

ACCULTURATION AND INTEGRATION: INDIAN STUDENTS IN WINNIPEG

A Thesis

Presented to

the Department of Sociology

The University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts



by

Toni Schwartz

April 1973

ABSTRACT

The subject of this study was to examine some of the effects education has on the acculturation and integration of Indian students into the dominant middle class-oriented Euro-Canadian culture. The survey was conducted of Indian students in Winnipeg, using a mailed questionnaire. Two hundred and forty-four questionnaires were sent out to Indian high school students in Winnipeg. A combination of a high non-response rate for key questions and a low rate of return in general made it impossible to complete the analysis as planned. The main outcome of this research was the delineation of areas to be pursued in future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to my committee: A. A. Hunter, R. Bienvenue, and D. B. Sealey for their help in preparing this thesis.

I would like to thank Mr. Leon Joubert, Director of the Guidance Division of the Indian Affairs Branch in Winnipeg, and to Father Allarie, Director of the Assiniboia Indian Residence for their cooperation. Without their help this research could not have been carried out.

Last, but not least, I must thank my husband, Abe Berenhaut, Without his encouragement and moral support this thesis could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	iv
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION.	1
I Review of Literature.	3
II Methodology	12
III Analysis of Data.	28
IV Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations.	32
References.	36
Appendix.	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Intercorrelations Among Exposure to Dominant Society Items	14
II	Factor Structure of Acculturation Items	18
III	Intercorrelations Among Individualism Items	19
IV	Intercorrelations Among Ethnocentrism Items	20
V	Intercorrelations Among Anomia Items.	21
VI	Intercorrelations Among Indian Identity Items	22
VII	Home Community.	26
VIII	Early Education	27
IX	Correlation Between Subtypes of Acculturation and Exposure to Dominant Society	28
X	Years in Residence Correlated with Subtypes of Acculturation.	29
XI	Years in a Private Home Correlated with Subtypes of Acculturation.	30
XII	Percentage of Non-response to Parents' Education Questions.	31

INTRODUCTION

In modern industrial societies, the educational system, as represented by the school, is an important agent of socialization. As Seeley, Sim and Loosley (1968) state:

The goals of education in North America are, more and more, the preparation of individuals to fill roles in a highly specialized industrial society and the socialization of children in terms of the middle-class values which are the regulative ideology of North American culture (Seeley, Sim and Loosley, 1968:383).

In the case of ethnically plural societies, where the value system (Parsons, 1951:12) of different groups differ from one another, the values transmitted within the context of the family will often differ significantly from those inculcated by the school. The family, as well as the ethnic community of which it is a part, tends to instil in the child the values of the minority group's culture, while the school, as a dominant group institution, promotes the value orientations of the dominant group. This has the potential of creating what Park (1928) has labelled "marginal men", that is, people who live on the fringes of both culture groups, but who are members of neither group.

The predominantly middle-class values promoted by the Canadian educational system and the values which form a part of Indian culture seem to differ in important ways. The Indian child is socialized into what has been described as a non-competitive, non-aggressive cultural group by his family and ethnic community, while he is socialized into a competitive and aggressive society by the school (Renaud, 1958; Fisher, 1969).

In this study, I propose to look at some of the effects education has on the acculturation of Indian students into the dominant Euro-Canadian culture. This will be done by surveying a sample of Indian students brought to Winnipeg under the auspices of the Indian Affairs Branch to complete their high school education.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

One major role of education in a society is to instil the value orientations of the dominant group, and to prepare individuals to participate in the ongoing social system:

Manifestly, the school's socializing function is to educate the young, that is, to transmit certain basic knowledge and skills of the culture (Elkin, 1960:57).

The school, in North America, has increasingly taken the place of the family as the primary agent which transmits the culture's values and beliefs to the young, and integrates them into the social system. That is, the school is responsible for the socialization of the young. In all Canadian provinces, all children, within a specified age range, are compelled to attend school regularly. In recent years, more and more children are placed in an educational institution at a younger age (Riesman, 1950). One finds that children, even infants, are being placed in institutions where specialists take over the role of the family, freeing the parents to pursue their own activities. In such a case, the family loses its primacy in the hierarchy of socializing agents. In place of the family, the educational institution becomes the primary agency for socializing the young:

Perhaps the most important agency of socialization teaching the broader American culture is the school (Elkin, 1960:89).

In highly industrialized societies, the school encourages the development of marketable skills. Each level of the educational system teaches

a marketable skill where possible, or prepares the student for the next higher level where such a skill will be taught.

North American education now aims to prepare all children for secular functions in an urban industrialized society (Seeley, Sim and Loosley, 1968:383).

In an ethnically heterogeneous society, the family and the school often promote different sets of values. When the school promotes the values of the dominant culture, and the family promotes the values of a minority group, conflict may occur on several levels--between ethnic groups, and within ethnic groups intergenerationally (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965; Banton, 1967).

The socialization process carried out by the family and by the dominant group can be regarded as being of a dual nature. There is, on the one hand, cultural assimilation or acculturation, which is the process by which an individual comes to adopt the customs and habits of a socio-cultural group (Gordon, 1964; Sengstock, 1962; Tremblay, 1962; Landecker, 1956; Weinstock, 1964). The individual's ethnic group socializes him into the minority group culture by means of the family and ethnic community. The dominant group acculturates the individual into the dominant culture group by means of such agents as the school, the peer group and the mass media (Handlin, 1953).

There is, on the other hand, structural assimilation, or integration (Gordon, 1964). The process of assimilation involves the entrance of the minority group member into the institutions and structures of the dominant society as a fully participating member, rather than just as a peripheral member. The entrance into dominant structures may or may not

involve direct inter-group contact. If the person were to enter a dominant structure, but has little or no direct contact with dominant group members, the process of full structural assimilation would be retarded. In general, one who enters a dominant group structure does have direct contact with dominant group members. Thus, one would expect the young person entering an ethnically integrated school to become more fully assimilated than one in a segregated school.

Acculturation is generally considered as coming before integration, when, in fact, they may occur simultaneously. Gordon (1964:77) points out that acculturation, while being the first step in the process of assimilation, may be the only step to occur. Acculturation is not necessarily the stage preceding integration. Acculturation may not lead to integration, but integration generally leads to acculturation (Gordon, 1964:81). In the case of the schools, one would expect the non-acculturated Indian child in an integrated school to become more acculturated than the Indian child in a non-integrated school.

The minority group child who is subjected to this dual socialization process may tend towards a marginal existence (Park, 1928). That is, the child may not be a full member of either group.

Kosa (1957) and Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) show how the second generation immigrants become marginal men by means of the educational system. During the child's early years at home, and all through the years at school, the family socializes the child into the value system of the minority group. The school socializes the child into the dominant group. This tends to occur even when the child attends a

school sponsored by his minority group (Handlin, 1953; Glazer and Moynihan, 1963).

According to Fisher (1969), Indian students are faced with a dilemma in regards to education. In order for them to be "good Indians", they must remain uneducated. If they choose to be educated, they risk losing their Indian identity.

Even though one function of the school is to resocialize the minority group child into the dominant group, it is often unsuccessful:

In recent years, educational specialists have become increasingly aware of the problems inherent in educating children of minority groups in institutions designed to meet the needs and standards of the majority. The failure of the schools to meet the varying needs of children from different socio-economic and ethnic groups can be reckoned in terms of the large number of under educated and unemployed individuals. The schools have been unable to resocialize such groups of children so that they become functioning adults in the social milieu of the majority (Hawthorn, 1967:105).

In failing to acculturate the child, the school succeeds in reinforcing his ethnic group status.

The school also functions as a "sorting and sifting" agency. It serves on the one hand to reinforce existing statuses of students, and on the other, to encourage upward mobility (Elkin, 1960:57).

Elkin goes on to point out that:

. . . children who do well in school whatever their family backgrounds, are likely to win awards, be encouraged by their teachers, go on to higher education and become successful men and women in the community (Elkin, 1960:58).

This dichotomous nature of the educational system helps to produce marginal men. On the one hand, the lower status ethnic group member is reminded of his status by the middle class dominated educational system (Dahlke, 1958:87; Elkin, 1960). On the other hand, the educational system, which is based on competition, advances its best students into the dominant system.

Fisher (1969) sees the Canadian educational system as producing marginality within the Indian students.

. . . the expanded educational opportunities for Canadian Indians are not really opportunities at all. For what the school offers is an irrelevant set of values and training. Moreover the school often comes into direct conflict with certain moral and cultural values of the students. Thus it is the educational system that fails the student and not the student who fails the system. In trying to be a good and successful Indian, the Indian student must often be a bad and unsuccessful student (Fisher, 1969:33).

The Indian Act (1952) states that all Indians between the ages of six and sixteen must attend school on a regular basis. There is a provision in the Act however that, under certain special circumstances, a child may be kept in school up to the age of eighteen.

The policy of the Canadian government is to provide Indian students with the same education as that provided to non-Indians. That means the same curricula, the same text books, and, where possible, the same classroom.

. . . wherever possible, education of Indian children in association with non-Indians is encouraged, and the Indian Affairs Branch has entered into agreements with provincial authorities for such joint education (Indian Affairs Branch, 1966:11)

In 1966, 40 percent of the Indian students in Canada were attending non-Indian schools (Indian Affairs Branch, 1966:11).

Indians recognize that education is one of the major tools that will help us strike off the shackles of poverty, and, incidentally, the tyranny of government direction. But the white man apparently believes that education is a tool for the implementation of his design of assimilation (Cardinal, 1969:51).

The government's educational policy for Indians is explicitly designed as an attempt to fit the Indian into the dominant structure.

Hawthorn (1967), Renaud (1964) and Fisher (1969) all suggest that one reason why Indian children do poorly in school, and often fail to complete their education, is their cultural background:

We suspect that too often because the community background of the child is constantly ignored, the curiosity the child brings to school is left unsatisfied, and eventually peters out before the objectives are reached. Too often indeed what is taught is not related formally to what the child knows from his home and community school does not turn out to be the place to learn, as it was claimed to be (Renaud, 1964:9).

In spite of this supposed inability on the part of the educational system to relate meaningfully to the Indian student, Indian students are completing their education in ever-increasing numbers.¹

Nagler (1970) points out that many educated Indians who possess a trade cannot return to the reserve because there are often no employment opportunities there. Also, many of Nagler's respondents state that, once they become educated, they become alienated from their home community and friends. These people no longer fit into the Indian way of life on the reserve, and there is some question as to whether they fit into the non-Indian way of life in an urban centre. Many of Nagler's respondents were marginal men as a result of their education.

Bryde (1970) found that Indian students, up to Grade Seven, are more than capable of working and advancing within the American system of education. It is after the Grade Seven level that the Indians begin to reject the dominant value system by rejecting the educational system.

¹In spite of some question of the accuracy of Indian Affairs statistics, they do show an increasing trend among the Indian students to stay in school.

Bryde found that very few Indians remain in school past Grade Seven, and that these students are atypical of the norm of Indian students. Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on the nature of this uniqueness on the part of the Indian students.

From Hawthorn (1967), Renaud (1964), Fisher (1969), Bryde (1970) and Nagler (1970) one can hypothesize that the degree of contact between the Indian student and the dominant culture will affect his levels of acculturation and integration:

Hypothesis I: The greater the exposure to the dominant society, the greater the child's level of acculturation.

Hypothesis II: The greater the exposure to the dominant society, the greater the child's level of integration.

In two studies done on Indian and non-Indian high school students in Alberta, Zentner (1963a; 1963b) found that the young Indians had internalized the dominant Canadian value system fairly well. Zentner found no differences in the Indian students' responses when he controlled for father's background, grade, age, and sex. On the whole, Zentner found the Indian students to be more optimistic of their position in the larger society than the non-Indian students were of the Indian's position in the society.

On the other hand, Abu-Laban (1966) studied Indian and non-Indian students in an Edmonton high school. He holds that

the most important influence on aspirations appeared to be father's occupation. . . . When this was taken into account differences in aspiration level between the Indian and non-Indian children tend to disappear (Abu-Laban, 1966:120).

Abu-Laban believes that the children possess a degree of acculturation before entering the integrated high school, and that this is

a function of the father's education.

None of the researchers mentioned above have looked at both the students' familial background and acculturation and integration. Zentner and Bryde examined acculturation, without looking at the background factors that may make the students unique. Abu-Laban, who examines both factors, uses a very crude measure of acculturation. This research will attempt to look at the students' background as well as their levels of acculturation and integration. In past research, integration has always been seen as a part of acculturation. Following Gordon (1964), I view them as two separate processes, and deal with them as such.

Insofar as education promotes acculturation, and children are socialized within the context of the family, it should follow that the children of well educated minority group members will, in general, be more acculturated than will their counterparts from families in which the parents have little in the way of formal education. Thus it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis III: The greater the parents' education, the greater the child's level of acculturation.

Also given that Hypothesis I is true, and acculturation tends to lead to integration, it should follow that:

Hypothesis IV: The greater the parents' education, the greater the child's level of integration.

SUMMARY

It follows from the literature reviewed above that there are a number of relationships which can be tested empirically.

From Hawthorn (1967), Renaud (1964), Fisher (1969), Bryde (1970) and Nagler (1970), one would conclude that:

1. The greater the exposure to the dominant society, the greater the child's level of acculturation.
2. The greater the exposure to the dominant society, the greater the child's level of integration.

From Elkin (1960) and Dahlke (1958), one would conclude that:

3. The greater the parents' education, the greater the child's level of acculturation.

From Abu-Laban (1966), one would conclude that:

4. The greater the parents' education, the greater the child's level of integration.

questions, which the author felt measured acculturation in all its forms, were asked of each respondent. It was assumed, however, that not all the questions would be an equally good measure of acculturation, and even if they were, they would not all be unidimensional. To ensure that the questions in the scale were all measuring the same underlying variable, it was decided to employ factor analysis to the responses to the set of questions.

Factor analysis is a statistical technique designed to isolate and identify the basic dimensions underlying a set of quantitative variates. According to the assumptions underlying the factor model, if two measures are statistically related, then they can be assumed to be measuring the same underlying variable.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Exposure to the dominant society was measured using a composite indicator composed of the following questions:

1. What is the name of your home community? (Used to measure geographic isolation.)
2. What grade had you finished before transferring to Winnipeg?
3. Where did you take your schooling before coming to Winnipeg? (Used to measure experience in integrated schools.)
4. How many years have you lived in Winnipeg?
5. How many years have you lived at the Assiniboia Residence?
6. How many years have you lived in a private home in the city?

While almost all the questions were scored in a self-evident manner, a few were more involved. Home community was scored according to

Deprez and Sigurdson's (1969:17) transitional-isolated dichotomy for Manitoba reserves. The only reserves that were not scored were those from out of the province and those that fell outside of Deprez and Sigurdson's (1969) frame of reference. The total number of un-codable responses was twelve. Early educational experiences were coded in a dual manner. First, the respondents were classified as to whether the bulk of their education was taken at an integrated or a non-integrated school; secondly, the last grade taken at a non-integrated school was scored.

The intercorrelations among the individual items are given below in Table I.

Table I - Intercorrelations Among Exposure to Dominant Society Items

Items	1	2	3	3a	4	5	6
1	-						
2	.07	-					
3	.37	.21	-				
3a	.26	.61	.37	-			
4	-.00	-.10	-.11	-.15	-		
5	-.07	-.21	-.10	-.17	.25	-	
6	-.12	.01	-.06	-.13	.49	.23	-

Scoring was derived by summing across the items, weighting them equally. All negative items were reverse-scored. The average intercorrelation among the items is .19 and, using Cronbach's alpha (1970:161) the reliability of the scale is .62.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES

As stated earlier, the questionnaire contains a set of forty questions which were factor analyzed to derive scales of acculturation. The following questions were included in the set, and were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale:

1. One of the best ways to ensure that the Indian culture is kept alive is through an education system run by the Native peoples.
2. An Indian education would tend to give a person a narrow, one-sided view of life.
3. All Indians should learn their tribal language.
4. My Native language is of greater importance than any other second language.
5. It is of tremendous importance to speak the Native languages in the home so they may be preserved for future generations.
6. It is embarrassing to me to see Indians conversing in their Native language in a mixed group of Indians and non-Indians.
7. For me, being an Indian is a real source of strength.
8. For me, it makes little difference whether the person I date is Indian or not.
9. Unless an Indian has good reasons, he or she should not marry a non-Indian under any circumstances.
10. Any Indian man or woman who marries a non-Indian should lose his or her treaty and reserve rights.
11. Children of mixed marriages should not be allowed to have any treaty or reserve rights.
12. Indian persons should not have an unfavourable attitude towards those who marry a non-Indian.
13. Parents who discourage Indian-non-Indian dating do a disservice to their children.
14. It is important, to me, that most of my close friends be Indian.

15. The presence of other Native people close by gives me a feeling of warmth and security.
16. My school friends, who are not Indian, seldom seem to become close friends.
17. My family seems to take a less favourable attitude towards my friends who are not Indian.
18. Indians should be more involved in Native organizations than in other organizations:
19. Indian organizations are wonderful because they allow one to take an active part in the affairs of one's own people.
20. Indian and other Native organizations are fine for the older people but they do not actively encourage the participation of young people in an active role.
21. The organizations of the Indian people seem to be concerned with their own narrow issues instead of the important issues of the world.
22. It gives an Indian a good feeling to live in a community composed almost entirely of one's own people.
23. For me, being an Indian is the most important thing in life.
24. Hard work and success are the most important things in life.
25. Without education you can never get ahead in this world.
26. A family is just a hindrance to getting ahead.
27. You must look out just for yourself, or you will never get anywhere.
28. Never trust anyone over 30.
29. There is no need for an Indian to feel inferior because most of them are already accepted by Whites.
30. Indians ought to leave the reservation and compete on equal terms with Whites.
31. Indians ought to stop thinking of themselves as Indians and try to behave like Whites.
32. Nowadays it is the person who uses his head rather than his heart that gets ahead and is looked up to.

33. Nowadays you have to think about what you can get out of other people and not worry too much about how they feel or what they think of you.
34. Nowadays it is better not to get too friendly with people because they will use what they know about you to take advantage of you.
35. Most Whites are so prejudiced that no matter how an Indian behaves he is not acceptable as an equal.
36. It is better for an Indian person to stay on his reservation where people know and understand him personally.
37. Indians ought to take pride in their race and not try to behave like Whites.
38. Nowadays people aren't interested in you as an individual; they don't care what happens to you because they are so busy thinking of themselves.
39. Nowadays there is no point in trying to make good friends because things change so fast and people move around so much you can't keep your friends anyway.
40. Nowadays there is no point in planning for the future because everything is too uncertain to make planning worthwhile.

While thirteen factors had eigenvalues equal to one or more, only five proved to be interpretable. Table II contains the factor structure for these five. Factor I explained 16.1 percent of the total variance in the matrix. Factor II explained 8.2 percent of the variance, Factor III, 5.6 percent; Factor IV, 5.4 percent, and Factor V, 5.3 percent.

Factor I, with high loadings on questions 20 (Indian organizations do not encourage active participation of young), 21 (Indian organizations only concerned with own narrow issues), 26 (family is a hindrance), 27 (only look out for yourself), 32 (use your head rather than heart), and 34 (people will use what they know about you against you) can probably best be interpreted as measuring the degree of individualism.

Table II - Factor Structure of Acculturation Items

Items	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V
1	-.10034	.20491	.23530	.02235	.42737
2	.02725	.08622	.18921	.10808	.07408
3	.05785	.12822	-.01699	-.04942	.68693
4	-.08772	.44041	.15852	.04202	.53175
5	.02481	.07569	-.05901	.00477	.75322
6	.16791	.03920	.12392	-.01558	.02641
7	-.07915	.28102	.27838	-.28106	.39699
8	.08879	-.05786	-.12680	-.00425	.01926
9	-.06596	.34456	.31754	.24038	.18469
10	.08987	.11427	-.04090	.84265	-.00463
11	.11444	.18862	.02101	.87344	.02250
12	-.15292	.05744	.12037	-.05331	-.04545
13	.26603	-.04663	-.04913	.12371	.13507
14	.17737	.69366	-.01683	.18973	.20390
15	.05399	.67091	.04083	.07816	-.01359
16	.34657	.31674	.22898	.15095	-.05710
17	.32695	.36921	.21580	.20842	.03457
18	.11348	.54710	-.03667	.09856	.27799
19	.09708	.23606	-.12016	-.01235	.29632
20	.67284	.12272	.13304	.05195	-.09125
21	.44827	-.16403	.30387	.21383	.00284
22	.11034	.63396	.21041	.04074	.28528
23	.12872	.13421	.22028	.06265	.59808
24	.08559	.01833	.02863	.03598	-.02393
25	.07176	.04132	.09492	.07739	.09335
26	.74937	.17795	-.05594	.11109	-.05331
27	.65353	.07585	-.00200	-.03488	.15325
28	.07877	.07013	.06788	-.00695	-.05765
29	.14608	.26569	-.13098	.04096	-.04405
30	.12507	-.18746	-.04599	.11059	-.12322
31	.25152	-.00559	.12696	.08946	-.04514
32	.43795	.09654	.22674	-.09092	.13706
33	.51209	.10212	.43637	.18395	.20937
34	.52439	-.06758	.12060	.14593	.28275
35	.10933	.46021	.22086	.05024	-.03617
36	.17314	.21525	.00419	.30294	.34767
37	-.13031	-.01480	-.13535	.15086	.42836
38	.20752	-.05420	.53127	-.13830	-.04302
39	.13298	.17151	.78155	.02741	-.05682
40	.00874	.01801	.74226	-.04050	.12529

Individualism is seen as the degree to which the person acts as an autonomous being, separate from friends, family, or group. A person ranking high on this factor is considered more acculturated than a low ranking individual as individualism is often considered one of the highly regarded values in the Euro-Canadian culture. Table III gives the intercorrelations for the items which go to make up this factor. Scoring was derived by summing across the items, weighting them equally. The average intercorrelation is .30, and the reliability coefficient is .72.

Table III - Intercorrelations Among Individualism Items

Items	20	21	26	27	32	34
20	--					
21	.38	--				
26	.43	.28	--			
27	.44	.16	.46	--		
32	.22	.01	.25	.32	--	
34	.30	.27	.30	.45	.25	--

Factor II may be interpreted as ethnocentrism, with high loadings on questions 14 (close friends be Indian), 15 (Native people close by gives me feeling of warmth and security), 18 (Indians should be more involved in Native organizations), 22 (gives an Indian a good feeling to live in a community of Indians), and 35 (no matter how an Indian behaves he is not accepted as an equal by Whites), all of which seem to measure the degree of in-group feeling. Ethnocentrism is here defined as one's identification with his own culture, and the assumption on the

part of the individual that the group's culture patterns are the right way of acting for him. There is a feeling of comfort with and acceptance of one's own group. An individual scoring low on this factor is considered more acculturated than one scoring high. Table IV presents the intercorrelation matrix for the items involved in this factor. Scoring was derived by summing across the items, weighting them equally. The average intercorrelation is .34, and the reliability coefficient is .72.

Table IV - Intercorrelations among Ethnocentrism Items

Items	14	15	18	22	35
14	--				
15	.38	--			
18	.48	.23	--		
22	.54	.27	.33	--	
35	.34	.27	.23	.33	--

Factor III, with high loadings on questions 38 (people are too busy thinking of themselves to care about you), 39 (people move around so much it's no use making good friends), and 40 (everything is too uncertain to make planning for the future worthwhile) closely follows Srole's (1956) anomia scale. Following Srole, this factor is defined as the feeling of social malintegration on the part of an individual. It should follow that a person scoring high on this factor would be less acculturated than one scoring low. A high scoring individual exhibits marginality as he lacks strong integration: with the dominant society and has no strong anchor in his minority group to offset the lack of

integration with the dominant group. The table below presents the intercorrelation matrix of the items involved in this factor. Scoring was derived by summing across the items, weighting them equally. The average correlation is .41, and the reliability coefficient is .76.

Table V - Intercorrelations Among Anomia Items

Items	38	39	40
38	--		
39	.36	--	
40	.37	.49	--

Factor IV appears to measure endogamy. Question 10 (man or woman who marries out should lose his or her treaty and reserve rights) and question 11 (children of mixed marriages should not have treaty or reserve rights) appear to express strong feelings against mixed marriages. This factor ties in closely with ethnocentrism, as strong feelings against out group marriages are one means of illustrating identification and feeling with one's own group. A low scoring individual, therefore, would be more acculturated than a high scoring individual. The intercorrelation between these items is .41, and the reliability coefficient is .69.

The last interpretable factor appears to measure Indian identity. Questions 3 (all Indians should learn their tribal language), 5 (important to speak Native languages in the home in order to preserve them), 7 (for me, being an Indian is a real source of strength), 23 (being an Indian is the most important thing in life), and 37 (Indians ought to take pride in their race and not try to behave like Whites). The

individual sees himself as being at one with the group. A person scoring low on Indian identity should be more acculturated than one scoring high. Table VI gives the intercorrelation matrix for the items involved in this factor. Scoring was derived by summing across the items, weighting them equally. The average intercorrelation is .30, and the reliability coefficient is .68.

Table VI - Intercorrelations among Indian Identity Items

Items	3	5	7	23	37
3	--				
5	.44	--			
7	.18	.31	--		
23	.30	.33	.45	--	
37	.26	.33	.22	.19	--

The integration index was derived by adding the scores of the following two questions:

1. Check which of the following statements is MOST TRUE.
 1. _____ My friends are almost all Indians.
 2. _____ My friends are a mixture of Indians and non-Indians.
 3. _____ My friends are almost all non-Indians.
2. What activities and clubs do you take part in, in your spare time? (for example: Indian-Metis Friendship Centre, high school track team, Assiniboia Residence Hockey team)

The correlation coefficient between the two questions is .25, and reliability coefficient is .39.

On July 21, 1965, the Province of Manitoba and the government of Canada signed an agreement whereby the province would undertake the education of Indian students, in what had formerly been non-Indian schools, while the federal government would finance the venture. This terminated the Indian Affairs Branch agreements with separate school boards throughout the province. Federally operated reserve schools and residential schools continue to exist following the agreement. The agreement merely facilitated the education of Indian students in non-Indian schools.

July 1, 1958, saw the opening of the Assiniboia Residential School in what was formerly a veteran's home complex. The school is equipped to handle one hundred and twenty students and is operated by the Order of Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.). In September of 1967, with the government policy of providing integrated education where possible, the school became a residence for Indian students attending Winnipeg schools. While the residence can handle over one hundred students, there were only seventy-two residents in the fall of 1971. By the end of February 1972, drop-outs and transfers to private homes had decreased the number of residents to approximately forty-two.

The bulk of Indian students in Winnipeg live in private homes. Often this is the choice of the parents or of the students themselves. In the case of students with mental or physical handicaps, this is the solution chosen by the Indian Affairs Branch. In the case of Protestant students there is no choice but to place them in private homes, because the residence is Catholic.