significantly higher. Table 18 ranks from highest frequency to lowest frequency the respondents' range of giving.

Table 18
Annual Household Range of Contribution to Non-family Members (N = 22)

Contributions	Number	Percent
1. $200 to $1,000	8	36%
2. $3,000 to $7,000	6	27
3. $2,000 to $2,999	5	23
4. $8,000 to $10,000	2	9
5 $1,500	1	5

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "Do you now do, or have you ever done, volunteer work? (If yes) For what organizations and for how long?" (see Table 19). All 22 respondents said yes to the first part of the question. Similarly, in the Smith et al. (1999) study, volunteering was very important to the participants, occasionally even more important than giving money. For the second part of the question, over three quarters said they contribute time for ceremonies; over two thirds said cultural presentation and that they volunteered for their spiritual groups, drumming, and/or playing instruments. In this study the respondents had a strong desire to preserve and teach Native American traditions. The respondents in this study do not see giving their time as volunteering but rather just doing what needs to be done.

Table 19
Volunteering Patterns of Respondents (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Yes (I have volunteered)	22	100%
2. Contributing for ceremonies	17	77
3. Presentation cultural and spiritual group, drumming and playing instruments	16	73
4. Cultural centers	15	68
5. Community organization	14	64
6. Volunteer for Native American groups	14	64
7. Community/Individual fundraisers	10	45
8. School and youth groups	9	41
9. Organizations with goals of interest to me	8	36
10. Prepare food for gatherings and ceremony	8	36
12. School programs	7	32
13. Human rights organizations	6	27
14. Native American health issues	5	23
15. Native American conferences	5	23
16. Help set up for cultural events	5	23
17. Political activism and social change	3	14

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "When you contribute money or give time, how often and under what circumstances?" (see Table 20). Under "Circumstances," more than 80% nominated families needing help; over two thirds answered community asking for or needing help; and almost two-thirds said giving back to the community. How often? Almost three quarters said many times a year, particularly at certain times for ceremonies, gatherings, and events; over one third said they volunteer every chance they get (when needed). Giving back time to the community was similarly communicated in ethnic philanthropy studies by Berry et al. (1999), Smith et al. (1999), and Salway Black et al. (2001). It is a tradition of honor, sharing, and giving back to those individuals, institutions, and organizations that have been instrumental in their survival and in maintaining their culture. When asked, "How often?" almost three fourths answered many times a year, particularly at certain times for ceremonies, gatherings, and events; over two thirds said every chance they get (when needed). At times, respondents go for 3 or 4 days with little or no sleep in order to fulfill their responsibilities to the community.

Table 20
Giving and Volunteering Patterns of Respondents (N = 22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
Circumstances		
1. Families needing help	18	82%
2. Community asking for/or needing help	15	68
3. Giving back to community	14	64
4. I volunteer and give for ceremonies	9	41
5. Native American community	8	36
6. Native Americans coming through needing place to stay	8	36
How often?		
7. Many times a year, more at certain times for ceremony, gatherings, and events	16	73
8. Volunteer every chance I get (when needed)	15	68
9. Volunteer every week	10	45

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "What are all the types of giving that you do?" (see Table 21). Slightly less than 100% of respondents said time; more than 80% said money; over three quarters said they gave food; and almost two thirds said giving of songs. Often there is a social obligation, which is met by giving of time, food, or a song. The gift does not always have to be material; people who are penniless can still be very generous with their time. Whenever one is asked to participate in a ceremony or a dance it is always an honor (Wells, 1999). Over one fourth said they offered a place to stay. Like recent immigrants in the Smith et al. (1999) study, Native Americans in urban areas give other Natives a place to stay; whether they are passing through or need accommodation for an extended period, they know they can count on help. Fourteen percent answered they give to major charities, and of those who gave to major charities, they designated that their donation go to the Native American community. As in the Smith et al. (1999) study, the respondents in this study practice much generosity, however very little goes to major charities; this was also particularly true among the Guatemalans, Mexicans, and Salvadorans. Also similar to the Smith et al. study, most of the respondents in this study expressed a strong distrust of institutions, including philanthropic and nonprofit organizations, as well as government and large firms.

Table 21
Native American Giving by Type (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
1.	Giving of time	21	95%
2.	Giving of money	19	86
3.	Giving of food	17	77
4.	Giving of ceremony	16	73
5.	Giving of money and materials for ceremony	16	73
6.	Giving of teaching	15	68
7.	Giving of songs	13	59
8.	Community/Individual fundraisers	13	59
9.	Organizing community events/gatherings	12	55
10.	Giving of in-kind donations	11	50
11.	Giving voice to others media and attending meetings	11	50
12.	Giving of dance	11	50
13.	Giving of drumming or playing of other instruments	11	50
14.	Community presentations	11	50
15.	Giving to spiritual circle	10	45
16.	Gift of counseling	10	45
17.	Giving of transportation	9	41
18.	Preparing food for gatherings and ceremonies	9	41

Table 21 Continued
Native American Giving by Type (N = 22)

Nomothetic Themes	Number	Percent
19. Powwows	9	41
20. Giving of prayers	8	36
21. Planning and strategies	6	27
22. A place to stay	6	27
23. Gift to scholarship fund	5	23
24. Being role model	5	23
25. Provide basic need for people and family	4	18
26. Travel expenses for elders or healer	4	18
27. Gift to major charities	3	14

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "What kinds of organizations would you consider giving either time or money to?" (see Table 22). Eighty-two percent said they would give to organizations that helped the elderly, youths, and children; 82% said their own spiritual group; 73% said cultural teaching organizations; 64% said Native American groups; and 32% said cultural arts. In comparison, in the Rose (1998) study, group identity was higher, at 78%, and significantly lower for social services (women and girls) at 50% and religion/spiritual at 31%. Despite the variations, Smith et al. (1999) found that all the Latino subgroups, as with Native Americans, provided caretaking services to the young and old.

Table 22
Giving and Volunteering by Type of Organization (N = 22)

	Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1.	Organizations that help elders and children	18	82%
2.	Own spiritual group	18	82
3.	Cultural teaching organizations	16	73
4.	Organizations that help Native Americans	14	64
5.	Human rights (social, peace, and justice)	11	50
6.	Native American church or groups that promote Native American spirituality	11	50
7.	Natural and spiritual healing and healers	9	41
8.	Education institutions	9	41
9.	Cultural arts organizations	7	32

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Research Question # 3

The third and final research question was, "In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give?" The responses to this question are addressed in Nomothetic Themes in Tables 23 through 25. When asked, "What percent of your annual household income goes to contributions?" over one third of the respondents said 10%; almost one fourth said 5% to 6%, and almost one fourth said 20%. The median was 10% of the annual household income; the mean was 18% (see Table 23). The Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) study did not provide enough data to offer any analysis on Native American giving practices.

Table 23
Percentage of Household Income Given as Contribution (N=22)

Percentage of contributions	Number	Percent
1. 5% to 6%	5	23%
2. 10%	8	36
3. 20%	5	23
4. 30% to 40%	2	9
5. 25%	1	5
6. 50%	1	5

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Respondents were asked, "How many hours per month do you give to those in need?" Almost half said they volunteered 40 hours per month; almost one fourth said 20 to 30 hours (see Table 24). The mean is 87 hours per month. Smith et al. (1999) reports survey data (Market Opinion Research 1991) of the average volunteer hours per month by four ethnic groups in the San Francisco Bay Area during 1991, showing all households averaging 12 hours, African Americans with 14 hours, Chinese with 8 hours, Hispanic with 9 hours, and whites with 14 hours (20). Even though there is 10 years' difference between the current exploratory study and Smith et al., one might infer from the data that none of the four groups contribute time at the same level as the respondents in the present study.

Table 24
Average Hours Volunteered Per Month (2001) (N=22)

Hours Volunteered	Number	Percent
1. 40 hours per month	10	45%
2. 20 to 30 hours per month	5	23
4. 180 to 200 hours per month	3	13
5. 50 to 60 hours per month	2	9
6. 16 hours per month	1	5
7. 80 to 100 hours per month	1	5

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Native American respondents were asked, "Other than time and money, what other gifts do you give?" (Table 25) Eighty-two percent said food; over three quarters (77%) said materials for ceremonies; and almost three fourths said attending ceremonies and meetings. Table 25 illustrates what happens when the concept of the word "philanthropy" is expanded beyond the giving of money, to include time, goods and other benefits; Native Americans, like blacks, emerge as having a strong, substantial philanthropic tradition (Carson, 1991).

Table 25
Gifts Other than Time and Money (N=22)

Nomothetic Theme	Number	Percent
1. Gift of food	18	82%
2. Materials for ceremonies	17	77
3. Attending ceremonies and meetings	16	73
4. Keeping Native traditions	16	73
5. Teaching Native American ways	15	68
6. Preparing of food for gatherings/ceremonies	14	64
7. Gift of crafts and supplies, beads, feathers	14	64
8. Giving rides	14	64
9. Gift of song and gift of dance	13	59
11. Gift of drumming and playing other instruments	12	55
12. Spiritual gifts	11	50
13. Resources for medicine	10	45
14. Exchange of goods or work	10	45
15. Writing of letters, brainstorming, and collaboration	10	45
16. Basic needs, place to stay, utilities, clothing	10	45
17. Whatever we have people need	8	36
18. Setting up ancestor alters	8	36
19. Auto repairs, cars and tools, and horses	4	18

Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Part 3: Interpretation of Findings

(With Reference to the Theoretical Framework Developed in Chapters 1 and 2)

This exploratory study had as its goal the presentation of a picture of giving by urban and suburban Native Americans in the Austin and San Antonio area. The study focused on Native American approaches to philanthropy. In Native American cultures, the belief is that the more one gives, the more one receives (Berry et al., 1999; Wells, 1999). Wells quotes Chavis: "No matter how much disposable income one has, Native Americans don't lose the concept that they are giving back, because in order to receive, one has to give."

The data gathered by the Berry et al. (1999) and Wells (1999) studies show different demographics than this study's population. In this study, all of the respondents were from the greater Austin and San Antonio area. The Berry et al. and Wells studies were based on national samples. Similar to the profile of Native American respondents in these studies, the majority (75%) of respondents of this study were employed full-time, yet only 50% were professionals and 14% were artists. This differs from the 1990 census, which indicates that more than 50% of Native Americans were employed in technical jobs, the second-largest group in laboring, and the third in service occupations. This could be attributed to the proportion of respondents in the present study who are better educated (all were high school graduates and 91% have had 2 to 4 years of college, or graduate and post-graduate degrees) whereas the educational levels indicated in the U.S. Census Bureau study (1998) were high school graduation 66% and Bachelor's or higher degree 9.3%. The data in the Berry et al. and Wells studies

did not include a category for education and therefore no direct comparison can be made. In the Wells study, all the respondents were professionals and worked in or had connections to the field of philanthropy. Respondents in both the Berry et al. and Wells study were high profile Native Americans. In the current study, only 9% fit into this category.

In addition, a national study by Yankelovich, Skelly, and White (1985) concluded that persons who have higher education tend to be in professional occupations and give more, and persons with less than a high school education give less. None of the respondents in the present study had less than a high school education and almost two thirds had college or graduate-level education. Therefore the variability of the sample was not wide enough to make educational level a strong factor, and so the influence of education on giving behavior was not correlated.

Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) found that full-time employment and household income strongly influence giving and volunteering. The relationship of labor-force status to giving and volunteering was not calculated since the majority of respondents worked full-time as executives and professionals, and therefore the variability of the sample was not wide enough to make it a strong factor. Factors such as occupation, education, and age were examined, but were not found to be significantly related to charitable giving and volunteering.

The three principal motivations offered for giving and volunteering were: (a) giving is very important, (b) reciprocity is both giving and receiving, and (c)

Native Americans have a strong desire to contribute to the Native American community.

Three principal motivation behaviors for giving and volunteering were: (a) giving to people in need, (b) giving to organizations that help the elderly and the children, and (c) continuing the family practices of giving and volunteering. Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) noted that those who as children or adolescents saw an admired role model donate time and service were more likely to volunteer at an appropriate age.

It is postulated by this researcher that a key factor usually associated with giving and volunteering in the general population, such as weekly attendance at organized religious services (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999), would not be as significant among Native American respondents. In the area of church attendance, 95% of the respondents of the present study said they participated in a Native American spiritual community, 23% said they were members of an organized religion, and 9% were not members of any church or spiritual community. There is an overlap between those who attend an organized church and those who also practice Native American spirituality. There does not seem to be a clear relationship between organized religion, church attendance, and amount of money and time given. Unlike other minorities in the Smith et al. (1999) study, the respondents in this study are less likely to have church attendance as a significant factor in influencing their philanthropic giving and volunteering.

Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) found that another key factor usually associated with giving and volunteering in the general population is being very active in civic, social, and charitable activities in the community. The data reveal a clear relationship between community involvement and amount of money given (see Table 23). The mean was 18% of household income and 87 hours per month of time (see Table 24). One hundred percent of the respondents were involved in the Native community, 82% were very involved, and 18% were somewhat involved. Among motivators, giving and volunteering (Tables 10, 13, 15, 20) and giving to the community in general ranked the highest. Therefore, this research concludes that community involvement is a key factor in the philanthropic giving behavior of Native Americans.

Part 4: Unanticipated Findings of Importance and Discussion of Results Outside of the Primary Objectives

Since the interview guide was structured into categories that represented three research questions, the researcher's focus was on collecting data that fit the description of the specific attitudes and behaviors of giving money, time, and other gifts within the Native American community. For this reason, to my knowledge, there were no results outside of the primary objectives.

The unanticipated findings of importance were the high percentage of household giving (median was 10%; mean was 18%) and the high amount of average hours of time donated (87 per month). Compared to the general population, it appears that Native Americans are more generous.

Similarly, the respondents were asked, "What is the governing principle that you see among Native Americans in reciprocity and giving?" On several occasions the respondents heard "governing" as having to do with the government and were sidetracked by particular feelings, perceptions, and interpretations with regards to the government. The researcher then had to repeat the question. There may have been some confusion in the respondents' minds about the word "governing." Respondents may possibly have interpreted this question two different ways, either as referring to the government of this country or as a governing principle of reciprocity. After this researcher reminded them that the question was related to governing principles of reciprocity, the respondents went on to respond appropriately on their views on giving and receiving.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The three research questions of this study are: (a) What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy? (b) What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy? and (c) In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give? This section seeks to present the key points and draw conclusions about the giving behavior of urban and suburban Native Americans in the greater Austin and San Antonio areas. Suggestions for additional research are offered. The chapter is organized into four parts: (a) Review of the Problem and Rationale for the Study, (b) Discussion of the Findings, (c) Conclusions, and (d) Recommendations for Action and Future Research. The purpose and focus of this research was to inquire about the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of Native Americans living off the reservation in regards to their philanthropy.

Review of the Problem and Rationale for the Study

Very little is known about Native American philanthropy. This exploratory research was conducted to provide basic information about philanthropic patterns and motivations of Native Americans living off the reservation in the Austin and San Antonio, Texas urban and suburban areas. It is a central presumption of this thesis that American philanthropy is defined by the norms of America's dominant Euro-American culture. This study examined selected cultural and social characteristics of 22 urban Native American respondents.

It became apparent that where many Native Americans are concerned, the fundamentals of mainstream American philanthropy are not particularly

relevant. Because of cultural misunderstandings, giving in the Native American culture has been greatly overshadowed by negative stereotypes. Often members of the Native American community are seen as takers rather than givers. An explanation for this may be as simple as a lack of monetary assets (many urban Native Americans struggle to earn adequate income) or as complex as Native traditions that obstruct the group's ability to engage in long-term, collective activities. The rationale for the study was to provide valuable insight into patterns of urban Native American philanthropic behavior. Philanthropy in the Native community is about sharing and honoring that which is uniquely Native American. Because this study is the first known research of its kind, the results should be regarded as a preliminary profile of urban Native American philanthropy. The results of the study suggested several important points to discuss.

Discussion of the Findings

The majority of the respondents consisted of executives/professionals and worked full-time. These respondents work in nonprofit organizations and in the private sector. One respondent is a full-time executive director in a nonprofit organization but receives no pay. The median income was $30,000; the average household income among study respondents was $49,857; the median annual household gift was to non-family members $2,000, and the mean was $3,182 or 16% of household income per year.

Native Americans from this sample usually mentioned that after their basic necessities are met, they share what they have. They give person-to-person and within their communities. One explanation for this surprisingly high 16% mean gift

of their household income may be that several of the respondents give large amounts of their household income to non-family members and their communities by supporting the cost of spiritual ceremonies, cultural events, and fundraisers. This researcher observed these attitudes and behaviors on November 3, 2001, at the 10th Annual Austin Independent School District Powwow, which is today a blend of dance, family reunion, and festival. The Native Americans saw and met the needs of others through the common practice of the blanket dances. There were individuals present who had a need; a dance was dedicated to that person, or family, and a blanket was placed in the ceremonial circle. As the drum played and dancers circled around, donors walked into the circle and placed gifts of money on the blanket. At least 30 recipients were observed being honored with a blanket dance.

The respondents in this study had a wide range of occupations and incomes. Regarding work, or employment, most of the respondents worked full-time; one was self-employed and received a pension; some were students; one was retired with a pension; some were involved in full-time household duties as housewives and mothers; and some were unemployed. Because of the small percentage of those who were not employed (2 out 22 respondents), no comparisons were made to test for differences between those who were and were not employed.

According to the literature on charitable giving and volunteering in America (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999), the higher the level of education, the greater the contributions. The respondents in this sample had a very high level of

education. Almost all had some level of college or university education. The overall percentage of contributions they made relative to their incomes was much higher than that of the general population. Tiehen and Andreoni (1993) presented an overview of the philanthropic behavior of women in which they compared data from the 1990 Independent Sector/Gallup Organization's survey of female and male donors. The researchers noted that the higher the level of education, the greater the contributions. Female decision-makers gave about 2.7% of their income to charity. In the Tonai (1988) study of Asian American charitable giving, respondents donated 2.7% of their household income to charity and 1.6% of their household income to Asian nonprofit agencies.

As previously noted in the literature on age-related giving, the age range with the highest level of giving is between 45 and 54 years (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1999). Similar findings are reported by Tiehen and Andreoni (1993), who go on to state that giving appeared to decrease for women ages 55 to 64 years and increase again for women over 65 years of age. In comparison, the majority of respondents in this present study were between 46 and 60 years old.

The respondents in this sample were more educated, slightly older, and had slightly less annual household income than the general population. According to Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999), the average charitable donation for the population in general is $1,075, or 2.1% of average household income ($50,483).

The researcher began this exploratory study by asking the first question, "What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy?" Themes

emerged from responses to the open-ended questions in the interviews (see Appendix B: Questions & Protocol). The three principal attitudes identified for giving and volunteering were (a) giving is very important; (b) reciprocity is both giving and receiving (the idea is to pass it on); and (c) Native Americans had a strong desire to contribute to the Native American community. Many respondents answered that giving and volunteering was a way of life, not a forced activity or something one does when one gets a charitable impulse. In Native American cultures the concept of "passing it on" means it is the responsibility of the receiver to pass it on, and not just to receive it without any regard for passing it on. Sometimes it is the same 20 bucks, but it just goes round and round. Most answered that they were raised in communities that gave generously, regardless of levels of income, and that the giving included money, goods, and services. Most of the respondents are very involved in their communities through family, friends, other tribal members, and intertribal networks or pan-Indian causes.

These beliefs guided Native American lives, building a spirituality that leads to interconnectedness. Their care for each other and for all around them was evident in the smallest aspect of their lives, right down to the simple gesture of "gifting." To an Indian, gifting means a lot. A gift can be as simple as a small bundle of sage or tobacco or as generous as a person's entire belongings. The researcher specifically observed these attitudes and behaviors during the opening ceremony of the Four Directions Conference on October 19-21, 2001, just outside of Austin. Native American elders were shown substantial respect. When one wants to learn about something special or to ask them for help, one

presents them with a gift prior to asking in acknowledgement of who they are. The coordinator of the conference and her husband presented the oldest elder with a gift of tobacco to officially open the conference. Tobacco is a very sacred herb in the Native community; he accepted the tobacco and then opened the conference with a prayer. When a Native American feels the desire to present a gift, he or she does so without hesitation. Throughout the conference this researcher observed as people gave each other gifts of feathers, jewelry, bags, and crafts. Everyone was encouraged by the conference coordinators to stay until the end of the conference and share food and a giveaway. This would honor those attending the conference and those who had volunteered to organize it. This study found that Native Americans practice much informal giving within family and intertribal communities and created their own giving structures and practices. This coincides with philanthropic activities of individuals from various ethnic communities in the Smith et al. (1999) study.

The researcher posed a second research question, "What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy?" The themes that emerged from the responses to the open-ended questions (see Appendix B: *Questions & Protocol*) were three principal motivations for giving and volunteering: (a) giving to people in need; (b) giving to organizations that help the elderly and children; and (c) continuing the family practices of giving and volunteering. Many respondents answered that they usually give person-to-person to those in need. Because the elders and children are considered the most precious possession, they want to give to organizations whose mission

statements reflect these values or whose mission is to primarily serve the disadvantaged. Many respondents expressed distrust for large charities and most said they were skeptical of the ability of mainstream organizations to understand their interests, therefore they make limited use of these resources. Native Americans view giving as a personal commitment of time and resources to support causes and programs as a way of continuing family practices of giving. For respondents in this study, tax considerations and deductions were not motivators for charitable giving. Berry et al. (1999) asserts this is true, even for affluent Native Americans, many of whom are not aware of the positive financial aspects of the tax deductions for charitable donations. Most respondents said it was very important to them to maintain the knowledge of giving, participating, and cooperating that they had learned from their families.

The researcher asked a third research question, "In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give?" The respondents were asked, "What percent of your household income do you give to non-family members and organizations?" The mean was 18% of household income. This is slightly higher than the 16% mean when asked in regards to non-family members. This may indicate that the other 2% was for organization. But this is significantly higher than the Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) study finding of 2.5%. One explanation could be that none of the respondents gave less than 5.5% and most of the respondents (82%) gave between 10% and 50% of their household income. In addition, more than half of the respondents hold positions of leadership within their spiritual groups and communities and therefore have a

responsibility to give more. Most respondents had no problem with giving at least 10%. This seems to correlate with a traditional 10% or "tithe" for charity. The general population in America, according to Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999), are among the most generous in the world but still fall well below the traditional 10% "tithe" for charity recommended by churches.

The respondents were asked, "How many hours per month do you give to those in need?" The mean was 87 hours per month; this was significantly higher than the Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1999) study results, which found an average of 16 hours per month. A reasonable explanation may be that most of the respondents (95%) volunteer 20 to 190 hours per month, two of the respondents volunteer full-time, and two respondents are unemployed and volunteer half-time. In addition, those in leadership positions do what is good for others at the sacrifice of individual goals and objectives; this means giving time and other gifts. Most Native Americans do not see giving time as volunteering. "I'm always a little startled when people describe me as a volunteer. I never see that as volunteerism; I see it as what one just does" (Mankiller [Cherokee] cited in Wells [1999]).

A theme emerged from the responses to the open-ended question, "Other than time and money what other gifts do you give?" The array of answers (see Table 25) indicate that the respondents practice various forms of giving, from food, rituals, and religious ceremonies to songs, rides, and car parts. Institutional philanthropy, as defined in Euro-American terms, reflects only part of the circle of giving among Native Americans; the giving and receiving of gifts completes the

circle. Gifts are not just money or time but also in-kind donations of goods or items, prayers, songs, and dance. The researcher observed this on November 9 through 11, 2001, at the Native Women's Gathering just outside of Austin, Texas. The weekend was a time of giving spiritual gifts: the gifts of sharing wisdom, sharing knowledge, supporting each other, sharing stories, and praying together in ceremony for Mother Earth, all children, the elders, peace, and all the men.

For most of the respondents it is not new to share and exchange; it is new to institutionalize and standardize these activities. To Native Americans, philanthropy is a tradition of honor, sharing and giving back to the individuals, institutions, and organizations that have been instrumental in their survival and in maintaining their culture.

Conclusions

This chapter reviewed the three research questions and the results as they emerged: (a) What are the attitudes of Native Americans toward philanthropy? (b) What specific behaviors of Native Americans support their philanthropy? and (c) In terms of money, time, and other gifts, how much do Native Americans give?

Fundraisers have recently begun to recognize that minority philanthropists have different concerns than the "traditional" philanthropists with regard to charitable giving and volunteering. Likewise, fundraisers should be knowledgeable about the different concerns urban Native Americans have compared to other minorities. This exploratory study provides a representative sample of the attitudes and behaviors of urban Native American philanthropy.

This researcher concluded that, although Native American philanthropic practices are similar to those of other minority groups in their giving and volunteering attitudes and behaviors, urban Native Americans have specific interests regarding the types of people, institutions, and organizations they prefer to support. The Native Americans in this study were oriented toward giving to family members, friends, and individual community members in need. They also gave to their own tribal group, as well as intertribal networks, and pan-Indian causes. Their gifts are often unplanned, unrecognized, and anonymous, offered without records or fanfare. Native Americans do not always think of these behaviors as acts of "philanthropy"; they are just the norm for daily behavior.

The results point to the importance of considering specific aspects of Native American giving and volunteering. Native Americans have not been solicited to participate in the philanthropic process in the United States; very often they are treated as recipients of philanthropy rather than as givers. Native American traditions of giving and sharing and community are truly philanthropic (Adamson, 2000). If researchers are to understand the factors and motivators that drive philanthropic behaviors across all cultures, Native American cultural giving practices offer clear insights into their generous nature. Wells (1999) quoted Norbert Hill of the Oneida Nation: "Throughout the country, I find Indian people very generous.... It's not just generosity with things, it's generosity of spirit" (p. 18). There are two key factors concerning giving and receiving: neither the feeling (the honor) that accompanies the gift for both the recipient and giver nor the sacrifice is meant in a negative sense, but rather it is an honor to give up

something for another (Wells, 1999). Native Americans do not need to be taught how to give. Native traditions of philanthropy may look a little different from those practiced by professional fundraisers, but they are woven into the fabric of Native American cultures.

It is the hope of this researcher that findings from the present study of urban Native Americans will provide basic information about Native American philanthropy and help increase their visibility of Native Americans.

Recommendations for Action and Future Research

Possible Actions to be Considered

1. Culture plays an important role in Native American philanthropy. Native Americans need to be approached differently in regard to philanthropy. Building relationships before soliciting funds is essential. This means making an effort to build personal relationships with individuals. The actual request for money should be relatively low-key, as should any donor recognition.

2. Humility is respected. Making a Native American population aware of a need is very nearly the equivalent of asking for a donation. Native populations require a clear connection of their giving to the need of individual lives, or to members of the community.

3. Interaction with Native American groups can provide opportunities and resources other than money for those willing to go beyond mainstream traditional fundraising practices. Philanthropy in the broadest sense means gifts of time, talent, and other material resources.

Possible Future Research

Of the various possible research designs, here are three that could prove most meaningful:

1. Future research could compare the philanthropic attitudes and behaviors of Native Americans living on the reservation to those of Native Americans living off the reservation.

2. Another possibility could be to compare Native American giving to that of other minority groups.

3. Native American giving and volunteering could be compared to that of the general population.

REFERENCES

Abbe, M. A. (2000, July/August). The roots of minority giving: Understand the philanthropic traditions of different cultures to solicit them more effectively. Retrieved April 6, 2001, http:www.case.org/currents/2000/july_august/abbe.htm.

Acton, W. R., & Walker, D. J. (1986). Acculturation and mind. In J. M. Valdez (Ed.), Cultural bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching (pp. 20-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Adamson, R. (1999, Fall/Winter). A river so wide: Native American philanthropy enters a new era. Indian Giver, *6*(1), 11-15.

Adamson, R. (1999, Spring). A river so wide: Considering the limits on Native American use of formal philanthropy. Indian Giver, *5*(3), 7-9.

Adamson, R. (1999, Summer). A river so wide: considering the options of Native American formal philanthropy. Indian Giver, *5*(4), 4-10.

Adamson, R. (2000, Winter/Spring). A river so wide: American Indian philanthropy gathers momentum. Indian Giver, *6*(1), 4-6.

Aguilar, J. (1981). Insider research: An ethnography of a debate. In D. Messerschmidt (Ed.), Anthropologist at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society (pp. 15-28). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beswick, R. (1990). Racism in American's schools (Series No EA 49 ed.). Eugene, OR: ERIC Digest.

Blackman, M. B. (1986). During my time: Florence Edenshaw Davidson, a Haida woman. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (2nd ed.). Boston: Boston and Bacon.

Bogden, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Boston and Bacon.

Brave Bird, M. & Erdoes, R. (1993). Ohitika woman. New York: Grove Press.

Bremner, R. H. (1988). American Philanthropy. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bureau of the Census (1992). Bureau of census report. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Campoamor, D. Diaz, W. A., & Ramos, H. A. (1999). Emerging philanthropy in communities of color: A report on current trends. Retrieved April 25, 2001, http://www.wkkf.org/wkkf-oldsite/Publications/EFCC.default.htm.

Carr, G. (1996, March/April). Urban Indians: The invisible minority. Poverty & Race, 5(2), 2,6-7.

Carson, E. D. (1991). Contemporary trends in black philanthropy: Challenging the myths. In D. F. Burlingame, & L. J. Halse (Eds.), Taking fund raising seriously: Advancing the profession and practice of raising money (pp. 219-238). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cornell, S. (1987, May). American Indians, American dreams, and the meaning of success. Retrieved January 11, 2001, http://www.ntda.rockyboy.org/members/predoc30.htm.

Cortés, M. (1995). Three strategic questions about Latino philanthropy. In W. Ilchman, & C. Hamilton (Eds.), New directions for philanthropic fundraising (pp. 23-40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P. (1988). Adults as learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dawson, T. E. (1996). Review and synthesis of acculturation literature: A move toward education and amelioration. New Orleans: Paper presented at annual meeting of the Southwest Education Research Association.

De la Garza, R. O., Kruszewski, Z. A., & Arciniega, T. A. (1973). Introduction. In R. O. De la Garza, Z. A. Kruszewski, & T. A. Arciniega (Eds.), Chicanos and Native Americans: The territorial minorities (pp. 1-6). Edglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Deloria, V. (1970). Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto. New York: Avon.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive interactionism. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dexter, L. A. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Dobyns, H. F. (1983). Their numbers become thinned: Native American population dynamic in eastern North American. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Ewen, A. & Wollock, J. (1996). *Survey of grant giving by American Indian foundation and organizations*. Lumberton, NC: Native Americans in Philanthropy.

Falicov, C. J. (1982). Ethnicity and family therapy. In M. McGoldrick, & J. K. Pearce (Eds.), Mexican families (pp. 134-161). New York: Guilford Press.

First Nations Development Institute (1999-2001, Winter/Spring/Summer/-Fall). Indian Giver.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Harper Collins.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Giorgi, A. (1985). Phenomenology and psychological research. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Glaser, R. G., & Strauss, A. I. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glazier, S. (1997). Random house word menu. New York: Random House.

Glesne, B. G., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. London: Longman.

Grim, J. A. (1998). A comparative study in Native American philanthropy. In W. F. Ilchman, S. N. Katz, & E. L. Queen II (Eds.), Philanthropy in the world's traditions (pp. 25-56). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gutierrez, R. A. (1995). Historical and social science on Mexican-Americans. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. McGee-Banks (Eds.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 203-222). New York: Simon & Schouster.

Haddox, J. H. (1973). American Indian values. In R. O. Del la Garza, Z. A. Kruszewski, & T. A. Arciniega (Eds.), Chicanos and Native Americans (pp. 61-77). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Herzog, B. C. (1988). Cortez and the conquest of Mexico by Spaniards in 1521: Being the eyewitness narrative of Bernal Diaz del Castillo. North Haven, CT: Shoe String Press.

Hodgkinson, H. (1992, September). The current condition of Native Americans. Retrieved May 9, 2001, http://www.nativechild.com/test.html.

Hodgkinson, V. A., & Weitzman, M. S. (1986). The charitable behavior of Americans: A national survey. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hodgkinson, V. A., & Weitzman, M. S. (1999). Giving and volunteering: In the United States findings from a national survey. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hodgkinson, V. A., & Witzman, M. S. (1994). Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hoebel, E. A. (1960). The Cheyennes: Indians of the Great Plains. New York: Rhinehart and Winston.

Hyde, L. (1983). The gift: Imagination and the erotic life of property. New York: Vintage Books.

Joseph, J. A. (1995). Remaking America: How the benevolent traditions of many cultures are transforming our national life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keen, R. H. (1964, November/ December). Dakota patterns of giving. Practical Anthropology, (1954-1972), 273-276.

La Vere, D. (1993, Fall). Friendly persuasions: Gifts and reciprocity in Comanche-Euroamerican relation. The Chronicles of Oklahoma, *71,* 322-337.

Lazarus, E. (1991). Black Hills white justice: The Sioux Nation versus the United States 1775 to the present. New York: HarperCollins.

Lee, R. (1990). Guide to Chinese American philanthropy and charitable giving patterns. San Rafael, CA: Pathway Press.

Levey, B. R., & Cherry, R. L. (1996). The national society of fund raising executives: Fund-raising dictionary. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lonner, W. J., & Berry, J. W. (1986). Field methods in cross-cultural research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McLuhan, T. C. (1971). Touch the earth: a self-portrait of Indian existence. New York: Dutton and Company.

Mellon, C. A. (1990). Naturalistic inquiry for library science: Methods and applications for research, evaluation, and teaching. New York: Greenwood.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mish, F. C. (1989). Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary. Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

Morgan, G. & Smircich, L. (1980). The case for qualitative research. Academy of Management Review, *5,* 491-500.

Muller, H. J. (1998, April). American Indian women managers: Living in two worlds. Retrieved January 25, 2001, http://www.umn.edu/~hmuller/living.htm.

Native American Rights Fund (1995). Twenty-fifth anniversary report. Boulder, CO: Native American Right Fund.

Native American Rights Fund (1996, Fall). See generally. Justice Newsletter.

Native American Rights Fund (2000). Answers to frequently asked questions about Native Peoples. Retrieved April 4, 2001, http://www.narf.org/pubs/faqs.html.

Odendahl, T. (1990). Charity begins at home: Generosity and self interest among the philanthropic elite. New York: Basic Books.

Paisano, E. L. (1993, September). We the first Americans. Retrieved May 12, 2001, http://www.census.gov/apsd/wepeople/we-5.pdf.

Pasquaretta, P. (1994, Summer). On the Indianess of bingo: Gambling and the Native American community. Critical Inquiry, *20*(4), 694, 707-708.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Raff, T. (1999). Create your own Native American board game: K-5 U.S. history. Retrieved April 2, 2001, http://school.discovery.com/lessonplans/-program/nativeamericans/.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tiehen, L. & Andreoni, J. (1993). A charity of one's own: A national profile of women as philanthropic decision makers.. In A. Thompson, & A. Kaminski (Eds.), Women and philanthropy a national agenda (pp. 40, 43, 44). Madison, WI: Center for Women and Philanthropy, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Rendon, E. (1999). Main factors that influence the attainment of the doctoral degree by Mexican-Americans (Dissertation ed.). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.

Rose, S. R. (1998). A study of Lesbian philanthropy: Charitable giving patterns. San Francisco: University of San Francisco.

Sahlins, M. D. (1965). On the Sociology of primitive exchange. In M. Banton (Ed.), The relevance of models for Social Anthropology (pp. 139-236). London: Tavistock Publications.

Salway Black, S. (2001). Native American philanthropy. In P. C. Rogers (Ed.), Philanthropy in communities of color: Traditions and challenges (pp. 41-56). Indianapolis, IN: ARNOVA.

Salway Black, S. Chao, J. Collier-Thomas, B. Conley, D. Cortés, M. & Rogers Ed., P. C. (2001). Philanthropy in communities of color: Traditions and challenges. Indianapolis, IN: ARNOVA.

Shaw, S. C., & Taylor, M. A. (1995). Reinventing fundraising: Realizing the potential of women's philanthropy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Simeone, W. E. (1995). Rifles, Blankets & Beads: Identity, History and the Northern Athapascan Potlatch. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Smith, B. Shue, S. Vest, J. L., & Villarreal, J. (1999). Philanthropy in communities of color. Bloomington, IL: Indiana University Press.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1990). The American cultural dialogue and its transmission. New York: Falmer Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston .

Stake, R. E. (1991). Retrospective on "the countenance of educational evaluation." In M. W. McLaughlin, & D. C. Phillips (Eds.), Evaluation and educating: At quarter century (pp. 67-88). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stones, C. R. (1981). Phenomenological psychology research: Toward a phenomenological praxis. In D. Kruger (Ed.), An introduction to phenomenological psychology (pp. 13-124). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newberry Park, CA: Sage

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School (1996). Statutes of the United States Concerning Native Americans: Chronological . Retrieved August 8, 2001, http://www.yale,edu/lawweb/avalon/statues...

Thorpe, D. (1989, Autumn). Looking to philanthropy though Native American eyes. The Journal, 17-20.

Thorpe, D. (1997, July/August). A Native American's view of philanthropy. Foundation News and Commentary, *38*(4), 41-42.

Tonai, R. M. (1988). Asian American charitable giving: Unpublished master's thesis, University of San Francisco, San Francisco.

U.S. Census Bureau (1998, October 26). American Indian Heritage Month: November 1-30. Retrieved May 9, 2001, http://www.census.gov/Press-release/cb98ff13.html

United Way of Alexandria (1995). United Way of America public opinion poll: Findings among African American and Hispanic respondents. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America.

USA Today (1994, April 28). A look at Native American across the USA. USA Today, (6A).

Van Biema, D. (1995, September 18). Bury my heart in committee. In Time, 48-51.

Vogt, W. P. (1999). Dictionary of statistics and methodology (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wasow, M. (1999). Charitable giving by people of color: African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans. Giving USA Update, (2), 1-13.

Weist, K. M. (1973, May). Giving away: The ceremonial distribution of goods among the Northern Cheyenne of southeastern Montana. Plains Anthropologist: Journal of the Plains Conference, *18*(60), 97-103.

Wells, R. A. (1999). The honor of giving: Philanthropy in Native America. Indianapolis: The Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.

Yankelovich, D. Skelly, J. & White, A. (1985). Charitable behavior of Americans. Washington, DC: Rockfeller Brothers Fund. Grobsmith, E. S. (1981). The changing role of the giveaway ceremony in contemporary Lakota life. Plains Anthropologist: Journal of the Plains Conference, *26*, 75-79.

Appendix A: Demographics

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Selected Demographics (N = 22)

Variable	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	11	50%
Female	11	50
Current Age (in years)		
30-35	2	9
36-40	3	14
41-45	3	14
46-50	4	18
51-55	6	27
56-60	3	14
Marital Status		
Married	17	77
Single	3	14
Divorced	2	9
Educational level		
Completed High School	2	9
Completed 2-4 years college	7	32
Bachelors Degree	7	32

Table 1, continued
Descriptive Statistics for Selected Demographics (N = 22)

Variable	Number	Percent
Masters Degree	5	23
Ph.D.	2	9
Annual Household income		
$10,000 - $17,000	1	5
$11,000 - $25,000	6	27
$26,000 - $50,000	8	36
$51,000 - $75,000	1	5
$76,000 - $100,000	1	5
$101,000 - $125,000	3	14
Unknown	1	5
Occupation		
Executive/Professional/Mgmt.	10	45
Artist	3	14
Student	2	9
Sales/Service/Clerk	1	5
Unemployed	2	9
Laborer	1	5
Housewife/Mother	1	5
Retired	1	5
Self-employed	1	5

Table 1, continued
Descriptive Statistics for Selected Demographics (N = 22)

Variable	Number	Percent
Religion		
Yes (Organized) church	5	23
Yes (Native American) church	6	27
No	2	9
Native Spirituality or practice	15	68
Community Involvement		
Very involved	18	82
Somewhat involved	4	18

Note. Source: Native American Interview Questions and Protocol

Appendix B: Respondents' Interview Questions and Protocol

Today is _____ , 2001 I am with respondent _____

_____. My name is Concepción Guerrero, a graduate student in the College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California. Thank you for sharing your time with me.

For the record, do I have your permission to tape record this interview?

1. _____ I have three initial questions:
    a. Do you categorize yourself as a Native American?

       IF NO: End interview.

    b. Do you live off the reservation?

       IF NO: End interview.

    c. Are you active in the Native American community?
2. What is your full name.
3. _____, my research is entitled:

NATIVE AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY: THE GIVING AND VOUNTEERING IN THE NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The main focus of this research will be your thoughts, feelings and experiences with regards to Native American philanthropy? Therefore I have structured these interviews in to four sections.

a. Demographics
b. Attitudes toward philanthropy
c. Family practices and specific behaviors with regard to philanthropy.

d. Philanthropic activities

4. When: Time: Where

Category of Inquiry # 1-- Demographic Data

1. What is your Gender_____
2. What is your Age____
3. 3. What is your Marital Status _____
4. How many children do you have? _____
5. Where are you from originally?_____
6. What is your level of education: highest grade completed _____

   reservation school or non reservation school (circle)?
7. What is your Tribe_____ 8. Clan_____
9. Do you go to church or are you affiliated with any religion or spiritual

   community?_____

   Please explain.
10. Are you a citizen of the U.S.? ____ or what status _____
11. How long in U.S. _____
12. Were you born on the reservation? _____
13. What is the Reservation name? _____
14. Did you grow up on the reservation? _____
15. Did you grow up in an urban area? _____ Where? _____
16. How do you remain active in the Native Community?

17. Do you keep in contact with your tribal community? _____

18. Language _____ , Other(s)_____, (Bi-,Tri-, Multilingual)

19. Occupation _____

20. Who lives with you? _____

_____

21. Do you support anyone other than the spouse, and children? Yes/No, Why?

22. Do you support extended family _____ Who are "those people"?_____

23. "What will be your total household income for the year 2001?" _____

24. Describe the neighborhood you live in.

25. Address: or Street coordinates _____

26. Phone: _____ Email:_____

Do you feel it is important to give time/money to help the less fortunate, or to aid the community?

CATEGORY OF INQUIRY #2 Attitudes, of Native Americans toward philanthropy.

1. As a Native American what are your views of giving and receiving?
2. What habits of giving do you believe are universal to all Native American tribes native to North American continent?
3. What various forms of giving do Native Americans that you know practice?
4. What is the governing principle that you see among Native Americans in reciprocity and giving?
5. What are your giving preferences as a Native American donor?

6. What fundraising strategies and messages are most effective in (and unique to) the Native community?

7. [What are your motivations when you give?] Why do you give (or not give) money? Why do you volunteer (or not volunteer) your time?

8. What do you see as a Native American that is different from the dominant culture in the way of giving?

9. Who do you believe should be taking care of the needy, and poor?

10. Please describe worthwhile causes you would give to.

11. Can Native values toward giving be extended outside of the Indian community? How ?

CATEGORY OF INQUIRY # 3—Family practices and specific philanthropic behaviors of Native Americans?

1. To whom do you give?

2. "What did your family practice in the way of volunteering time and giving money?"

3. Which practices do you continue to follow?

4. Will you continue to practice culture type giving and teach them to your children and others? (If yes) How will you do this?

5. If a family or extended family member is in need, how do you respond?

6. "How much money did you give to non-family members last year?"

7. Do you now, or have you ever done volunteer work? (if yes) For what organizations and for how long?

8. When you contribute money or give time, how often and under what circumstances?

9. What are all the types of giving that you do?

10. What kinds of organizations would you consider giving either time or money to?

CATEGORY OF INQUIRY # 4—Total philanthropic activities in terms of money, time and other gifts?

1. What percent of your household income goes to contributions?
2. How many hours per month do you give to those in need?
3. Other than time and money what other gifts do you give?
4. WHAT ARE ANY OTHER ISSUES OR TOPICS THAT YOU WANT TO TALK ABOUT?

Appendix C: Sample Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Purpose and Background

Ms. Concepción Guerrero, a graduate student in the College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco is doing a study on Native American philanthropy in the Austin, Texas urban and sub-urban area and active in the Native American community. The researcher is interested in investigating those personal factors, if any that may be conducive to my own formal and informal philanthropic practices in the Native American community.

I am being asked to participate because I am Native American and active in the Native community.

Procedures

If I agree to be a participant in this study, the following will happen:

1. I will complete a short questionnaire giving basic information about me, including age, gender, race, and religion.
2. I will participate in an interview with a research assistant, during which I will be asked about my thoughts, feelings and experiences with regards to Native American philanthropy.

I will complete the survey and participate in the interview at a location agreeable to both the researcher and myself.

Risk and/or Discomforts

1. It is possible that some of the questions in the personal interview may make me feel uncomfortable, but I am free to decline to answer any questions I do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time.
2. Participation in research may mean a loss of confidentiality. Study records will be kept as confidential as is possible. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in locked file cabinets at all times. Only the researcher will have access to the files.
3. Because the time required for my participation may be up to 2 hours, I may become tired or bored.

Benefits

There will be no direct benefit to me from participating in this study. The anticipated benefit of this study is a better understanding of the thoughts, feelings and experiences of present and future Native donors.

Cost/ Financial Consideration

No expenses, what so ever, will be incurred by me for my participation in this study.

Payment/Reimbursement

I will receive no payment for my participation.

Questions

I have talked to Ms. Guerrero about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about the study, I may call her at (512) 478-6865 or Dr. Brad Smith at (510) 524-1938.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with the researcher. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact IRBHPS, which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBHPS office by calling (415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by emailing IRBHPS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBHPS, Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been given a copy of the "Research Subject's Bill of Rights" and I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

I understand that my PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or withdraw from it at anytime. My decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on my present or future status as a student or employee at USF.

My signature below indicates that I agree to participate in this study.

_____

Subject's Signature Date of Signature

_____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent Date of Signature

Appendix D: Sample Cover Letter

October 11, 2001

Name
Address

Dear_____,

My name is Concepción Guerrero, and I am a graduate student in the College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco. I am doing a study on Native American philanthropy in the Austin, Texas urban and suburban areas. I am interested in investigating those personal factors, if any, that may be beneficial to formal and informal philanthropic practices in the Native American community. You recently expressed interest in participating in my research.

You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a Native American in the Austin, Texas urban or suburban area. I obtained your name from your response to an invitation sent to various Native American groups and community members inviting Native Americans to participate. If you would like to be in this study, please complete the attached informed consent form, and then return the form in the enclosed pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelope to me and keep this letter as your copy of the consent form.

It is possible that some of the questions on the survey may make you feel uncomfortable, but you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time. The interviews will not be anonymous; I will know that you were asked to participate in the research because I sent you this letter and will conduct the face-to-face interviews. Participation in research may mean a loss of confidentiality. Study records will be kept as confidential as is possible. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in locked files at all times. Only study personnel will have access to the files. Individual results will not be shared with anyone.

While there will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study, the anticipated benefit of this study is a better understanding of the thoughts, feelings and experiences of present and future Native American donors.

There will be no cost to you as a result of taking part in this study, nor will you be paid for your participation.

If you have questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at (512) 478-6865. If you have further questions about the study, you may contact the IRBPHS at the University of San Francisco, which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the IRBPHS office by calling

(415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by e-mailing IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point.

Thank you for your attention. If you agree to participate, please sign the attached consent form and return it to me in the enclosed pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Concepción Guerrero

Graduate Student
University of San Francisco

Appendix E: Field Notes

In order to better understand and to gain insight into Native American philanthropy, this researcher attended three events: (a) Four Directions Conference, (b) 10th Annual Austin Independent School District (ISD) Powwow and American Indian Heritage Festival, and (c) Native Women's Gathering. The Four Directions Conference is dedicated to bringing elders together from the four directions of the Earth and to promote global and racial healing. The conference receives funding from many individual sponsors, volunteers and a registration fee. The Native American Parent Committee of the Austin ISD and its support group, First Americans of Central Texas, put the 10th Annual Austin Independent School District Powwow and American Indian Heritage Festival together and charge no admissions fee. There is a long list of individuals and companies who make substantial contributions, including the city of Austin; also there are T-shirt sales, raffles, food and crafts booths. Proceeds from this day fund American Indian education, cultural programs, and scholarships for area schoolchildren. The Native Women's Gathering is a time of sharing wisdom, sharing knowledge, supporting each other, sharing stories, and praying together for the children and the men and ceremonies.

Event #1: Four Directions Conference

Date: October 19-21, 2001

Times: Arrived at 5:00pm Friday and left at 6:00pm Sunday

Place: Ranch just outside of Austin, TX

Guests of Honor: the 40 elders of all four directions of the Mother Earth.

Friday, October 19.

Friday evening, I arrived at the Ranch around 5:00 pm and drove to the main house. There were several elders there, and I introduced myself and asked where to leave my food offering. (When there is a gathering or ceremony, Indians always bring food.) I met the kitchen crew as well as the people working with registration and coordination for the conference. Among all the new faces, there were also some that I already knew. The coordinator and I had spoken on the phone several times in the past year, and I knew two of the women volunteers are both sun dancers. The main coordinators, husband and wife, told us where we could camp and that dinner would be at about 6:30. As we signed in for the conference, I explained that the rest of the dance group would not be there until Saturday. Everyone was very happy that the Aztec group would be there to dance. I was told to camp out in any area that looked comfortable. The grounds were spacious and there were buffalos and lots of trees everywhere. I chose a spot near many trees, a good place for several tents to be pitched for us and the other dancers. After pitching the two tents we brought, we put our camping supplies away.

At dinner, one of the sun dancers presented a spirit plate and the food was blessed. We had the meal at about 6:45 pm and the ceremony started about 8:30 pm. Dinner was lamb, accompanied by different salads, fruits and other delicious side dishes. Elders from all over the country had come, and we met several people sitting at our table. I noticed several of the conference volunteers and helpers exchange gifts of jewelry with each other.

During dinner, I also met the media coordinator; she was in charge of the videotaping and helping keep things on schedule. She explained what some of the activities would be and told me that we would dance on Saturday night at 8 pm. She said they were thrilled to have us there; the coordinators and the Maestro (an elder from the South from Mexico City) were very happy that we would be dancing.

After dinner we went back to our camp, and several folks came by to welcome us and make sure were settled in. I wanted to become familiar with the area where we would be dancing so I could explain it to the rest of the group when they arrived. I was given some information including that we would be dancing outdoors and the location of the bathing area and the sanitary facilities.

The conference was under a tent with Indian blankets over bales of hay for seats. As I got to the tent, the coordinator told me that council wanted to honor me as an elder and Peace Maker and asked if that was okay. It was and I was asked to give my information to the person collecting it in front of the tent.

The mistress of ceremony started the ceremony with an honoring song for the Great Spirit to join us and be with us through the third and final year of this ceremony and blessings for genetic healing for 1000 years back and forward. She thanked all of the helpers and volunteers.

Everyone should always be approached with respect; as Indians we especially respect our elders. When we want to learn about something special or ask them for help, we present them with a gift—prior to asking—in acknowledgement of who and what they are. Depending upon the request and

the impact it has on or in our lives, we may present them with another gift before we part. If, due to unforeseen circumstances, this is not possible, we would see that the elder would receive a suitable gift as soon as possible after the request has been granted. This is the way we do it—the good way.

The coordinator of the conference offered the oldest elder a gift of tobacco to officially open the ceremony. Tobacco is a very sacred herb in the Native community, and he accepted the gift and the opened the ceremony.

As the first speaker, Maestro offered a prayer for the homeless, those at war, those in need, and the souls of tragedy. Peace is possible. He spoke a blessing for those elders and helpers who started this gathering and all the newcomers. He spoke of Indigenous traditions and interconnectedness to all things and about the elders' importance in the community as grandfathers. "We elders want something for all but for ourselves we want nothing. Ometeo."

The second speaker said this is "the third or fourth time I have been to this conference. We are all family. Especially honoring and thanking the two women one had as a gift to the elders designed the Peacemaker sashes and the conference gift bag. The sash is lavender with dark purple and reads Peace Maker. Each elder was honored with the presentation of the sash and purple and lavender gift bag reads Dream, Believe, Imagine, Hope, Love.

The third speaker was an elder; she spoke of Spirit vision during surgery earlier this year. She spoke about how, even though she was still recovering from it, it was important to her to attend the conference.

A grandfather from England, a Druid Shaman, was the fourth speaker. He talked about the powerful statement that was made at the conference by prayers for healing, individuals, our planet, and Power and the use of it. The first year there were many elders who came. If Creator speaks to us, we have to honor it. Because the sacred hoop was broken last year, he brought a sacred wand to replace the symbol this year. "Getting it here was no problem, even so soon after September 11th. I never had to explain it; every time someone questioned the wand, someone with authority at the checkpoints stepped forward and said 'that is a religious artifact.' It will be here tomorrow to stay on the site. The wand is a sacred object and is for healing."

Chief and his wife were the fifth and sixth speakers. He spoke first, Aho Mi' takuye' Oyasin, about our three choices. We can (a) discount everything, (b) believe everything, or (c) take some, leave some. His wife explained that the chief was very ill and could only say a few words but that they both felt it was important to attend the conference.

Next, the mistress of ceremony and two volunteers honored the elders who were there. The elders were given their sash and gift bag and asked to give a few words. In the purple gift bag were gifts of soaps, lotions, body gel, and sage. A moment later, one of the elders gave out cloth gift bags containing fruit, candies, Tums, and other treats. Everyone was told what time the conference started the next morning and to wear their regalia. Cookies were passed out.

Saturday, October 20.

Breakfast was at 8 am, and the conference started at 10 am. I spoke with our dance leader and found out that the group would arrive at around 6 pm.

The conference started with songs and prayers; the coordinators—husband, wife and son—welcomed everyone. More elders were honored and presented with sashes and bags.

Elders spoke about power, healing, and equality between men and women. He mentioned things like power being the creation of beauty, people eating, people cutting grass (which had be done for the conference), ditches were dug and cooking. A visitor from Fiji arrived as well as an Elder from Africa, an Efi African Traditional High Priest.

Lunch was once again a great meal, and all of the elders were served at a separate place of honor.

At 2:00 pm, shortly after lunch, they had a women's circle, and everyone passed the talking feather. The first women said that women have been given the gift of sharing, joy, song and emotional experiences. The talking feather went around the circle and each woman shared what she felt being there. The men were allowed in the tent to support the women, but they could not sit in the circle or speak. At 4:30 we took a twenty-minute break for fruit, cookies and drinks. After the snack break, more elders spoke.

We broke for dinner around 5:30. The meal was wonderful: lots of food and fry bread. We returned to the conference at about 6:30 pm, and I decided to go and wait for the rest of the dancers. They arrived about fifteen minutes later; I showed them where to camp and told them that we would be dancing at 8:00

They pitched the tent, built a fire to prepare the drum, and we dressed in our regalia to get ready to dance.

We danced until about 8:30, and everyone seemed to love the dancing. In the middle of the dancing, one of the coordinators told us that they were putting down a blanket and asking people to honor us with monetary gifts. The blanket dance is a common practice at powwows and other Native American functions. If someone or an organization has a need, a dance is dedicated to them and a blanket is placed in the ceremonial circle. As the drum plays and dancers circle around, donors walk into the circle and place gifts of money on the blanket. We finished dancing, and the coordinator collected the blanket and gave us the money. We prayed and thanked the creator for being able to give our danza as a gift to the conference. Our group decided that, if the committee wanted us to, we would be honored to dance the next day. The elders would meet the next day, and the coordinator said she would let us know their decision. She thanked us, and said everyone was moved spiritually by our dance and they were all so grateful for our blessing.

The group decided that rather than split the money we would use it to buy items the group could use like leg wrappings, and rattles.

Sunday, October 21.

Our group saluted the four directions and blew the conch for sunrise. Breakfast was at 8:30 am, and there we were asked if we would dance and assist Maestro with the Four Colors Ceremony this afternoon.

The conference was opened in the usual way and then the elders that had not spoken spoke. Some elders spoke before lunch and the rest spoke after. Grandmother from Canada was the last elder to speak. After the speaking, we took a 30 minute break, had snacks and were told to reconvene at 4 pm.

That afternoon, we opened the Four Colors Ceremony with two dances, and then we assisted Maestro. After the end of the ceremony, the committee encouraged everyone to stay and complete the ceremony by sharing food together and participating in the giveaway. During conferences and ceremonies usually three meals a day are served, and the last meal was a big feast. The husband and wife conference coordinators had planned a giveaway, and they had blankets, T-shirts, jewelry, food, gift soaps, candles, and feathers for it. The Maestro gave a book, several necklaces and a special feather to our dance teacher. As a feather that had been prayed over at many gatherings around the world, it had a lot of prayer energy. By the end, everyone was given something.

There were many volunteers at the conference and even before the big giveaway, I had witnessed many different forms and examples of gift giving. One elder gave semiprecious stones and beads to folks at our table during meals. He said that he always gave gifts of stones, and now people knew that he liked to do this so they gave him bags of stones and beads to give away. I observed several women give gifts to other women at different times. Even I, knowing the culture and being moved by so much goodwill, wanted to present gifts: I brought a 25 lb. bag of oranges, I danced, I gave blessings with the smudging and I brought a tent for folks to stay in. Throughout the whole gathering, I saw people moved to

give each other gifts of feathers, jewelry, bags, and crafts. It was not part of the big giveaway, and was not simply a routine way to close a conference. The whole weekend I witnessed, over and over again, the generosity of all the people.

Event # 2: 10th Annual Austin Independent School District (ISD) Powwow and American Indian Heritage Festival

Date: November 3, 2001

Times: Arrived at 11:00 am Saturday and left at 11:20 pm

Place: Burger Center, Austin, TX

These ceremonies, commonly known as powwows, evolved from a formal ceremony of the past into a modern blend of dance, family reunion, and festival. Powwows are famous for their pageantry of colors, regalia and dance which have adapted and changed since their beginnings into a bright, fast, and exciting event geared towards Native Americans and visitors alike.

Today powwows are held all across the North American continent, from small towns such as White Eagle, Oklahoma, to some of the largest cities like Los Angeles, California. They can take place anywhere from cow pastures to convention centers. They occur year round, each festival lasting only one weekend, and usually draw Native Americans and visitors from hundreds and even thousands of miles away.

There is a reason that makes the hours of travel worthwhile. This reason that deals with who you are, what you feel and what you believe. Some people

come to these celebrations to "contest," some come to sing songs, some come to see relatives and friends, and some come for the atmosphere. A powwow makes people feel good in a deep way. It is a feeling that is mental and physical. For this reason, powwows spread across the plains quickly, and today serve as one of the main cultural activities of some Native Americans.

The event is put together by the Native American Parent Committee of the Austin ISD with the help of its support group called First Americans of Central Texas.

I arrived and found a place to sit on the floor where I could watch all of the events. Each year, this event is organized by a small group of American Indian parents, students, and others who work throughout the year to give this day as a gift to the Austin area. About 25,000 people show up for this event throughout the day, including some people from Canada and Mexico and more than half of the 50 states. American Indian artists, dancers, singers, musicians, craftspersons, and other entertainers perform to show the nation's original cultures.

This year, the event included an American Indian dance contest inside the center along with musicians and storytellers on an outdoor stage. In the middle of the dance floor, singers sat in a circle and beat drums simultaneously while dancers moved back and forth in a flowing stop-and-go motion.

The Powwow director gave us a brief history of powwows. He told us that they began with the Plains Indians. As winter approached, tribes could not exist as large units because of limited resources, so they split up into winter bands. They would rejoin in the spring, as the end of winter gave way to plant-growth, to

renew friendships, and mourn the dead. "They got together and hadn't seen relatives and friends in a long time," he said. "They hunted buffalo, feasted, sang, and reunited as a unit." Today, just as it was back then, powwows are important to rekindle the spirit of tribal unity.

In preparation for Saturday's event, a tribal elder blessed the arena on Friday night, making it sacred land. "We've been doing this for hundreds of years," he said. "When you walk into that circle on the dance floor, you feel a renewed spirit—there's power."

"There is no one theme for the songs and many have become intertribal as many historically disparate tribes have mingled together. But the drumbeat that fills the air represents the heartbeat of the people," this tribal elder said. The songs are not written down and their meanings can be interpreted in many ways. A presenter with the powwow committee agreed with the elder's sentiment. "It's a way of life, not just a dance," she told me. "To me the drum speaks to my heart, because that's the way I pray."

A committee member, and Austin resident and former dancer, attends the powwow every year. "I enjoy the honor that [powwows] give to each other and to their religion," she said. They help both to dispel stereotypes some might have about American Indians, and "demystify" the Native-American identity for some people, she added. "They're people who are in your community, all around you and you may not know, but they're there and this is part of their life."

The co-director of the Longhorn American Indian Counsel, an electrical engineering senior, said the stereotype of American Indians living only on

reservations is still around, but not true. He wants people to know that American Indians live normal lives just like every other American. Powwows help to educate people, he said, but the level of information they get depends on the level of interest spectators carry. "If you go there just to see some neat costumes, and see some dancing, you'll see the powwow and it will be very entertaining," he said. "If people just want to casually take a look around and just leave, they're only going to pull out that sort of image of Native Americans."

A dancer dropped an eagle feather from his regalia, and all the dancing stopped. If an eagle feather is dropped during a powwow, everything stops until a vet, medicine man or healer comes and prays. Someone of that level of responsibility has to pray over the dropped feather; after this blessing, the eagle feather can be picked up.

A Dancer is honored, and a blanket is put out and the dance is offered. Only the Natives on the floor danced and gave money as a gift to a man struggling with cancer in the community.

After much more dancing, including the grand-entry, volunteers in the community provided fruit, drinks and food for the dancers.

About mid-day there was a T-shirt throw, and different dancers threw T-shirts into audience as a giveaway.

There was another Intertribal blanket dance; this time the audience was asked to give to honor the head drum, Little Eagle. These guys do not get paid for what they are doing, and so the blanket dance is to honor them and help with their travel expenses.

Blanket for Hoop dancers: two very young boys received what was put into the blanket.

Blanket for 2nd Drum

The dancers placed money at the feet of other dancers and elders. Many individuals were honored: honored with songs, honored for showing courage, such as serving in the military forces, honored for being grandparents; children were honored, young dancers were honored, the drums were honored, grandchildren were honored, a woman in wheelchair who had had a hard year, an elder was honored, and the princess was honored. In some cases, only the men gave; in others, the women also gave. Money was gathered and given to the person being honored. Then the second blanket was laid out for drum groups, and this time the order was reversed: the main drum got the second blanket. There were about 30 peopled honored with a blanket dance.

There was a second giveaway of T-Shirts, together with Native American calendars. Everyone was thanked and honored. The volunteers, 5 judges, Educational Program persons, head singer, dancers, singers, and harmonica player were given envelopes of money as a way of honoring them. An elder honored us all by praying and ending the powwow.

I am grateful to have experienced the event. Many of my family members saw each other, visited, ate, danced, and contributed to the intertribal blanket collection when we were invited. The drum beat and the singing made it enjoyable and easy for me to stay all day and night.

Event # 3: Native Women's Gathering

Date: November 9–11, 2001

Time: Arrived at 5:30 p.m. Friday and left at 5:30 pm Sunday

Place: Campground just outside of Austin, TX

The women's gathering was a time of sharing wisdom, knowledge, and stories; supporting each other; and praying together for the children, the men and ceremonies.

November 9.

After setting up my tent on the first night, I joined the rest of the women who were there for the weekend. We gathered in a circle and shared who were and where we came from. We went over the weekend's event, and then we had a sweatlodge ceremony. The ceremony is commonly known as the Sweat, and it is a sacred ceremony of the Plains people and many other tribes. It is a cleansing rite that is performed prior to ceremonies, vision quests, and other social rites such as marriage. The sweatlodge is a dome-shaped structure made from saplings, covered with materials that keep heat in and the light out. Prayers were offered to the Great Spirit for loved ones and all who live on the Earth, for the weekend, for the women, and for other ceremonies. It lasted about 1 1/2 hours, and was followed by a big feast prepared as a gift by one of the volunteering men.

November 10.

We met for breakfast at about 9 am, more or less waited for the presenter to start the day's events. It was about noon when she joined us. She spoke of many things including her health, families and other women's issues.

Unexpectedly, she received a call that a group of people wanted to come over a bit later to meet her. They started to arrive at 4 pm, and they arrived in a total of thirty cars. There was a total of about 45 of them, a few of whom she had known for a long time. They brought flowers for the table, talked and laughed with her, and had snacks coffee, sodas and donuts. They brought wood and food and wanted to stay for the sweatlodge that night.

After several hours, they took turns meeting her and gave her many gifts. They said they wanted to honor her for being a positive force in their lives. They had been taught by someone that she had taught, and they wanted to thank her. The honor gifts were given one by one, and each person spoke with her. She received blankets, jewelry, candy, tobacco, clothes, scarfs, flowers, and some money.

They left at 3:30 in the morning. She and her staff were up the next day with the rest of us at 8 a.m.

November 11.

At 8:30 am we had coffee, and then breakfast was served at 9:30. The coordinator explained that the previous afternoon and evening had been very typically Indian. It is the custom that when people show up, you show them the best hospitality you can. You never turn anyone away. Today, she was very tired.

We had a ceremony for November 11. We prayed for the wounded feminine and for the feminine to come together perfectly on this day, signifying possibilities for a great healing of our collective spirits as we prepare for a future. May this day of truth reflect the deepest truth of our beings, and may this be the

message that we send out to the universe as we prepare for the dawning or what is to come. The prayer was followed by a pipe ceremony and a giveaway. Everyone received gifts: songs, sage, semiprecious stones, pins, bracelets, shells.

That was the end of the gathering, and it was a good weekend.