

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Native American Youth and Alcohol: An Annotated Bibliography. By Michael L. Lobb and Thomas D. Watts.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/32w40287>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Forslund, Morris A.

Publication Date

1990

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

two apparently opposite implications. On the one hand, it makes generalization dangerous. On the other, it offers a unique opportunity for approximately controlled comparisons that seek out the factors—internal and external—that appear to advance or retard tribal development agendas. In other words, that same diversity makes interesting and useful generalization possible. Now more than ever, generalizations grounded in the comparison of specific reservation experiences would be invaluable.

And their value would be not only to researchers. The focus of this collection is the impact of public policy—for the most part, federal policy—on development. Such a focus is necessary and appropriate these days, as cutbacks in programs continue and the attack on sovereignty and tribalism appears to be in a resurgent phase. But the feds are not the only policymakers whose actions count in Indian country. As tribes take over more control of reservation affairs and programs, the examination not only of tribal governing institutions but of tribal government policy will become increasingly important. Tribal leaders face momentous decisions, and there is a need for research that not only illuminates development processes and the factors that condition them, but assists in the effort to make policy at both federal and tribal levels more informed, intelligent, and effective.

Stephen Cornell
University of California, San Diego

Native American Youth and Alcohol: An Annotated Bibliography. By Michael L. Lobb and Thomas D. Watts. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1989. \$39.95 Cloth.

In 1985 the Harvard University Press published *Summing Up: The Science of Reviewing Research* by Richard J. Light and David B. Pillmer. These authors suggest how one might go about organizing a reviewing strategy, how one might use quantitative measures in conducting reviews, and use qualitative or narrative information to complement quantitative data; they also outline what can be learned from reviews of research that cannot be learned from single studies, and they provide a series of some ten questions that one might ask after completing a review or

considering a review completed by someone else (pages 161-73). Because I think these are very reasonable questions, I shall begin by asking and answering them with respect to this effort by Lobb and Watts.

What is the precise purpose of the review? Are procedures matched to that purpose? What question is being asked? Frankly, it is not easy to answer these questions. The "Introduction and Review of the Literature" refers to the ". . . emerging literature on Native American youth alcoholism. . . ." The title of the book is *Native American Youth and Alcohol*. Clearly alcohol and alcoholism are not the same thing!

A related second question is, How are studies chosen for inclusion? Are selection criteria stated? Are implications of those criteria clear? Lobb and Watts state (page x), "We pursue the published work of any and all disciplines having relevance for Native American youth and alcoholism." Again, there seems to be some confusion between alcohol use and alcoholism. The above quotation refers to relevant published work, yet the bibliography includes unpublished work such as conference papers. At no point are we really informed as to precisely how studies were chosen for inclusion. Except for the above (obviously imprecise) statement, no selection criteria are stated; therefore, the implications of the selection criteria are never made clear. If the intent is, indeed, to include "published work in any and all disciplines," the implied intent to be inclusive did not come close to succeeding. Published articles in fairly well known journals include my (along with Ralph E. Myers's) "Delinquency among Wind River Indian Reservation Youth" published in *Criminology*, and "Problem Drinking among Americans" by E. P. Dozier and "The Use of Alcohol in Three Salish Indian Tribes" by E. M. Lemert, both published in the *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, among many others. Given that Lobb and Watts do, in fact, include unpublished studies, they missed such well known unpublished works as "The Social Pathology of American Indian Drunkenness" by R. Dana.

The third question is, Is there publication bias? In terms of the stated intent of the review, yes. But the book does include a number of unpublished studies as well as such things as government reports and dissertations. There is, however, no clearly specified estimate of the extent of publication bias.

Fourth, Have treatment groups in different studies been examined to see if they are similar in fact as well as name? The answer here is sometimes—but rarely and not consistently.

Fifth, Have control groups in different studies been examined for similarities and differences? Again, the answer is sometimes, but rarely and not consistently.

Sixth, What is the distribution of study outcomes? In this instance, the authors do provide some subjective (but never objective) indication of the balance of study outcomes, including (occasionally) some reference to “outliers.”

Seventh, Does the review relate findings from different studies to type of research design? Once again, the answer is sometimes, but rarely and inconsistently.

Eighth, Does the review relate outcomes to different features of (a) programs, (b) participants, and (c) settings? Again, this is done sometimes, but rarely and not consistently.

Ninth, Do studies use similar units of analysis? For example, here, are individual or aggregated units studied? Lobb and Watts do, at least implicitly if not explicitly, include some information on this issue, but not in a consistent and precise fashion.

Tenth, Does the review offer guidance for designing future studies? Yes. At least there are numerous suggestions or implications for future research presented in this review.

Now, what about the review itself? The authors have provided useful summaries of numerous articles dealing with drinking and/or alcoholism, involving Native American youth. These are presented under ten categories: “Accidental Death,” “Biomedical Factors,” “Crime,” “Etiology,” “Gender,” “Policy and Prevention,” “Reservations,” “Sociological Factors,” “Suicide,” and “Treatment.” They are then subjectively summarized in an “Introduction and Review of the Literature.” Unfortunately, probably most of the studies summarized here could be included in more than one category. What the bibliography needs is some sort of table that cross-categorizes the studies.

Unfortunately, too, there are a number of other problems with this effort. The book contains altogether too many typographical errors, awkward or imprecise sentences, and grammatical errors, and information is missing in references and elsewhere. For example (one could cite these *ad nauseum*), there is a reference to “the keystone annotated bibliography by Mail and McDonald

containing the definitive literature by Leland." There is, however, no complete reference for either of these bibliographies anywhere in the book!

There are also contradictions, inconsistencies, and errors in some of the summaries. To use a 1978 article of mine ("Functions of Drinking for Native American and White Youth") as an example, the summary on page 90 is accurate, if incomplete. On page xxxvi, however, the authors refer to me as "they" and state that "they find no significant differences in personal effect and positive social factors between Native American and white secondary students in Fremont County, Wyoming." The relevant sentences from the article are, "More than half of all responses by students in each race-sex group fall in the positive-social category. Although the percentage differences are not great, a significantly higher percentage of the responses of white rather than Indian males and Indian rather than white females fall into this category. About one-fifth to three-tenths of the responses to these items fall into the personal-effect category for the four race-sex groups. Again, the differences are not great, but a significantly higher proportion of responses by Indian rather than white males and by white rather than Indian females fall into this category."

Despite these criticisms, by publishing this bibliography Lobb and Watts have performed a real service for those who are involved in research on the use of alcohol and alcoholism among Native American youth. Clearly, alcohol-related problems are severe and endemic, if not epidemic, among both Native American youth and adults. Obviously, between Native Americans there are gender differences, rural and urban differences, and regional as well as tribal differences, in problems associated with excessive alcohol use and alcoholism. Lobb and Watts have indicated many areas where research is sorely missing and desperately needed—such as alcohol use and accidental death, the etiology of alcoholism, local cultural input in prevention and treatment, the permissiveness-antipermissiveness hypothesis, ways in which Native American culture provides some protection against serious drug use, the role of alcohol in suicide attempts and suicide, methodology, cultural differences and reviews of treatment programs, and urban-rural differences in alcohol use/alcoholism problems. I would hope that Michael Lobb and Thomas Watts would update this bibliography periodically, taking into account these rather critical comments. This would be

of great importance not only to researchers in this area but to Native Americans in general and Native American youth in particular.

Morris A. Forslund
University of Wyoming

Indian Agriculture in America: Prehistory to the Present. By R. Douglas Hurt. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1987. 290 pages. \$29.95 Cloth.

R. Douglas Hurt has undertaken an ambitious task in attempting to provide a general survey of American Indian agricultural history, and he has produced a broad and useful reference work. As the first major book to deal with this important subject, it certainly deserves attention. Hurt reviews the achievements and contributions that Indians made to agriculture in North America and seeks to explain the decline of agriculture among Indians after European contact. He argues that the failure of federal agricultural policies for Indians, the harsh environment of the Plains and Far West, and Indian cultural resistance prevented the expansion and, in some cases, the creation of an agricultural economy among Indians.

Hurt's explanation for why Indians were successful agriculturalists prior but not subsequent to European contact focuses mostly on the federal policies that deprived Indians of a land base. Hurt also argues that the government failed to provide long-term financial, educational, and technological support for the establishment of commercially oriented Indian farmers. For the most part, Hurt interprets government policy as misguided and concludes that the government's failure to formulate and execute an appropriate agricultural policy was the reason Indian agriculture did not succeed. Readers are led to believe that with more time, government aid, and education, Indians would have become successfully integrated into the market economy. The argument assumes that Indians themselves had accepted commercial agricultural production as a goal. But Hurt mentions that some tribes were content to raise only enough agricultural products to meet their own needs, while others followed their own cultural traditions and combined agriculture with hunting