racial and ethnic groups that are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, a person who identified as Black may report that they are a recently immigrated queer person from the Dominican Republic. In this case, this person may be categorized as "Black," "Afro-Latino," "LBGTQ," and "Black immigrant."

The 2020 CMPS data were collected between April and October of 2021—a period characterized by uncertainty and cross-state policy inconsistency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Ideally, an oversample for hard-to-reach groups would include on-the-ground and face-to-face interviews in partnership with non-profit organizations. This simply was not possible at the time. As a result, the oversample directors and CMPS principal investigators focused on quota samples to meet minimum-sample-size thresholds.

The use of a quota strategy means that although the Black immigrant oversample is richly diverse, it is not a nationally representative sample. Nonetheless, the 2020 CMPS provides a carefully curated set of weights that rely on data from the US Census Bureau. In the cases of groups that were not robustly considered and measured by official government data, weights were based on research that focuses on those groups of concern (e.g., Pew Research Center and Center for Migration Studies). We considered research for the best-known estimates from public data in our decision-making calculus.

Moving Forward

The Black immigrant oversample in the 2020 CMPS provides an unprecedented source of data for scholars of Black politics, the politics of immigrants and immigration, and pan-ethnic politics. By using the Black immigrant oversample data, we may be able to better understand the increasing number of complexities that we observe around us. Consider, for example, the different challenges that Ilhan Omar, a Somali American congressional representative, may face in comparison to her colleague, Ayana Pressley, a Black American born and raised in the Midwest. We might better understand how Davino Watson, a Black citizen, could be held illegally in immigration detention for three and a half years. As the child of a Black immigrant, Watson found himself in the crosshairs of the criminal legal system and the immigration system. Moreover, as the contemporary movement for Black lives seeks to carve out a more capacious understanding of Blackness and those who lean toward an American Descendants of Slaves (ADOS) orientation seek to narrow the definition of Blackness contend with one another, it behooves scholars to stay informed and up to date about these ever-changing dynamics.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research. ■

REFERENCES

Anderson, Monica. 2015. "A Rising Share of the U.S. Black Population Is Foreign Born." *Pew Research Center*, April 9. (Accessed October 25, 2023.) www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2015/04/09/a-rising-share-of-the-us-black-population-is-foreign-born.

Capers, K. Jurée, and Candis W. Smith. 2021. "Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration: Assessing the Link between Passive and Active Representation for Foreign-Born Clients." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 31 (4): 704–22.

Gooding, Cory Charles. 2019. "Black Immigration: A Tale of Two Cities." In *Black Politics in Transition Immigration, Suburbanization, and Gentrification*, ed. Candis Watts Smith and Christina M. Greer, 49–76. New York: Routledge.

Greer, Christina M. 2013. *Black Ethnics: Race, Immigration, and the Pursuit of the American Dream*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lacarte, Valerie. 2022. "Black Immigrants in the United States Face Hurdles, but Outcomes Vary by City." *Migration Policy Institute*, February 10. (Accessed March 1, 2024.) www.migrationpolicy.org/article/black-immigrants-united-states-hurdles-outcomes-top-cities.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.

Rogers, Reuel R. 2006. *Afro-Caribbean Immigrants and the Politics of Incorporation: Ethnicity, Exception, or Exit*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Candis Watts. 2014. *Black Mosaic: The Politics of Black Pan-Ethnicity*. New York: New York University Press.

Tamir, Christine, and Monica, Andersen. "One-in-Ten Black People Living in the U.S. Are Immigrants." *Pew Research Center* (2022). Published electronically January 20. https://www.pewresearch.org/race-ethnicity/2022/01/20/one-in-ten-black-people-living-in-the-u-s-are-immigrants/.

Wright Austin, Sharon. 2019. "African American, Black Ethnic, and Dominican Political Relations in New York City." In *Black Politics in Transition Immigration, Suburbanization, and Gentrification*, ed. Candis Watts Smith and Christina M. Greer, 25–48. New York: Routledge.

SURVEYING NATIVE AMERICANS: EARLY LESSONS FROM THE CMPS

Raymond Foxworth, *University of Colorado Boulder, USA*
Cheryl Ellenwood, *Washington State University, USA*
Laura E. Evans, *University of California Riverside, USA*

DOI:10.1017/S1049096524000337

The Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS) is one of the few national surveys to intentionally oversample Native Americans. These data have the potential to advance data inclusion for Native American public opinion in the social sciences. At the same time, the CMPS is a reminder of ongoing tensions with data collection on Native American people. This article highlights findings from the CMPS and offers comments looking toward the future by identifying early lessons, challenges, and considerations that social scientists must grapple with when attempting to survey Native Americans.

Native Americans have been invisible in large-scale survey research (Herrick et al. 2019; Lavelle, Larsen, and Gundersen 2009; Lujan 2014) but Native peoples are not under-researched (Deloria 1998; Smith 2006). Generally, social and human science research on Native peoples and communities has been exploitative and extractive (Smith 2006; Walter and Andersen 2013). Moreover, research has not been designed to benefit Native peoples or their communities. Examples include the Barrow studies, which attempted to survey Alaska Native peoples about alcoholism (Wolf 1989). However, the researchers failed to consult Native peoples and communities that had significant ethical concerns related to survey design and purpose. Similarly, national newspapers have used surveys to justify the use of racist Native American mascots (Hamilton et al. 2019; Hodge 2012). These studies have weaponized data against Native peoples and know nothing about them and their unique histories (Fryberg et al. 2021).

According to the 2020 US Census, the American Indian and Alaska Native population (alone or in combination) totals more than 6.6 million people (US Census Bureau 2023). There currently are 574 federally recognized Native nations, and many other state-recognized and -unrecognized Native nations, that all are diverse culturally, linguistically, economically, and politically. Political

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000337 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scientists generally layer racial and ethnic classification over Native American identities as individuals. However, social scientists must acknowledge that Native peoples constitute separate nations that have been dispossessed and forcibly included in the United States. The sovereignty of Native nations as political collectivities becomes central to the political, ethical, and methodological issues surrounding data collection (Orr and Orr 2022; Wilson 2020).

Who Is A Native American?

The question of is a Native American can be contentious. The Native American Rights Fund defines a Native American as "a person who is of some degree Indian blood and is recognized as an Indian by a tribe/village and/or the United States" (Native American Rights Fund n.d.). Native nations have always had diverse mechanisms for identifying and recognizing citizens of their nations (Rodriguez-Lonebear 2021). However, federal Indian laws and policies have attempted to define who is a Native American, historically motivated by genocidal campaigns to exterminate Native American peoples, their identities, and cultures (Deloria and Lytle 1998; Hill and Ratteree 2017; Pevar 2012; Wilkins and Stark 2017). These policies, combined with socioeconomic realities resulting from colonialism for Native peoples living in reservation communities have led to migration, relocation, and urbanization. There also has been a pervasive phenomenon of settlers "playing Indian" and falsely appropriating Native identity and heritage (e.g., "pretendians"). Family lore is sustained across generations of settlers, with many claiming a Cherokee princess in the bloodline, for example (Deloria 1998). These claims may be corroborated by new DNA tests that reveal some percentage of "Indigenous blood" (Kolopenuk 2023; Nagle 2019; TallBear 2013). These are only a few of the factors that contribute to the complexities of defining who is a Native American.

Questions of identity are significant because current survey methods perpetuate a race-based understanding of Native American identity, disregarding the sovereign rights of Native nations as political collectives with inherent rights to determine and recognize their citizenry. Questions of identity also raise important questions about who speaks for Native peoples, what their cultural and political connections are to their Native nation(s), and do those who claim to be Native American understand and/or have lived experiences of Native life under settler colonialism (Wilkins and Stark 2017).

The CMPS attempted to address some of the complexities of Native American identity by asking multiple questions, with self-identification as a baseline for further exploration. Table 1 lists some of the CMPS indicators, including Native nation ancestry. These data reveal that there are differences in self-identification, lineage, and tribal connections. Individuals may self-identify as Native American but it may not be their primary identity—and even if people state that being Native American is their primary identity, they may not have identified as Native American on the 2020 US Census. CMPS questions did not ask if respondents were enrolled tribal citizens but they did ask about tribal ancestry. Many respondents did not know to which Indigenous tribe they trace their ancestry. Beyond these measures, the CMPS also contains an additional identity measure with a weighted total of 1,956 self-identified Native American respondents (not used in this analysis). Researchers using the CMPS should consult the CMPS Methods Statement, be transparent about their measure of Native American respondents, and justify why it is appropriate, as well as the possible limitations of the indicator(s).

Identity, Culture, And Political Outcomes

The questions of who is Native American and how we measure it may affect the political outcomes we are interested in as social scientists. Table 2 presents descriptive outputs from the CMPS Native American sample for the following identity measures: individuals who self-identify as Native American, individuals who state that Native American is their primary race or ethnicity, and individuals who identified as Native American in the 2020 US Census. Of those respondents who self-identified, 69% stated that Native American is their primary identity and 58% identified as Native American on the 2020 US Census (Liebler 2018; Liebler, Bhaskar, and Porter 2016).

We describe subsample differences and similarities in select social, political, and cultural variables to show similarities and differences in some outcomes. There were differences in whether individuals perceive themselves as multiracial: 62% of those who self-identified as Native American stated that they are multiracial; 58% stated that Native American is their primary identity; and 54% of those identified as Native American on the 2020 census. We also found differences in political variables by identity measure. For example, those who stated that Native American was their primary identity were less likely to be registered to vote (37%) compared to individuals who self-identified as Native American (43%) and those who identified as Native American on the 2020 US Census (40%). There also were differences in vote-choice and party-identification rates. Individuals who noted that they were Native American on the 2020 US Census were slightly more likely to state that they voted for Joe Biden in 2020 (50%) compared to the other two subgroups. Regarding party identification, Native Americans tend mostly to identify as Independents; however, 33% of respondents who identified as Native American on the 2020 US Census identified as Democrats—slightly higher among identity measures. One of the major differences between identity measures was respondents who reported discussing politics with their friends or family: 60% who self-identified as Native American reported having done so, with smaller rates among those who identified as Native American in the 2020 US Census (52%) and those who stated being Native American was their primary identity (55%).

Questions of identity are significant because current survey methods perpetuate a race-based understanding of Native American identity, disregarding the sovereign rights of Native nations as political collectives with inherent rights to determine and recognize their citizenry.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000337 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1

Native American Identity Questions on CMPS and Sample Size

What do you consider your race or ethnicity? Respondents who selected Native American (could select multiple)	1,332
Which racial category did you choose on the 2020 US Census? Respondents who selected American Indian or Alaska Native option	774
Even if they are all important, which of these would you consider your primary race or ethnicity, if you had to choose one? Respondents who selected Native American	916
Do you consider yourself or your family ancestry to be Native American or American Indian? (could select multiple)	
Yes, myself	1,468
Yes, one of my parents	1,180
Yes, one of my grandparents	1,527
Yes, another more distant relative	1,177
What is the race of your biological mother? Respondents who identified Native American (could select multiple)	1,006
What is the race of your biological father? Respondents who identified Native American (could select multiple)	955
There are 574 federally recognized tribes living within the United States; to which tribe do you or your family trace your ancestry? (asked of self–identified Native Americans)	
Navajo	175
Cherokee	640
Sioux	73
Chippewa or Ojibwe	58
Choctaw	108
Apache	113
Pueblo	50
Iroquois	57
Creek	69
Blackfeet	112
Alaska Native	52
Latin American Indigenous	183
Other (Specify)	432
Don't Know	628
Refused	74

Note: *Weighted sample (os_weight).*

The CMPS also asked questions that attempted to capture a connection to Native American culture and community, and there were differences among these identity measures. This was similar to Fryberg et al.'s (2021) research, which used more than 20 different measures of attachment. For those respondents who self-identified as Native American, a greater percentage stated that they have never attended a cultural event, are less likely to express trust in tribal governments, and do not speak a Native language either well or somewhat well. These cultural connections are somewhat more pronounced across identity measures and can yield important insight into how cultural factors shape the politics of Native Americans (Foxworth, Ellenwood, and Evans 2024). Some differences in political outcomes are subtle and not always statistically different; however, greater exploration is needed to understand if and how differences in Native American identity, lineage, and citizenship matter for political outcomes.

Ongoing Challenges: Indigenous Data Sovereignty, Governance, And Care Principles

In responding to histories of research exploitation, Indigenous peoples have mobilized to call for research that centers them, their knowledge, and governance systems. This call asserts that ethical research practices should support Indigenous communities by advancing their methods of inquiry and be used to advance Native rights and other sovereign interests. To accomplish this, scholars must engage directly with Native communities to understand their needs, interests, and research methods and designs. Unfortunately, political science continues to devalue community-engaged research, which often is dismissed as "activist scholarship" that violates standards of objectivity and neutrality (Gellman 2022; Smith 2006; Walter and Andersen 2013).

Indigenous peoples are operationalizing new research standards, practices, and protocols rooted in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Indigenous Data Sovereignty (ID-Sov) and Indigenous Data Governance (ID-Gov). ID-Sov is the inherent right of Native nations to govern the collection, ownership, and application of their own data. ID-Gov centers on collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, and ethics (CARE) principles, outlining how research and data must center and benefit Indigenous peoples. This is in sharp contrast to research practices that have problematized Indigenous peoples, their experiences, and sovereignty (Kukutai and Taylor 2016). CARE principles include the following:

- Collective benefit ensures that Indigenous peoples develop, benefit from, and access research and data.
- Authority to control is the right of Indigenous peoples to govern data.
- Responsibility positions data to build the local capacity of Indigenous communities.
- Ethics requires Indigenous values and ethics to be reflected in research so that Indigenous peoples can benefit from research.

ID-Sov and ID-Gov ensure that Indigenous peoples' values, worldviews, knowledge, and governance systems are centered within the entire research process. CARE principles implement ID-Gov and supplement mainstream data principles such as Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable and Data Access and Research Transparency (Global Indigenous Data Alliance n.d.). CARE principles "empower Indigenous Peoples by shifting the focus from regulated consultation to value-based relationships that position data approaches within Indigenous cultures and knowledge systems to the benefit of Indigenous Peoples" (Carroll et al. 2021, 108). That is, to advance survey research that includes Native peoples, researchers must ensure that ID-Sov and ID-Gov are addressed in their research practices and designs. Many Native nations manage formal Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) to actualize their inherent rights of ID-Gov. Native nation IRBs vary in size, scope, and authority, but Native nations actively govern data-collection processes that occur on tribal lands and/or include data about their Native nation and citizens. Given that surveys may collect data from Native peoples in Native nations,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000337 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2

Native American Identity and Select Socioeconomic Status, Political, and Cultural Variables

	Self-Identify as Native American (Respondents Could Select More Than One Response) (1)	Native American as Primary Race or Ethnicity, if You Had to Choose One? (2)	Respondent Identified as Native American on the 2020 US Census (3)
Sample Size (N)	1,332	916	774
Do you consider yourself multiracial? Percentage responding yes	62%	58%	54%
Registered to vote in the state	43%	37%	40%
Vote Choice			
Democrats Joe Biden and Kamala Harris	48%	43%	50%
Republicans Donald Trump and Mike Pence	37%	40%	37%
Discussed politics with family and friends? Percentage responding Yes, I am certain I did that last year	60%	55%	52%
Political Party Identification			
Republican	20%	22%	23%
Democrat	31%	27%	33%
Independent	40%	41%	37%
Percentage of respondents who reported never having attended cultural events, such as powwows, community meals and ceremonies?	35%	26%	23%
How much of the time do you think you can trust your tribal government to do what is right? Percentage responding always or most of the time	50%	57%	55%
How often do you vote in tribal elections? Percentage responding I always or sometimes vote	23%	27%	31%
How important is being Native American to your identity? Percentage responding extremely or very important	57%	62%	62%
How well, if at all, do you speak another Native or tribal language? Do you speak another language? Percentage responding very well or somewhat well	13%	16%	18%

Note: *Weighted sample (os_weight).*

the issues of navigating Native Nation IRBs, tribal sovereignty, and distinct tribal laws requires further exploration and have implications for future survey research.

ID-Sov and ID-Gov both prioritize Native American community engagement in research, but the scope of engagement can vary by community. However, minimum standards must include discussions with Native-community cross-sector leaders, ensuring Native-nation access and ownership of data and prioritizing community needs and sovereign interests. Ownership of data is one aspect that many social scientists may take issue with because this means that these scholars must cede power to the communities that they seek to understand (Gellman 2022). Therefore, researchers must actively take additional measures to not harm Native American peoples and their communities. The small population of Native peoples in some geographic areas, combined with the historical and ongoing levels of colonial violence and hostility, significantly increases the importance of ensuring Native participants' safety, security, and anonymity.

Recognizing who is a "real" Native American is an ongoing challenge for survey research. This is important because Native American identities are not only racial and ethnic categories; Native peoples also are citizens of sovereign Native nations.

Concluding Thoughts On Surveying Native Americans

In 2020, oversample directors with CMPS principal investigators developed a plan to engage Native leaders and other experts to solicit their input on best practices, instrument design, and more. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic impaired these efforts. The CMPS can be a valuable source of public survey data on Native American political attitudes as well as a first important step toward engaging important issues that are related to histories of research abuse, tribal sovereignty, complexities around identity, and the need to engage Indigenous scholars and scholarship across academic disciplines. A panoptic solution to engaging Native communities is beyond the scope of this article. However, we believe that it provides insight into current tensions between survey research and Native Americans by identifying pathways to improve data practices that are responsive to Native communities.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research documentation and data that support the findings of this study are openly available at the *PS: Political Science & Politics* Harvard Dataverse at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DIZ4ZB.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000337 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research. ■

REFERENCES

Carroll, Stephanie Russo, Edit Herczog, Maui Hudson, Keith Russell, and Shelley Stall. 2021. "Operationalizing the CARE and FAIR Principles for Indigenous Data Futures." *Scientific Data* 8 (1):108.

Deloria, Philip J. 1998. *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deloria, Vine, and Clifford M. Lytle. 1998. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Foxworth, Raymond, Cheryl Ellenwood, and Laura Evans. 2024. "Replication Data for 'Surveying Native Americans: Early Lessons from the CMPS.'" *PS: Political Science & Politics*. Harvard Dataverse. DOI:10.7910/DVN/DIZ4ZB.

Fryberg, Stephanie A., Arianne E. Eason, Laura M. Brady, Nadia Jessop, and Julisa J. Lopez. 2021. "Unpacking the Mascot Debate: Native American Identification Predicts Opposition to Native Mascots." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 12 (1): 3–13.

Gellman, Mneesha. 2022. *Indigenous Language Politics in the Schoolroom: Cultural Survival in Mexico and the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Global Indigenous Data Alliance. n.d. "CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance." www.gida-global.org/care. Accessed May 16, 2024.

Hamilton, Vanessa, Carlton LeCount, Nicole Parker Cariaga, and Kristine Sudbeck. 2019. "Research On vs. Research With." *Great Plains Research* 29 (1): 17–24.

Herrick, Rebekah, Jeanette Morehouse Mendez, Ben Pryor, and James A. Davis. 2019. "Surveying American Indians with Opt-In Internet Surveys." *American Indian Quarterly* 43 (3): 281–305.

Hill, Norbert S., and Kathleen Ratteree (eds.). 2017. *The Great Vanishing Act: Blood Quantum and the Future of Native Nations*. Wheat Ridge, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

Hodge, Felicia Schanche. 2012. "No Meaningful Apology for American Indian Unethical Research Abuses." *Ethics & Behavior* 22 (6): 431–44.

Kolopenuk, Jessica. 2023. "The Pretendian Problem." *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 56 (2): 468–73.

Kukutai, Tahu, and John Taylor. 2016. *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Lavelle, Bridget, Michael D. Larsen, and Craig Gundersen. 2009. "Strategies for Surveys of American Indians." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (2): 385–403.

Liebler, Carolyn A. 2018. "Counting America's First Peoples." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 677 (1): 180–90.

Liebler, Carolyn A., Renuka Bhaskar, and Sonya R. Porter. 2016. "Joining, Leaving, and Staying in the American Indian/Alaska Native Race Category Between 2000 and 2010." *Demography* 53 (2): 507–40.

Lujan, Carol Chiago. 2014. "American Indians and Alaska Natives Count: The US Census Bureau's Efforts to Enumerate the Native Population." *American Indian Quarterly* 38 (3): 319–41.

Nagle, Rebecca. 2019. "How 'Pretendians' Undermine the Rights of Indigenous People." *High Country News*, April 2. www.hcn.org/articles/tribal-affairs-how-pretendians-undermine-the-rights-of-indigenous-people.

Native American Rights Fund. n.d. "Frequently Asked Questions: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions About Native Peoples." *Native American Rights Fund*. https://narf.org/frequently-asked-questions. Accessed May 16, 2024.

Orr, Yancey, and Raymond Orr. 2022. "Deception-Based Knowledge in Indigenous and Scientific Societies: American Indian Tricksters and Experimental Research Designs." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 12 (1): 46–62.

Pevar, Stephen L. 2012. *The Rights of Indians and Tribes*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rodriguez-Lonebear, Desi. 2021. "The Blood Line: Racialized Boundary Making and Citizenship Among Native Nations." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 7 (4): 527–42.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2006. "Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples." Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

TallBear, Kim. 2013. *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

US Census Bureau. 2023. "A Look at the Largest American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes and Villages in the Nation, Tribal Areas, and States." October 3. www.census.gov.

Walter, Maggie, and Chris Andersen. 2013. *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Wilson, Shawn. 2020. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Wilkins, David E., and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark. 2017. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wolf, Aron S. 1989. "The Barrow Studies: An Alaskan's Perspective." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 2 (3): 35–40.

EXAMINING NATIVE HAWAIIANS SELF-IDENTIFICATION AND POLITICAL RELEVANCE: INSIGHTS FROM THE 2020 COLLABORATIVE MULTICULTURAL POST-ELECTION SURVEY NATIVE HAWAIIANS OVERSAMPLE

Ngoc T. Phan, *Hawai'i Pacific University, USA*
Leilani De Lude, *University of New Mexico, USA*

DOI:10.1017/S1049096524000428

The goal of the Native Hawaiian oversample for the 2020 Collaborative Multicultural Post-Election Survey (CMPS) was to survey 1,000 Native Hawaiians across the United States (Frasure et al. 2021). This article discusses the data-generation process, initial findings, and sample limitations.

Sample Relevance To Studying Political Science

The goal of the CMPS sample was to enhance data disaggregation of Native Hawaiians. They comprise a group that often is categorized as either (1) Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI), a frequently used term to capture all Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (Pratt, Hixson, and Jones 2015); or (2) Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (NHPI), a term used to separate Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders from the more extensive Asian category (Morey et al. 2020; Sasa and Yellow Horse 2022). Because NHPI also includes a person who originated from the Indigenous Peoples of Hawai'i, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands, the goal of the CMPS sample was to disaggregate Native Hawaiians from other Pacific Islander groups. Researchers often overlook the distinctions between Native Hawaiians and other ethnic and racial categories, thereby missing opportunities to study Indigeneity and Native Hawaiian lived experiences (Kana'iaupuni 2011; Sasa and Yellow Horse 2022, 344).

Data disaggregation amplifies the lived experiences of Native Hawaiians. Separating Native Hawaiians from the broader AAPI and NHPI categories provides insight into the intragroup and intergroup differences among Native Hawaiians compared to other AAPIs. For example, political and legal status differs within the Pacific Islander category. Nativity and citizenship in the United States for those born in Hawai'i, American Samoa, and Guam are automatically considered. Conversely, those from Fiji, the Marshall Islands, Western Samoa, and Tonga are not native to the United States through birth (Harris and Jones 2005). Pacific Islanders also include the Federal States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau—all of which have a unique relationship with the United States as a result of the Compact of Free Association (COFA). COFA gives the United States exclusive use of land for bases and military strategic positions in the Pacific in exchange for travel, legal residence, and work in the United States without requiring a visa (Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum 2021). Because there is great diversity even among Pacific Islanders, studying Native Hawaiian samples independently from the AAPI and NHPI categories has significance for political scientists and policy makers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000337 Published online by Cambridge University Press