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ABSTRACT

The present study examines the assimilation of Mexican Americans in the United States. Their relative non-assimilation into American society was first traced through three historical periods. These periods were Conquest and Conflict, which covered the period between settlement to the 1850's; Partial Accommodation, from the 1850's to the 1930's; and Towards Cultural Pluralism from the 1940's to the present. Although the group relations were very different in each of these periods, Mexican Americans did not Assimilate.

In the contemporary period a more detailed analysis was undertaken. Gordon's model of assimilation was tested on a sample of Mexican Americans. This sample was obtained from NC-128 samples in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Michigan and Texas. Due to the broad scope of Gordon's model, only four of the many possible hypotheses were tested. These four were: 1) an inverse relationship between Cultural Heterogeneity and Assimilation, 2) a direct relationship between Value Consensus and Assimilation, 3) an inverse relationship between stereotyping and assimilation, and 4) Structural Assimilation is a stronger type of assimilation than in Civic Assimilation.

The two dimensions of Cultural Heterogeneity measured here were Spanish and Familism. Both of these were statistically significant in their associations with Structural and Civic Assimilation. The third hypothesis also found some support here, as the two measures of
Stereotyping, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice, were statistically significant in their associations with Structural but not Civic Assimilation. In the fourth hypothesis, Structural Assimilation was also found to be a more significant type of Assimilation than Civic. It had more statistically significant associations with the independent variables than did Civic Assimilation. Also, these associations tended to be of greater strength as determined by the R's. Support could not be found here for the second hypothesis dealing with Value Consensus and either Structural or Civic Assimilation.

In a cursory examination of sex differences, Mexican American females were found to be more susceptible to assimilation pressures than were Mexican American males. This was evidenced in the statistically significant differences in the strength of the associations between Structural Assimilation and the independent variables for females.
CHAPTER 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Mexican Americans\(^1\) and Anglo Americans (henceforth called Anglos)\(^2\) have been in contact with each other in what is now the Southwestern part of the United States for over 150 years. In the course of this contact the relative size of the groups and the dominance-subordinance relationship between the two groups have dramatically changed. During the early years, Anglos were the immigrants as well as the minority group in terms of subordination. The situation soon changed. The social and ethnic structure reversed in the mid-19th century, taking the form that we know today where Mexican Americans are considered to be the immigrant group and the minority. Yet over the course of the past century and a half, Mexican Americans have not been assimilated to mainstream American life. Mexican Americans continue to be a distinct ethnic group with a separate

---

1. The term Mexican American will be used throughout. Other titles such as Spanish, Spanish American, and Latin American are not used as they are inaccurate since they refer to a different population than the one being addressed here. While the term "Chicano" could have been used, "Mexican American" appears to be more widely used and accepted in the literature. See Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970:386-387; Nostrand, 1975: 159-161; Simmens, 1972:53-56; and Stoddard, 1973:63-71.

2. This term oversimplifies the population that is being referred to. It would be impossible to try and specify correctly for each individual member of the group their precise ancestry. In the present study, Anglo refers to the white (non-Hispanic) population of the U.S.
array of cultural traits including the more tangible forms such as language, food, music, dress, etc., as well as the less visible forms that come under the headings of values, beliefs and attitudes. The question of Mexican American assimilation has seldom been addressed in a systematic manner. This dissertation takes this sociological phenomenon as its thesis, looking at the history of interaction between Mexican Americans and Anglos and presents findings on a contemporary sample of Mexican Americans as a test of a major theory of assimilation.

The literature on race relations presents several theoretical approaches regarding the choices that minorities have regarding their subordinate position. According to Wirth (1945:354-363), there are four strategies for adaptation that a subordinated minority group, such as Mexican Americans, can adopt in response to their position: assimilation, pluralism, secession and militancy. Schermerhorn (1970), expressing another point of view, notes that knowing the policies of the minority groups is not enough. One must also consider the policies of the majority group towards the minority group. Because the majority group is more powerful, its policies are more important. This proposition, as shall be seen in Chapter 3, holds true in the case of Mexican American/Anglo relations.

Milton Gordon (1964, 1978), one of the principal modern authorities on race relations, maintains that intergroup contact in the U.S. has been basically assimilationist. More specifically, he maintains that the assimilation that has occurred has been primarily in the cultural sphere, i.e., cultural assimilation, rather than in the economic or social spheres, i.e., structural assimilation.
The issue of assimilation has been a topic of much interest recently. However, little of the prevailing work on assimilation in sociology has focused to any extent on Mexican Americans. Greeley (1969, 1974), Glazer and Moynihan (1970, 1975), Schermerhorn (1970) and Gordon (1964, 1978), to name a few of the recent writers on the topic, have dealt primarily with European immigrant groups, and to some extent with Blacks and Puerto Ricans. Rarely, if ever, have they specifically included Mexican Americans in their discussions of assimilation. This dissertation focuses on Mexican American assimilation, or more accurately, the lack of assimilation.

Mexican Americans, we suggest, may be considered to be both a conquered group and an immigrant group. Like American Indians, Mexicans were in the territory that is now most of the American Southwest before the Anglo American migrated to this region. Mexican Americans and American Indians are therefore the only conquered people in the continental U.S. The other ethnic groups have migrated to the U.S. either voluntarily, e.g., Irish, Germans, and Italians, etc., or involuntarily, e.g., Blacks.

On another level, Mexican Americans may also be considered to be an immigrant group. In the early 20th century, for example, large waves of immigrants entered the U.S. from Mexico. However, Mexican immigrants were not like other immigrants (e.g., Asians and Europeans) in that they were not moving to an area that was totally strange and new, except for those few Mexican Americans who continued to the Midwest. Mexican Americans have been in the area for many years and were still there in
substantial numbers. In addition, when Mexican immigrants traveled northward to the American Southwest, they did not have a large physical barrier, such as an ocean, to overcome. Historically, as in the present, for Mexican Americans the homeland remained very close and relatively accessible. This proximity and accessibility to home country have certainly had a deterring effect on Mexican American assimilation.

Overview

In this first chapter, the literature on race relations is examined, focusing specifically on assimilation. The first part consists of a discussion of terms and concepts central to the study of social and ethnic groups and then moves into a theoretical discussion of intergroup contact with respect to assimilation.

In Chapter 2, Gordon's theory of assimilation is discussed as it was presented in his two major works, *Assimilation in American Life* (1964), and *Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity* (1978). Also presented is an outline of the model that derived from his theory and which will subsequently be tested in Chapter 6.

In Chapter 3, the contemporary position of Mexican Americans vis-a-vis Anglos is examined by studying several demographic, social and economic indicators of assimilation. In most cases, differences were found that lead to the conclusion that Mexican Americans have not melted, but rather that they remain intact relatively speaking as a clearly distinct ethnic group. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that this pattern of non-assimilation will change in the near future.
Chapter 4 presents the history of contact between Mexican Americans and Anglos in the Southwest during three time periods: Settlement to 1850s, 1850s to 1930s and 1940s to the present. This historical analysis provides information on some of the causes for the present non-assimilation of Mexican Americans. During each of these time periods, the position of Mexican Americans relative to Anglos changed considerably. However, none of the changes examined here worked to foster assimilation. In fact, by the end of each period studied, there were several major forces working against the assimilation of Mexican Americans.

The procedures used in the development of the questionnaire, sampling and data collection for the test of Gordon's theory of assimilation are presented in Chapter 5. In this chapter the methodology used in the analysis of the data, as well as the operationalization of variables, is also discussed.

In Chapter 6 the findings for each of the four hypotheses studied are presented and discussed. Basically, the results indicated support for hypotheses focusing on cultural heterogeneity, stereotyping and structural assimilation. Finally, Chapter 7 presents a summary, some conclusions, and suggestions for future research on Mexican American assimilation and the testing of Gordon's theory.

**Concepts**

The field of Race Relations\(^3\) and, more specifically, the literature on assimilation, use terms and concepts which are given wide interpretation. Therefore, a discussion of these fundamental terms and

\(^3\) The field has several names including minority relations, intergroup relations, assimilation, etc.
concepts is imperative at this early point in the dissertation. This discussion will serve to both elaborate on the concepts and terms and also to elucidate how they will be used in this dissertation.

Race

The term "race" is an explosive and heavily connotated term in American society. It is also one of the most frequently misused and misunderstood words in the English vernacular (Rose, 1974). There are several possibilities for the origin of the concept of "race." Its origin may have been with nationalism, as a phenomena which was used to bind the sentiments and loyalty which had previously been devoted to the family, the clan, or other blood groups. Another proposition is that white Europeans developed it to justify exploitations of non-European groups (Berry, 1978:35). In the 16th, 17th and part of the 18th century, "race" was used to refer to the descendents of a common ancestor, emphasizing kinship linkages or generations (Krogman, 1945:38). It was not until the 18th century that race came to refer to a distinct category of human beings with physical characteristics that were transmitted by descent. This is not to say, however, that there were no distinctions made based on physical differences.

The first use of this term in the sense of the biological or physically distinctive categories of human beings is believed to have been in the 1770s when Immanuel Kant used the German phrase "races of mankind" (Rose, 1968:32-33). Since then, humans have been grouped into races on a wide basis including color of skin, degree and type of body hair, shape of facial features, bloodtype and even cephalic index.
However, all of the classifications of race are pseudo-scientific as they assume that the various races belong to different species when in fact all human beings belong to one species, "homo sapiens." Since biological species are genetically closed systems, no interbreeding or gene exchange would be able to occur between them. However, because races are genetically open systems, there has been considerable interbreeding and gene exchange between them. Biological scientists maintain that "homo sapiens" evolved only once and that only after they migrated to different parts of the world did they develop into different races (Rose and Rose, 1965:313). Notwithstanding the physical differences that might have existed at one time between the groups, the interbreeding between them has caused many of the "racial" characteristics to be continuous rather than discrete. This continuous nature also serves to weaken even the potential utility of race as a categorical or descriptive classification system, by not permitting the classification of all individuals into mutually exclusive categories (Berry, 1978:23-33; Marden and Meyer, 1978:129; Schaeffer, 1979:13-18).

The concept of race continues to have many contemporary uses and misuses. It is used to refer to: people of particular countries or nations, people who speak a certain language, religious groups, a hypothetical "pure" type assumed to have existed in the distant past such as Nordic or Germanic, and major biological divisions such as Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Negroid (Berry, 1978:30). Mexican Americans have been the subject of misapplications of definitions of these definitions of race. Because they are identified as the people of a particular country,
Mexico, and with speaking a certain language, Spanish, they have been referred to as a racial group. However, using the biological criteria discussed above, they are not a race.

The miscegenation of which Mexican Americans are a product has resulted in Mexican Americans not being considered a part of the "Caucasian" race. Virtually all Mexican Americans may be considered to be Mestizos. Borah (1954:34) noted that by the end of the eighteenth century, "there were few individuals of pure race left in the country [Mexico]." Morner (1967:3) also pointed out that not only Mexicans but most Latin Americans are a product of amalgamation between individuals from as varied backgrounds as Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Negroid.

The dynamics of miscegenation plays a very prominent part for Mexican Americans. Vasconcelos (1942:130), the Mexican philosopher, in a now famous declaration, called all Latin Americans a new race, "made of the treasury of all the previous races, the final race, the cosmic race." Mexican Americans do have some Caucasoid features such as light skin, prominent chin, relatively long trunks and frequent balding, but mostly Mongoloid ones such as brown skin, black hair, broad cheekbones, and low nose bridges. However, for the most part, they are not usually regarded as having any of the physical characteristics usually attributed to the Negroid race.

Aside from the strictly scientific aspect of race there is a social definition which may override any biological or legal criteria. In attempting to give the definitive definition of race, UNESCO revealed that, "For all practical purposes, 'race,' is not as much a biological phenomena as a social myth" (Montagu, 1972:118). Cox (1948:402) was the
first to discern the social relevance of race by defining it as being "any people who are distinguished or consider themselves distinguished in social relations with other people by their [physical] characteristics." This social aspect of the concept of race is still being employed today by prominent contemporary researchers such as van den Berghe. According to van den Berghe (1967:9) a race is defined as a group "that defines itself and/or is defined by other people as different from other groups by virtue of [presumed] innate and immutable physical characteristics."

According to Cox's and van den Berghe's definitions, Mexican Americans could be considered to be a distinct "racial" group. However, there are problems in using this type of categorization. Race, for example, is all too often associated with the scientifically invalid biological definition. Also the social definition is so completely relativistic that groups can be considered racial groups on the basis of purely cultural characteristics. There are other categories (e.g., ethnic groups) under which cultural groups can validly be studied. Therefore, Mexican Americans will not be considered a racial group in this study.

Ethnic Group

Gordon (1964:27-28) defined an ethnic group as being a "group with a shared feeling of peoplehood." This "peoplehood" refers to the social psychological core of an individual's race, religion, national origin, or some combination thereof. Gordon (1964:79-82) also divides the cultural traits involved in the definition of ethnic group into
extrinsic, which includes external traits such as dress, accents, and patterns of emotional expressions, and intrinsic, which are the vital ingredients of culture such as religious beliefs, linguistic traditions, and even patterns of leisure time.

A thorough definition of ethnic group was developed by Barth who combined many of the elements usually associated with ethnicity in the literature. According to his definition (1969:10), an ethnic group is one that: a) is largely biologically self-perpetuating; b) shares fundamental cultural values realized in overt unity in cultural forms; c) makes up a field of communication and interaction; and d) has a membership which identifies itself and is identified by others as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order. "Biologically self-perpetuating" does not refer to a racial criteria. Rather, Barth uses this concept in the sense of a somewhat homogeneous group with fairly rigorous endogamous rules, for example, members of such a group would tend to marry only other members of the group and thus be biologically self-perpetuating.

The second characteristic noted by Barth, common group culture, is generally regarded as being of central importance in the definition of an ethnic group. For example, Longstreet (1978:20) considered ethnicity as being "those things even as adults for which we have no rational basis, but for which we have a gut level need to continue doing." Culture, to Longstreet (1978:19), is developed "before the individual is in complete command of his or her abstract intellectual powers," i.e., internalized during the socialization process. Although Longstreet uses the notion of culture to refer only to what Gordon previously referred
to as intrinsic culture, the definition used by Barth here would appear to be broad enough to also include the extrinsic aspects.

The third characteristic put forth by Barth, fundamentally refers to the social milieu of an ethnic group. The individual members of an ethnic group are most likely to almost exclusively engage in communication and interaction with other members of the same group.¹

The fourth and last point of Barth's definition is composed of two parts, namely, how the group is regarded by other members of society and how the group views itself. Other members of society must perceive the group as being a separate entity, i.e., different from others in that society. The group must also consider itself a separate and distinguishable entity. According to Barth, if less than all four of these conditions are met, then the group under consideration may not be regarded as an ethnic group.

Mexican Americans do meet these criteria and thus may be deemed an ethnic group. They are very endogamous (as we will see in Chapter 3 in the section on intermarriage) and thus largely biologically self-perpetuating. They also tend to share the same fundamental culture rooted in their Mexican ancestry. Also, due to residential segregation, economic discrimination and cultural reasons, many Mexican Americans tend to interact and communicate mostly with other Mexican Americans. In addition, they meet both parts of Barth's fourth criterion; Mexican Americans are generally regarded as being a separate group by non-Hispanics in American

4. This does not seem too surprising, particularly when it is these individuals that one feels most at home with, especially when they are of the same social class (see Gordon, 1978:134-36).
society, and most Mexican Americans perceive themselves as being a separate distinguishable group.

Therefore, Mexican Americans will be considered an ethnic group in this dissertation. The term ethnic group is a more accurate description of Mexican Americans in relation to Anglos than the concept of race. Also, because assimilation primarily concerns social and cultural processes, ethnicity is a more relevant concept in the study of assimilation.

Minority

Contemporary usage of the term "minority group" has divested it of all statistical meaning. One of the first uses of the term without its statistical appendages was done by Louis Wirth. He asserted that a minority group was: "A group of people who because of physical or cultural characteristics are singled out from the others in the society they live for differential and unequal treatment and who therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination" (1945:347). This definition, which is still in use today, contains nothing about the relative numbers between groups. In some cases the "minority group" is statistically a majority (see Legum, 1975 and Schermerhorn, 1970).

Wagely and Harris (1958:10) noted two additional characteristics of a minority group. The first is that membership in a minority group is transmitted by rule of descent which is capable of affiliating succeeding generations even in the absence of readily apparent physical or cultural traits. The second is that by choice or necessity, minority group members tend to exhibit a high degree of endogamy.
In the United States, the physical or cultural characteristics which are used to delineate a minority are: race, national origin, language and religion. Thus, the criteria of a minority group causes a substantial overlap with the term "ethnic group." Mexican Americans could be considered to be a minority group according to the definitions stated here. As a group, they differ from non-Hispanics on physical and cultural characteristics. They are physically distinguishable from other "white" groups. They also tend to speak Spanish and to be Catholic. They have also been and continue to be the objects of prejudice and discrimination. Additionally, they tend to exhibit a high degree of endogamy. However, because the terms "minority group" and "ethnic group" are defined by many of the same cultural characteristics, e.g., national origin, language, and religion, there is an extreme amount of overlap. Therefore, to avoid multiple references, only the term "ethnic group" will be applied to Mexican Americans.

Prejudice

Prejudice against Mexican Americans, as will be seen in Chapter 4, has been one of the factors hindering their assimilation. The classic definition, and the one to be used here is the one proffered by Gordon

5. In the U.S., Blacks are regarded as both a racial and a minority group. The unscientific nature of the use of "race," which was discussed previously, is also applicable to Blacks. The problems noted here with the use of the term "minority group" also extend in their application to Blacks. Although it is more scientifically sound to use the term "ethnic group" to refer to Blacks also, the social and legal nomenclature of our institutions have so ingrained the terms "race" and "minority group" that any suggestions to the contrary here would not be successful.
Allport (1954:10). He defined prejudice as being, "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or towards an individual because he/she is a member of that group." Secord and Backman (1974:165) added a cognitive component to this definition by defining prejudice as being "an attitude that predisposes a person to think, feel and act in favorable or unfavorable ways towards a group or its individual members."

There are many theories concerning the causes of prejudice. While a thorough accounting of these theories is beyond the scope of this paper, several of the major ones will be briefly examined. These are: functional theory, instinct theory, behaviorist theory, neo-behaviorist theory, and authoritarian personality theory.

The functional theory of prejudice is exemplified by Katz and Stotland (1959) and Katz (1960) who asserted that prejudice serves four functions in society: knowledge, ego defensive, instrumental, and value expression. Prejudice provides a knowledge function by providing the basis for coping and dealing with the hundreds of different individuals that may be seen everyday. The ego-defensive function is accomplished by allowing an individual to rationalize personal failures and successes by holding pejorative attitudes about a group and then blaming them for the current state of affairs. Prejudice provides the instrumental function by helping to rationalize and maintain current patterns of economic, political, and social superordination and subordination. When prejudice is a central societal value as well as a central personal value (see Westie, 1965), its manifestation fulfills the value expressive function.
The instinct theory of prejudice as promulgated by Park and Burgess (1924:578) maintains that there is a natural dislike of differences. Prejudice is rooted in the "fear of the unfamiliar and uncomprehended." However, the validity of this argument is questionable since the objects of dislike varied substantially across regions and time.

Behaviorist theory regards prejudice as resulting from negative conditioning. According to this theory, a unique and traumatic experience with the members of a particular ethnic group is the source of the prejudice against that group. The usefulness of this argument is limited since many individuals are prejudiced towards a group without ever having encountered a member of that group (Dworkin and Dworkin, 1976:96). This fact would appear to suggest that prejudice does not stem from contact with a group but rather that it is learned from people who are prejudiced (Berry, 1978:240).

The Neo-Behaviorist school is based upon the frustration-aggression model of prejudice. According to this theory, as represented in the works of Dollard et al. (1939) and Allport (1959), the aggressive tendencies that people acquire as a response to frustration find expression in hostility towards an ethnic group. The actual frustrating source may be so strong and complex that the frustration is directed at a weak, highly visible and accessible group.

The authoritarian personality theory of prejudice began in the 1940's with the work of Max Horkheimer (1946). His work first asserted the relationship between prejudice and the personality of an individual. The real impact came later with the work of Adorno et al. (1950) on the authoritarian personality. According to the authoritarian personality
theory, prejudice results from rigid and repressive childhood training. This theory maintained that prejudiced people shared a number of traits; they were highly conventional, superstitious, anti-intellectual, as well as uneasy about money matters. This theory was also supported by other research that found that individuals who were prejudiced against one group also tended to be prejudiced against other groups (Hartley, 1946).

The last theory of the causes of prejudice to be discussed here is based upon the psychological concept of projection. According to this theory, when individuals do not want to acknowledge certain motives that they sense in themselves, they may instead attribute them to other people particularly other ethnic groups. Although the motives under consideration here are important in the culture of the dominant group, there is also a concomitant ambivalence towards them, e.g., sexual gratification, security, work, cleanliness. An example of this type of theory is illustrated by the individuals, cited by Rose and Rose (1965:319) who because they are "fearful of today's existence persecute so that by creating in others terrors greater than those they themselves experience seek to build up for themselves an illusion of security and safety."

Discrimination

While prejudice has been defined as an attitude, discrimination can be described as behavior. Schaeffer (1979:78) defined discrimination as being that "behavior that excludes all members of a group from certain rights, opportunities, or privileges." Others such as Hankins (1978:186) have defined discrimination as "unequal treatment of equals, either by bestowal of favors or impositions of burdens." Although both of these
definitions are acceptable, for the purposes of this paper, the definition by Feagin (1978:14) will be used, as it explicitly addresses the issues involved in discrimination. According to him, discrimination is "actions or practices carried out by members of dominant groups or their representatives which have a different and harmful impact on members of subordinate groups." It should be noted that discrimination can only be carried out by the dominant group in a society because this group alone has the power to accomplish it. This has certainly been the pattern in the case of Anglo/Mexican American relations (Fernández and Marems, 1980).

Feagin (1978:15) also provides a four-fold typology of discrimination. These four parts are: isolate, small-group, direct, and indirect. Many of the other typologies of discrimination can for the most part be subsumed under this typology. These four types vary along two dimensions, individual or group, and legal or illegal.

The first type, isolate discrimination is the kind of discrimination that occurs when a single individual of a dominant group takes it upon himself, without institutional support, to undertake harmful actions against members of a subordinate group. The concept of individual discrimination used by Rose (1965:65), and Yetman and Steele (1975:361) is similar to isolate discrimination.

Small group discrimination is similar to isolate except that it is a small group rather than an individual who undertakes the harmful actions. The adaptive type of discrimination used by Yetman and Steele (1975:362) could be considered an example of this type of discrimination. The type of discrimination exhibited by the Ku Klux Klan against Blacks, Jews, and Mexican Americans is an example of this type of discrimination.
Direct institutionalized discrimination refers to those actions by the dominant group as a whole that utilizes social and institutional support for subordinating minority group members. This type of discrimination could also be called "de jure" because there are usually legal antecedents for it. The economic, political, religious and social types of discrimination discussed by Rose and Rose (1965:70) could be considered as being types of direct institutional discrimination. The concept of structural discrimination used by Yetman and Steele (1975:364) is also similar to this type of discrimination. For example, reapportionment in the Southwest has been used to legally keep Mexican Americans from comprising a majority in a voting district.

The last type of discrimination used in Feagin's typology is indirect institutional discrimination. This type refers to those actions which have a negative impact on subordinate group members, although these actions are not specifically intended to harm the members of the subordinate group. Yetman and Steele's cultural discrimination may be regarded as a dimension of indirect institutional discrimination. Cultural discrimination refers to the situation where the dominant group sets the standards and criteria for evaluation. An example is the whole area of I.Q. and achievement testing and admission into institutions of higher education. It has been documented that such tests work systematically against Mexican Americans and other cultural minority groups (Mercer, 1973).

Unlike prejudice, there are very few theories that tend to concentrate only on causes of discrimination. Most of the theories that deal with discrimination also tend to be oriented towards the economic
sector. These theories tend to overlook Merton's (1949:99) "nonprejudiced discriminator" and Allport's (1959:14) scapegoating. For example, Barth's (1969:19) economic competition theory maintains that it is groups in competition for the same scarce resources within the same ecological or social niche that cause prejudice and discrimination to arise. Similar to this, except more Marxist in its orientation, is the economic exploitation theory as typified by Cox (1976). Briefly, this theory maintains that a minority group is stigmatized as inferior by the ruling class in order to justify its exploitation.

The split labor market theory (sometimes called the dual labor market theory of ethnic antagonisms) developed by Bonacich (1972) combines elements from both the economic competition and the economic exploitation theories. According to this theory, workers from two groups in the labor market have different levels of skill resources and expertise. The group with the lower levels of skills can only compete with the more skilled group by offering its labor at a lower wage. Laborers from the dominant group seek to protect their jobs from those laborers willing to work for a lower wage. This hegemony is accomplished by relegating minority group laborers to the lower status, low paying jobs, while keeping the high status, better paying jobs for themselves. It thus seems possible to conclude that discrimination secures economic advantages while prejudice provides the rationalization. Moreover, both prejudice and discrimination work against assimilation.

---

6. For an illustrative recent application of the split labor market to Mexican Americans, American Indians, Chinese, and Women, as well as the consequences and problems of this practice, see Stewart and Glenn (1975:185-190).
Stereotyping

Stereotypes have been defined as being a "set of ideas based upon distortion, exaggeration and oversimplification applied to all members of a group which may also be used as justification for prejudice and discrimination" (Shepard and Voss, 1978:78). Allport's definition of a stereotype, i.e., an exaggerated belief associated with a category which functions to justify (rationalize) conduct towards that category, also touches upon many of the same points.

Stereotypes are also based upon prejudice. Dworkin and Dworkin (1976:73) maintain that stereotypes may be regarded as the language of prejudice because they provide their users with a vocabulary of motives or a body of rhetoric with which to rationalize the minority-majority relationships included in the definitions noted above. Like prejudice, stereotypes also tend to be negative and are passed on from generation to generation through the socialization process (Marden and Meyer, 1978:54). Goodman (1964) observed that by the time they were four years old, both white and black children had observed the current popular stereotypes of their respective groups.

The saliency of stereotypes results from the pernicious effect they can have on the subordinate groups in society. Merton (1957:421-36) noted one of these pernicious effects in his concept of self-fulfilling prophecy. According to this concept, stereotypes can bring about a situation that is in agreement with them. According to Merton, this is accomplished in the following manner: the dominant group provides definitions of situations in such a manner that the subordinate group is
systematically discriminated against. The subordinate group is left with no alternative other than to intensify the negatively perceived behavior, thus validating the stereotype. Thus, although stereotypes are closely related to prejudice, they are sufficiently independent to warrant this separate examination.

In terms of Anglo/Mexican American relations, Anglo images of Mexicans and Mexican Americans have been quite negative and thus have worked against assimilation (Dworkin, 1965; Robinson, 1977; and Simmons, 1970). Likewise, the Mexican and Mexican American stereotypes of Anglos have generally not been favorable.

**Intergroup Contact**

There are two foremost schools of thought that involve the outcome of inter-ethnic group contact. These are Conflict and Assimilation. These two are generally regarded as being diametrically opposed and thus being incompatible with each other. The conflict school, sometimes called the power conflict school, contains such specific theories as the one of caste and internal colonialism. It views society as a stage on which struggles for power and privilege take place. The individual is regarded as very self-centered, i.e., placing his and his group's interests before those of others.

The other school of thought, Assimilation, also contains various theories concerning inter-ethnic group relations. They can basically be grouped into three groups: Anglo conformity, melting pot, and cultural pluralism. This school of thought tends to emphasize the positive
aspects of intergroup contact. It tends to be much more concerned with the *modus vivendi* than with the friction of a society.

**Power Conflict Models**

According to one of the principle proponents of the power conflict school of thought, Gerhard Lenski (1966:51), "...the foundation of political sovereignty and the foundation of the distributative system in every society where there is a surplus to be divided is force."

Force, as used here, may be interpreted in the Weberian sense of power, i.e., being able to obtain one's wishes and desires in spite of resistance from others. The more power a class or group controls in a society, the larger the part of the surplus that it will obtain. Lenski (1966:70-80), to be sure, also makes the point that in the United States, race and ethnicity constitute one of the classes within the more general class system. Thus according to Lenski, the cause of Mexican Americans not sharing in the distribution of the surplus to the same extent as other classes may be attributed to their lack of power.

One example of the theories of race relations within the power conflict school, is W. Lloyd Warner's (1941) "theory of caste."

According to this theory, Blacks in the South could be regarded as being in a caste system. The Post-Civil War situation involved very strict economic and social differentiation between Blacks and Whites. This situation was characterized by a good deal of endogamy as intermarriage was strictly prohibited. Warner noted that the discrimination practices were so extensive and systematic that the racial sentiments to which they were tied had to be much more complex than just prejudice. He
postulated that the caste system would provide the across-the-board sentiments required in this complex separation between groups.

Warner's theory has some limitations which prevent it from becoming more widely used to include Mexican Americans. Its focus was limited to a very specific population, i.e., rural southern Blacks and its application to other groups may be more difficult. It also fails to recognize that racial subordination is also found in urban areas and is not limited to the South or to Blacks. Warner was thus mistaken in his belief that industrialization, urbanization, and the northward migration of Blacks would break down the caste system.

A major theory of the power conflict school is the internal-colonialism model. This theory has as its base the "external" colonialism of the European nations. This colonialism covered hundreds of millions of individuals and extended into Africa, Asia, Latin America, as well as into the island populations (Balandier, 1966). Under this system, the external colonies were kept in a penurious condition to fulfill two functions. First, they provided cheap raw materials for processing in the industries of the mother country. Secondly, they provided the markets for many of the goods made from the raw materials (Bailey and Flores, 1973:151-53).

On the other hand, internal colonialism is what develops when the dominant group continues to stay in power after foreign control by the mother country has ended. Blauner (1972) maintains that there are four components to the Colonialization Complex (his term for internal colonialism). The first component concerns the unwanted entry of the
colonizing power. He notes that for Blacks in the U.S. the situation was slightly different from peoples victimized by "external" colonialism in that rather than the colonizing power intruding on a territory, it was Blacks who were brought involuntarily into the country.

Although Blauner tends to focus his arguments towards Blacks, the Colonizing Complex is also applicable to Mexican Americans. For Mexican Americans, the entry of the colonizing power was similar to that of external colonialism, as the conquering power came as an outside force into the area inhabited by Mexican Americans.

The second component deals with acculturation. It is accomplished by the colonizing power carrying out, "a policy which constrains, transforms, or destroys indigenous values, orientation and way of life" (Blauner, 1972:396). Due to the cultural, historical, economic, and political background of Mexican Americans (discussed in Chapter 4), they have been resilient to this "pressure cooker acculturation."

The third component discussed by Blauner is the lack of local control and ownership. Members of the colonized group tend to be "... managed and manipulated by outsiders in terms of ethnic status" (1972:396). This component readily applies to Mexican Americans as many of the businesses held in the predominately Mexican American neighborhoods are owned by non-Mexican Americans. Many of the civil positions are held by outside non-Mexican American administrators although this situation has been changing somewhat in recent years.

The last component is that of racism. Blauner maintains that because a group is defined as inferior, its exploitation, control, and oppression are justified. To be sure, Mexican Americans have been
labeled as inferior and they have been exploited, controlled and oppressed (Acuña, 1981). Thus, this last component of the model also applies to this group.

Several researchers have applied the concept of internal colonialism specifically to Mexican Americans. Barrera, Muñoz and Ornelas (1972:465-498) conceived of the barrio as an internal colony of the U.S. where Mexican Americans exist in a condition of powerlessness. They maintain that it is racism and stereotyping that justifies the colonialism which dominates and exploits Mexican Americans. Flores (1973) accepted the argument put forth by Barrera et al. (1972) and adds his own concept of racial-cultural surplus value. According to Flores, this racial-cultural surplus value is obtained and maintained by the dominant ideological apparatus. This value results from the racial-cultural superordinate position of the colonizer over the colonized. Almaguer (1974) believes that the colonized experience of Mexican Americans results from the dialectic of one group of colonizers overwhelming another group, and from the expansion of mercantile and industrial capital.

Moore (1970) maintained that Mexican Americans were subjected to three different types of colonialism: classic, conflict, and economic. Moore defines classic colonialism as the conquest of Mexican Americans. She cites New Mexico as a place where this conquest was bloodless. In New Mexico, the structure of the annexed society remained relatively intact along with the elite of the Mexican American majority. Texas is cited as the example of the second type of colonialism, conflict colonialism. Mexican Americans were greatly outnumbered there by Anglos,
and suppressed by such instrumentalities as the Texas Rangers (Samora, Bernal and Peña, 1979). In addition, the Mexican American elite were prevented from participating politically.

California was cited by Moore as the example of economic colonialism, the third type. The local Mexican American population was swamped by the Anglo immigrants during the Gold Rush. The Mexican American settlements and economy were built around large land holdings rather than villages. This was not very conducive to a strong social organization. Thus, the large numbers of Anglo immigrants were able to overwhelm and to economically manipulate Mexican Americans relatively easily.

The theories examined here under the conflict school of thought serve to partially explain the oppressive and sometimes tumultuous aspects of the relationship between Mexican Americans and Anglos in the U.S. However, the standard criticism leveled against this school of thought is also applicable here. Theorists of the conflict genre tend to overly concentrate on the areas of conflict. They fail to consider those areas where the modus vivendi is relatively stable. Loomis (1974) maintained that conflict theorists stress particular segments of society such as the "proletariate" and such factors as "interests or power." Thus, they overlook society as a whole, and values such as rewards and norms. In short, if intergroup relations are as intolerable as most conflict theorists maintain, the question arises as to why the subordinate group or groups do not, in desperation, rise up and revolt against their oppressors. The lack of revolt is subject to many interpretations as there are a good number of factors which tie groups together that are overlooked by the conflict theorist.
Assimilation

The concept of assimilation has many contemporary uses. Some refer to both cultural and structural elements while others refer only to one of these. The Latin root of the term "assimilate" is "assimalare" which means to make similar. In the case of American society, Gordon (1964:85) maintains that there are three basic theories of assimilation to which all of the other theories of assimilation can be reduced. These three are Anglo Conformity, Melting Pot, and Cultural Pluralism. This latter theory is not actually concerned with making groups similar, but rather with how groups coexist. However, its study can be justified under the rubric of assimilation, if it is regarded as an alternative situation to "becoming similar." In other words, it concerns those groups that coexist without becoming similar.

According to the first of the three theories, Anglo Conformity, the English culture, as modified by the American revolution, is the standard to which all immigrant groups should yield. This ideology has been present since colonial times. Most of the founding fathers, including Adams, Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington, were suspicious of the detrimental effects that large numbers of foreign immigrants would have on American institutions. Anglo conformity was evidenced in the mid-19th century in the sometimes extreme American nativism movement. Groups such as the "American" or "Know-Nothing" Party which were part of this movement, regarded all foreigners with suspicion, because they were not "American." It is not surprising that they had more tolerance for immigrants that were considered to be more compatible with American
institutions such as the groups from Northern and Western Europe. These immigrants were considered to be from a more superior stock than the inferior breeds of Eastern and Southern Europe.

Gordon (1964:103) points out that care must be taken not to confuse Anglo conformity with racism. The motivating force behind Anglo conformity may be the belief in the cultural superiority of Anglo-Saxon institutions not the racial superiority of Anglo-Saxon individuals. Based on this strong belief in the superiority of American institutions as translated from Anglo-Saxon ones, the Anglo-conformist believes that it is acceptable that "newcomers should be expected to adjust accordingly." In other words, the superiority of his institutions is so obvious to the Anglo conformist that he expects all other groups to recognize and accept this superiority. Hence, such a person would argue that Mexican Americans should learn to communicate in English and ignore the cultivation of Spanish.

The notion of the United States as being a mixture of many peoples has been around almost as long as the Anglo Conformity theory. Crevecoeur, the 18th century romantic writer, wrote about the American being a mixture of all breeds. Speaking about the U.S., he declared, "Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men" (1904: 54-55). However, the nations to which he referred were all European. Emerson also wrote about the superior virtues of the final product resulting from mixing the peoples of different nations. Byron also voiced the same philosophy, "Great have been the Greek, the Latin, the Slav, the Celt, the Teuton, and the Saxon; but greater than any of these is
the American who combines the virtues of them all" (in Park and Burgess, 1924:33ff).

It was not until the turn of the 20th century that Israel Zangwill's play coined the name "Melting Pot" for this perspective. In this play, an immigrant Russian Jew declares, "America is God's Crucible, the great Melting Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming! . . . The real American has not yet arrived. He is only in the Crucible, I tell you he will be the fusion of all races, the coming superman" (1909:37-38).

The "race relations cycle" proposed by Robert Park (1950) was one of the first major theories of assimilation and may be classified as a melting pot theory under Gordon's scheme. The race relations cycle had four stages: Contact, Competition, Accommodation, and Assimilation. In the contact stage, individuals from different groups come together. This contact leads, in turn, to competition and conflict between the groups. Park believes that eventually, the two groups reach an accommodation stage in order to survive. This particular stage is an unstable condition that occurs rapidly where adjustments to the fundamental aspects of the social order take place. Assimilation, the last stage, is more gradual "...a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups and by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life" (Park and Burgess, 1924: 735). Thus, the race relations cycle maintains the basic melting pot assumption, that the eventual assimilation of groups into a common culture is "apparently progressive and irreversible" (Park, 1950:150).
However, Park noted later that some groups such as Blacks in the United States might be possible exceptions to this model (Hullum, 1973:80-81). To some extent, Mexican Americans may also be considered as an exception since they have remained unassimilated for over 150 years.

In the 1940's Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy (1944, 1952) reported that in New Haven there was not one large single melting pot, but rather a triple pot based on three religious groups: Protestant, Catholic and Jew. Approximately a decade later in the 1950's, Herberg (1955) also found a tripartite religious community based upon institutional and ideological pluralism.

More recently, Kinloch (1974) maintains that although intergroup relations which result from a colonial situation may be full of conflict, there will eventually be a form of accommodation between the groups. The accommodation that is used by Kinloch can be classified as part of the melting pot theory in that it is an interethnic cultural exchange affecting both groups in contact.

The theory proposed by Glick (1955) maintains that there are two possible eventual outcomes to the situation of intergroup contact. There will be either a nationalistic movement by the oppressed group or integration of the dominant and subordinate group. The "integration" outcome places this theory within the melting pot category.

Gordon (1964:124) points out that there has been no systematic treatment of this theory. The proportionate influence of different groups in the melting pot has not been systematically examined. Using Gordon's example, if there are 1000 Sylvanians living in their own country and 200 Mundovians enter as immigrants, will the blend in the
melting pot be equal Sylvanian and Mundovian? Or will importance be
purely proportional to the groups size, e.g., the Sylvanians being fifty
times more important than the Mundovians? Or is the answer somewhere in-
between?

Melting pot theory also changes in nature when carried to logical
conclusions. One extreme interpretation of this theory would have the
immigrant group blending completely into the dominant culture. These
results would thus be very similar to Anglo conformity. Another extreme
interpretation of this theory in a different direction would have an
immigrant group constitute its exact proportion of the population in the
culture. This interpretation would make the consequences of melting pot
theory very similar to cultural pluralism.

Other critics of the melting pot theory have pointed out that in
the U.S. experience ethnic groups have not really melted. "The experi-
ence of Zangwill's hero and heroine was not general. The point about
the melting pot is that it did not happen" (Glazer and Moynihan, 1963:
290). It certainly has not occurred in the case of Mexican Americans.
Zangwill, the father of the term "melting pot," wrote in 1916, "It was
vain for Paul to declare that there should be neither Jew nor Greek.
Nature will return even if driven out with a pitchfork. Still more if
driven out with a dogma" (quoted in Leftwich, 1957:255).

Another criticism carries the triple religious melting pot argu-
ment further to include ethnic groups, racial groups, and intellectuals.
These are other "pots" which comprise groups that are not allowed to
blend structurally with the dominant group (Gordon, 1964:130-31).
The Pluralistic approach to assimilation recognized that from the very beginning Ethnic groups coming into the United States established de facto ethnic societies and resisted the Americanization movements of the mid-nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Kallen (1915a, 1915b, 1924) is given the credit for coining the term "cultural pluralism" early in the 20th century. He argued against the comprehensive Anglo conformity trend that was prevalent at the time. For him cultural pluralism was a system that permitted a common language and political structure with each group being permitted to keep its own "aesthetic and intellectual forms." To Kallen the preservation of the ethnic group was of the utmost importance for an individual as it represented, "the center at which he stands, the point of his most intimate social reactions, therefore of his most intensive emotional life" (1924: 200).

According to Kallen (1924:209), the value of pluralism was based on the contributions of diverse elements which made the total national culture more varied and richer. Pluralism had as its goal the maintenance of enough subsocial separation to guarantee the continuation of the ethnic cultural traditions and the persistence of the group without at the same time interfering with the carrying out of standard responsibilities to the general American civic life.

Gordon drew a distinction within pluralism, when he maintained that the U.S. experience has been structural pluralist rather than cultural pluralist. According to him the trend has been towards overall
acculturation and the maintenance of structural boundaries along religious, racial, and ethnic group lines.

W. E. B. DuBois (in Brotz, 1966:487) believed that one's ethnic or racial community were of primary importance and should thus be preserved. He maintained that it was only through collective action by the ethnic or racial community that change for acceptance could be brought about.

Another sociologist, Parenti (1967:724) claims that residual ethnic cultural valuation and attitudes persist, i.e., that acculturation of ethnic groups in the U.S. is far from complete. Unlike Gordon, he regards Structural Assimilation as being neither inevitable nor imminent. He further maintains that the psychological feelings of minority group enjoyment and negative defense mechanisms continue to be deeply internalized.

Glazer and Moynihan denied the operation of the melting pot in favor of the pluralistic approach. They maintained that ethnic identity continues to have social meaning although it might be based upon political and economic determinants (1967:310, 1970:xxxiii-xli). More recently, they argue that the demands by ethnic groups for remaining different will not only continue, but increase for the immediate future (1975:1-26).

They (1967) noted that one possible reason for the maintenance of ethnic identities is that it replaces the role formerly played by working class identities which have lost status and respect in American society. Another is that for several ethnic groups, domestic events in the United States have become more important than the homeland
issues. Additionally, Religion has declined as a focus of primary and ethnic identification for Americans.

Greeley (1969:31-37) has proposed a six-step process of pluralism consisting of: 1) Cultural shock, 2) Organization and self-consciousness, 3) Elite assimilation, 4) Militancy, 5) Self-hatred and anti-militancy, and 6) Emerging adjustment. The last step signifies an easy acceptance of both the "... ethnic and American identities as completely compatible."

He continued developing Cultural pluralism theory with his more recent concept of "Ethnogenesis" (1974:309). According to this concept, public schools and the mass media served to enhance the pre-existing similarities and increase the number of common cultural traits between the ethnic group and the dominant group. However, in spite of these adaptive forces, nationality traits and heritage differences still persist.

Problems with the pluralism perspective have been noted by individuals such as Higham and Berry. Higham (1975:233-234) noted that "Pluralism assumes a rigidity of ethnic boundaries and a fixity of group commitment which American life does not permit. It also encourages the further illusion that ethnic groups typically have a high degree of internal solidarity." Berry noted that one of the inhibiting aspects of pluralism was that it placed limitations on the more autonomous and adventuresome of the group. He also pointed out that the communities that are encouraged by pluralism may be prejudiced, narrow-minded, and suspicious. Therefore, pluralism may tend to overlook the diversity within the ethnic group, and to concentrate on the ethnocentric aspects of ethnic group membership.
However, these problems do not negate the social differentiation based on ethnicity. This differentiation is the essence of pluralism. Furthermore, it is possible to see the relationship of pluralism to assimilation in Higham's (1975:211) assertion that pluralism appeals most to those people who are for the most part assimilated and can imagine the advantages of maintaining separate group status.

Needless to say, the review of the literature on race and ethnic relations and assimilation presented here is a general one that touched on only the major themes of those bodies of literature. In this review, nevertheless, it became clear that the Mexican American population, a relatively unassimilated ethnic group, has seldom been addressed as a topic of primary importance. Conspicuously absent have been those studies which attempt to empirically understand the process of assimilation in this population.

In the present research, assimilation is examined in light of the history of interaction between Mexican Americans and Anglos. Additionally, as a test of a major theory of assimilation, findings based upon a contemporary sample of Mexican Americans are presented.
CHAPTER 2

GORDON'S THEORY OF ASSIMILATION

Milton Gordon has had an important influence on social structure theory in general, and race and ethnic relations theory in particular. This influence was achieved primarily through the multi-dimensional model of assimilation he presented in Assimilation in American Life (1964), a work that is cited throughout the literature. This model as well as the one Gordon outlined in his later work, Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity (1978) are discussed in this chapter. Also discussed is a model that was derived from Gordon's latter work for testing specific hypotheses about Mexican American assimilation.

First Model

The typology of assimilation that Gordon presented in his 1964 work has been adopted completely or adopted and modified by many researchers in this area. Perhaps the most innovative aspect of his work was that he divided the assimilation process into seven different types.

The first of these types was cultural or behavioral assimilation, which dealt with the change of cultural patterns from those indigenous to the racial or ethnic group to those characteristic of the host society. This type of assimilation is synonymous with what is generally called acculturation in anthropology and the social sciences.
in general. Structural assimilation refers to large scale entrance into the institutions of the host society on the primary group level, i.e., intimate social networks and institutions. The third type of assimilation is marital. This process is large-scale intermarriage between the ethnic group and the host society. Gordon's marital assimilation is synonymous with amalgamation. Identificational assimilation refers to identification with the host group. The root of the sense of peoplehood or ethnicity changes from the ethnic group to the host society, i.e., individuals begin to think of themselves as part of the host society, and not as members of an ethnic or racial group.

Attitude receptional assimilation and behavioral receptional assimilation are the next two types of assimilation. These two are perhaps more closely related than any of the seven types. Attitude receptional refers to the absence of prejudice on behalf of the host society, while behavior receptional assimilation is the absence of discrimination by the host society. Thus, these two concepts are linked to one another in the same way as the concepts of prejudice and discrimination. It is possible to argue that at a sufficiently macro-level of analysis, such as the societal one, these two concepts are much more mutually dependent than at an individual level of analysis. For example, at the societal level the social pressures that cause Merton's "nonprejudiced discriminator" to discriminate are not operating.

Nevertheless, attitude receptional and behavioral receptional assimilation should be regarded as separate variables for several reasons. Although they might both exist or be absent together in a society, it may
be possible that one of these can vary somewhat independently of the other. For example, it is possible for a society to have several levels of prejudice for a constant level of discrimination. Conversely, it is also possible for a society to discriminate at varying degrees with a fairly constant level of prejudice.

The last type of assimilation that Gordon identified is civic assimilation. Gordon stated that this type of assimilation is the absence of value and power conflict between the host society and the ethnic/racial group. An example of this value and power conflict between ethnic/racial groups and the host society is that found in the U.S. in the conflict Blacks and Mexican Americans have had with a large portion of the host society over issues such as integration, social welfare programs, and affirmative action.

Gordon's theory of assimilation continued by positing three hypotheses of how these different assimilation types relate to one another. The first of these hypotheses states that cultural assimilation (or acculturation) is the first consequence of majority and minority group contact. Second, cultural assimilation may occur without any other type of assimilation having occurred. Third, after acculturation, the next most important type of assimilation is structural. Once structural and cultural assimilation have occurred, the five other types of assimilation will necessarily (my emphasis) follow. He does not specify the order with which these five types of assimilation occur.

It is this relative ordering of the various assimilation types that has been the most controversial aspect of Gordon's model of assimilation. Very few researchers in this area have disagreed or challenged
his first or second hypotheses. Most researchers in the race and ethnic relations area agree that acculturation is indeed the first type of assimilation to take place and furthermore that it can occur without any other form of assimilation taking place. Blacks in the United States are frequently cited as an example of this. It is the third hypothesis and its corollary that are most often questioned by scholars, i.e., whether structural assimilation is necessarily the second type of assimilation in the assimilation ordering.

The corollary, cultural and structural assimilation being necessarily followed by the other types of assimilation, has also been the subject of much criticism. It is possible to imagine a society where cultural and structural assimilation have occurred, but due to stratification of the social and/or economic type, the marital, identificational, attitude and behavior receptional, or civic types of assimilation do not occur. Although Gordon may be granted the point that it is likely to happen, his positing that the other assimilation processes necessarily have to follow appears to be too extreme.

Second Model

In his most recent work, Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity (1978), Gordon turns his model of assimilation into one of race and ethnic relations (see Figure 1). The new model is essentially a reformulation of his previous theory in light of the work of other race and ethnic relations theorists such as: Pierre L. van den Berghe, Race and Racism:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSIMILATION</td>
<td>A. Societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Type of Assimilation</td>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Degree of Assimilation</td>
<td>2. Value Consensus or Dissensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree of Conflict</td>
<td>3. Cultural Heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Degree of Access to Societal Rewards</td>
<td>4. Ideologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Power Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Power Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Degree of Access to Societal Rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Political Nature of Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interaction process</td>
<td>1. Stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Frustration-Aggression Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Felt Dissatisfaction Phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Success Chances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Conflict Escalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Biosocial Development</td>
<td>1. Behaviorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Narcism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Intellectual Functioning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Milton Gordon's model.
Dependent Variables. Gordon's most recent model maintains that the area of race and ethnic relations is much too complex to be measured by any single variable. He therefore presents a multifaceted variable which consists of four measures: type of assimilation, degree of assimilation, degree of conflict and degree of access to societal rewards. These are used as dependent variables in this more recent model.

Although Gordon discusses the operationalization of the dependent variables, it is quite general in nature. In the first of the dependent variables, "type of assimilation," Gordon is basically referring to either the cultural or structural form. Both of these forms are quantifiable along a continuum that ranges from complete pluralism to complete assimilation. Yet, there are some very important questions that are left unanswered. For example, should only one of these two measures of assimilation be used or should both be used? If both are to be used simultaneously, do they consist of equal components or does one take preference? And if so, which one?

The second dependent variable, "degree of total assimilation" is an index of scores of seven assimilation types. These seven types are the seven that he put forth in his earlier work, Assimilation in American Life (1964). Ideally, the index would consist of a combination of the scores of each of the seven types of assimilation. However, he does point out that for the sake of research economy, the index could consist of four subtypes: cultural, structural, marital and identificational.
"Degree of conflict," the third dependent variable, refers to both the extent of conflict between majority and racial and ethnic groups as well as between different racial and ethnic groups. Although Gordon does not elaborate further on this variable, it seems that he intended that both covert and overt conflicts be considered.\(^7\)

The fourth variable, "degree of access to societal rewards," measures dimension of equality with respect to the distribution of economic, political, or institutional rewards. Gordon further suggests that for methodological and analytical purposes these variables should be trichotomized into high, moderate, or low categories. However, he does not provide any justification for this trichotomization other than the implicit reason of its facilitation of analysis. He further suggests using the distributions of either income or occupation for the racial and ethnic group and comparing them to the distribution of the majority. However, the possibility of using political or institutional rewards as measures is not discounted.

There are some problems associated with the manner in which Gordon has set up his dependent variables. The most obvious of these is that there appears to be a great deal of overlap between two of the variables, "type of assimilation" and "degree of total assimilation." Two of the measures included in "degree of total assimilation" are also included in "type of assimilation." Thus, statistically covariance would

---

7. This information is based on a conversation I had with Gordon in August, 1979 in Amherst, Massachusetts regarding his model. During the conversation he stated that general group conflict theory might be useful in attempts to deal with this particular variable.
appear to be a problem here. Conceptually the problems are of not having distinct variables.

Gordon (1978:71) also points out that, "There might be good theoretical reasons for assigning variable weights to scores on the difference types [of assimilation], although this is not an issue that need concern us here." This latter statement indicates that he is mostly interested in the theory and not in empirical tests of it. Put another way, operationalization does not appear to be a matter of concern in this latter work. For example, if the cultural and structural variables were weighted much heavier than the others, which is certainly possible within the framework given by Gordon, then the "degree of total assimilation" variable would be virtually the same as the "type of assimilation" variable. Thus, two almost identical measures would be used to represent two different variables.

As discussed previously, Gordon (1978:178) posits that once cultural and structural assimilation have occurred the other types of assimilation will follow. This leads to the assumption that the other five types of assimilation are basically a function of cultural and structural assimilation. Therefore, to combine all these different assimilation variables into one, i.e., "degree of total assimilation," is to ignore any possible independence between the different types of assimilation.

Gordon is also unclear about the measurement of "degree of conflict." As was noted earlier, he maintains that general group conflict theory might be utilized here. Although this suggestion is helpful as
it follows from his idea of competition following group contact but preceding assimilation, it is somewhat incomplete and puzzling. However, competition may not be the same as group conflict. Also assimilation theories, such as Gordon's, are not usually regarded as being compatible with those of conflict theorists. In addition, he does not address in any way the types of variables that should be used in the assessment of conflict.

The dimension of equality is also very difficult to deal with in terms of measurement. Gordon fails to specify precisely how one is to measure "access" to the economic, political or institutional rewards. Should one be concerned with the actual possession of these social rewards, or should one be satisfied with examining equality of opportunity for obtaining the rewards? These would entail very different philosophical, methodological, and analytical approaches. Additionally, is it necessary to consider all three aspects: economic, political, and institutional or will one of these suffice? Thus, although Gordon suggests which distributions to employ, his discussion of this topic yearns for further clarification.

These are only some of the questions that have not been answered by Gordon and that need to be resolved prior to a thorough testing or application of this model.

Independent Variables. There are three types of independent variables that Gordon (1978:72-89) uses in his race and ethnic relations model: societal, interaction process, and biosocial development. The societal variables are basically of the type used in his previous model.
Here he lists seven different ones: demographic, value consensus or dissensus, cultural differences, ideologies, power distributions, power source, degree of access to societal rewards, and political nature of society. The "demographic" refers not only to relative size but also to the territorial dispersion of groups.

"Value consensus" determines the particular value area or areas where consensus or dissensus exists. "Cultural differences" seeks to measure those cultural differences at contact, such as language or religion, that would inhibit assimilation. The philosophies that one has about race, religion, and ethnic groups, the degree of equalitarianism and humanitarianism, and the type and amount of assimilation desired by groups come under "ideologies." "Power distribution" refers to the distribution of competitive, political, and disruptive power between majority and racial and ethnic groups. Gordon uses "power source" to refer to whether a racial or ethnic group obtains its power from within the society\(^8\) or from another sovereign state with which the group has ties of language, race, religion, or national origins.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) By "within the society" Gordon refers to the internal source of power of a group. This source of power may be the group itself or the one or more other groups that it may have as allies.

\(^9\) This power base is a particularly interesting one for Mexican Americans. Until very recently, the motherland of Mexican Americans, Mexico, had been regarded with contempt and dismay and generally relegated to a position of secondary importance by the U.S. government. However, recently, coinciding with the rise of Mexico to the position of the fourth largest oil producing country in the world, the U.S. government has become very amiable towards Mexico. Although it will depend to a large extent on how supportive the Mexican government wants to be of Mexican Americans, this newly acquired status by Mexico, applying Gordon's model, should benefit Mexican Americans by supplying an external source of power.
The "degree of access to societal rewards" affects the "degree of felt dissatisfaction," one of the interaction process variables. This dimension is also included as one of the dependent variables discussed above. However, Gordon (1978:86) maintains that this should produce no great "... methodological disquietude, since this simply attests to the constant feedback and interaction effects of factors in societal processes."

The last variable under the societal class of independent variables is the "political nature" of the society. This variable measures where and how behavioral implications as well as ideological and value decisions are decided, i.e., in the legislative arenas or by a small group of elite rulers.

The interaction process variables are a second type of independent variables in Gordon's model. Gordon lists five such variables: stereotyping, frustration-aggression mechanisms, felt dissatisfaction phenomena, success chances and conflict escalation. Gordon does not discuss stereotyping nor frustration-aggression to any large extent. About the only thing that he (1978:79) notes with regard to stereotypes is that they result from "widespread cognitive inadequacies reinforced by affective tendencies and lack of equal-status primary group contact between groups ..." With respect to frustration-aggression mechanisms, he only notes that they are produced by "... frustration and directed, ... either to the perceived source or toward scapegoats ..." (1978:79). Gordon's discussion of these variables does not touch on measurement or operationalization aspects.
Gordon included "felt-dissatisfaction" as a variable in his model because he believes that human beings are basically comparers (1978:81). He maintains that individuals are engaged in "endless invidious comparisons." From these comparisons, the amount of felt-dissatisfaction is determined by the value systems and actual reward system of the society through the workings of social psychological mechanisms such as relative deprivation, rising expectations, status inconsistency and cognitive dissonance. For example, if the value system of a society stresses upward mobility but actually allows very little mobility, then a good deal of felt-dissatisfaction could result. Also, stressing acquisitive values, such as those characteristics of modern capitalistic societies, but allowing the reward system to function for only one group would also result in an increase of felt-dissatisfaction for the group left out.

The fourth variable at the interaction level is the process whereby individuals or groups take into account any perceived power sanctions before any action involving conflict is undertaken. Gordon refers to this process as "success chances." He maintains that this is similar to the "dynamic assessment" concept of MacIver (MacIver, 1942).

The last interaction process variable is called "conflict escalation." This variable is intended to measure the tendency of human conflict to escalate once it has begun. If a person or group "wrongs" another one, in either an actual or threatened manner, the "wronged" party will retaliate in a stronger manner. This retaliatory process continues escalating until either one or the other group is annihilated.
or conflict reducing mechanisms, such as legal adjudication or arbitration, are brought into play. For a disadvantaged racial or ethnic group, Gordon maintains that the best route is to keep conflict from escalating as once this process gets underway, "... the costs (to the racial or ethnic group) are unknown and the benefits uncertain" (1978:85).

The interaction level variables differ from the societal ones in several respects. Interaction variables tend to concentrate on the relations between the dominant majority and a specific subordinate racial or ethnic group in the society. For example, the stereotype variable necessarily entails examining both the group doing the stereotyping and the group being stereotyped. The societal variables, on the other hand, deal with more general society-wide issues. For example, the variable on the political nature of the society concerns itself with the entire society rather than with specific inter-group relations.

The interaction variables also have many, if not more, of the operationalization deficiencies that were encountered with the societal variables. Gordon's treatment of them tends to be strictly at a theoretical level. He does not concern himself with the operationalization of these variables, nor does he provide any examples that might serve as clues as to how it might be done.

The biosocial development level of variables are different from the other levels of independent variables. Basically, Gordon (1978:75) attempts to take human nature into consideration with these variables. He isolates and discusses three different aspects of human nature. The first of these is "behaviorism." He believes that there is a behavioral
infrastructure of human societies and is opposed to the concept of cultural determinism. Although he does stop short of "instincts," he maintains that the human organism is much more than the passive receiver of the cultural determinist viewpoint. To Gordon, the human organism does not just passively accept culture, but rather has an active part in determining what it is going to learn.

The second variable under the biosocial development section is narcissism. Gordon contends that Man, unlike other animal species, is narcissistic. Furthermore, it is this narcissism that is at the root of aggression. He (1978:77) cites Gregory Rochlin, "... when narcissism is threatened, we are humiliated, our self-esteem is injured, and aggression appears." Thus, Gordon seems to imply that it is the defense of the ego that is behind human aggression. Thus, aggression appears to be basically a defensive mechanism in Gordon's scheme.

The third aspect of human nature that Gordon deals with is the area of cognition. By the "cognitive" aspect, Gordon (1978:78) refers to levels of "intellectual functioning." These levels are related to the ability of human intelligence to "... think of groups in terms of the distribution of individuals along normal or bell-shaped curve, to imagine the functional value of cultural diversity, (and) to foresee the dysfunctional consequences of unchecked and exacerbated conflict ..." He then cautions against ready acceptance of this view in light of the racism predominant today. Thus, although Gordon believes that the individual is capable of realizing that stereotypes do not apply to all members of a group, that cultural diversity enriches the social atmosphere,
and that unrestrained conflict against a group has negative consequences for the entire society, he does not believe that humans do in fact exercise this capability.

As it turns out, Gordon does not use human nature as a set of distinct, testable variables but rather as a constant, where man is "... basically motivated by self-interest, irresistibly narcissistic and protective of the self, ready to defend the self by aggressive behavior and possessed of not unlimited intellectual capacity ..." (1978: 79). This assumption, together with his assertion that ethnicity, because it is totally ascriptive, causes it to become incorporated into the self, thus leading to a dialectical process where ethnic and racial groups and their individual members are "... at one time part of the cause and at another time, or perhaps simultaneously, part of the effect in the ever recurrent drama of intergroup relations" (1978:79).

Since Gordon uses human nature as a constant and because of human nature's role in making intergroup relations a dialectic process, it is only possible to utilize human nature as a background factor.10

Model to be Tested

The model to be tested as part of this study has been derived from Gordon's model and is illustrated in Figure 2. It is only a small part of Gordon's larger model. The dependent variables are derived from

10. In my conversation with Gordon on these points, he stated that human nature should be regarded as a "contextual" variable and that it should not be included in the actual model. This "contextual variable" would serve its purpose if it were used as an explanatory factor falling outside of the model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Assimilation</td>
<td>Cultural Spanish Familism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Preference</td>
<td>Value Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Assimilation</td>
<td>Consensus American Traditionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Stereotyping Possibility of Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Meeting</td>
<td>Perception of Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
his "type of assimilation" variable of his most recent model (illustrated in Figure 1). However, only two "types," structural and civic, will be examined here, due to some limitations of the data available for analysis. The two types are distinct in that structural assimilation is one of the two main types of assimilation in Gordon's scheme, while civic assimilation is one of the secondary types. Thus, the model to be tested in the present study is representative of the different types of assimilation posited by Gordon.

This model will permit the testing of four hypotheses taken from Gordon's scheme. These four hypotheses are listed below.

1. There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of cultural heterogeneity there is between groups and assimilation.

2. There exists a direct relationship between the amount of value consensus between the two groups under consideration and assimilation.

3. There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of stereotyping between groups and assimilation.

4. The model using structural assimilation as a dependent variable has stronger associations with the independent variables than the model using civic assimilation.

The operationalization of each variable will be discussed in full detail in Chapter 5. A discussion of several demographic measures of assimilation that provide an assessment of the current degree of assimilation between Mexican Americans and Anglos is presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

CONTEMPORARY SETTING

In this chapter we examine the contemporary position of Mexican Americans vis-a-vis Anglos by studying several of the demographic, social, and economic indicators of assimilation. In most cases, as the reader will see, the differences found between the two groups in these indicators lead to the conclusion that Mexican Americans have not become assimilated into the social structure of American society. The information presented clearly shows that Mexican Americans have certainly not melted, they remain intact as a clearly distinct ethnic group. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that this pattern of non-assimilation is likely to change in the near future.

Demographic Indicators of Assimilation

The demographic indicators of assimilation included in this profile are standard socio-demographic factors such as sex ratio, age structure, marital status, intermarriage, family size, and mortality. Basically, the more Mexican Americans are assimilated, the more similar these indicators were expected to be.

Size and Distribution

Mexican Americans are the largest component of the nation's fastest growing ethnic group, Hispanics. In 1970 there were approximately
9,072,602 Hispanics in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 1971). Of that number, 4,532,435 or about 50 percent were Mexican Americans. By 1978 the Hispanic population had increased by 32.8 percent to 12,046,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1979). This growth represented a combination of both natural growth and immigration. The proportion of Mexican Americans increased in this time period to 59.4 percent and numbering 7,151,000.

Mexican Americans continue to be concentrated in the Southwest. Although there has been some movement out of the Southwest, Mexican Americans have resisted any "en masse" migration out of this region. About 6,189,000 or 84.5 percent live in the five southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. In addition, most members of this group tend to live in metropolitan areas. Any basis for the stereotyping of this group as a predominately rural people is no longer true as it was in the pre-World War II period (Dworkin and Dworkin, 1976:169). Currently, only nineteen percent of Mexican Americans live in non-metropolitan areas (U.S. Census Bureau, 1979:12). This compares with 35 percent of the non-Hispanic population.

Sex Ratio

The sex ratio indicates the relative numbers of males to females in a society. A sex ratio is calculated by dividing the number of males by the number of females and multiplying by a constant, usually 100. Any two groups can vary in their sex ratios for several reasons. A difference may be due, for example, to unequal immigration or emigration
rates between sex groups, or due to lower life-expectancies of one sex group resulting from unequal participation in wars or other hazardous employment (Barclay, 1958:21-24; United Nations, 1973:270).

Currently the U.S. population as a whole has a sex ratio of 94 (Table 1). The non-Hispanic population had the same sex ratio, 94. However, Mexican Americans had a higher sex ratio of 97. One possible explanation for this higher relative abundance of males in the Mexican American population is the sizable number of immigrants, both legal and illegal that become part of it every year. These migrants tend to be overwhelmingly males and thus have a major positive effect on the sex ratio (Dagodag, 1975; North and Houstoun, 1976; Reichert and Massey, 1979). The sex ratio of the entire Mexican American population without any consideration of age is too general an indicator to be reliable and useful. However, one implication is that having more males available to Mexican American females may discourage intermarriage and thus, indirectly may work against assimilation. Moreover, this becomes even more important in light of the fact that it is Mexican American females that tend to intermarry at a higher rate than males (Miller, 1978:224).

Age Structure

Age structure is also an important factor to consider when examining two groups. Large variations between two groups indicates that there are important differences between them in fertility, mortality, or migration rates (Barclay, 1958:222-225). Table 2 contains a pertinent age parameter, median age. In 1978, the United States population, as a whole, had a median age of 29.5 years. However, the non-Hispanic
Table 1. Ratio of males per females (x 100) by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2. Median age by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population had a higher median age of 30.0 years. This is due to Hispanics, particularly Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans having a much lower median age. Mexican Americans tend to be considerably younger than the non-Hispanic population with a median age of 21.3 years (Table 2).

If the relative proportions in different age categories are examined, the differences are more apparent. The total U.S. population and the non-Hispanic population have very similar proportions in each age category (Table 3). In the youngest category (0-14 years), the total U.S. population has 23.8 percent and the non-Hispanic has 23.1 percent of their respective populations. This is the largest difference between these two groups. The differences between these two groups are small because non-Hispanics compose the overwhelming proportion (94.4 percent) of the U.S. population. The age structure of Mexican Americans is different from that of the non-Hispanic population. The largest difference between these two groups is also in the 0-14 years of age category, where Mexican Americans had 36.6 percent of their population resulting in a difference of 13.5 percentage points. The 30-44 age category held the smallest difference on only 1.6 percentage points. Mexican Americans had 16.8 percent of their population in this age category compared to the 18.4 percent for non-Hispanics.

The youthfulness of Mexican Americans implies that it is a faster growing population than the non-Hispanic one. This has two very important implications: one, Mexican Americans are not going to be absorbed by the non-Hispanic group because of a lower rate of natural
Table 3. Percent in each age category by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-29</th>
<th>30-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Total Number (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(214,159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanics</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(202,113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(12,046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(7,151)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


increase, and two, Mexican Americans are going to become a proportionately larger group in the United States.

According to some researchers (Barth and Noel, 1972; Blalock, 1967), the relative numbers of the two groups have an effect on assimilation. The closer they are in size, the more difficult assimilation becomes for the groups. Thus, as Mexican Americans are tending towards a larger relative size, assimilation becomes increasingly difficult. But absolute equality in size is not in the near future.

Marital Status

Recent work by Sweet (1978) indicates that there are important differences between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics in living arrangements and marital statuses. He found that Whites had a total of 10.5
percent of their group living outside of families (Table 4). The two categories he used that could both refer to Mexican Americans were Spanish surname and Mexican Origin. These categories refer to slightly different groups because of the samples he used. "Spanish surname" was an objective identifier and limited to the Southwest while Mexican origin was obtained from a self-identifier and encompassed the entire nation (also see Hernandez, Huang and Wagner, 1971). There are small differences between these groups in the proportion living outside of families. The Spanish-surname group had 5.5 percent in this category, which was slightly lower than the Mexican Origin group which had 5.0 percent. Both of these groups were below the White proportion of 10.5. This would seem to indicate that Mexican Americans, in general, appear to have a slightly higher propensity for living with their families than do Whites.

Blacks, discussed here because they constitute the second largest group in the non-Hispanic category, had the highest proportion not living with their families, 11.3 percent. This was almost double the figures for Spanish-surnamed and Mexican origin individuals. Thus, Mexican Americans also have a stronger tendency than Blacks to live with their families.

It could be possible that the pattern suggested above is a consequence of Mexican Americans being younger than non-Hispanics. By being younger, Mexican Americans would be more likely to be dependent on their families. Sweet also considered this possibility and examined individuals between the ages 18 and 24. It is this age group where it becomes
Table 4. Proportion living outside of families by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race-Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Non-Family Households</th>
<th>Group Quarters*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Surname</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Armed Forces, jails and prisons, and college dorms.
Source: Sweet, 1978, table 10.3.

feasible for young people to move out of the parental home. These data are presented in Table 5. The tendencies noted above in Table 4 are also apparent in Table 5. Mexican Americans in this age group have a stronger propensity to be living at home than do non-Hispanic groups, e.g., Whites and Blacks.

These data also lend support to the traditional Mexican American cultural characteristic of "familism" (Grebler et al., 1970:351). Although residence is affected by other factors such as education and work, cultural values may also play a major role. The patterns observed here, thus appear to contribute to the belief that Mexican Americans place greater importance on the family than the non-Hispanics by remaining in it to a greater extent.11

11. Familism is usually purported to be indicated by the extended family and the attitudes towards the family particularly the aged (Miller, 1978:212). Here however, familism will be used in a more general way, to refer to pro-family tendencies.
Table 5. Proportion of never-married persons aged 18-24 living in the parental household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race-Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Surname</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


When the sex differential is examined in Table 5, it is possible to note that 18-24 year old females consistently have higher proportions of never-married people living in parental households than do males. Among females, the same inter-ethnic pattern as among males can be observed. The non-Hispanic females examined here have a lower proportion living at a parental home than do Mexican American females. White females had 62.9 percent and Black females had 64.9 percent living in the parental home while 78.7 percent of Spanish-surname females and 79.4 percent of Mexican origin females live at home. In addition, non-Hispanic females tended to be more similar to their male counterparts in the percents at home than Spanish-surname and Mexican origin females. This appears to support the traditional pattern of Mexican American female children being more protected and restricted than their male counterparts (Alvirez and Bean, 1976:279). Conversely, this table may also indicate that Whites treat their children more equally, e.g., sending both males and females away to school.
These findings are also consistent with more recent data from the Current Population Survey (CPS). According to Table 6, non-Hispanics have more than double the percentage of primary individuals, i.e., individuals living alone, than Mexican Americans. These percents are 9.2 and 3.6 respectively. In addition, for non-Hispanics, 35.5 percent of individuals in households are children of the head. For Mexican Americans this figure was 48.0 percent. Thus recent CPS data also suggest that Mexican Americans have a lower tendency to live alone and conversely, a higher tendency to live with their own parents than do non-Hispanics.

Sweet (1978:235) postulates that the increased preference for living alone is due to increasing affluence, growing employment, rising earnings of women and perhaps an increased "taste" for privacy. A higher relative propensity to remain at home with the family indicates that Mexican Americans are not as affected as non-Hispanics by the factors that affect preference to live alone. This suggests the possibility that Mexican Americans have not been acculturated in this area, and that subsequently, familism may possibly be continuing to exercise a more important influence on Mexican Americans than other groups.

There are some minor differences between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics in the proportions in the various marital statuses. Mexican Americans had 61.6 percent in the married category while non-Hispanics had 60.5 percent (Table 7). This was a very small difference.

With respect to divorce, non-Hispanics had 5.2 percent of their population in the divorced category. Hispanics were close with 5.0 percent, while Mexican Americans had the smallest percent divorced, 4.0.
Table 6. Proportion of primary individuals and children by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Primary Individual</th>
<th>Child Of Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanics</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7. Proportion in each marital status by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Number (in '000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>167,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanics</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>159,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Hispanics had almost double the percentage widowed (7.4) compared to Hispanics with 3.9 percent. Mexican Americans were very similar to the Hispanic figure with 3.6 percent widowed. This may be due at least in part to the relative youth of the Mexican American population that was discussed previously. The differences in the percentage single between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics is also at least partly attributable to the relative youthfulness of Mexican Americans. Because age is such an important consideration and it could not be controlled here, it was not possible to reach any conclusions about the cultural factors that might be responsible for higher marriage rates of Mexican Americans, however, overall, differences did emerge.

Intermarriage

Mexican Americans have also been characterized by a high degree of endogamy. It is a very salient factor in ethnic relations as it "... constitutes compelling evidence of the presentation of the minority community as a relatively discrete socio-cultural entity" (Murguia and Frisbie, 1977:375). Murguia and Frisbie (1977) point out that a high rate of endogamy of social groups is an indication that the group is being preserved as a separate entity in that society. On the other hand, a low endogamy rate signifies that the group is being absorbed into the larger society. Thus a high rate of endogamy would indicate that the group is successfully resisting assimilation.

Currently Mexican Americans are experiencing a high degree of endogamy or conversely, a low rate of intermarriage. Merton (1941:363-4) conceived of intermarriage as the most conclusive indicator of
assimilation. By creating new primary-group relations and disrupting old ones, intermarriage leads to assimilation (Grebler et al., 1970:417). According to Census data, 85.8 percent of Mexican American individuals were married to other Mexican American individuals (Table 8). An additional 1.4 percent were married to other Hispanic individuals. Thus only 12.5 percent had non-Hispanic spouses. If the analysis is limited to the five Southwestern states, the differences become even more marked. A higher percentage of Mexican Americans, 88.9, are married to other Mexican American individuals with an additional 1.2 percent being married to individuals who are of Hispanic origin. These higher rates of endogamy are easily understood, if the higher concentration is considered. Thus the opportunities are greater of meeting fellow Mexican Americans in the "marriage market" arenas such as church, neighborhood, school, and place of employment. These areas provide contacts in one's own educational level and occupational status (Bossard, 1932; Hollingshead, 1950; Mittelback and Moore, 1968).

Several studies have provided evidence that suggests that the social isolation of Mexican Americans by high endogamy may be diminishing (Alvirez and Bean, 1976:285; Miller, 1978:224). Other studies, however, using more recent data (Murguia and Frisbie, 1977:387) concluded that the decrease has been very small. The slowing of the trend as well as the high level of current endogamy allow Murguia and Frisbie (1977:387) to

12. Gordon (1978:169-80) describes marital assimilation as the ultimate step of the assimilation process. When all the other types of assimilation have occurred, this one assures that the one group has completely been absorbed by another. This topic is discussed in greater detail in a later section.
Table 8. Husband-wife households by origin for the U.S. and the five southwestern states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Maried To:</th>
<th>Mexican Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Not Known</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


conclude that "... it seems probable that the Mexican American population will continue to represent a distinct sociocultural entity for some time."

Family Size

There were important differences in the size of families of the groups being examined here. In 1978 the mean number of persons per family for the total U.S. was 3.31 (Table 9). This figure was the same for non-Hispanic groups. Hispanics as a whole, had about a half-person more per family with a mean of 3.88 persons per household. However, Mexican Americans were much higher than the national average with a mean of 4.06.
Table 9. Proportion in each family size by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7+</th>
<th>Mean Family Size</th>
<th>Number of Families*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>57,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanics</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>54,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in thousands


Families that had only two people in them comprised 38.5 percent of the total U.S. population. Non-Hispanic families were higher with 39.5 percent having only two people. Mexican Americans had only 21.4 percent of their families with two persons in them. However, when large families (six or more persons) are examined, the Mexican American proportion is the largest (19 percent). Hispanics have a lower percentage with 15.7 percent having families with six or more persons. The total U.S. population has a comparable figure of 7.9. Non-Hispanics have a slightly lower percent in this same category (7.5 percent). Thus the largest differences between groups may be seen in the large family category.

Bradshaw and Bean (1972, 1973) examined the fertility of Mexican Americans in the Southwest by employing Children Ever Born (CEB). They
found that in 1970 there were 2,004 CEB for every 1000 women.\textsuperscript{13} Non-Spanish white women had a comparable figure of 1,709, a considerable difference of 14.7 percent. Adjusting for different age compositions, the CEB for Mexican Americans were 2,306 and 1,649 for Anglo women. The difference between these adjusted figures increased to 39.8 percent. Sweet (1974) also noted that in 1970 Mexican American fertility was about 43 percent higher than that of urban whites and 17 percent lower than that of rural whites.

These differences in family size and fertility between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics can be attributed to several factors. Motivation for smaller families is heavily influenced by social and economic factors.\textsuperscript{14} Since Mexican Americans have been prevented from participating in social and economic mobility because of discrimination (Poston, Álvírez and Tienda, 1976; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978; Wilber et al., 1975), they have not absorbed the motivation for smaller families to the same extent as non-Hispanics, and thus, have not become assimilated in this area.

There are other factors that affect the fertility differential between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics. Mexican Americans have a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Bradshaw and Bean used fertility data from the 1970 U.S. Census. The problems that they encountered in identifying the Mexican American population are thoroughly discussed in Hernandez et al., (1971).
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Bean and Wood (1974) examined the difference between "relative" and "potential" income on Mexican American fertility. A detailed analysis of the relation between fertility and the social and economic factors can be found in Bradshaw and Bean (1972, 1973). A good review of the "social characteristics" and "minority group status" hypothesis can be found in Bean and Marcum (1978).
\end{itemize}
lower age at marriage, lower use of contraception, smaller birth intervals, and greater desires for larger families than do Whites (Bradshaw and Bean, 1972, 1973; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978). One frequently cited factor affecting fertility is religion. However, Alvírez (1973:33) found that it was so fused with culture that it was extremely difficult to distinguish an independent effect on fertility. Thus, differences in family size (and related indicators) demonstrate that cultural differences between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics continue to be viable and that total assimilation has certainly not occurred.

Mortality

There is a paucity of research on Mexican American mortality. One of the few studies in this area, Bradshaw and Fonner (1978:268), found that in Texas Mexican Americans had lower crude death rates than did Whites. However, they also found that this situation disappeared or reversed itself when the figures were adjusted for age. This was due to the lower median age of Mexican Americans. When mortality rates are examined by sex, differences between the groups do emerge. As Bradshaw and Fonner (1978:270) noted, "Spanish-surnamed male mortality is substantially higher (56%) than white male below the age of 30, but lower beyond the age of 45 when most deaths occur." Concerning female differences, they noted (1978:270) that "Mortality of Spanish-surname females, however, is higher than that of other White females at every age." The mortality rates of Mexican American males exceeded that of Whites in four areas; infections and parasitic diseases, diabetes, influenza, and accidents and violence. It should be kept in mind that these four causes of death
are "preventable and manageable." In the highest numerical types of death, neoplasms and circulatory diseases, Mexican American males have lower age-adjusted mortality rates than do white males (1978:277).

In contrast to Mexican American males, Mexican females have an age adjusted mortality rate that is higher than that of White females. The "preventable and manageable" causes include 16.9 percent of Mexican American females and 13.1 percent of White females. The neoplasms and circulatory diseases category included 72.6 percent of White females and 64.2 percent of Mexican American females.

Thus, both Mexican American males and females tend to be proportionately higher than non-Hispanics (both Whites and Nonwhites) in the preventable causes of death. This suggests that there are conditions in their environment which are responsible for this differential, that is, conditions that are not found in the non-Hispanic environments. These conditions could include housing, sanitation facilities, hygiene, diet, crowding, education and cultural attitudes towards health care (see Clark, 1970; García and Juárez, 1978; Kay, 1977; Illich, 1976). By not having assimilated (structurally) or culturally, Mexican Americans are, therefore more susceptible to those environmental conditions which provide the medium for the high mortality rates. These higher rates for Mexican Americans indicate that they are exposed to those environmental conditions which provide the medium for the higher mortality rates. This disproportionate exposure in turn, indicates that Mexican Americans are not (structurally) assimilated. If they were assimilated, they would perhaps not have these mortality differences.
Taking all of these demographic measures—sex ratio, age structure, marital status, intermarriage, family size, and mortality—it is fair to say that Mexican Americans are still far from becoming assimilated into American society. The pattern of social distance between Anglos and Mexican Americans, while it has changed somewhat over the years, continues to be fairly intact.

Social and Economic Indicators of Assimilation

In addition to the demographic indicators of assimilation, there are social and economic dimensions that need to be examined. The factors examined here, language, income, occupation, and education, reflect some of the critical areas. These indicators are sometimes identified as some of the causes which inhibit assimilation. However, if Mexican Americans were for the most part assimilated, these factors would be more similar between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanics. It thus seems justifiable to use them as indicators.

Language Maintenance

Language is a very important aspect of culture. It is often referred to as the carrier or transmitter of culture. It is the manner in which meanings and experiences are stored, accumulated knowledge passed on, and thus makes possible the development of the human culture and allows large complex societies to be built. It should be noted that language does not simply reflect culture. According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, language is not simply a passive receptor of culture, but it
actually helps to shape thoughts and directs the interpretation of the world. Whorf notes the essential and dynamic part that language plays for the individual:

Language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas, but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade (1956:211-13).

Thus, language maintenance plays a crucial role in the resistance to assimilation. Without the maintenance of a separate language, acculturation would be well on the way.

Language, and more specifically language maintenance, are often cited as factors which inhibit the assimilation of Mexican Americans. Language, to be sure, is a very important aspect of social stratification. This is one of the principle conclusions reached by Longstreet (1978:44); "The criterion for judging social status which we all seem to have within us is based in significant ways on how people sound to us as well as how 'correctly' they structure the spoken language." That Mexican Americans are aware of this is illustrated by the research in this area (Barker, 1947; Krear, 1971; Ryan and Carranza, 1976; and Tovar, 1973). Researchers have found that some Mexican Americans do make attempts to erase the traces of Spanish from their English in an attempt to increase their social opportunities.¹⁵

Among Mexican Americans, however, there is high degree of language maintenance. Veltman (1979), after examining eleven groups in

¹⁵. An excellent account of this attempt is illustrated in Amado Muro's (1964) short story "Cecilia Rosas."
the U.S., concluded that "The Spanish language group is the most reten-
tive group among the foreign born, 'only' 30 percent of its members
adopt the English language as the usual language." He also found that
of the foreign born who claim Spanish as their usual language 43.5 per-
cent had low proficiency in English (1979:26). Others such as Waggoner
(1976) found that Spanish speakers constituted 62 percent of those whose
usual language is something other than English and 44 percent of the
total estimated number of persons who report a non-English mother tongue.
In addition, according to the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey
(1976:5), 73 percent of the individuals over 4 who claimed Spanish as
their usual tongue claimed English as their second language. However,
54 percent of these same individuals also reported having difficulty
with English.

Estrada (1977) noted that the Spanish Origin population was 9.9
percent Spanish monolingual, 41.2 percent Spanish dominant/English bi-
lingual, 35.7 percent English dominant/Spanish bilingual, and 13.2 per-
cent English monolingual. Thus, about three-fourths (76.9 percent) of
individuals of Spanish Origin claim to be bilingual. Since Mexican
Americans comprise a large proportion of the Spanish Origin population,
then at a minimum, the overwhelming majority of Mexican Americans could
be considered to be at least bilingual. This would suggest that accul-
turation of Mexican Americans, if continuing, is doing so at a very slow
pace.
Income

Mexican Americans have had and continue to have lower differentials than non-Hispanics in areas such as income and occupation (Wilber et al., 1975). In 1977 the mean income for all persons 14 years of age and over in the U.S. was $8,886 (Table 10). The median income was lower, $6,429. The income levels were slightly higher for non-Hispanics with $8,977 and $6,484 respectively. Hispanics were $2,054 or 22.9 percent below the mean income and $920 or 14.2 percent below the median income. Mexican Americans were even lower, with a mean income of $6,713 and a median of $5,536. The Mexican American mean income is $2,264 or 25.2 percent below the comparable income level of non-Hispanics while the median income is $948 or 14.6 percent below.

Not surprisingly, the situation that holds true for individuals also holds true for families (Table 11). The median income for families in the U.S. as a whole was $16,009. The median income for non-Hispanic families was $16,284. However, when the median income of Hispanics is examined, it drops to $11,421. In addition, the median income of Mexican Americans ($11,742) is only slightly higher than that of Hispanics.

Mexican Americans and Hispanics in general are overrepresented at the lower levels of income. Mexican Americans had 13.3 percent of their families with incomes below $5,000, while Hispanics had 15.8 percent. These figures compared with 9.1 and 9.4 for non-Hispanics and the total U.S. population respectively.

As expected, Mexican Americans and Hispanics are underrepresented in the upper income levels. The total U.S. had 36.3 percent of their families with incomes over $20,000. Non-Hispanics were slightly higher
Table 10. Income in 1978 for persons 14 years of age and over by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>% Below $4,000</th>
<th>% Above $20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>$8,886</td>
<td>$6,429</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>$8,977</td>
<td>$6,484</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$6,923</td>
<td>$5,564</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>$6,713</td>
<td>$5,536</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11. Income in 1977, percent below $5,000 and percent above $20,000, for families by ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>% Below $5,000</th>
<th>% Above $20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>$18,264</td>
<td>$16,009</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>$18,517</td>
<td>$16,284</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$13,293</td>
<td>$11,421</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>$13,304</td>
<td>$11,742</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with 37.1 percent of their families having incomes over $20,000. Hispanics and Mexican Americans are substantially below these percentages with 19.3 percent and 19.0 percent respectively. These differences in family income become even more extreme when the larger mean family size noted in Table 9 is considered. These figures, again illustrate that Mexican Americans have not assimilated into the economic structure of U.S. society.

Occupations/Employment

Important differences between the groups with respect to occupational categories are illustrated in Table 12. The differences are most evident between the White and Blue collar categories. Slightly more than half, 51.9 percent of non-Hispanics were in the White collar group, while only 28.1 percent of Mexican Americans were in this group. The Blue collar group contained 32.6 percent of all employed persons over 16 years of age in the U.S. Non-Hispanics were very close to this figure with 31.9 percent. Hispanics had a good deal more with 46.5 percent. Mexican Americans were even higher with 50.6 percent being in the Blue collar category.

The differences between groups was much smaller in the Service and Farm Worker categories than in the White or Blue collar ones. The Service category contained 13.6, 17.9 and 16.3 percent respectively of non-Hispanics, Hispanics, and Mexican Americans. The Farm Worker category has been declining in employment for several decades, so that it now contains relatively small numbers. This category has the smallest differences observed between the groups examined here. Non-Hispanics
Table 12. Employed persons 16 years of age and over by ethnic group and occupational category for March 1978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Service Worker</th>
<th>Farm Worker</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100 (91,965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100 (87,755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100 (4,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100 (2,557)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


had 2.6 percent of their population in this category, compared with 3.4 for Hispanics. Mexican Americans were slightly higher with 5.0 percent.

Considerable research has been conducted on the employment differences between non-Hispanics, Hispanics and Mexican Americans. Wilber et al. (1975) reported findings similar to those reported above using 1970 Census data. They found that Mexican American males had an occupational achievement level\textsuperscript{16} equal to .72 of that of White males and that

\textsuperscript{16} The calculation of occupational achievement levels was done in several steps. (1) An index of occupational achievement was calculated by ranking occupations according to Blau and Duncan's (1967) Socioeconomic Index (SEI). (2) Occupational scores were calculated by taking the proportion of workers above the median level of education and earnings adjusting for age in each of the 203 occupations. (3) A regression equation was used to estimate the score for each occupation. These scores were then rescaled in the 0 to 99 range. (4) Individuals were assigned a score in accordance with his or her occupation in 1970. For more detailed information see Wilber et al. (1975), Appendix A.
Mexican American females had one equal to .68 that of White females (1975:80-81). Similar findings were also reported by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1978:24). Also using 1970 Census data, Long (1977:371) found that controlling for age, education, and region, "males of Spanish origin were more likely to hold jobs as laborers or service workers--occupations typically characterized by low pay." In a study of Black and Mexican American migrants to Racine, Washington, Shannon and Shannon (1973:108) concluded that a larger proportion of Mexican Americans and Negroes are unemployed whether at origin or destination of move than are Whites. Briggs, Fogel and Schmidt (1977:65-67) conclude that the relative concentrations of Mexican American individuals and families in the less lucrative occupational categories is at least partly responsible for the lower income levels noted above.

In a landmark study, Poston et al. (1976) examined the cost of being a Mexican American worker. Rigorous controls were employed to eliminate as many extraneous factors as possible. The sample was limited to men that were between 20 and 49 years of age in 1960 and between 20 and 59 in 1970. In addition, the subjects had to have worked at least 40 weeks in the preceding year as well as at least 35 hours in the week before the Census. Finally, the subjects had to be in a predominantly urban occupation and living in one of the five Southwest States. Their conclusion was that the "cost" of being a Mexican American worker increased during the decade of the 1960's. In other words, Mexican Americans tended to make less in comparable positions than did their White counterparts. It should be kept in mind that this occurred in spite of gains in educational attainment and intensity of social programs. This
does not mean that Mexican American workers lost money, but rather that they were not able to translate education into earnings as efficiently as Anglos (see "Queing" theory in Briggs et al., 1977:68).

The causes of the "cost" of being a Mexican American worker have been due in part to discrimination and to the difficulty of enforcing occupational and earnings equality in the labor market (Marshall, 1974). Becker (1971) points out that employment discrimination is committed not only by employers, but also by fellow employees and by consumers. Another example of employment discrimination was reported by Siegel (1965:49) who illustrated how the "etiquette of retail relationships" denied Spanish workers access to higher paying managerial occupations involving supervision of Whites and compelled Mexican Americans to engage mostly in small retail businesses.

Another factor contributing to the concentration of Mexican Americans in the lower paid occupations is the lack of English speaking abilities (García, 1980). Others (García, 1978:17) however, have pointed out that the relationship between English and occupational status is a complex one. García (1978:17) concluded that "The lack of higher occupational status among monolingual English-speaking Chicanos may suggest exclusionary policies and continual discrimination against Chicanos despite the absence of limited English-speaking ability."

Another researcher in this area, S. García (1979) using the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) found that English speaking abilities exerted a very strong influence on education. He also noted that English speaking abilities affected occupational status and earnings through education. Thus, the factors responsible for hindering the
assimilation of Mexican Americans into the economic and occupational arenas are more varied and complex than simply language and other "cultural" aspects.

Education

Education has played a very important part in the assimilation process of most ethnic groups in the United States (Selakovich, 1978:14). Schools were and are still regarded as one of their primary functions: the "Americanization" of the ethnic groups in the United States. The schools were to aid the immigrants in "melting" into American society. However, it is not altogether certain that the schools did, in fact, completely achieve this end with European ethnic groups (Novak, 1971) or Mexican Americans (Selakovich, 1978:67-98).

The acculturating effects of the educational system may be divided into direct and indirect ones. The direct effect is achieved through processes like teaching the dominant language, philosophies, and customs. The more schooling a group has, the more acculturated it will become, but only up to a point (Novak, 1971). The indirect effect of education is through education qualifications, particularly for the more lucrative jobs. By allowing members of an ethnic group into certain occupations, they are also allowed into the accompanying elements such as residence, social clubs, and eventually primary groups. These social contexts have significant consequences for assimilation. According to Gordon (1964:125-26) for a group to completely assimilate, it must first enter the primary groups and institutions of the dominant society. It
is extremely difficult to see how this could happen without having edu-
cation as the foundation.

The literature on Mexican Americans and education is bountiful. It has addressed many of the problems that Mexican Americans are having in the schools such as segregation (Litsinger, 1973:64), illiteracy (Moore, 1970:65), self-concept (Gordon, 1968; Felice, 1973; Carter, 1968), school curricula (Carter, 1970:97-102), labeling of mentally retarded students (Mercer, 1973:96-189), ability grouping (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974:21-22), language (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974:58) as well as the consequence of these problems, i.e., low levels of education attainment (Carter, 1970:30-31; Grebler et al., 1970:142-155; Moore, 1970:67-69).

A recent educational profile indicates that Mexican Americans in 1976 continued to have low levels of education relative to other groups (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978:12-15). In 1978, according to CPS data, Mexican Americans still had very low levels of education (Table 13). For non-Hispanic groups in the U.S., only 3.0 percent of the population over 25 years old had completed less than 5 years of school. Hispanic groups had more than five times the proportion of those who have less than 5 years of education. Mexican Americans fared poorly, 23.1 percent of their population had less than five years of schooling.

At the High School level, there was a much higher percentage of non-Hispanics with at least four years of high school, 67.1 percent compared with 34.3 percent for Mexican Americans. In terms of college
Table 13. Percent of population 25 years old and over by ethnicity and years of schooling for March 1978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed Less Than 5 Years of School</th>
<th>Completed 4 or More Years of High School</th>
<th>Completed 4 or More Years of College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


education, 16.1 percent of non-Hispanics had finished four or more years of college, while only 4.3 percent of Mexican Americans had achieved this level of education.

The largest differences between the groups appear to be in the lower educational levels. Few Mexican Americans, 34.3 percent, have not completed high school. This is extremely important in light of the direct and indirect assimilation consequences of education discussed earlier. In terms of education, assimilation of Mexican Americans is still not expected in the near future.

As was the case with the demographic indicators, the social and economic dimensions studied above—language maintenance, income, occupations/employment and education—clearly indicate that Mexican Americans
are not assimilated into American society and that there is no reason to
expect a major shift in the near future. Although several other cultural
variables such as religion, dress, food, music, patterns of interaction,
etc., could have also been selected, the indicators discussed above are
important measures of both structural and cultural assimilation and thus
serve to illustrate the non-assimilation of Mexican Americans. The
question remains as to why Mexican Americans have not assimilated given
the long history of contact between Anglos and Mexicans. Part of the
answer may lie precisely in the nature of this historical contact and
interaction. In the following chapter a discussion of this history is
presented.
CHAPTER 4

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

In this chapter we examine the history of the Mexican Americans in three time periods. We believe that this historical analysis will shed light on the interaction and conflict between Anglo and Mexican American culture and point to the roots of the causes for the non-assimilation of Mexican Americans into mainstream American society.

The first period deals with the time when Mexicans first made their entrance into the Southwest until the 1850s. This may be roughly considered as the period in which Mexican Americans were dominant in the region. The middle period, from the 1850s to the 1930s, basically refers to the time when the Mexican American was exploited and subjected to a great deal of social and institutional prejudice and discrimination. The last section covers the time period from the 1940s to the present. It is within this latter period that a collective consciousness began to surface and relative improvements in education, income, and political participation can be seen.

History of Mexican Americans in the Southwest

Settlement to 1850s: Conquest and Conflict

The people currently called Mexican Americans have been in what was formerly Northern New Spain, i.e., the area now entirely or partially
comprised by the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New
Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, for more than four centuries (Moquin and
Van Doren, 1971:ix). As early as the mid-sixteenth century, Spanish
explorers such as Aviles, Cabeza de Vaca, Coronado and Niza traveled
into this area, but traces of lasting influence on this area were minimal
(Gibson, 1966:182-201). Long term influences, however, were made by the
missions established by the Franciscans and Jesuits. The first mission
established in the northern region of New Spain was San Bartolome,
founded in 1581.

The first settlement of any duration was that of the Kingdom of
New Mexico. It was founded along the northern banks of the Rio Grande
in 1595 by Juan de Oñate principally to serve as a buffer state between
the Indians and the settlers. The present city of Santa Fe was founded
nearly fifteen years later in 1610. These settlements spent the next
two centuries in relative isolation from the authorities in Mexico City
(Spicer, 1962).

In the 1680s, the Jesuit, Eusebio Kino, worked in the areas of
Sonora and Arizona. By the time of his death in 1711, the missionary
bases he had established helped to set the stage for Spanish movement
into California (Machado, 1978:17-21; Bolton, 1936). However, domestic
and international conflicts kept Spain from launching ventures from the
bases until the 1770s when Gaspar de Portola led an expedition which
included Franciscan Friars such as Junipero Serra. This expedition be-
gan the founding of settlements along the coastal strip from San Diego
to San Francisco (Gibson, 1966:187).
It was not until the early 19th century that significant numbers of Anglo-Americans began to move into this area.\textsuperscript{17} Around 1790 they began to move into the region now comprised of New Mexico to trap beaver. When the demand for beaver died out, the trappers were replaced by merchants who brought with them American goods, such as manufactured tools and furniture, that the local New Mexico population had done without during their 200 years of isolation. At first the merchants were not warmly received by either the settlers or the Spanish government. Shortly after, however, the settlers changed their minds and welcomed the traders and the goods. This trade flourished despite the loud and boisterous nature of the merchants which was in sharp contrast to the local population, and the opposition of the Spanish and later the Mexican government.

Although Anglos had made their way into Texas as early as 1785, their numbers were very small. It was not until 1821 that significant numbers entered Texas as Stephen Austin moved 300 families into San Felipe de Austin (Manuel, 1965). From that point on the numbers of Anglos moving into Texas increased at a very rapid rate lured primarily by the cheap land and the amount of its availability. This immigration increased so rapidly and reached such great proportions that in 1830 the Mexican government decreed that all further immigration from the U.S. was prohibited. This was more or less ignored by the Anglo settlers so

\textsuperscript{17} The area being treated here is the one referred to as "Aztlán" by Rendon (1971), basically the region known as the American Southwest. The states involved are roughly: Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and California.
that by 1835 the approximately 5,000 Mexicans living in this area were greatly out-numbered by about 30,000 Anglos. Given the militant and independent attitudes of both Anglos and Mexicans on Texas soil and the despotic dictatorial government of Santa Ana, the Texas revolution became inevitable by this time (McWilliams, 1968:99).

In September 1832, residents of Texas convened, not to declare independence, but to become a separate state within Mexico. Stephen F. Austin traveled to Mexico City to meet with Santa Anna, the then president of Mexico, to discuss the terms of the convention. They were not able to agree on the terms. In particular, there was disagreement on the idea of separate statehood for Texas. Because of Austin's encouragement for separate statehood, he was jailed for several months.

The Texans, mostly Anglos, subsequently chose to fight. In the first skirmishes early in the summer of 1835, the Texans captured several Mexican posts. On December 5, 1835, they seized the Alamo mission in San Antonio which was the principal city at the time. This enraged Santa Anna who immediately began preparations to retake the garrison with a force of several thousand men. While he prepared, the Texans declared independence on March 2, 1836 (Horgan, 1954).

While conflicts had been going on for some time, with this declaration the Texas War of Independence had officially commenced. Four days after the declaration of independence, Santa Anna recaptured the Alamo. Soon thereafter he won another important battle at Goliad. However, on April 21, 1836 Santa Anna was attacked, defeated, and subsequently captured by Sam Houston in San Jacinto. With this victory, Texas had
its independence (Hollon, 1968) and gave Anglos clear control of the social-political development of the state.

California, which was the ultimate goal of American Expansionists, was not penetrated until after New Mexico and Texas. Before 1840 only a few Anglo adventurers\(^\text{18}\) had reached California (McWilliams, 1968:90). By 1848, Anglos numbered about 14,000 or about half of the non-Indian population (Eldredge, 1915:153). However, the Gold Rush of 1848 brought with it an enormous number of individuals, most of whom were Anglos. Between 1848 and 1852 the non-Indian population of California increased more than twenty-one fold to about 300,000 (Eldredge, 1915:404).\(^\text{19}\) Through sheer increase in numbers, Anglos were able to wipe out the last vestiges of Spanish-Mexican control and appearance of the area.

Racial prejudice did not result merely from the rapidly increasing Anglo population. A strong, although not virulent, anti-Mestizo (anti-mixed-blood) attitude was already in California before Anglos arrived in large numbers. The "Californios" prided themselves on their pure Spanish heritage, although by 1800 very few were "gachupines" or "criollos" i.e., either born in Spain or Spaniards born in the New World (Vigil, 1980:67-69; Machado, 1978:20). Since Mestizos were equated with Mexicans and Mexico, they were also rated as inferior. This prejudice against "Mexicanness" was only enhanced with the arrival of Anglo settlers who also

\(^{18}\) Although some of the individuals of this handful of adventurers were British, Scottish, German, and French citizens, they played an important part in the over-taking of the state by Anglos (see McWilliams, 1968:88-94).

\(^{19}\) Cleland (1944:256) noted that the Federal Census of 1850 counted 93,000 inhabitants for California whereas the California estimate for the same area was 260,000.
exhibited intolerance and contempt for nonwhites and mixed bloods. Anglo colonists viewed the Mexicans as being indolent, ignorant, bigoted, immodest, cheating, dirty, wretched, and cowardly halfbreeds (McWilliams, 1968:131; Poinsett, 1825:37; Robinson, 1963:31-65; Pitt, 1968:290). On the other hand, Mexicans also had their stereotypes of Anglos. They were viewed as being arrogant, audacious, aggressive, lawless, vicious, devoid of humanity, and disrespectful towards law and God (Acuña, 1972: 19; Lowrie, 1973:95; Sanchez, 1972:81-83). Such stereotypes, of course, are not conducive to assimilation and served to create greater social distance between Mexicans and Anglos.

Racism was only one of the factors that caused Mexicans and Anglos to be at loggerheads. Another such factor was the philosophical differences between the groups. The Anglos who came into the Southwest brought other ideas and philosophies that were very different from those of the local population. Anglos came with Montesquieuan ideas of juridical equality, representative government, checks and balances, the value of work for its own sake, and "manifest destiny" (Machado, 1978:21-30). These differences resulted in an irreconcilable chauvinism that was to hinder assimilation for a long period of time.

The negative group relations between Mexicans and Anglos may be largely attributed to racism. Most of the Anglo settlers coming in wanted nothing to do with the Mexican half-breeds who combined "the worst qualities of Spaniards and Indians to produce a truly despicable race" (Weber, 1973:60). This racism was also evident at the national level. Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina delivered a speech on the Senate floor which put forth the argument that "Colored races such
as the Mexicans were incapable of democratic government." And that "Mexicans would make inferior United States Citizens" (Weber, 1973:135). These types of attitudes influenced profoundly the relations between the groups for a long time and served to keep Mexicans from assimilating.

Religious prejudices served to reinforce the negative stereotypes that each group had of the other. In general, the predominately Protestant Anglos and particularly New Englanders took a very dim view of Catholic Spaniards and Latin Americans of all types (Weber, 1973:21). Some believed that the predominately Catholic Mexican culture was inferior and therefore no match for a triumphant Protestantism (Bernstein, 1961:6-10). Others, such as New England's Cotton Mather were more aggressive in their denouncement of Catholicism. He was not contented with passively regarding the Mexican as inferior, he wanted them "... to open their eyes and be converted away from Satan to God" (Bernstein, 1961:9). He even wrote a missionary tract in Spanish to help achieve this end.

On April 11, 1845 after Taylor refused a demand from Ampudia, the General of the Mexican forces, to withdraw back to the Nueces River, Mexican troops crossed the Rio Grande. On April 23, Mexico declared a "defensive war." The U.S. followed with its own declaration of war on May 11, 1846. Such conflict, to be sure, served to widen the social distance gap between Anglos and Mexicans.

The Mexican-American War was a disaster for Mexico. It lost more than half of its territory including the present states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Colorado, Utah, Texas, and bits of
Oklahoma and Wyoming. The War also created a bitterness and animosity previously unseen toward the U.S. from Mexico but also from many of the other Latin American countries. In the acquired lands, the War also exacerbated the anti-Mexican feelings.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed by Mexico on February 2, 1848. It was not ratified by the U.S. Senate for another three months. This Treaty not only officially ended the War, but it also created a new group of people, the Mexican Americans (Alvarez, 1971). These Mexican Americans were unique in that they became part of the U.S. as a conquered people.

The Treaty contained guarantees for the rights of the people left behind, Mexican Americans. These individuals were to be allowed one year to choose whether to return to the interior of Mexico or to remain in "Occupied Mexico" (Acuña, 1972:29). The Treaty also guaranteed that Mexican Americans would possess "... the enjoyment of all rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction" (Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in Moquin and Van Doren, 1971:185). This has been interpreted as meaning that "... besides the rights and duties of American citizenship, the Mexicans would also have special privilege derived from their previous customs in language, law, and religion" (Perrigo, 1971:176). However, as we shall see in the next section, the Treaty was disrespected in both spirit and in fact by Anglo residents of the Southwest (Samora
This tradition of ignoring the rights outlined in the Treaty has continued to the present.

This early period already sets the stage for the lack of assimilation of Mexican Americans into Anglo American society. The negative perceptions held by Anglo settlers of "mixed-bloods" and Mexicans in particular was an initial factor that kept the two groups at a social distance. This social distance, as shall be seen in the next section, was only broadened in the next historical period as outward Anglo discrimination against Mexican Americans became the norm.

1850's to 1930's: Partial Accommodation

The time period between 1848 and 1930's was important for Mexican Americans as two processes occurred during the period that had an enduring effect on the assimilation. The first event involved Anglos usurping control of the Southwest from Mexican Americans, relegating the "new" ethnic group to a secondary role in such central areas as politics and economics. This made any halcyonic co-existence difficult and assimilation extremely improbable. Moreover, by 1910 Anglos had achieved more or less complete dominance in the Southwest and quickly relegated Mexican Americans to a second class citizen status.

The second major process was the increased immigration from Mexico. Although immigration had never stopped, it increased around the turn of the century due primarily to the chaos created by the Mexican Revolution. This movement of people across a relatively open border kept the traditional Mexican culture alive in the U.S. and thus contributed to the non-assimilation of Mexican Americans.
To keep the newly formed group, Mexican Americans, from participating in politics, they were manipulated and intimidated. Different methods were employed by Anglos in the different states in the truncation of political rights. In Arizona, for example, the state capital, originally in Tucson, was moved first to Prescott and then to Phoenix where relatively few Mexican Americans resided in order to facilitate Anglo political control (Park, 1961:210). In New Mexico, Mexican Americans were able to assert their influence longer than any other group primarily because they remained a larger proportion of the population (Weber, 1973:144). Eventually, techniques such as all-white primaries and poll taxes were able to reduce the influence of Mexican Americans. These same techniques were also used in Texas to deter Mexican Americans from voting (Barr, 1971:233). In California, the rapid influx of large numbers of Anglos caused the decline of Mexican American political influence (Pitt, 1968:210), so the blatant coercive measures common elsewhere were not needed.

Mexican Americans were also being stripped of more immediately tangible goods other than political rights such as land. Moquin (1971:190) has called this time period the greatest land grab in American history. In the territory newly acquired by the U.S., land grants were protected by Articles VIII and XI of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and by the Protocol of Queretaro (in Duran and Bernard, 1973:202). Without this statement of Protocol which reaffirmed the protections of the land

20. Statehood was not granted to either Arizona or New Mexico until Mexican American control had been relinquished to the Anglo politicos (Forbes, 1973:115).
grants, it is doubtful that the Mexican Congress would have passed the Treaty (Perrigo, 1971:176). Nevertheless, land ownership slipped away from Mexican owners.

Perhaps the central source of difficulty in the dispute for land titles was the different cultural backgrounds with which land ownership was viewed. The Mexican system was based on the Spanish colonial land grant system which used general descriptions of land. This made descriptions of land holdings somewhat unreliable. Specifically, importance was given to tradition, not necessarily to the legal documents which tended to become lost over time. This system stood in stark contrast to the Anglo system of laws which utilized exact geographic surveys measured in degrees and feet (Samora and Simon, 1977:135) and included provisions for taxing the land.

These differences made the protection and maintenance of land titles extremely difficult in the slow and expensive litigation. These difficulties were only enhanced by the venal courts. Even when Mexican Americans were able to win a court fight, they usually had to face some reduction in acreage as well as exhorbitant legal fees that forced them to use their land as collateral (Acuña, 1972:43). Payment of taxes also forced the forfeiture of land. However, while a land dispute was in litigation, the land was kept in the hands of the party in possession. This caused exasperated Anglos to employ coercion, violence, and chicanery to dispossess Mexican Americans of their lands (Pitt, 1968:Ch. 5).21 Such

21. Sometimes land was sold for ridiculously low prices to pay delinquent taxes. One example is the Rancho de los Alamitos, consisting of 265,000 acres, which was sold for delinquent taxes of $152 (McWilliams, 1968:91-92).
comportment by Anglos made Mexican American assimilation even more difficult and improbable.

During this time period, Mexican Americans were subjected to extensive violence and depredations. The number of lynchings of Mexican Americans that occurred between 1850 and 1930 was greater than the number of lynchings of Blacks in the South during the same time period (Moquin and Van Doren, 1971:181). In California, Mexican American, Sonoran, and Chilean miners were all categorized as "foreigners" and forced, sometimes through lynchings, to abandon their claims (Weber, 1973:169).

This violence was not limited to miners; it was extended to farmers and other land owning groups of Mexican Americans (Moquin and Van Doren, 1971:181). Although violence usually erupted over a specific dispute or accusation, in some cases lawlessness was so rampant that individuals were lynched for no other reason than being of Mexican origin and unfortunate enough to be in the proverbial "wrong place at the wrong time." In some cases even local officials participated in these senseless killings (Campa, 1973:15-22; Weber, 1973:174-175).

By the 1870's the conditions along the Texas-Mexico border had developed into such an inimical state that the U.S. Congress sent an investigative Commission which concluded that the entire crime problem along the border was due to Mexican border raids and the Mexican officials who permitted the raids to continue. The Mexican Government responded with their own "Comisión Pesquisadora" which reached different conclusions. According to the Mexican commission, there was no justice
for Mexicans in Texas and Texas Mexicans enjoyed no greater personal security than did their property (Weber, 1973:182). Although both of these reports were biased, Rippy (1926:288), in what is perhaps the most detailed study of the period, concluded that the truth perhaps "... corresponds more nearly with the findings of the Mexican commissioners."

In Texas, the Rangers served to further discourage any type of assimilation by helping to keep Mexican Americans in their subordinate position. They acted not so much as peace officers, but as the ruthless personal strong-arm men of Richard King and other Anglo ranchers and merchants (Paredes, 1971:29; Samora et al., 1979). The ruthlessness with which Mexican Americans were treated or even killed was consistent with the basic Ranger operating premise that "A Mexican's life is of little value anyway" (Paredes, 1971:29).

Due to the injustices that resulted from this type of attitude, Mexican Americans were not only the victims of lawbreakers, but also of the law enforcers. State representative Cox urged the elimination of the Rangers. He argued that there was more danger to the public from the Rangers than from the men they were supposed to hunt down, that there was no respect for law in the Ranger force and that they were the most irresponsible officers in the state of Texas (Paredes, 1971:31).

Not surprisingly, the violence against Mexican Americans eventually led to confrontations between Mexican Americans and Anglos in Texas and throughout the Southwest. Some of these confrontations took the form of social banditry (Hobsbawm, 1969:15). Social banditry, according to some historians such as Weber (1973:206), came about because of the
frustration arising from the decline in the effectiveness of the old customs coupled with the difficulty of assimilating into Anglo society. This illegal manner of fighting or getting revenge was more common in California. Some of the most notorious social bandits in California were Joaquín Murrieta, "Three-fingered Jack" García, and Tiburcio Vásquez (Machado, 1978:34; Pitt, 1968; 261).

In Texas, the social bandits tended to be more social revolutionaries than bandits, i.e., individuals who appeared to have more altruistic intentions than those in California. Some of the most well known of these included Gregorio Cortéz, Jacinto Treviño, and Juan Cortina (Paredes, 1971:7-32). Juan Cortina was perhaps the most influential, if only because he was able to evade ever getting killed and thus was able to exert an influence longer than the others. His notoriety began in 1859 when he witnessed a local deputy sheriff named Spears beating one of his mother's ranch employees who apparently had had too much to drink. He demanded that the deputy release the man to his custody. The deputy refused and insulted Cortina. Cortina then shot and wounded the deputy and took the ranch hand with him to his mother's ranch. After hearing about further Anglo transgressions, he rode into Brownsville, attempted to raise the Mexican flag, and issued proclamations against Anglos. He then went into battle against both the Brownsville militia and the Texas Rangers and defeated both of them.

Cortina posed such a real or perceived threat that the governor of Texas, Sam Houston, requested special assistance from the War Department. The request was granted with well trained and equipped troops
under the command of Robert E. Lee. However, Lee and his troops were never able to find Cortina. It seems that Cortina had shifted his base of operations south of the Rio Grande to the Mexican state of Tamaulipas where he later served as military governor.

The strong negative racial attitudes held by many of the Anglo settlers made a substantial contribution to the prevention of assimilation of Mexican Americans. The asperity was probably stronger in Texas because it had been the original battleground for open conflict between Anglos and Mexicans (Machado, 1978:35; Paredes, 1971:20). Mexican Americans were regarded as being, at best, only a cut above the Black slaves that many of the settlers had at the time, and thus not fully human in the Anglo's image.

Mexican Americans who competed with the Anglo or were in some other manner successful were the ones most likely to be harassed because they most visibly threatened the ideas of Anglo racial superiority. Evidence of this was seen in the "Cart War of 1857." Mexican Americans had a highly successful business of hauling freight between Indianola and San Antonio, Texas to Chihuahua, Mexico. Seeing how lucrative this business was, Anglos wanted to cut in. At first, harassment of the freighters consisted of stealing or destroying oxen, oxcarts, and freight. Then, persistent Mexican Americans who had not been intimidated began to be murdered. However, no legal action was taken to either hinder or ameliorate this lawlessness. Although the Mexican government protested these actions, it was not until Anglo freighters were subjected to these inimical actions that U.S. troops were called in to guard and escort the freighters (Weber, 1973:153).
Another incident which demonstrated the increasing conflict between Anglos and Mexican Americans was the Salt War of 1877. The local population of El Paso which was predominantly Mexican American had been accustomed to gathering salt for marketing and for personal use from a salt mine located 100 miles east of the town. Under Mexican law, the salt was considered part of the public domain, thus no one had bothered to stake a claim on it. Under American laws the minerals, including salt, could be considered part of the private domain. Anglo entrepreneurs staked a claim and proceeded to charge people for the salt they were taking. This sudden change created a great deal of controversy in local politics. When one of the mine owners killed an Italian born politician who had been fighting for the position of the salt gatherers, Mexican Americans revolted. In the ensuing revolt, the mine owner and two other Anglos were killed, and thousands of dollars of damage was incurred. After the violence had subsided, the Texas Rangers and U.S. troops came to restore peace. Following their tradition of "revenge by proxy," the Rangers killed several Mexicans in retaliation. The charge for the salt was also reinstated (Casey, 1950:144-215; Sonnichsen, 1961, 1971:108-156).

By the turn of the century, cultural assimilation was making inroads into some of the Mexican American population. However, the Mexican American population was not a monolithic population that had all members affected equally by all changes. Rather, this population was a diversified group. At one end of the spectrum were Mexican American individuals who were learning the ways of the Anglos and using these for their own
benefit. At the other end, Mexican immigrants were replenishing and keeping alive Mexican culture in the Southwest. This is a very important issue with respect to assimilation since the more recent the arrival and the easier the access to the homeland of an immigrant group, the more difficult assimilation for that group will be (Mack, 1968:229). Although a few individuals might assimilate into Anglo society, the group as a whole would be much less likely to follow suit.

The turbulent economic and political conditions in Mexico after Porfirio Díaz left office in 1911 were greatly responsible for the increase in immigration to the U.S. There had, however, always been a good sized migration stream between the two countries. In 1900 there were about 100,000 Mexican immigrants in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. By 1910 there were 200,000 immigrants in these states. The number of Mexican immigrants increased to about 423,000 by 1920 and to 1,225,000 by 1930 (McWilliams, 1968:163). In addition to these numbers were the Mexican illegal aliens (Samora, 1971:33-57). The international border had not become an important separating boundary as the migration stream across both sides of the border brought culture along with it. Some of the increased migration was due to the return migration of individuals to their homes in the Southwest after they had been forced to flee them during and after the Mexican-American War (Weber, 1973:177). However, in most cases it was the new Mexican immigrants who came to fill the labor demands of the rapidly growing railroads, mines, farms, and ranches of the area (Cortés, 1974; Grebler, 1966:19; Taylor, 1970).
It is extremely difficult to attempt to estimate the numbers of the immigrants of the late 19th to early 20th century. This is due in part to the absence of record keeping by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). In fact, there were no records whatsoever kept between the years of 1886 and 1893 (Samora, 1971:17). The INS records that do exist greatly undercount the number of immigrants. For example, in the 1870's the INS reported 5,162 Mexicans as having immigrated to the United States. For this same time period, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reported an increase of 26,000 Mexican-born individuals (Weber, 1973:221). Even this latter number is probably an undercount as sparsely populated rural areas, where most of the Mexican Americans lived at this time, are one of the greatest areas of Census undercounts. By 1908 the Federal government estimated that about 50,000 Mexicans were arriving annually (Clark, 1908:520; Grebler et al., 1970:61-81).

According to INS figures, in the decade between 1910-1919, 224,705 individuals immigrated to the U.S. from Mexico. These numbers almost doubled (426,733) in the 1920's (Reisler, 1976). However, the economic crash of 1929 not only caused immigration to drop substantially, it also caused a large temporary return migration stream. Previous Mexican immigrants were blamed for the economic ills of the U.S. Thus, to alleviate the perceived source of this problem, a large "voluntary" repatriation program was instituted (Hoffman, 1974). The program was supposed to repatriate only those individuals who were in the U.S. without the proper documents. However, in the fervor to reduce welfare rolls and the competition for work of unemployed individuals a considerable
number of Mexican resident aliens and even Mexican Americans who were U.S. citizens were repatriated (Meier and Rivera, 1972:159). This program repatriated around 300,000 individuals according to official U.S. figures. However, unofficial estimates put the actual number of repatriated individuals closer to 500,000 (Acuña, 1972:190; McWilliams, 1968:193). The number of immigrants to the U.S. was to remain low for the next 20 years.

The economic circumstances of the 1930s brought unemployed Mexican Americans and unemployed Anglos into direct competition for jobs. This served to fuel the racial problems, heightening distance between the two groups and thus further hindering assimilation.

At the end of the 1930s Mexican Americans were worse off than they had been in the 1850s. They were now firmly relegated to a position of second class citizens. They had lost most of their economic and political influence and were segregated in residential and public facilities. For the most part they were concentrated in the menial work positions, but even when they performed the same work as whites, they were paid considerably less (López y Rivas, 1973:35).

Even if assimilation had been considered to be a worthwhile goal by Mexican Americans, the Anglo would not have permitted it. The Anglo, with a general phobia of "mixing blood," wanted to keep completely apart from the Mexican Americans. In South Texas, there was a saying, "If a Mexican wears guaraches, he is all right. If he wears shoes, he is tolerable, but if he wears boots and speaks English, he is no good" (Forbes, 1973:120). These segregationist attitudes were translated into public policy whose impacts are still evident today.
The historical data presented above makes it poignantly clear that this period resulted in a society in which the social distance between Anglos and Mexican Americans was formalized and widened through institutional arrangements, making assimilation even more difficult. It was not until the next decade, the 1940s, that Mexican Americans would have any real opportunities to make fundamental changes in the social system that held them in a subordinated position.

1940s to Present

The 1940s brought with them World War II which set in motion several trends of social change that were to affect the composition of Mexican Americans as a group. The War also helped to bring Mexican Americans from the rural areas into the metropolitan centers to fill the void resulting from the rapidly expanding defense industry or to be absorbed by the armed forces. In turn, these changes resulted in an affluence that was previously unknown to Mexican Americans in urban areas. This affluence also brought with it a revitalization of ethnic pride and self-awareness. Mexican Americans were now beginning to compete on a more equitable basis with Anglos in some areas of the economic system, although past patterns of discrimination made this difficult. This allowed some to begin to break out of the second class citizen status. They also began to view the prejudice and discrimination against them in a new light. The fact that Mexican Americans were working alongside many Anglos points out that discrimination, at least in some areas, was being reduced even if only slightly. Yet, assimilation did not come with this relative rise in economic status.
This period of urban affluence also brought with it youth gangs or "Pachucos." Many of these young individuals wore zoot suits. This was a somewhat outlandish garb that was symbolic of the headway that Mexican Americans were making in overcoming their subservient status. While pachucos wore these outfits with pride, other groups who felt threatened by the recent changes in the status quo vis-a-vis the Mexican American felt threatened by pachucos and their appearance. The Zoot Suit Riots of Los Angeles in 1943 is evidence that prejudice and discrimination were still significant factors against Mexican Americans.

These riots seem to have been set off by an altercation on the night of June 3, 1943 between some sailors and persons believed to be Mexican Americans. The following night, two hundred sailors seeking revenge drove around Mexican American neighborhoods in a fleet of taxi cabs. They brutalized every Mexican American in a zoot suit they could find. The local police, almost unbelievably, responded by arresting the severely beaten Mexican Americans. After other branches of the armed services and thousands of civilians joined in the riot and began attacking Filipinos and Blacks as well, the military police stepped in and declared downtown Los Angeles off limits to all military personnel. Because of inaction on the part of local civil authorities, the riots continued for two more days before subsiding (Acuña, 1981: McWilliams, 1968:244-258).

In light of these events, it is probable that the pachuco experience may have contributed toward greater polarization between Mexican Americans and Anglos. This polarization was further aggravated by the
attacks on the zoot suits and finally erupted out of control by the inaction on the part of the local civil authorities.

The war years also may have introduced a sense of "false progress" in regards to assimilation. During World War II, many Mexican Americans served in the armed forces of the United States. In fact, the percentage of Mexican Americans in the armed forces was greater than their percentage of the general population (Morin, 1966:16). Mexican Americans were proportionately the most highly decorated group of the War, i.e., they had the highest proportion of Congressional Medals of Honor (Acuña, 1972:158).

While in the military, Mexican Americans acquired marketable work skills and learned that they could successfully compete with Anglos. The military service also gave Mexican Americans a new perspective on the prejudice and discrimination that they had experienced in their local areas. After the War, the G.I. bill provided opportunities for employment, high school and college education, increased job training, and resources for purchasing homes and life insurance. These opportunities had a significant effect on Mexican Americans because they provided the fundamentals needed to permit them to acquire a better life (López y Rivas, 1973:63).

During this post-WWII period, individual Mexican Americans taking advantage of these opportunities stopped being "culturally loyal" to Mexico (Alvárez, 1971:24). In their attempts to diminish or eradicate prejudice and discrimination against them, many Mexican Americans were willing to relinquish their Mexican culture and Spanish language
(Alvárez, 1976:47-49). Many of these individuals mistakingly believed that their acculturation was responsible for their increase in economic well-being when in fact, much of this gain was due to the general economic prosperity of the time. However, because many people were experiencing an increase in economic affluence, Mexican Americans tended to retain their place at the bottom of the economic ladder (Alvárez, 1971:45). Furthermore, any cultural assimilation that was occurring at the time did not cause any increase in primary group contacts or structural assimilation.

The large migration from the rural areas to the industrial urban areas during World War II created a serious agricultural labor shortage. American growers responded by proposing the importation of Mexican labor. However, they met with opposition from Mexican officials. These officials remembered the callous deportations and repatriations of the previous decade. Moreover, they were concerned that having thousands of workers leave the country would have an adverse effect on Mexico's economic development. They also believed that the "labor shortage" could merely be a scheme by American agriculturalists and the American government to exploit cheap Mexican labor (Galarza, 1964:46).

On August 4, 1942 an Executive order established what has come to be known as the Bracero Program. It officially alleviated the concerns of Mexican officials by incorporating stipulations on recruitment, means of transportation, health care, wages, housing, food and number of working hours. Although this was to be a temporary program to aid American agriculture during the War years, it continued until December, 1964. Although it provided agricultural labor for the American growers
during the crucial war years, its most important effect was that it helped to establish and formalize a pattern for individuals to come to the U.S. both legally and illegally (Samora, 1971:18-19). These individuals, of course, continued to revitalize Mexican American culture and possibly slow the process of assimilation.

While the Bracero Program facilitated legal entry into the United States, it also had the effect of encouraging illegal entry (Samora, 1971). This pattern of illegal immigration continues in large proportions even today (Siegel et al., 1980:19; Cornelius, 1977:1). This immigration is very important to Mexican Americans because its sheer magnitude provides a cultural infusion. This phenomenon provides continuous fresh contact with Mexican culture providing the opportunity to maintain Mexican American culture and thus serves to delay assimilation by inhibiting acculturation. Estimates of the size of the Mexican illegal alien population vary greatly and are the source of much controversy. A recent "cautious speculation" of the number of Mexican illegal aliens by a group of senior Census Bureau demographers is between 1.5 and 2.5 million.²³

²² Leonel Castillo, former Commissioner of INS preferred using "undocumented workers" to refer to this population. He maintained that this was a more accurate description as matters are not illegal until there has been a judication on them. The use of "illegal alien" also implies an instant moral judgment. Thus "undocumented worker" is a more accurate, less connoted term.

²³ The estimates of Mexican illegal aliens have run as low as .4 million (Heer, 1979) and as high as 6 million (Chapman, 1976). The estimate of this population by a group of senior U.S. Census Bureau demographers was between 1.5 and 2.5 million (Siegel, Passel and Robinson, 1980:19). The mass media, however, used what may best be described as an offhand estimate by Chapman of 12 million.
This population of undocumented workers also tends to be of a seasonal rather than of a permanent nature (Cornelius, 1977:7; Heer, 1979:418). By being in a constant state of flux with new immigrants always coming in and others leaving, a continuous flow of Mexican culture is introduced into the Mexican American population. This, in turn, may further contribute to the relative nonassimilation of Mexican Americans into American society.

In the 1960's there were three developments that provided the background impetus for Mexican Americans in their attempts for equal citizenship. They were the Black Civil Rights movement, President Johnson's War on Poverty, and the Vietnam War protest (Vigil, 1980:187). During this time period, tactics including rhetoric, polemics and obstreporous acts were used as a means of sensitizing Mexican Americans to their subjugated status. Ethnic solidarity was restimulated for Mexican Americans while the emphasis on assimilation declined (Fraga, 1980:61). Mexican Americans were organizing groups to deal with the resolution of specific problems or to achieve the more general goal of helping the Mexican American castoff his second class citizenship status. Although these types of self-help activities had been present in Mexican American communities for a very long time, the modern organizations did have a new focus. They tended to be more concerned with achieving social and political equality than had previous organizations. They also tended to actively discourage assimilation, unlike the groups immediately following WWII.

The new groups strove to sensitize Mexican Americans to their cultural identity and to their political potential. Some of the major
groups that formed during this time were: Mexican American Political Association (MAPA), Community Service Organization (CSO), American G.I. Forum, Political Association of Spanish Speaking Organizations (PASSO) and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF). MAPA was founded in Fresno, California to appeal exclusively to a Mexican American audience. It strongly emphasized political goals and was anti-assimilation. PASSO was formed in Phoenix, Arizona in 1960. Although it had the same basic goals as MAPA, it addressed itself to a more general audience than just Mexican Americans and sought an alliance with other Hispanic organizations (Guzmán, 1966:173). The G.I. Forum was organized to fight discrimination while the CSO worked to promote voting rights for Mexican Americans. These last two groups subsequently began to concentrate in the area of political education. MALDEF was formed to litigate civil rights for Mexican Americans in general.

There were also several Mexican American activists who rose to prominence during the 1960's. César Estrada Chávez rose out of the CSO to organize Mexican American agricultural workers into a union, the United Farm Workers (UFW). Using labor, religious, and Civil Rights movement volunteers and financial support, he was able to organize successful boycotts and win grower recognition for the California farm-workers union (Acuña, 1972:177; Gómez, 1973:74).

Reies López Tijerina was one of the principle organizers and spokespersons of "La Alianza Federal de la Mercedes." This group had as one of its chief goals obtaining the return of the communal land grant in New Mexico. The lands in dispute had been assigned to the public domain by the Surveyor General on the premise that only those land claims
that were made by individuals could be protected (Swadesh, 1973:270). The Alianza based their arguments for their rights to these lands on the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. They even went to Mexico to turn over to then President López Mateos a memorial signed by thousands of Mexican Americans requesting his assistance in making the United States live up to the terms of the Treaty (Blawis, 1973:522). By challenging the Forest Service, Tijerina became a hero of militant Mexican Americans. At the same time actions, such as the attacks by Alianza members of the Tierra Amarilla courthouse, made moderate Mexican Americans less than enthusiastic (Knowlton, 1971:94).

Another prominent figure, Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales is best known for his founding of the Crusade for Justice and his writing of the epic poem, "I am Joaquín." His appeal tended to be focused towards barrio youth. In Denver, he established the Crusade for Justice Center and worked for educational issues that affected Mexican Americans. His political ideology tended to be more leftist, e.g., he advocated the formation of separate Chicano communities (Acuña, 1972:241).

These groups and individuals from the 1960s had at least two motivating factors in common. First, they were interested in seeking an end to the second class citizenship status for Mexican Americans as they actively sought equal participation in all the institutions of American society. Second, all of these groups were vigorously opposed to the idea of acculturation as being a prerequisite for the Mexican American to achieve first class citizenship in the United States. In fact, they sought to formalize the cultural differences, e.g., the implementation of bilingual education.
The ideological thrust from the 1960s continued into the early 1970s. A good example of this may be seen in José Angel Gutiérrez and La Raza Unida Party. In the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, Mexican Americans comprised, in some cases, more than eighty percent of the population. However, they had virtually no political influence. Since neither the Republican nor the Democratic parties had addressed the issues, problems and concerns that were of exigency to Mexican Americans, Gutiérrez, along with other Mexican American activists, established La Raza Unida Party. The first task undertaken by this Party was to organize parents and students disenchanted with the local school system. In the spring elections of 1970, La Raza Unida won four out of seven seats on the school board of Crystal City as well as City council seats in nearby towns (Acuña, 1972:235). The Party expanded and established other chapters in California and Colorado (Fraga, 1980:68).

The ideologies, rhetoric, and polemics that were so central to Mexican American activism in the 1960s attained a secondary importance in the 1970s. In this latter decade, the focus was on more tangible goals such as social programs to alleviate specific needs in the community and obtaining fair representation in the educational, political, and economic spheres of society.

As a result of the post W.W. II benefits and of the general prosperity of the country, Mexican Americans were becoming more educated, more professional, and joining an expanding middle class. As Mexican Americans penetrated the social, economic, and political systems of society, they learned where the access points were and the details of the mundane operations of the various institutions. Mexican American
organizations began to reflect the recently acquired goals, experiences, and backgrounds of their members.

An example of how organizations reflected the changes in values of the Mexican American movement can be seen in the history of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). When it was formed in the 1930's, LULAC stressed loyalty to the United States, use of the English language, the importance of education, and in general, middle-class values (Weeks, 1929:265). In the 1940's and 1950's the organization reached a period of stagnation. Its members tended to be satisfied with their past accomplishments and participated primarily in noncontroversial activities such as scholarship programs. Since they were out of step with the times, they lost members and potential members to more aggressive and politically active groups such as the G.I. Forum (Briegel, 1974:169; Cuellar, 1969:17).

In the 1960's, partly out of necessity and partly due to the leadership, LULAC became more sensitive to the needs of the Mexican American community. It moved to establish programs in three areas of need: housing, job training-employment, and education. LULAC constructed low cost housing using monies available from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. To assist the community with its employment needs, SER-Jobs for Progress Inc. was established to conduct job training and to otherwise assist in employment. However, it is in the area of education that LULAC has been most active (Garza, 1972:28-29). The first major Mexican American educational program of the 1960's was the LULAC Educational Fund Inc. This program raised funds to
prepare pre-school Mexican American children for elementary school partially by teaching them 400 basic English words (Fuqua, 1970:13).

The early 1970's found the organization in the same condition and with the same focus as in the late 1960's. However, by the late 1970's LULAC was in stride with other major Mexican American organizations by continuing the politicization of the organization, particularly that of Mexican American youth, and the formalization of ethnic pluralism for Mexican Americans in U.S. society. They were also expanding into other Hispanic communities particularly in those states where no previous LULAC councils had existed.

Today, Mexican Americans for the most part continue to follow the pattern of resisting assimilation in several ways. First, they participate in bilingual-bicultural educational programs. This helps retard acculturation. A second aspect is the establishment of a parallel economic structure including everything from banks to construction companies to national chain restaurants. Although prejudice and discrimination against the Mexican American are still in existence today, they are much less intense and overt than previously. However, while Mexican Americans are ridding themselves of negative stereotypes against them (Fallows, 1970) and becoming an identifiable and more acceptable group in the United States, they are simultaneously losing identity by being categorized into the "Hispanic" category. The categorizing of all Latino groups under the umbrella term of "Hispanic" causes the individual groups, such as Mexican Americans, to become lost in the artificial category.
The situation of Mexican Americans is characterized by a conscientious effort to reject total assimilation. While Structural Assimilation seems to be a goal which is actively and aggressively pursued by Mexican Americans, Cultural Assimilation (acculturation) is clearly a goal that is unacceptable to most Mexican Americans. An example of this may be seen in the educational sphere. Mexican Americans want to participate as full members in the educational institution. However, they do not desire this participation to be a unicultural monolingual experience. They want to insure that their children have the opportunity to develop language skills in Spanish. Mexican Americans recognize that this language maintenance is important for the preservation of Mexican American culture.

The historical analysis presented in this chapter found a persistent trend of non-assimilation of Mexican Americans. In the initial period of contact, the attitudes, beliefs and perceptions of both Anglos and Mexicans about each other served to create a social distance between them. This social distance virtually guaranteed that assimilation for Mexican Americans would not occur.

In the second time period, Anglos still considered Mexican Americans to be an inferior people. However, victory in the war with Mexico had the consequence of giving Anglos the power to formalize and institutionalize the prejudicial feelings against Mexicans and Mexican Americans. This resulted in widespread discrimination against Mexican Americans, which in turn increased the social distance between these groups. This further inhibited the assimilation of Mexican Americans into American society.
In the third time period, W.W. II and the concomitant rural to urban shift resulted in economic mobility for Mexican Americans. However, because of the general prosperity during this time, all groups experienced some mobility. Thus the relative position of Mexican Americans vis-a-vis Anglos did not change. Consequently, Mexican Americans continued to be fairly unassimilated.

This non-assimilation continued and later surfaced as a major issue during the social movements of the 1960's. During these years, Mexican Americans became increasingly conscious of their second class citizen status and decided that while they want to change this, they do not want to become completely absorbed into Anglo society in the process. Mexican Americans not only resisted assimilation, but took an active vigorous stand against it.

The model of assimilation derived from Gordon's theory of assimilation (discussed in Chapter 2) is presented, developed and discussed in the next chapter. This model will be tested with data from a recent sample survey of Mexican Americans in four Southwestern states and Michigan. Also presented in Chapter 5 are a description of the sample, the methodology used in the analysis, the operationalization of the variables, and details of the sampling procedures and data collection.
CHAPTER 5

PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND METHODOLOGY

Problem to be Studied

According to most theories of assimilation, Mexican Americans should have been assimilated during the approximately 150 years that they have been in contact with Anglos (Machado, 1978; Manual, 1965). However, there has been relatively little assimilation and this group remains culturally distant (Fallows, 1970). Milton Gordon's model of assimilation as presented in Assimilation in American Society (1964) and more recently in Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity (1978) and discussed in Chapter 2 is considered to be one of the major conceptual works in the field of assimilation. As can be said of most theories and models of assimilation, Gordon's framework has not been tested in a systematic and empirical manner. Given the far reaching influence that Gordon's model has had in the sociological, anthropological and psychological literature, it is indeed surprising that the model has not been empirically tested on any ethnic group. Therefore, the empirical testing of Gordon's model in this thesis serves to fulfill two important functions. First, it provides for the much needed empirical test of the model. Secondly, it provides for an empirical application of a major assimilation theory to Mexican Americans.

Although additional discussion of Gordon is provided at the end of this chapter when we discuss the operationalization of variables, it
is important to have a brief statement here of the problem to be examined. The two models to be tested as part of this thesis are derived from Gordon's macro-level assimilation theory. Each of these models has as its dependent variable one of the seven types of assimilation which are part of Gordon's overall framework. The two types of assimilation that will be used as dependent variables are "Structural" and "Civic." Since Gordon's model maintains that the same independent variables affect the seven dependent variables, both of the models tested here have the same independent variables: cultural heterogeneity, value consensus, and stereotyping.

Four basic hypotheses derived from Gordon's model will be tested in this study.

1. There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of cultural heterogeneity there is between groups and assimilation. That is, the more different the two groups are culturally from each other, the lesser the assimilation.

2. There exists a direct relationship between the amount of value consensus between the two groups under consideration, and assimilation. The more similar the two groups are with respect to values and ideologies, the greater the assimilation is likely to be.

3. There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of stereotyping between groups and assimilation. The greater the amounts of stereotyping occurring between groups, the lesser the assimilation.

4. The model using structural assimilation as a dependent variable has stronger associations with the independent variables than the model using civic assimilation. This is due to structural
assimilation being one of the dominant types of assimilation in Gordon's model that necessarily precedes the five minor types.

As stated above, the testing of these four hypotheses will serve two independent and important functions. The paucity of empirical research in the literature on Mexican Americans will be addressed by this application of one of the dominant assimilation theories. In addition, through empirical testing, the field of race relations will be provided a basis on which to evaluate the assimilation model

Questionnaire Development

The data used in this study to test Gordon's model were collected as part of the regional project NC-128. This project was originally undertaken to examine factors that affected quality of life. Fourteen states participated in this project. In order to facilitate the progress on this collaborative project which involved a variety of researchers from social science disciplines, the project was highly structured.

Part of this formal structuring entailed using pre-coded questionnaires. The items of these questionnaires were separated into three levels. The first level consists of a core group of questions that was to be utilized by all participating states. The second level embodied a "package" to deal with each of the eleven domains under study. The third level was composed of questions directed to individual state research interests.

24. These fourteen states included Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, and Texas.
The items that made up the core primary questionnaire were written, pretested and critiqued by the technical committee of NC-128. These items were combined into three different questionnaires. The first form, the primary adult questionnaire, was intended to be completed in a personal interview with either the husband or wife of the family. It focused upon the social, economic, and demographic information of the entire family which prevented needless duplication of these items in the other two questionnaires. These other two questionnaires, completed by the other spouse and an adolescent, were identical to the primary adult one except for the information on the entire family.

In particular, the primary questionnaire included questions on age, education, health status, current employment status, length of marriage, identification of individuals in the household as well as their kinship, number of children not living at home, extent to which health of family members interferes with activity, labor force status, family income, savings, tenure of housing, number of bedrooms, number of years in present dwelling, neighborhood, community and state, racial or ethnic origin, and religion. In addition, there were two sets of questions, one measuring satisfaction, the other importance for each of the quality of life domains (see Appendix A). To facilitate the answering of the questionnaire, flash cards with the appropriate responses were developed and utilized.

The second part of the questionnaire was a package that was specifically developed for each of the states from the 44 packages which focused upon the eleven domains of the project. The eleven domains were:
education; health; community services; community environment; family; management; leisure; friendships; employment; financial security; and housing. The 44 "packages" were constructed by domain committees with the understanding that if an individual state expressed a desire to examine a particular domain, the entire package which had been determined as being valid and reliable would be used.

However, those states that were studying Mexican Americans were all required to use the same package. The areas included here were: employment, source of income, interfamily economic transfers, rurality-urbanity, moral climate of the community, American traditionalism, religiosity, familism, formal social participation, perception of ethnic prejudice, perceived possibility for ethnic integration, desire for ethnic integration, assimilation/separatism scale, acculturation scale, speaking Spanish, use of Spanish mass media, and interethnic contacts. These forms allowed the Mexican American subcommittee to study the questions pertinent to its individual member states.

The Mexican American subcommittee was comprised of those states involved in the study of Mexican Americans: Arizona, California, Colorado, Texas, and Michigan. These had an additional step involved in the development of questionnaires and flash cards. All the questionnaires, the primary adult, the other spouse, and the adolescent, as well as the second package, had to be translated into Spanish. This task was accomplished by the Arizona Committee and required special considerations. The level of Spanish used could not be too formal in order to avoid causing respondents to experience difficulty in comprehension. At the
same time, care had to be taken to not make it overly simple for fear of losing preciseness and possible respondent misinterpretation. With these considerations in mind, a medium level translation was completed. Also, variations in the Spanish vernacular between states created some problems. These factors, among others, made the pretesting of the Spanish instrument an extremely crucial step. This was done by both the Michigan and Texas Committees which had more resources at their disposal than other states studying Mexican Americans, e.g., Arizona. The results of the pretesting were subsequently used to refine the Spanish questionnaires.

The third level of items employed in the questionnaire were developed, tested, and used by either individual states or small groups of states. These questions were designed to permit the fulfillment of particular research designs that might be of interest to only one or two of the states participating in NC-128. There was very little overlap with these questions in the states studying Mexican Americans.

**Sampling and Data Collection Procedures**

The NC-128 project sought 1) to derive a framework for the evaluation of quality of life, 2) to assess the determinants of quality of life for individual family members, the family unit, the community, and 3) to study the inter-relations among these social units. In more general terms, it sought to develop a descriptive base in order to document and analyze change in the attributes of quality of life.

The national NC-128 technical committee defined the criterion for the selection of the communities to be chosen by each state. The first
criterion was that each state choose one metropolitan and one non-metropolitan community. The metropolitan community was to be the central city of an SMSA, and it was to have a population range between 100,000 and 200,000. The non-metropolitan community was to be selected from a county other than the SMSA which had the sample metropolitan community. It should be at least 30 but preferably more than 50 miles from the city chosen as the metropolitan site. In addition, the non-metropolitan site was not to include communities with unique characteristics such as state capitals, small college towns, or heavily surveyed towns.

Of the 14 states participating in NC-128, five were on the Mexican American subcommittee: Arizona, California, Colorado, Michigan, and Texas. Because Michigan went into the field earlier than the other states, it used a slightly different form of the questionnaire. Therefore, the data collected by Michigan did not correspond completely with the data collected by other states. Fortunately most of the information required for the present analysis was collected in all five states in the same format. In addition to adherence to the stipulations set forth by the national committee, the Mexican American subcommittee also imposed the additional requirement that the sites chosen for data collection should be comprised of at least 25 percent Mexican American families.

Due to resource constraints and differences in research objectives the samples were drawn in a slightly different manner in each state. The national criteria were to select a sample community and refine the target population by sampling only families with both spouses present and at least one child between 12 and 18 living at home. The five states
studying Mexican Americans had the additional task of identifying the Mexican American population in the sampling community and then further stratifying the sample by locating the eligible families within that sample. These constraints on the eligibility criteria were designed to maximize the achievement of each state's research objectives.

However, because the communities were purposive sites, i.e., not chosen randomly, and the population targeted for sampling consisted of those families with at least one teenage child at home, any generalizations to a national or even a regional level are tenuous. But some general comments can be made about Mexican American families with teenagers at home since this is the population sampled. The data from NC-128 were not ideally suited for a testing of Gordon's assimilation model, since the intent and orientation of the NC-128 project were really substantially different from the study of assimilation. Nevertheless, this data set is the best available one which was also accessible.

Description of Communities

Arizona

In Arizona, a small mining town with about 50 percent Mexican Americans was chosen as the non-metropolitan community. Due to time and severe monetary constraints, this state could not select a metropolitan sample. Since there was no city directory available in the sample community, a general list of households was compiled from an alternative source, cross-referencing the current local telephone directory and the Spanish-surname book (U.S. Dept. of Justice, 1973). With the aid of the
local interviewers, this list was corrected. Based on their knowledge the list was supplemented by adding the names of those families without telephone service, with an unlisted telephone, or with an Anglo surname. Their knowledge was also helpful in purging the list of American Indians or those families which did not contain any teenage children at home.

When corrected, the list contained 141 families. The sample was generated by a systematic random sampling procedure which resulted in the selection of 94 families. All the families on this list were subsequently contacted for an interview. The systematic random sampling procedure was used to select families from the original list to replace those who refused or who could not be contacted after repeated attempts. A total of 66 families were subsequently interviewed. This was a completion rate of 70 percent.

About half of the data were collected by two local bilingual interviewers. The other half were collected by the research team, consisting of the project director and four graduate students. Most of the research team's efforts were directed towards those families that refused participation with the local interviewers. Because most of the refusals were due to concerns with confidentiality, utilization of interviewers from outside the community contributed to a higher completion rate. The research team also conducted most of the followup work on incomplete questionnaires.

The interviewers were trained in two parts. The first session was in the local community and provided general information. The second session was on the University of Arizona campus. This session included detailed instruction in interviewing procedures and practice interviews.
California

California was able to obtain both a metropolitan and a non-metropolitan sample. The sites chosen met the NC-128 selection criteria and were both located in the southern part of the state. The non-metropolitan site was chosen because it was the most self-contained town of the ones eligible for this project. The metropolitan site was primarily chosen because of its proximity to the research institution coordinating the project in California. Although it did, of course, meet the basic NC-128 stipulations for a metropolitan site.

Mexican American households were identified by cross-referencing the current city directory with the same Spanish-surname book of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) used in Arizona (U.S. Department of Justice, 1973). The list of households was then numbered sequentially. Households were selected from this list utilizing a table of random numbers. The use of this process yielded 620 elements in the sampling frame for the metropolitan area and 204 for the non-metropolitan community. Of these, 242 (39 percent) in the metropolitan area and 96 (47 percent) in the non-metropolitan community were eligible on the basis of the criterion developed by NC-128. A telephone contact was utilized to determine eligibility and schedule interviews where appropriate. The number of ineligible households, disconnected telephones, and changes in residences forced the research staff to select more names from the eligible list. Ultimately, 53 families for a completion rate of 22 percent participated from the metropolitan area. In the non-metropolitan
site 31 families participated in the survey yielding a completion rate of 32 percent.

Colorado

Both the metropolitan and the non-metropolitan areas in Colorado met the basic selection criterion established by NC-128. The local city directories were cross-referenced with the Spanish-surname book (U.S. Department of Justice, 1973) for the identification of the sample. However, Colorado added another step in the sampling process. They identified those census tracts that had more than 10 percent of their population Mexican American. The city directories and the Spanish-surname book were then applied only to these areas. This additional step was primarily utilized to aid Colorado in cost containment of the project.

In the metropolitan sampling community, 350 households were randomly chosen for the sampling frame from the sources in the same manner as in Arizona, i.e., a systematic random sample. Using this method yielded 214 families for the sampling frame in the non-metropolitan area. These households were then contacted by mail. The letter they were sent contained a description of the project and also informed the family that they would be contacted again. Telephone calls were then used to screen the households for eligibility on the basis of the pre-established criteria. If the household did not have a telephone, the interviewer made the screening at the household residence. Ultimately, Colorado completed 80 family interviews, or 43 percent of the eligibles, in the metropolitan area and 22, or 12 percent of the eligible families, in the non-metropolitan area.
In Michigan, a list of Spanish-surnamed families was drawn up for the metropolitan sample by the Latin American Affairs Department (LADD) of the Catholic Diocese of Saginaw. LADD used the city directory to obtain their list. Subsequently, a systematic random sample of the list was used to obtain the sample. Because the participation rate was lower than expected due to the selected sites, four additional lists of potential respondents were generated. There were a total of 600 eligible names in the metropolitan sampling frame. Of these a total of 106 families participated in the survey by completing the questionnaire, making the completion rate 37 percent.

The non-metropolitan sample was drawn from several communities in the same county. In addition to the local city directories, two other sources were used by LADD to obtain the list of Spanish-surname families. These two other sources were a 1977-1978 census of Spanish-speaking population of Gratiot County which had been conducted by the LADD, and a list of families which had made contact with the Alma office of LADD for services. The sampling procedure was similar to the one used in Saginaw. The sampling frame in this non-metropolitan area included 364 families. Of these, 125 participated in the survey making the response rate quite high, 81 percent. The data in both the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas were collected by bilingual enumerators from the communities themselves.
Texas

The Texas study group drew its sample in a slightly different manner than did the other states. The metropolitan community selected was slightly smaller than the limits set forth by the NC-128 technical committee. Given the concentration of Mexican Americans in this area, and the slight degree of the infraction, the selection was approved by the Mexican American subcommittee. In addition, rather than drawing the sample frame from a source which would cover the entire city, they chose to limit their sampling to a particular section of the city. They did not use Census Tracts to target areas. This area contained a sufficient number of eligible households and was almost completely Mexican American.

This area was divided into 19 "natural areas" which were then divided again into sub-areas. Sub-areas were randomly chosen for interviewing in numbers proportional to their size in the natural areas. There were a total of 619 households in the metropolitan sampling frame of which 185 were eligible. Of the eligible families that met the project stipulations, 99 were subsequently interviewed for a completion rate of 54 percent.

The non-metropolitan sample area was not a specific community but rather a group of six different communities located in one of the Southeast Texas counties. Three of these communities constituted an area that was similar in composition to the area chosen for the metropolitan area. Eligibility was determined through a personal visit. The remaining three communities tended to be small rural communities within the same county. There were a total of 409 families included in the sampling frame. Of
these, 322 or 79 percent were ineligible for the project or vacant. Of
the remaining 81 families, 61 (about 75 percent) of the eligible families
participated in the survey.

Sampling Procedures

Each state adopted specific sampling procedures to make the best
use of their available resources. These differences, in turn, inter-
jected slightly different biases into each of the five samples.

In Arizona, the sampling procedure that was employed very likely
resulted in a very representative sample of the community. The local
telephone directory and the Spanish surname list were combined to
identify the Mexican American population. However, with the familiarity
of the local interviewers of the local population, the shortcomings of
this method in identifying the Mexican American population were overcome.

The major deficiency of the sample in the state of Arizona is
that it had no metropolitan sample. The entire state sample was limited
to the non-metropolitan sample, a somewhat isolated mining community.
The sample community has basically one source of employment, the mining
company. Most of the housing in the community is company owned. Virtu-
ally every household is in some way dependent upon the mining company for
economic support. Therefore, the community consists of a concentration
of well paid workers, many of whom are Mexican American. This biased the
sample towards higher economic levels. However, the impact of this bias
is weakened since economic factors did not have a direct role in this
work.

Both metropolitan and non-metropolitan samples were obtained in
California. Both of the sources, city directories and Spanish-surname
list, which were employed to obtain the sampling frame, were problematic for the identification of Mexican Americans. One of the weaknesses of city directories is that they are not very accurate in the older and poorer parts of a city. These areas are most likely to include low rent, difficult to find, transient, apartments or houses. However, given that the economic distribution of Mexican Americans is skewed towards the lower end, it is likely that Mexican Americans may be disproportionately represented in these types of houses; and thus be missed.

The accuracy of Spanish-surname lists is not complete. In the Southwest, 77 percent of the Mexican origin individuals had a Spanish surname (U.S. Census Bureau, 1975:3). Although there is some evidence that the Spanish Origin population without Spanish surnames may be different educationally from the one with Spanish surnames, there is virtually no difference in age, marital statuses or income between these groups (U.S. Census Bureau, 1975:5).

Also the use of the telephone to establish eligibility for a household may have had an additional bias on the sample towards those homes that have telephones. Thus in California, the sampling process tended to be biased against the very poorest of Mexican Americans without an established address and without a telephone. This may have excluded those individuals that were the least subjected to assimilation pressures.

Since Colorado also drew its sample for the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas using a city directory and Spanish-surnamed book, the concerns discussed for California were also applicable here. However,
Colorado determined eligibility through personal contact at the residence. This did not limit the population to those that owned telephones.

The uniqueness of the Colorado sample was that it limited its sampling to those Census tracts that included at least a ten percent Mexican American population. Thus they systematically excluded those Mexican Americans who live in areas with very few other Mexican Americans. This was important in that these individuals may have been in higher economic levels as well as having greater preference for assimilation. However, the ten percent minimum criterion is not such a large percent that would limit the selection to those tracts which had high concentration of Mexican Americans. Thus, it would appear to have been a well planned cost-containment decision.

Since the metropolitan sampling frame in Michigan had been selected from Spanish-surnamed families in the city directory. The limitations of this process have been discussed previously. However, the non-metropolitan sample was drawn from three sources, the city directory, a local Catholic Diocese census of the Spanish-speaking population, and a list of clients of a social service agency for the Spanish speaking of the Diocese. It is likely that the combination of these lists improved coverage in the non-metropolitan area. However, this also had some drawbacks, since the lists were not mutually exclusive. Not every family had the same chances of being included in the sample. It was possible for a family to be included on all three lists and thus have potentially three times as great a chance of being involved in the sample as those that were on only one of the lists. This would have the effect of
biasing the sample towards those families who needed and also sought the social services from the Catholic Diocese.

By choosing to draw the sample from specific geographical areas, Texas did not have the problems associated with the use of city directories and Spanish-surname lists. However, by limiting the sampling area to a specific geographical area, Mexican Americans living outside the area were systematically excluded. This would bias the results to the extent that those Mexican Americans living outside of the barrios chosen for sampling are different from those living in them. Not knowing the exact boundaries that were used, it is not possible to speculate on the extent of this difference. This technique in the non-metropolitan area insured that a large spectrum of Mexican Americans would be represented in the sampling frame by sampling from six different communities rather than only one.

The different methods used in the five states did have different biases which had different effects on the sample. None of these biases were so overwhelming as to invalidate the sample, and they tended to counterbalance each other.

Statistical Procedures to be Used

The method of analysis to be used in this study is that of multiple regression. This method was chosen primarily because of its ability to analyze simultaneously the effects of several independent variables on the dependent variable. This procedure more closely approximates the way in which assimilation works in the social setting, where the dependent variable, assimilation, is affected by many variables and
factors at the same time. This method was also adequate for testing the four hypotheses from Gordon's model.

Another major factor in the utilization of regression techniques over others is that they are one of the common and standard forms of analysis in sociology and other social sciences. Additionally, the use of a standard technique will make the results of this research available to a wide audience including researchers in the race and ethnic relations field who are not quantitatively oriented.

Multiple regression has four basic assumptions that were met by the data. The first is that there be a linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The second is that the effects of the independent variables are cumulative, i.e., can be added together to yield a prediction of the dependent variable. The third is that the independent variables not be correlated with each other, and the fourth is that the variables be interval level variables (Blalock, 1972; Loether and McTavish, 1976:311). When using Organization as the dependent variable, the first assumption was not completely followed as most respondents reported zero membership in organizations. To correct for this, the log was taken for each of the measures to achieve a more linear relationship.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program was used to process the data (Nie et al., 1975). The simple regression design statements of the regression subprograms were used to obtain the equations used in our study. Some of the components of the regression equation that are used in the analysis are: the partial
unstandardized regression coefficients, the significance of that coefficient, the standard error, the $r$ or Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, and the $R^2$ or proportion of variance explained.

The partial unstandardized regression coefficient, $B$, examines the change in the dependent variable for each change of one unit in the independent variable, while holding constant the other independent units. The significance of $B$ is determined by the use of the $F$ ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Sum of Squares (explained)}}{\text{Sum of Squares (residuals)}} = \frac{k}{(N-k-1)}$$

where $k$ is the number of independent variables in the equation and $N$ is the number in the sample being examined.

Because the data set being used here is essentially sample data, the standard error becomes an important component to examine. The standard error may be regarded as the standard deviation of the sampling variability of $B$. It should also be noted that $B$ is a sample estimate of the population $B$. To estimate the confidence interval of $B$, the standard error of $B$ and $B$ are used. For example, if the estimated $B$ were .163 and the standard error were .03, a 95 percent confidence interval would be calculated in the following way:

$$.163 - 1.96(.03) < B < .163 - 1.96(.03)$$

This would provide information on the reliability of the coefficient $B$.

The $R^2$ is a goodness of fit measure which basically explains the proportion of variance of the dependent variable that is accounted for by the cumulative effects of the independent variables. This statistic is worthwhile to use when comparing different regression equations.
The r, or Pearson's product-moment correlations for pairs of variables is important as an indicator of the extent of multicollinearity. If according to the r an independent variable is highly correlated to another independent variable, a problematic situation arises because an assumption of regression is violated.

**Operationalization of Variables**

In this section the operationalization of the theoretical variables derived from Gordon's model of assimilation is discussed. To refresh the reader's memory, we are studying two major types of assimilation, structural and civic.

**Dependent Variables**

The structural assimilation variable is operationalized here by two different indices, Integration and Preference for Interaction. Integration is composed of the score of seven different items (see Appendix A). The individual items inquire about the respondents regular interaction with Anglos in situations with varying degrees of intimacy such as stores, work, church, neighborhood, etc. The responses to these items were added. This sum was then assigned as the value of Integration. Due to the coding of these items, Integration is a negative indicator of assimilation, i.e., the higher the score of Integration, the lower the amount of assimilation. The direction of this relationship is illustrated in Figure 3.

Integration represents the extent to which there is actual interaction between respondents and Anglos, i.e., frequency of interaction.
Figure 3. Directional relationships between structural and civic assimilation and their indicators and Value Consensus, Cultural Heterogeneity and Stereotyping and their indicators.
This measure includes many of the aspects from Gordon's discussion of social structure. Basically, it is expected that the greater the number of areas in which there is regular interaction between Mexican Americans and Anglos, the more structural assimilation there is.

The second index used to measure Structural assimilation was Preference for Assimilation. This index also consisted of seven individual items (see Appendix B). These items deal with the same seven areas with varying degrees of intimacy as the Integration index. However, where Integration was concerned with regular interaction, Preference dealt with another dimension, whether the respondent preferred to interact exclusively with their own group or with both Mexican Americans and Anglos. The seven responses were also summed with the value of the sum being assigned to Preference. This second measure also allows us to examine the orientation of individual respondents towards structural assimilation. Since Preference for Assimilation is a positive measure of assimilation, the higher the number of activities an individual prefers to engage in with both Mexican Americans and Anglos, the more structurally assimilated that person should be (see Figure 3). While this index taps a dimension that is not actual interaction, nevertheless, the desire or preference for interaction should be an important element to consider as it is such an important component of assimilation.

Civic assimilation is the second type of assimilation that is being examined in this study. It is measured by two items, the first examines the number of formal groups or organizations to which an individual respondent belongs and the second is the frequency with which
meetings of these groups are attended. There were three different measures of each of these variables. For number of organizations the first was simply a sum of all the organizations an individual belonged to. This is merely a general indicator of how active in formal organizations an individual is. The second is the sum of those organizations whose members were either "all" or "mostly" Mexican American. This index is called Mexican American Organization. The third index is the sum of organizations who had either "few" or "no" Mexican American members, i.e., they were mostly Anglo. This measure is called Anglo Organization.

The proportion of Mexican American members in an organization was determined by using the items that asked how many members were of Mexican American background (see Appendix C). It is assumed that the greater the number of predominately Mexican American organizations an individual belongs to, the less civically assimilated he is, or conversely, the more predominately Anglo organizations an individual belongs to, the more civically assimilated that he will be (see Figure 6, page 172). Since the line of organizational membership is somewhat skewed with about 60 percent reporting no organizational membership, the log of each of the three measures was also used to permit somewhat better handling of the skewness. Org became Log1, MAorg became Log2 and Angorg became Log3.

The frequency with which meetings were attended was also measured in three different ways. The first case we summed the attendance at all organizations. This was called Frequency. The second was calculated by summing the attendance at only those organizations that were predominately Mexican American. This measure was called Mexican
American Frequency. The third measure was calculated by summing the attendance at those organizations that were predominately Anglo. This measure was called Anglo Frequency. It is assumed that both Frequency and Anglo Frequency will be positively associated with Civic Assimilation (see Figure 3), i.e., the more meetings of organizations that are attended, the greater the Civic Assimilation. However, the assumption underlying Mexican American Frequency is in the opposite direction. In this case, the higher the frequency with which predominately Mexican American organization meetings are attended, the less Civic Assimilation there will be.

Independent Variables

The model examined in this study utilized three of Gordon's independent variables. Two of these, Value Consensus or Dissensus, and Cultural Heterogeneity are part of his societal type of independent variables. The third one, Stereotyping, is part of his interaction type of variables. Each of these variables is measured by two indices that purport to measure a different dimension of the independent variable.

The Value Consensus independent variable refers to those areas of consensus or dissensus between the majority and the racial or ethnic groups being considered, in our case between Anglos and Mexican Americans. If both groups have similar value systems, then the acceptance of the dominant societal ideologies and reward systems becomes much easier. This obviously serves to facilitate assimilation (Gordon, 1978:85) (see Figure 3). The Value Consensus variable is measured by two dimensions, a Work index and an American Traditionalism index (see Figure 2).
The Work index is measured by two different scales, satisfaction and importance. Each of these scales contains eleven separate items dealing with various aspects of employment such as prestige, advancement, schedule and income (see Appendix D). The importance of each of these items to the respondent constitutes the "importance scale," while the satisfaction of the respondent with each of the items forms the "satisfaction scale." In each index, standard five point Likert-type scales were used to determine the extent of the importance or the satisfaction. The individual responses on satisfaction and importance were summed to determine individual respondent Work importance or Work satisfaction scores. High scores are reflective of the dominant society's value of work. Therefore, the higher the importance and satisfaction scores on this variable, the higher the amount of Value consensus with the dominant society and thus the more the assimilation of the individuals (see Figures 3 and 4). It should be remembered that it is not actual scores or parameters of the dominant society (e.g., Anglos) that are being dealt with here, but rather, ideal types of the dominant society.

The second index used to measure value consensus is American Traditionalism. This indicator consists of a thirteen item scale which reflects different Value Areas such as private property, patriotism, competition, and sex education (see Appendix E). A five part Likert-type scale was employed to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement with the values. The responses were numbered from 1, which represented strongly disagree to 5 representing strongly agree. The numerical values of the responses were added and the resulting sum was
Figure 4. Directional effect of the Independent variable measures on assimilation.
the value of American Traditionalism. The weights of the responses are such that a higher score of American Traditionalism indicates that more prescribed American traditional answers were given by the respondent. Thus, the higher the score on this measure, the more value consensus there should be with the dominant society (see Figure 3). These higher scores may be interpreted as being indicative of higher amounts of Value Consensus. Since Value Consensus is positively related to assimilation, the higher the American Traditionalism or Work score of an individual, the more assimilated the individual is assumed to be (see Figure 4).

The Cultural Differences variable, according to Gordon (1978:85), refers to the cultural differences between the dominant group and the racial or ethnic group being examined. Gordon further specifies that ideally this difference should be examined at the time of initial contact. This assertion is consistent with other researchers in the field such as Lieberson (1975) who also believes that the point of initial contact has serious and long lasting consequences for the subsequent intergroup relations. However, the method of research used here, a social survey, does not allow this type of analysis to be done, as the point of initial contact between the groups being studied occurred long before any of the respondents were born. However, as was discussed in Chapter 4, cultural differences between Mexican Americans and Anglos have persisted from the time of initial contact.

The two indices used to measure the Cultural Differences variable, language and family, represent two different aspects of culture.
Language is often called the carrier or transmitter of culture. Language is the means by which meanings and experiences are stored, and accumulated knowledge is passed on to the next generation. This is what makes possible the development of human culture and allows large complex societies to be built (Robertson, 1977:70).

Language does not simply reflect culture. According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, language is not a passive receptor of culture, but actually shapes thoughts and directs the interpretation of the world. Whorf notes the essential dynamic part language plays for the individual: "Language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade" (Whorf, 1956:211-213).

Thus language may be considered to be not only the medium used to transmit culture, but also an essential part of culture, perhaps being the most important cultural symbol. In our study language use was measured by Spanish (see Appendix F). Spanish is an index which consists of eleven items from the survey instrument which inquired about the respondents competency in three different aspects of language use: speaking, writing and reading. The remaining items were questions about places or situations in which the respondent used Spanish such as with family, close friends, in neighborhood, and place of employment.

A lower score on Spanish was associated with more extensive use of Spanish. In turn, more extensive use of Spanish is indicative of greater cultural differences between the groups. Because of the coding of Spanish, it should be negatively associated with Cultural Differences
(see Figure 3). Since Cultural Differences are negatively associated with Assimilation, that is, the greater the cultural differences between the groups the lower the level of the assimilation, Spanish is positively related to assimilation (see Figure 4).

The other index used to measure the Cultural Differences variable, Family, is also a fundamental aspect of culture. The family is regarded as being the main agent of cultural transmission and socialization. Many sociologists have discussed the family's important role in the socialization process. Socialization, for example, is one of Murdock's (1949:1) four main functions of the family. According to Mead (1934), a child's socialization process takes him through reacting first to "significant others" and then the "generalized other." These "significant others" are usually members of the child's immediate family. Also, according to Cooley's "looking glass self" (1964:184), the individual comes to know himself by what he perceives to be reflected by other people. For the crucial formative years of childhood, these "other people" tend to be members of the family. Thus, there appears to be wide support for the salience of the family's role in the transmission of culture to the individual.

In our study, Family was originally operationalized by three different indices of familism (see Appendix G). The first index consists of four items that deal with the importance of various familial functions of a house such as a location for relatives to get together or a place for the respondent's parents to live. The importance of these items to the respondent was measured by a five point Likert-type scale. The second
index consists of ten items that deal with different aspects of the relations between parents and children and with parental and offspring roles such as the teenager helping the parents with their work or parents sticking up for the teenagers. The responses are again five point Likert-type scales which seek to measure how accurate the respondent feels the topical statement describes his own family situation. The third index also includes ten items and deals with the same familial topics as the second set. However, the five point Likert-type scales used in the third set have responses that seek to determine the extent to which the respondent concurs with the statement, i.e., how the respondent feels about the appropriateness of the relation or role being discussed. Only the first set was used in the present study, as it had much better associations with assimilation than the other two sets.

Familism is expected to be a positive indicator of Cultural Differences; the greater the extent of Familism the greater the Cultural Differences with the dominant society (see Figure 3). Since Cultural Differences and Assimilation vary inversely, Familism should be negatively related to Assimilation (see Figure 4).

The third independent variable of the model being tested is Stereotyping. It was measured by two different indices, "Perception of Prejudice" and "Possibility of Interaction." These two measures examine different aspects of Gordon's definition of stereotyping.

The first of the indicators, "Perception of Prejudice," consists of five items that deal with purported stereotypes the respondents believe Anglos in their locale have of Mexican Americans. For example,
"Anglos around here think that they are cleaner than Mexican Americans" (see Appendix H). The responses to these items measure, using a four point Likert-type scale, to what extent the respondent believes that there are stereotypes of Mexican Americans by Anglos. These responses were summed into a score. The larger the score, the higher the amount of stereotyping (Figure 3). Since stereotyping and assimilation are negatively related, a higher score on this indicator should lead to a lower amount of assimilation (see Figure 4).

The second indicator, "Possibility of Interaction," is an indirect measure of stereotyping in that it attempts to examine the beliefs about equal-status primary group interaction between groups, one of the causes of stereotyping according to Gordon (1978:79) (see Appendix I). This measure included seven items which had two responses, "Possible" and "Not Possible." It is here assumed that the belief of respondents that it is not possible for Mexican Americans and Anglos to interact in particular circumstances is based on a stereotype of the other group, e.g., that Anglos do not want to interact with Mexican Americans because they do not like them. Thus, a greater score on "Possibility of Prejudice" implies greater "Stereotypes." Since stereotypes are negatively associated with assimilation, then, more beliefs that interaction is not possible may lead to lower levels of assimilation. Thus, a negative relationship between possibility of interaction and assimilation is expected.

The following chapter includes the presentation and the discussion of the findings using the model and data described in this chapter.
CHAPTER 6

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

In this section the results of the statistical analysis of the data are presented. The Cultural Heterogeneity, Value Consensus, and Civic versus Structural Assimilation hypotheses are examined in light of the data used here. The first three hypotheses are examined for both Structural and Civic Assimilation. The fourth is discussed in the Civic Assimilation section. Acceptable support for these hypotheses is first, statistical significance of the association and secondly that the directionality of the association be in the expected direction.

Structural Assimilation

Integration as a measure of Assimilation is examined first in order to determine the extent of support for the first three hypotheses. Multiple regression techniques were used here to assess the independent and combined effects of the indicators and to examine sex differences. The gender difference is studied in order to allow some insight into whether Mexican American females are more prone to assimilation than males (see Miller, 1978:224), as well as to determine if violations of sampling independence were serious. The male subsample contained 296 individuals while the female subsample contained 321.

Construction of Indices. Integration the first of the indicators of Structural Assimilation, was measured by an index consisting of the
seven items listed in Appendix A. The Integration index is the extent to which there is actual interaction between Anglos and Mexican Americans in the seven areas listed in Appendix A. It should be noted that due to the coding of the responses, the Integration index is a negative measure of assimilation, i.e., the lower the score on the Integration index, the higher the amount of assimilation. Therefore, it is expected that its statistical relationships with the independent variable indicators would be the opposite direction from those presented in Figure 4 dealing with the independent variable indicators and the concept of assimilation.

Chi-squares and Pearson's product moment correlations were calculated for each possible pair of dependent and independent items, i.e., one of the seven Integration items, and one of the individual items from the independent indicators of Value Consensus, Cultural Heterogeneity, and Stereotyping. The seven Integration items were then ranked according to the number of items of the independent variables that they were significantly associated with at .05 level of probability on the basis of Chi-squares and Pearson's product moment correlation. This analysis indicated that one of the seven items, specifically item five which dealt with interaction between Mexican Americans and Anglos in the workplace, was associated significantly with the fewest number of items of the independent variables so it was subsequently dropped from the Integration index. Therefore, a new Integration index consisting of six items was developed.

Repeating this process for the two additional items with the next lowest numbers of significant associations: item seven, dealing
with children playing outside of school; and item six, dealing with school attendance. These two items were then deleted so that two additional measures of Integration consisting of four and five items were constructed. Thus there were three measures of Integration comprised of six, five and four items. These three were then used simultaneously in Table 14 to determine if a more parsimonious index, e.g., with five or four items would be as good as a full index with six items in terms of the number of statistically significant independent variables and $R^2$'s. This table is presented later. Therefore, the relationships are expected to be in the opposite direction as those presented in Figure 4. These modified associations are presented in Figure 5.

The second measure of Structural Assimilation is Preference. It refers to the extent of the preference the respondent had for interacting with Anglos in the same seven areas that were considered in the Integration index. The same measures used for the independent variables in Tables 14 and 15 were also employed here. Value Consensus was measured by two indicators, Spanish and Familism. Stereotyping was also measured by two indicators, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice.

Preference was originally composed of seven items (see Appendix B). After initial analysis, the process for reducing the index used for Integration was employed. Chi-squares and Pearson product moment

---

24. The possibility of changing this indicator to one that would have been positively associated with assimilation was considered. However, since the Integration measure was central to the manner in which the theory was developed here, it was left unchanged.
Figure 5. Directional effects of the Independent variable measures on Integration and Preference.
correlations were calculated for every possible pair of items composed of one of the seven Preference items and one of the individual items from the independent variables. From these calculations it was determined that item three, the question dealing with Mexican American and Anglo children playing together, was related to a very few of the independent items and was subsequently dropped from the index. Therefore, the full measure in this analysis consisted of six items. In an attempt to remove some of the covariation from within the Preference Index, two additional items were removed. These were chosen on the basis of having the next two lowest proportions of significant associations with the measures of the independent variables. The items deleted were: item four, dealing with Mexican Americans and Anglos living in the same neighborhood; and item six, buying from stores owned by Mexican Americans. The deletion of these items resulted in two additional Preference indices, one composed of five items and the other of four.

The findings for the three indices of Integration with six, five and four items, are presented in Table 14. Multiple indicators of Integration were used in order to determine if a more parsimonious index could be used without losing significance or proportion of variance explained. Since two of the three independent variables, Cultural Differences and Stereotyping each had two indicators, there are four possible models for each of the three measures of Integration. All four of these models are also presented in Table 14. A fifth model simultaneously containing all five indicators of the independent variables is presented in Table 15.
Table 14. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between alternative measures of structural assimilation (integration) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice).—(Standard errors in parenthesis.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (6)**</td>
<td>-.022(.020)</td>
<td>-.166(.012)*</td>
<td>-.246(.062)*</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (5)</td>
<td>-.015(.018)</td>
<td>-.151(.011)*</td>
<td>.172(.056)*</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (4)</td>
<td>-.007(.015)</td>
<td>-.123(.009)*</td>
<td>.164(.046)*</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MODEL 2**
Integration (6)  -.020(.020)  -.157(.012)*  .052(.018)*  11.14  .198  762
Integration (5)  -.012(.018)  -.144(.011)*  .032(.016)*  9.66  .203  719
Integration (4)  -.006(.015)  -.118(.009)*  .025(.013)  7.79  .198  756

**MODEL 3**
Integration (6)  -.010(.021)  .106(.014)*  .212(.062)*  4.72  .078  813
Integration (5)  -.003(.019)  .100(.012)*  .150(.056)*  3.90  .084  770
Integration (4)  -.001(.015)  .083(.010)*  .143(.045)*  2.95  .086  807

**MODEL 4**
Integration (6)  -.009(.020)  .101(.014)*  .081(.018)*  5.38  .088  799
Integration (5)  -.001(.019)  .095(.012)*  .060(.017)*  4.30  .091  756
Integration (4)  -.005(.015)  .079(.010)*  .047(.014)*  3.48  .084  793

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.
**Indicates the number of items that comprise the scale.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
Table 15. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between structural assimilation (integration, preference) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish and familism), and stereotyping (possibility of integration and perception of prejudice), total and by sex.--(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Assimilation</th>
<th>Amtrad</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Familism</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Percept</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (6)**</td>
<td>-.026(.020)</td>
<td>-.143(.013)*</td>
<td>.037(.015)*</td>
<td>.251(.062)*</td>
<td>.050(.018)*</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (5)</td>
<td>-.017(.018)</td>
<td>-.130(.012)*</td>
<td>.038(.013)*</td>
<td>.178(.056)*</td>
<td>.031(.016)*</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (4)</td>
<td>-.011(.015)</td>
<td>-.106(.010)*</td>
<td>.033(.011)*</td>
<td>.171(.046)*</td>
<td>.024(.013)*</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>.006(.014)</td>
<td>.009(.009)</td>
<td>.018(.010)</td>
<td>-.214(.040)*</td>
<td>-.062(.012)*</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (5)</td>
<td>.007(.012)</td>
<td>.006(.008)</td>
<td>.013(.008)</td>
<td>-.173(.033)*</td>
<td>-.053(.010)*</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (4)</td>
<td>.004(.001)</td>
<td>.006(.006)</td>
<td>.013(.007)</td>
<td>-.144(.028)*</td>
<td>-.044(.009)*</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (6)</td>
<td>.020(.033)</td>
<td>-.155(.022)*</td>
<td>.024(.024)</td>
<td>.246(.118)*</td>
<td>.015(.028)</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>.001(.021)</td>
<td>.011(.014)</td>
<td>.014(.015)</td>
<td>-.146(.068)*</td>
<td>-.050(.017)*</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (6)</td>
<td>-.020(.033)</td>
<td>-.171(.021)*</td>
<td>.018(.023)</td>
<td>.311(.093)*</td>
<td>.084(.030)*</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>-.020(.020)</td>
<td>.018(.013)</td>
<td>.009(.014)</td>
<td>-.073(.058)</td>
<td>-.055(.018)*</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.
**Indicates the number of items that comprise the scale.
It should be pointed out that none of the models presented here included Work as a measure of Value Consensus. It was dropped from the analysis early on because a substantial number of respondents were not working and those regression equations which included Work as a measure of Value Consensus were based on unacceptable low N's. Also, because the vast majority of working respondents were men, any attempt at analysis by sex would have been difficult and results inconclusive at best.

Tests of Hypotheses. The first hypothesis from Gordon's model to be tested here maintains that there is an inverse relationship between Cultural Heterogeneity and Assimilation. In all four models presented in Table 14, the associations between Cultural Heterogeneity, as measured separately by both Spanish and Familism, and Structural Assimilation, as measured by Integration, tend to support this hypothesis. Spanish as an indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity was utilized in Models 14 and 15. Spanish was found to be negatively associated with Integration in all six of the regression equations. Keep in mind the inverse coding of Spanish, i.e., a higher score on Spanish indicates less usage of Spanish and thus a lower amount of Cultural Differences. This lower amount of Cultural Differences, in turn, translates into greater amounts of Assimilation (see Figures 3 and 4) and therefore the associations between Spanish and Integration, in Table 14, were in the expected direction, negative. These complex relationships can be followed in Figures 3, 4, and 5.
This expected association between Spanish and Integration is evidenced in the negative B's seen in Table 14. In Model 1, the B's declined from -.166 for the equation with the six item measure of Integration to -.123 for the four item measure. In Model 2 the comparable B's declined from -.157 to -.118. Not only were the associations between Spanish and Integration in the expected direction, they were also statistically significant in all of the equations, adding further support for the first hypothesis.

All three of the equations presented in Model 1 explained virtually the same amount of variance, about 21 percent (see Table 14). The regression equation using Integration as measured by five items had the highest $R^2$ with .218, while the six item measure had the lowest $R^2$ with .212. This difference of .006 is, of course, not an important one. The explained variances in the equations of Model 2 were also very close. The highest $R^2$ was obtained in the five item model, .203. The other two equations had identical $R^2$'s of .198.

The second indicator of Cultural Differences, Familism, is presented in Models 3 and 4 of Table 14. Familism varied from the other indicator, Spanish, in the direction of its association with the Integration indicator of Structural Assimilation (see Figures 4 and 5). Familism was expected to be positively associated with Integration. Indeed, this is what was found in both models (see Table 14). In Model 3, the B's ranged from .106 for the six item measure of integration to .083 for the four item measure. In Model 4, the B's were similar ranging from .101 to .079 for the six to four item measures. Although all the
B's were low, the associations between Familism and Integration were statistically significant. These relationships were consistent with the first hypothesis and hence provided support for it.

The proportions of explained variance for Models 3 and 4 were lower than those for Models 1 and 2 which used Spanish as the indicator of Cultural Differences. *Ceteris Paribus* this would suggest that of the two, Spanish is the better indicator.

The combined effects of Spanish and Familism were also examined and are presented in Table 2 as Model 5. The B's for the simultaneous effects for these indicators were, not unexpectedly, slightly lower in Model 5 than those observed earlier in Models 1 through 4. However, the associations were in the same direction as those reported for the previous analysis and again, statistically significant. Hence, the findings from the combined effects of Spanish and Familism continued to provide support for the first hypothesis.

The male and female subsamples were analyzed separately in Table 16 to determine if there was any difference between these groups with regard to the associations between Integration and Spanish and Familism; otherwise, the Models presented in Table 16 correspond to those presented in Table 14. The six item measure of Integration was used in this analysis, since, there did not appear to be a sufficient difference between it and the more parsimonious indices with five and four items to warrant using either one or both of the latter two. For both males and females, the effects of Spanish and Familism were similar to those reported above. Spanish was negative and statistically significant in its
Table 16. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between structural assimilation (integration) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice) by sex.--(Standard errors in parenthesis.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.035 (.032)</td>
<td>-.171 (.020)*</td>
<td>.234 (.117)*</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.032 (.033)</td>
<td>-.187 (.019)*</td>
<td>.320 (.094)*</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.027 (.033)</td>
<td>-.167 (.020)*</td>
<td>.018 (.028)</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.015 (.033)</td>
<td>-.179 (.019)*</td>
<td>.089 (.029)*</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.040 (.034)</td>
<td>.092 (.022)*</td>
<td>.214 (.116)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.013 (.035)</td>
<td>.115 (.022)*</td>
<td>.249 (.092)*</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.027 (.034)</td>
<td>.086 (.022)*</td>
<td>.041 (.022)*</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.002 (.035)</td>
<td>.010 (.022)*</td>
<td>.114 (.031)*</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
association with Integration while the association with Familism was positive and also statistically significant. In all the four Models, the regression using females tend to have slightly higher B's and proportions of variance explained. This is consistent with other research (see Miller, 1978:223) that reports that historically Mexican American females are more subject to assimilation pressures resulting in inter-marriage than males, but this trend is changing. Since the associations are in the expected direction, and statistically significant, the equations presented in Table 16 continue to add support to the first hypothesis.

The evidence is consistently supportive of Gordon's hypothesis in all the Models where Integration was used as the measure of Assimilation and Spanish and Familism served as the indicators of Cultural Heterogeneity.

Therefore, these results can be interpreted as indicating that the greater the Cultural Heterogeneity between two groups, the lower the amount of assimilation that occurs between them. In terms of the sample used here, the more culturally different that Mexican Americans are from Anglos the less likely that they will assimilate.

The three indices of Preference with six, five, and four items are presented for each of the four models in Table 17. Since Preference is a positive indicator of assimilation (see Figure 3), Spanish was expected to be positively associated with this measure (see Figure 5). Although the results presented in Table 17 are in the expected direction, positive, in neither Models 1 nor 2 was the association between Spanish
Table 17. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between alternative measures of structural assimilation (preference) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice).—(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)**</td>
<td>.011(.014)</td>
<td>.009(.008)</td>
<td>-.243(.040)*</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>(809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (5)</td>
<td>.012(.012)</td>
<td>.007(.007)</td>
<td>-.197(.034)*</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>(807)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (4)</td>
<td>.007(.010)</td>
<td>.006(.006)</td>
<td>-.163(.028)*</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>(807)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>.011(.014)</td>
<td>.003(.009)</td>
<td>-.070(.012)*</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>(797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (5)</td>
<td>.012(.012)</td>
<td>.002(.007)</td>
<td>-.069(.010)*</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>(795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (4)</td>
<td>.008(.010)</td>
<td>.002(.006)</td>
<td>-.050(.009)*</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>(795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>.007(.013)</td>
<td>.007(.009)</td>
<td>-.201(.037)*</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>(853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (5)</td>
<td>.007(.011)</td>
<td>.006(.007)</td>
<td>-.164(.031)*</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>(851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (4)</td>
<td>.004(.009)</td>
<td>.005(.006)</td>
<td>-.136(.026)*</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>(851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (6)</td>
<td>.007(.013)</td>
<td>.010(.009)</td>
<td>-.070(.012)*</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>(840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (5)</td>
<td>.007(.011)</td>
<td>.008(.007)</td>
<td>-.060(.010)*</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>(838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (4)</td>
<td>.004(.009)</td>
<td>.007(.006)</td>
<td>-.049(.008)*</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>(838)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

**Indicates the number of items that comprise the scale.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
and Preference statistically significant. Although the findings presented here did not contradict the first hypothesis, they did nevertheless fail to provide statistical support.

Familism, contrary to Spanish, was expected to be negatively associated with Preference (see Figures 3 and 5). The results, however, indicated that Familism did not vary in the expected direction (see Table 17). Moreover, the B's were insignificant and so small that they do not merit discussion. Yet it is clear that the various measures of Preference demonstrated no support for the first hypothesis. While the first hypothesis was not contradicted when the sex differences were examined in Table 18, it was also not supported as there was no statistical significance.

In Model 5 (Table 15), using Preference as the indicator of assimilation, the patterns were consistent with those noted above. When Spanish and Familism were entered simultaneously into the regression equation, neither indicator was found to be significantly related to Preference. This was also true when we performed the analysis separately for the male and female subsamples. Thus, the findings presented in Table 15 also fell short of providing support for the first hypothesis.

No support for the first hypothesis was found when Preference was used as the measure of Assimilation. However, it should be emphasized that the results did not contradict the hypothesis, but merely did not provide support for it. Additionally, the distinction between the two measures is that Preference deals with tastes or attitudes, while Integration deals with actual situations or events. Thus, Cultural
Table 18. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between structural assimilation (preference) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice) by sex.--(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.000 (.021)</td>
<td>.017 (.013)</td>
<td>-.166 (.070)*</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.014 (.020)</td>
<td>.015 (.011)</td>
<td>-.109 (.057)</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>-.000 (.021)</td>
<td>.007 (.013)</td>
<td>-.054 (.017)*</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.013 (.021)</td>
<td>.014 (.012)</td>
<td>-.065 (.018)*</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.001 (.020)</td>
<td>.002 (.013)</td>
<td>-.132 (.064)*</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.016 (.019)</td>
<td>-.001 (.012)</td>
<td>-.070 (.050)</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.002 (.019)</td>
<td>.007 (.013)</td>
<td>-.056 (.017)*</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.013 (.020)</td>
<td>-.003 (.012)</td>
<td>-.062 (.018)*</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
Heterogeneity had a stronger relationship with actual interaction between the two groups than with attitudes towards the interaction. It is not unusual to have individuals say one thing and act in a different manner.

The two indicators of Cultural Heterogeneity that were used, Spanish and Familism, have particularly important considerations for Mexican Americans. The results regarding Spanish suggest that maintenance of a language different from that of the dominant society permits a certain amount of successful resistance to Assimilation. Mexican Americans have exhibited a strong propensity for this characteristic of language maintenance throughout their history—as was pointed out in Chapter 4. This trait is particularly noteworthy since language is important not only for the group, but also the essential dynamic role (discussed in Chapter 3) that it has for individuals. Thus language maintenance would appear to be one of the factors responsible for the long resistance of Mexican Americans to assimilation. This relationship adds an important dimension to bilingual programs and policies. By providing education in both languages, bilingual education may teach Spanish and reinforce its use for those who speak it. Thus bilingual education may encourage the use of Spanish more than, for example, the old practices of forbidding the use of Spanish and forcing everyone to learn English upon entering school. Thus bilingual education implies indirect support for Mexican American efforts to not assimilate.

Familism is also a factor that is extremely important in the case of Mexican Americans. In this study, Familism measured the inclination or desire towards interaction with and accommodations for
(housing) the members of one's own family. It should be emphasized that Familism as used here specifically does not refer to the stereotypes of the Mexican American family such as the tri-generation household (extended family) nor the possibly oppressive "family communism" where individuals subordinate themselves to the desires of the family (see Grebler et al., 1970:353). It should be noted that it is desires for spending time with the family and having them around and not actual behavior that is being dealt with here. The findings indicate that Familism is an important factor affecting Mexican American assimilation. Specifically, the relationships indicated that the greater amount of time Mexican Americans wanted to spend with their families, the less they interacted with Anglos, i.e., the greater the Familism, the lower the Assimilation.

It is not surprising that the associations between the indicators of Cultural Heterogeneity and Integration and Preferences were different, since they refer to different aspects of human behavior as was pointed out earlier. Additionally, our results suggest that the preferences of an individual towards interacting with members of another group may not necessarily correspond with actual interaction patterns. They also suggest that individual's preferences are not as important as actual behavior as an indicator of assimilation.

The second hypothesis asserts that there is a direct relationship between the amount of Value Consensus between the two groups under examination and Assimilation. The only indicator for the variable of Value Consensus used here was American Traditionalism. The other
indicator of Value Consensus, Work, was deleted from the analysis early because of the methodological reasons discussed previously. American Traditionalism was expected to be negatively associated with Structural Assimilation (see Figure 4). Subsequently, it was expected to be negatively associated with Integration and positively with Preference. That is, the greater the perceived differences in values between Anglos and Mexican Americans, the lower the rate of integration and the higher the preference towards interaction with members of one's own ethnic group.

The relationship between American Traditionalism and Integration was in the expected direction (see Table 14). However, none of the associations in any of the Models presented in Table 14 were statistically significant. In Model 5 (Table 15), the association between American Traditionalism and Assimilation was again in the expected direction, but not statistically significant. However, Model 5 was not as important for the analysis of American Traditionalism as it was for the other variables, as it was the only indicator of Value Consensus that was entered into the regression equation at this stage. It could not be compared with the Work indicator. Nevertheless, it is important in that it permits the examination of American Traditionalism in a regression equation containing all of the other indicators.

When the relationships were analyzed for males and females separately, a sex difference was found (see Table 16). For the female subsample, the association between American Traditionalism and Assimilation continued to be negative in Models 1, 2, and 3, although not
statistically significant. However, for males in all Models and for females in Model 4, the associations were in the positive direction. The B's for females were again larger than for males. But none were statistically significant.

The pattern observed in Table 16 was also found in Model 5 (Table 15); in the subsample of females, the associations were in the negative direction, as expected, while in the male subsample they were in the positive direction. None of these associations, however, were statistically significant. Therefore, virtually no support was found for the second hypothesis when Integration was used as the measure of Assimilation.

Similar results were obtained when Preference was used as the measure of Assimilation. The figures presented in Table 17 indicate that American Traditionalism was associated with Preference in the expected direction, positively. However, no significant associations emerged in any of the four models between American Traditionalism and the different measures of Preference.

When the sex differences were examined (Table 18), the associations between American Traditionalism and Preference were in the opposite direction of those obtained when Integration was used as the indicator of assimilation. In this case, the associations for males in Models 1, 3, and 4 were in the expected direction, while the associations were opposite for females. The relationships for females in all four Models and for males in Model 2 were negatively associated with Preference and were thus not in the expected direction. However, as was noted above,
none of these were significant. The B's for the male subsample were some of the smallest encountered in this study, so low that any discussion of direction becomes meaningless and does not disconfirm the hypothesis.

The pattern observed above in Table 15 was also evident in Table 18. The male subsample continued to exhibit a positive association between Preference and American Traditionalism. On the other hand, for the female subsample, the associations were negative.

It is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding Value Consensus, since its indicator, American Traditionalism, was not statistically significant in its relationship to Assimilation in any of the equations. Also, the B's were generally so small that they do not warrant further discussion. The most that can be said of these findings is that they did not lend support to the second hypothesis since the proposed positive association between Value Consensus and Assimilation was not found.

One possible reason for these insignificant findings may be due to the structure of the American Traditionalism index, which consisted of thirteen items. This index was not subjected to an analysis that would determine if individually any or all of the items were significantly related to the two measures of Assimilation. That type of analysis was done only on the dependent variables. It is possible, then, that American Traditionalism may not be an index of a single underlying construct, and thus responsible for the low B's and lack of significance.

The third hypothesis maintains that there is an inverse relationship between Stereotyping and Assimilation. In the findings presented
in Table 14, Stereotyping was measured by two positive indicators, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice. The greater the scores on the two indicators, the greater the amount of stereotyping. Stereotyping was in turn expected to be negatively related to Assimilation (see Figure 3). Its two indicators, thus, were also expected to be negatively associated with Assimilation (see Figure 4). Furthermore, since Integration was a negative measure of Assimilation, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice were also expected to vary positively with Integration (see Figure 5).

In Table 14, support for the third hypothesis is evidenced in the positive association of the first measure of Stereotyping, Possibility of Integration, with the first measure of Structural Assimilation, Integration, in both Models 1 and 3. In Model 1, the B's ranged from .246 for the six item measure of Integration, to .172 for the five item measure, to .164 for the four item measure. In Model 3 the B's were slightly lower and declined from .212, to .150, to .143 for the comparable measures of Integration. Since these B's were in the expected direction and statistically significant, the conclusion may be made that the associations between Possibility of Integration and Integration provide support for the third hypothesis.

The second measure of Stereotyping, Perception of Prejudice, was used in Models 2 and 4 of Table 14. Again, the associations were in the expected direction, positive. The B's were slightly smaller in these Models than in Models 1 and 3. But this difference may only be due to
the variation in the items used in the scales of the two measures (see Appendices H and I). The B for Perception of Prejudice on Integration was .052 for the six item, .032 for the five item, and .025 for the four item index of Integration. The only equation in Model 2 that was statistically significant was the one that used the four item measure of Perception of Prejudice. The B's in Model 4 were all significant and ranged from .081, to .060, to .047 for the six, five and four measures of Integration, respectively. Since the associations in Models 2 and 4 were in the expected direction and except for one case, statistically significant, it appears that the findings regarding the association of Perception of Prejudice and Assimilation also lend support for the third hypothesis.

When both indicators of Stereotyping were entered simultaneously into the regression equation (Model 5 of Table 15), support for the third hypothesis continued. The B's of the indicators in Models 1 through 4 were very similar to those presented in Table 14, where their effects were examined separately. The associations between the indicators of Stereotyping and Integration were in the expected direction and, except for one B, they were statistically significant.

Sex differences were also analyzed and the findings are presented in Table 16. In Models 1 and 3, Possibility of Integration continued to be positively related to Integration for both males and females. Of the two sex subgroups, slightly larger B's were found in the female subsample. For example, the B for females was .320 in Model 1, compared to .234 for males. Both of these were statistically significant. In Model
3, the B for females (.249) was only slightly higher than it was for the males (.214). For the males however, the association in Model 3 was not statistically significant; whereas for the female subsample, significant associations emerged in both Models.

Perception of Prejudice was associated with Integration in the expected direction in Models 2 and 4. However, the associations were statistically significant for females only. Therefore, the findings for this subsample clearly lend support for the third hypothesis. However, the support for the third hypothesis from the associations observed in the male subsample is not as straightforward. Perhaps some of the complex effects of sex may not be due to the sex group differences, they may actually be due to the impact of age structure since only husbands and wives were included in the sex group subsamples; whereas the complete sample also included adolescents.

In the regression equations for each sex subsample in Model 5 (Table 15), the associations between Possibility of Integration, Perception of Prejudice, and Integration are similar to the individual associations noted above and reported in Table 16. In Model 5 both of the indicators were associated in the expected direction, for the male subsample, but only the association between Possibility of Integration and Assimilation was statistically significant. For the female subsample, the effects of both indicators were in the expected direction and both of the associations were statistically significant. Thus, using Integration as the measure of Assimilation, only partial support among males and full support among females was found for the third hypothesis.
The use of Perception of Prejudice as the indicator of Stereotyping also produced results consistent with the third hypothesis. The results of this measure are reported in Models 2 and 4 (Table 17). The B's reported for this indicator were lower than those presented for Possibility of Integration in Models 1 and 3. In Model 2, the B's ranged from -.070 for the six item measure, to -.060 for the five item measure, to -.050 for the four item measure. All of these were, however, statistically significant. The B's in Model 4 were also negative and significant. The B's for the six and five item measures of Preference were identical to the ones in Model 2, -.070 and -.060. The B for the four item measure was almost the same, -.049.

The associations using both measures of Stereotyping (Model 5, Table 15) continued to be consistent with the patterns proposed in the third hypothesis. In Model 5, the same patterns noted above were also evident. The B's were negative and statistically significant in both cases. The impact of the differences in the scales of Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice continued to be evidenced in the relatively larger B's of Possibility of Integration.

When the sex differences were examined (Table 18), support for the third hypothesis was again mixed. Using Possibility of Integration, the associations were negative, as expected, for both groups (Models 1 and 3). However, they were not significant for females. Thus, for Possibility of Integration, the findings for males tended to support the third hypothesis while those for females did not.
For Perception of Prejudice (Models 2 and 4), the B's more closely followed the patterns noted earlier and found in Table 17. The variables were negatively associated and statistically significant for both males and females, and thus, consistent with the third hypothesis.

When the two indicators of Stereotyping were entered together (Model 5, Table 15) in the regression equations with the other indicators of the independent variables, the results were mixed. One of the measures, Perception of Prejudice, continued to be negative and significant in its association with Preference for both the male and female subsamples, thereby lending further support for the third hypothesis. However, the other indicator, Possibility of Integration although in the expected direction, negative, for both groups, was significant only for males. Thus, in this case support for the third hypothesis emerged for the male subsample but not for females. This pattern was also observed in Table 18.

The third hypothesis was thus generally supported when either measure of Assimilation, Integration and Preference was used. Both of the indicators of Stereotyping, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice, provided fairly consistent support for the hypothesized inverse relationship between Stereotyping and Assimilation.

However, when the sex differences were taken into account, this general support broke down and became more complex. This was particularly true when Integration was used as the indicator of Assimilation. Males provided support for this hypothesis by having statistically significant associations with both indicators of Stereotyping and Integration.
Females, on the other hand, had a statistically significant association only between the Perception of Prejudice indicator and Integration.

Civic Assimilation

Test of Hypotheses. As was stated earlier, the first hypothesis to be tested here maintained that there was an inverse relationship between the amount of Cultural Heterogeneity between the dominant and a racial or ethnic group (Anglos and Mexican Americans in this study) and the amount of assimilation. In this section, Civic rather than Structural Assimilation will be examined. Civic assimilation or the absence of value and power conflict was measured by three sets of variables: Organization (number of organizations belonged to), Logarithm of Organization (logarithm of the number of organizations belonged to), and Frequency (how often meetings of all organizations were attended). Each of these was, in turn, divided into an Anglo and a Mexican American component, i.e., Anglo Organization, Mexican American Organization, Anglo Log of Organization, Mexican American Log of Organization, Anglo Frequency and Mexican American Frequency. These different components have been discussed previously and were presented in Figure 3. Each of the first three hypotheses derived from Gordon's model will be examined in light of these different variable sets.

Organization and Anglo Organization are positive measures of Civic Assimilation and Spanish was expected to vary positively with them according to the first hypothesis (see Figures 3 and 6). Organization and Anglo Organization were expected to vary negatively with the other indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity, Familism (see Figure 6). The other
component of Organization is Mexican American Organization which is a negative measure of Civic Assimilation, therefore its associations with Spanish and Familism were expected to be in the opposite direction as they were with Organization and Anglo Organization (see Figure 6). Mexican American Organization was expected to vary negatively with Spanish and positively with Familism.

The evidence presented in Table 19 provides some support for the first hypothesis. In Model 1 and Model 2\(^{25}\) the associations between Spanish and Organization, Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization only the latter ones, with B's of .022 and .019 in Models 1 and 2 respectively, were statistically significant. This implies that the less widespread the usage of Spanish is, the greater the number of memberships that will be in the predominately Anglo Organizations and consequently, the greater the Assimilation. Also found in Models 3 and 4 (Table 19) was additional support for the first hypothesis. The associations between Organizations and Familism were in the expected direction, positive, and statistically significant. In Model 3, the B for the association was .039 and .040 in Model 4. This was thus consistent with the first hypothesis. Additional support was found in the association between Anglo Organizations and Familism. The B's for these

\(^{25}\) It should be remembered that these are the same models used previously with Structural Assimilation and that they include different indicators of the Value Consensus, Cultural Heterogeneity and Stereotyping variables.
Figure 6. Directional effects of the Independent variable measures on Organization, Mexican American Organization, and Anglo Organization.
Table 19. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between various measures of civic assimilation (organization) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice).—(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>-.012(.018)</td>
<td>.014(.013)</td>
<td>-.032(.068)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorganization</td>
<td>-.017(.019)</td>
<td>-.008(.013)</td>
<td>.041(.070)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorganization</td>
<td>.005(.013)</td>
<td>.022(.009)*</td>
<td>-.073(.048)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>-.009(.019)</td>
<td>.012(.019)</td>
<td>.013(.020)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorganization</td>
<td>-.016(.019)</td>
<td>-.008(.014)</td>
<td>.025(.021)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorganization</td>
<td>.007(.013)</td>
<td>.019(.010)*</td>
<td>-.012(.014)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>-.012(.018)</td>
<td>.005(.012)</td>
<td>-.034(.070)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorganization</td>
<td>-.024(.018)</td>
<td>.039(.012)*</td>
<td>.038(.070)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorganization</td>
<td>.012(.012)</td>
<td>-.034(.008)*</td>
<td>-.072(.047)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>-.009(.018)</td>
<td>.008(.012)</td>
<td>-.004(.020)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorganization</td>
<td>-.023(.018)</td>
<td>.040(.012)*</td>
<td>.017(.020)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorganization</td>
<td>.014(.012)</td>
<td>-.032(.008)*</td>
<td>-.021(.013)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
associations in Model 3 and 4 were -.034 and -.032. Moreover, they were in the expected direction and statistically significant.

This evidence suggests that the greater the emphasis placed upon family activities, the more the number of memberships in predominately Mexican American Organizations and subsequently, lower Assimilation. The association between Anglo Organization and Familism suggests the opposite of this; the lower the amount of importance placed on spending time with the family, the greater the number of memberships in predominately Anglo Organizations. This pattern of membership in organizations, in turn, implies greater amounts of Assimilation. Both of these patterns are supportive of the first hypothesis.

Additional support for the first hypothesis was found when the sex differences were examined (Table 20). In Model 1, for both the male and female subsamples, the associations between Spanish and Organization, Mexican American Organization, and Anglo Organization were all in the expected directions but none were statistically significant. For both the male and female subsamples, the associations between Organization and Spanish were negative, i.e., not in the expected direction. However, since these B's were quite small and not very statistically significant, the problem of the unexpected direction is not serious. It can be concluded, however, that they did not lend support to the first hypothesis.

Support was found for the first hypothesis in Models 3 and 4 (Table 20) which utilized Familism as the measure of Cultural Heterogeneity. In Model 3, for both Males and Females, the association between Anglo Organizations and Familism was in the expected direction and
Table 20. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationship between civic assimilation (organization) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, familism) and stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice). *(Standard errors in parentheses.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>-.021(.033)</td>
<td>.003(.020)</td>
<td>-.045(.156)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>.016(.034)</td>
<td>-.025(.020)</td>
<td>.010(.160)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>.004(.027)</td>
<td>.028(.016)</td>
<td>-.054(.130)</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>-.035(.026)</td>
<td>.006(.018)</td>
<td>-.054(.186)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>-.030(.026)</td>
<td>-.021(.017)</td>
<td>.035(.081)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>-.005(.020)</td>
<td>.027(.014)</td>
<td>-.089(.068)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>.031(.034)</td>
<td>-.004(.022)</td>
<td>.025(.031)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>.034(.034)</td>
<td>-.037(.022)</td>
<td>.030(.051)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>-.002(.028)</td>
<td>.035(.018)</td>
<td>-.004(.020)</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>-.034(.026)</td>
<td>-.005(.020)</td>
<td>-.055(.055)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>-.034(.024)</td>
<td>-.005(.051)</td>
<td>-.024(.019)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>.000(.021)</td>
<td>.021(.016)</td>
<td>.050(.050)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>.011(.031)</td>
<td>.002(.017)</td>
<td>.010(.154)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>.008(.031)</td>
<td>.042(.017)</td>
<td>.054(.152)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>.003(.015)</td>
<td>+.040(.014)*</td>
<td>-.043(.125)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>-.029(.025)</td>
<td>-.020(.016)</td>
<td>-.054(.066)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>-.027(.024)</td>
<td>.013(.016)</td>
<td>.026(.043)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>-.001(.020)</td>
<td>+.033(.012)*</td>
<td>-.080(.066)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>.021(.032)</td>
<td>.006(.017)</td>
<td>.016(.080)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>.025(.031)</td>
<td>+.046(.017)*</td>
<td>-.056(.030)</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>-.003(.026)</td>
<td>-.040(.014)*</td>
<td>-.020(.025)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>-.031(.026)</td>
<td>-.016(.017)</td>
<td>-.059(.025)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAorg</td>
<td>-.032(.025)</td>
<td>.015(.016)</td>
<td>-.017(.031)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angorg</td>
<td>.001(.020)</td>
<td>-.030(.013)*</td>
<td>-.022(.025)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as a measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as a measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
statistically significant. In these associations the B's were -.040 for Males and -.033 for Females. The associations between Organizations, Mexican American Organization and Familism in this Model failed to provide support for the hypothesis since they were neither significant nor in the expected direction.

In Model 4, the associations between Anglo Organizations and Familism were also consistent with the first hypothesis for both Males and Females. The association for the male subsample yielded a B of -.040 while the association for the female subsample yielded one of -.030. Both of these associations were in the expected direction and statistically significant. There was some additional support for the first hypothesis in this Model. In the Male subsample, the association between Mexican American Organization and Familism with a B of .046 was also in the expected direction and significant. In the female subsample this association, although in the expected direction was not significant, therefore it did not provide support for the first hypothesis.

Support for the first hypothesis continued in Model 5 (Table 21) which included all the indicators of the independent variables. The associations between Familism and Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization were in the expected direction with respective B's of .048 and -.029. These associations were also statistically significant and thus supportive of the first hypothesis. The association between Organization and Familism was not in the expected direction nor statistically significant. It was therefore, not supportive of the first hypothesis.
Table 21. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between civic assimilation (organization, logarithm of organization) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish and familism), and stereotyping (possibility of integration and perception of prejudice), total and by sex.—(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Amtrad</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Familism</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Percept</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>-.013(.019)</td>
<td>.019(.015)</td>
<td>-.030(.014)</td>
<td>-.042(.071)</td>
<td>.015(.021)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAOrganizations</td>
<td>-.019(.019)</td>
<td>.014(.015)</td>
<td>.048(.014)*</td>
<td>.052(.071)</td>
<td>.028(.021)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AngloOrganizations</td>
<td>.007(.013)</td>
<td>.004(.010)</td>
<td>-.029(.009)*</td>
<td>-.094(.047)</td>
<td>-.013(.014)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.006(.009)</td>
<td>.008(.008)</td>
<td>.007(.007)</td>
<td>-.018(.035)</td>
<td>.009(.010)</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.008(.011)</td>
<td>.004(.009)</td>
<td>.028(.008)*</td>
<td>.040(.040)</td>
<td>.015(.012)</td>
<td>-.612</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>.009(.008)</td>
<td>.004(.007)</td>
<td>-.019(.006)*</td>
<td>-.064(.031)</td>
<td>-.007(.009)</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>.033(.035)</td>
<td>.005(.026)</td>
<td>.012(.021)</td>
<td>-.066(.160)</td>
<td>.028(.032)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAOrganizations</td>
<td>.040(.034)</td>
<td>-.006(.025)</td>
<td>.051(.020)*</td>
<td>-.023(.155)</td>
<td>.034(.031)</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AngloOrganizations</td>
<td>-.007(.028)</td>
<td>.010(.021)</td>
<td>-.039(.017)*</td>
<td>-.045(.129)</td>
<td>-.006(.026)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>.021(.019)</td>
<td>.005(.014)</td>
<td>.006(.011)</td>
<td>-.031(.085)</td>
<td>.018(.017)</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>.030(.021)</td>
<td>-.003(.015)</td>
<td>.035(.012)*</td>
<td>-.449(.095)</td>
<td>.016(.019)</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>-.005(.019)</td>
<td>.007(.014)</td>
<td>-.026(.011)*</td>
<td>-.029(.088)</td>
<td>-.004(.017)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>-.037(.027)</td>
<td>-.015(.023)</td>
<td>-.023(.020)</td>
<td>-.076(.089)</td>
<td>-.037(.034)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAOrganizations</td>
<td>-.034(.025)</td>
<td>-.022(.021)</td>
<td>.002(.019)</td>
<td>.021(.084)</td>
<td>-.006(.032)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AngloOrganizations</td>
<td>-.003(.021)</td>
<td>.006(.018)</td>
<td>-.026(.015)</td>
<td>.097(.070)</td>
<td>-.031(.027)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.023(.014)</td>
<td>-.005(.012)</td>
<td>-.012(.011)</td>
<td>-.034(.048)</td>
<td>-.012(.018)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.020(.016)</td>
<td>-.011(.013)</td>
<td>.004(.012)</td>
<td>.021(.052)</td>
<td>-.002(.020)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>-.003(.013)</td>
<td>.006(.011)</td>
<td>-.016(.010)</td>
<td>-.063(.044)</td>
<td>-.015(.017)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.
Examination of the sex differences in Model 5 indicated continued support for the first hypothesis. In the Male subsample, the associations between Familism and Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization had B's of .051 and -.039 respectively, they provided additional support for the first hypothesis. In the female subsample, the B's for the association between Familism and Organization, Mexican American Organization, and Anglo Organization were all in the expected direction, but none were statistically significant and therefore, not in support of the first hypothesis.

The associations between Spanish (as the indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity) and Organization and Anglo Organization were also in the expected direction, but not statistically significant (Table 21). The association between Spanish and Mexican American Organization was neither in the expected direction, nor statistically significant. Thus use of Spanish is not as important a factor in determining membership in Mexican American Organizations as was expected. The analyses within sex groups were also not consistent with the first hypothesis.

As was stated earlier in Chapter 5, the distribution of Organization and hence of Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization was skewed with about 60 percent of the respondents claiming no organizational memberships. To deal with this issue, the logarithm was used for all three measures—Organization, Mexican American Organization, and Anglo Organization. The result of the equations when these logarithms were used is presented in Table 22. Although the utilization of the log function was expected to taper the curve of the association, the direction
Table 22. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between alternative measure of civic assimilation (logarithm of organization) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, familism), and stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice). (Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.007(.009)</td>
<td>.007(.006)</td>
<td>-.010(.034)</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.007(.011)</td>
<td>-.008(.007)</td>
<td>.034(.040)</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>.003(.008)</td>
<td>.015(.006)*</td>
<td>-.049(.031)</td>
<td>- .509</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.004(.009)</td>
<td>.006(.007)</td>
<td>.008(.010)</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.006(.011)</td>
<td>-.009(.008)</td>
<td>.013(.012)</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>-.004(.008)</td>
<td>.014(.006)*</td>
<td>-.007(.009)</td>
<td>-.815</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.006(.009)</td>
<td>.000(.006)</td>
<td>-.011(.034)</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.011(.010)</td>
<td>.025(.007)*</td>
<td>.033(.039)</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>.008(.008)</td>
<td>-.023(.005)*</td>
<td>-.048(.031)</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogOrg</td>
<td>-.004(.009)</td>
<td>.002(.006)</td>
<td>.000(.009)</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogMAOrg</td>
<td>-.010(.010)</td>
<td>.025(.007)*</td>
<td>.010(.011)</td>
<td>-.613</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogAngloOrg</td>
<td>.009(.008)</td>
<td>-.022(.006)*</td>
<td>-.013(.009)</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as a measure of cultural heterogeneity and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as a measure of cultural heterogeneity and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
of the associations were expected to remain the same as those discussed above and presented in Figure 6. The expected directions for these associations between Log Organization, Log Mexican American Organization, and Log Anglo Organization and Spanish and Familism are presented in Figure 7.

To be in line with the first three hypotheses, Spanish and Familism were expected to be associated with these three logarithm variables in different directions. Spanish was expected to be positively associated with Log Organization and Log Anglo Organization, and negatively with Log Mexican American Organization. Familism was expected to be related to these variables in the opposite direction, i.e., it was expected to be negatively associated with Log Organization and Log Anglo Organization, and positively with Mexican American Organization.

Support for the first hypothesis was found in all four Models of Table 22. In Models 1 and 2 the associations between Spanish and Log Organization, Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization were all in the expected directions. The respective B's for these associations were .007, -.008 and .015 in Model 1 and .006, -.009 and .014 in Model 2. However, only the associations between Spanish and Log Anglo Organization supported the first hypothesis since they were the only ones that were statistically significant.

Additional support for the first hypothesis was found in Models 3 and 4 using Familism as the indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity. The associations between Familism and Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization were supportive of the first hypothesis as they
Figure 7. Directional effects of the Independent variable measures on Log Organization, Log Mexican American Organization, and Log Anglo Organization.
were both in the expected directions and statistically significant. The associations between Log Organization and Familism were neither in the expected direction nor statistically significant.

Additional support was found for the first hypothesis when sex differences were examined (Table 23). In Models 1 and 2, which used Spanish as the indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity, the associations were in the expected directions for both males and females. However, only the association between Log Anglo Organization and Spanish in the female subsample was statistically significant only in Model 1 and supportive of the hypothesis. It should be kept in mind that the comparable associations in Table 20 were not significant.

Additional support for the first hypothesis was found when Familism was used as the indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity. In Model 3 the direction of the associations for both males and females were in the expected directions. However, the associations between Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization and Familism were both statistically significant and thus in agreement with the first hypothesis for the male subsample only. The B's for these two associations were .028 and -.026 respectively. The association between Log Organization and Familism was nonsignificant. For the female subsample the associations between Log Organization, Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization and Familism were consistent with the first hypothesis. The association between Familism and Log Anglo Organization had a B of -.022 and was the only one that was statistically significant and thus in line with the first hypothesis.
Table 23. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between alternative measures of civic assimilation (logarithm of organization) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, familism), and stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice).—(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>.013 (.017)</td>
<td>.004 (.011)</td>
<td>-.019 (.033)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>.014 (.021)</td>
<td>.016 (.015)</td>
<td>.016 (.099)</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>.003 (.018)</td>
<td>.019 (.011)</td>
<td>.038 (.088)</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>-.022 (.014)</td>
<td>.066 (.010)</td>
<td>-.025 (.046)</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>-.017 (.015)</td>
<td>.013 (.011)</td>
<td>.029 (.054)</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>-.004 (.013)</td>
<td>.019 (.009)*</td>
<td>-.004 (.043)</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>.020 (.018)</td>
<td>.001 (.012)</td>
<td>.017 (.016)</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>.025 (.021)</td>
<td>.024 (.014)</td>
<td>.014 (.019)</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>.002 (.019)</td>
<td>.022 (.012)</td>
<td>.003 (.017)</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>-.014 (.014)</td>
<td>.002 (.011)</td>
<td>-.011 (.018)</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>-.020 (.015)</td>
<td>.011 (.012)</td>
<td>-.011 (.019)</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>-.001 (.010)</td>
<td>.016 (.010)</td>
<td>.012 (.016)</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>.007 (.016)</td>
<td>-.001 (.009)</td>
<td>.012 (.082)</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>.004 (.019)</td>
<td>.028 (.010)*</td>
<td>.027 (.094)</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>.001 (.017)</td>
<td>.026 (.009)*</td>
<td>.029 (.085)</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>-.014 (.014)</td>
<td>-.011 (.009)</td>
<td>-.024 (.086)</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>-.014 (.015)</td>
<td>-.011 (.010)</td>
<td>-.024 (.051)</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>-.001 (.010)</td>
<td>-.021 (.009)*</td>
<td>-.053 (.042)</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>.013 (.017)</td>
<td>.001 (.009)</td>
<td>-.011 (.016)</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>.025 (.019)</td>
<td>.031 (.010)*</td>
<td>-.012 (.098)</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>.002 (.018)</td>
<td>.027 (.009)*</td>
<td>.014 (.017)</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrg</td>
<td>-.020 (.014)</td>
<td>-.009 (.009)</td>
<td>-.014 (.017)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWM</td>
<td>-.019 (.015)</td>
<td>.011 (.010)</td>
<td>-.009 (.019)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logOrgWMlog</td>
<td>-.001 (.013)</td>
<td>.020 (.008)*</td>
<td>-.010 (.016)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
The results paralleled those in Model 3 (see Table 23). The same two associations were in the expected direction and statistically significant for the male subsample and therefore consistent with the first hypothesis. The B's were also very similar. The associations between Familism and Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization had B's of .031 and -.027. For the female subsample the association between Familism and Log Anglo Organization was the only one that was both in the expected direction and statistically significant and thus in line with the first hypothesis.

When Model 5 was examined (see Table 21) there was still support for the first hypothesis when the logarithmic indicators of Organization as the dependent variables were used. The B's for the association between Spanish and these indicators were very small and not significant. However, the associations between Familism and Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization were in line with the first hypothesis as they were in the expected directions and statistically significant.

When sex differences were examined, it was found that for males the same associations between Familism and Log Mexican American Organization and Log Anglo Organization were still in support of the first hypothesis. However, there was no such support in the female subsample.

The last set of indicators were Frequency, Anglo Frequency and Mexican American Frequency. The first two are regarded as positive indicators of Assimilation and thus were expected to vary directly with Assimilation. Mexican American Frequency is regarded as a negative
indicator of Assimilation and thus expected to vary indirectly with Assimilation (see Figure 3).

Frequencies refer to how often the meetings of the organizations were attended in a year. Mexican American Frequency dealt with how often meetings of predominately Mexican American Organizations were attended while Anglo Frequency dealt with how often the meetings of predominately Anglo organizations were attended. Greater amounts of Frequency and Anglo Frequency were expected to be associated with a greater amount of Assimilation. However, greater amounts of Mexican American Frequency were expected to be associated with lower amounts of Assimilation.

According to the first hypothesis, Spanish is expected to be positively related to Frequency and Anglo Frequency and negatively to Mexican American Frequency. Also, Familism was expected to vary negatively with Frequency and Anglo Frequency and positively associated with Mexican American Frequency.

There was some support for the first hypothesis in each of the Models of Table 24. In Models 1 and 2, the associations between Anglo Frequency and Spanish had respective B's of .764 and .593. These were in the expected directions and statistically significant, thereby providing support for the first hypothesis. The associations between Spanish and Mexican American Frequency in Models 1 and 2 were in the expected direction, but they were not statistically significant. It should also be noted that the association between Total Frequency and Spanish was not in the expected direction and not statistically significant.
Table 24. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between civic assimilation (frequency) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), and stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice). --(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.837(.844)</td>
<td>-.054(.595)</td>
<td>1.11 (3.16)</td>
<td>60.70</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFrequency</td>
<td>-.974(.861)</td>
<td>-.818(.607)</td>
<td>1.71 (3.22)</td>
<td>69.43</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.137(.366)</td>
<td>.764(.257)*</td>
<td>-.606(1.37)</td>
<td>- 8.74</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.704(.865)</td>
<td>-.111(.655)</td>
<td>.114(.847)</td>
<td>64.53</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFrequency</td>
<td>-.870(.882)</td>
<td>.703(.668)</td>
<td>.558(.966)</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.166(.352)</td>
<td>.593(.267)*</td>
<td>-.445(.385)</td>
<td>- 5.77</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-1.02 (.821)</td>
<td>.504(.555)</td>
<td>.816(3.16)</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFrequency</td>
<td>-1.29 (.826)</td>
<td>1.54 (.558)*</td>
<td>1.54 (3.18)</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.272(.349)</td>
<td>-1.03 (.236)*</td>
<td>-.729(1.34)</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.915(.845)</td>
<td>.565(.567)</td>
<td>-.352(.904)</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFrequency</td>
<td>-1.21 (.850)</td>
<td>1.55 (.570)*</td>
<td>.290(.910)</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.303(.335)</td>
<td>-.983(.225)*</td>
<td>-.641(.359)</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural differences and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
In Models 3 and 4 (Table 24) support for the first hypothesis was found in the associations of Familism with both Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency. In Model 3 Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency has respective B's of 1.54 and -.729. In Model 4 the comparable B's were .290 and -.641. All four of these associations were in the expected directions and statistically significant.

Support for this hypothesis continued when sex differences were examined (Table 25). In Model 1, the association between Mexican American Frequency and Spanish was supportive of the hypothesis for both the males and females. The associations were in the expected direction and statistically significant. The B's were similar, -1.54 for the association in the male subsample and -1.45 for the female one. Additional support was found in the association between Anglo Frequency and Spanish for males. This association was not significant for females.

Models 3 and 4 had fairly consistent patterns of support for the hypothesis. In both of these Models, the associations between Anglo Frequency and Familism were in the expected direction and statistically significant for both sex groups. The B's for the male subsample were the same in both Models, -1.30. For females, the B in Model 3 was -.828 and -.760 in Model 4.

When Model 5 was examined (Table 26), further support was found for the first hypothesis, particularly in the associations between Familism and Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency which were in the directions and statistically significant. When sex differences for the full Model were examined, only the male subsample proved to be in line with the hypothesis. This came from the association between
Table 25. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between civic assimilation (frequency) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish, family), and stereotyping (possibility of integration, perception of prejudice). --(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Value Consensus</th>
<th>Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Stereotyping</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.33 (1.06)</td>
<td>-0.641 (0.645)</td>
<td>-4.23 (5.08)</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>0.65 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.625)</td>
<td>0.39 (4.81)</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.55 (1.64)</td>
<td>0.001 (0.818)</td>
<td>-0.86 (2.04)</td>
<td>-19.48</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>-0.51 (1.90)</td>
<td>1.45 (1.76)</td>
<td>3.17 (1.51)</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.56 (1.11)</td>
<td>-0.819 (1.0)</td>
<td>-5.05 (1.0)</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>0.75 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.74 (1.67)</td>
<td>-0.41 (5.53)</td>
<td>53.88</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2.36 (0.95)</td>
<td>-0.57 (1.76)</td>
<td>-0.00 (2.0)</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>0.13 (1.97)</td>
<td>-1.12 (1.79)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.22)</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.25 (1.01)</td>
<td>-0.51 (0.55)</td>
<td>-1.54 (4.98)</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>1.59 (1.57)</td>
<td>0.785 (0.54)</td>
<td>-1.04 (4.88)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.91 (1.95)</td>
<td>1.384 (0.64)</td>
<td>1.58 (1.51)</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>0.95 (0.60)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.62)</td>
<td>3.02 (1.16)</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.01 (1.06)</td>
<td>-0.32 (0.56)</td>
<td>-4.52 (2.0)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>0.56 (1.05)</td>
<td>-0.67 (0.53)</td>
<td>-0.54 (2.0)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.98 (0.67)</td>
<td>1.28 (0.6)</td>
<td>0.02 (2.17)</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNil frequency</td>
<td>1.16 (0.90)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.65)</td>
<td>1.83 (1.18)</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Model 1 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 2 uses Spanish as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping. Model 3 uses Familism as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Possibility of Integration as the measure of stereotyping. Model 4 uses Familism as the measure of cultural heterogeneity and Perception of Prejudice as the measure of stereotyping.
Table 26. Unstandardized partial regression coefficients for the relationships between civic assimilation (frequency) and value consensus (American traditionalism), cultural heterogeneity (Spanish and familism), and stereotyping (possibility of integration and perception of prejudice), total and by sex.--(Standard errors in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Assimilation</th>
<th>Amtrad</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Familism</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Percept</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.865 (.879)</td>
<td>.306 (.727)</td>
<td>1.00 (.655)</td>
<td>.281 (3.28)</td>
<td>.228 (.961)</td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Frequency</td>
<td>-1.01 (.883)</td>
<td>.182 (.731)</td>
<td>1.99 (.658)*</td>
<td>2.29 (3.29)</td>
<td>.667 (.966)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.148 (.344)</td>
<td>.125 (.285)</td>
<td>-.988 (.257)*</td>
<td>-2.01 (1.28)</td>
<td>-.439 (.376)</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.03 (1.14)</td>
<td>-1.13 (.831)</td>
<td>-.616 (.678)</td>
<td>-4.10 (5.10)</td>
<td>-.425 (1.03)</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Frequency</td>
<td>.405 (1.09)</td>
<td>-1.24 (.793)</td>
<td>.798 (.647)</td>
<td>-4.30 (4.86)</td>
<td>-.104 (.981)</td>
<td>54.32</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.624 (.608)</td>
<td>.111 (.442)</td>
<td>-1.41 (.361)*</td>
<td>.204 (2.71)</td>
<td>-.320 (.547)</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.002 (.990)</td>
<td>-.649 (.881)</td>
<td>-.075 (.737)</td>
<td>1.71 (3.22)</td>
<td>.215 (1.24)</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Frequency</td>
<td>-.182 (.997)</td>
<td>-.793 (.886)</td>
<td>.724 (.741)</td>
<td>3.75 (3.24)</td>
<td>.606 (1.25)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Frequency</td>
<td>.184 (.554)</td>
<td>.143 (.493)</td>
<td>-.800 (.412)</td>
<td>-2.02 (1.80)</td>
<td>-.391 (.695)</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level or beyond.
Anglo Frequency and Familism. In this case however, Spanish as an indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity was a poor variable.

According to the second hypothesis, a positive association was expected between Value Consensus and Civic Assimilation. More specifically, it was expected that American Traditionalism would be positively associated with Organization, Anglo Organization, Log Organization, and Log Anglo Organization and negatively associated with Mexican American Organization and Log Mexican American Organization (see Figures 6 and 7). With Frequency and Anglo Frequency, American Traditionalism was expected to be associated positively. With Mexican American Frequency it was expected to be negatively associated.

The only support found for this hypothesis was in Table 25. For the male subsample, in Models 1 and 3, the association between Anglo Frequency and American Traditionalism was in the expected direction and statistically significant. Thus the greater the score on American Traditionalism, the greater the frequency with which Anglo Organization meetings were attended. In other words, the more traditional the response by males tended to be, the more often they tended to attend meetings of predominately Anglo organizations.

As stated earlier, the third hypothesis maintained that there was an inverse relationship between Stereotyping and Assimilation. According to this hypothesis, it was expected that the indicators of Stereotyping, namely Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice would be negatively associated with Organization and Anglo Organization and positively with Mexican American Organization (see Figure 6).
The associations between Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice and the logarithmical functions of Organizations and Mexican American Organization are also expected to be in the same direction (see Figure 7) as their counterparts in Figure 6. With Frequency and Anglo Frequency, the two stereotyping indicators were expected to be associated in a negative direction (see Figure 8). With Mexican American Frequency they were expected to vary positively. With Civic Assimilation, no statistical support was found for this hypothesis. The evidence presented in Tables 19 through 26 had no statistically significant associations for these expected associations. Some of the variables were sometimes not in the expected directions. Some of this may have been a function of one or the other of the components, e.g., Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization, having a larger effect on the combined variable, e.g., Organization. Due to these complex findings, no conclusions were able to be reached about the third hypothesis.

The fourth and final hypothesis derived from Gordon's model and tested in this study maintained that the effects with Structural Assimilation were stronger than those of Civic Assimilation. This relationship was expected to be evidenced in stronger relationships between the indicators in the model using Structural Assimilation as the dependent variable than those in the model using Civic Assimilation as the dependent variable.

To determine if there was support for this hypothesis the equations that had been presented in Model 5 were used. This Model included simultaneously all of the independent indicators for each indicator of Structural and Civic Assimilation.
Figure 8. Directional effects of the Independent variable measures on Frequency, Anglo Frequency, and Mexican American Frequency.
The regression equations which contained the indicators of Structural Assimilation were reported in Model 5 (Table 15). It appears that Integration is a stronger indicator of Structural Assimilation than Preference for several reasons. The proportion of the variance explained of Integration was greater and it was also associated with more statistically significant indicators of the independent variables than was Preference. Throughout the analysis, Integration was a better indicator with all three of its different measures and for both males and females. Therefore Integration was used as the indicator of Structural Assimilation in comparisons with Civic Assimilation.

For Civic Assimilation, the indicators were divided into their respective Mexican American and Anglo components. This division into six measures resulted in an improvement of the fit of the regression equations as well as the number of indicators that were statistically significant. Overall these six measures of Civic Assimilation: Mexican American Organization, Anglo Organization, Log Mexican American Organization, Log Anglo Organization, Mexican American Frequency, and Anglo Frequency were very similar. The only association that was statistically significant between these indicators and the others was with Familism and will be discussed later (Model 5, Tables 21 and 26). These associations also tended to be positive for the Mexican American component and negative for the Anglo dimension. Both the highest and the lowest percentage of variance explained were found using the various components of Frequency. Mexican American Frequency had the lowest with 0.5 percent and Anglo Frequency had the highest with 9.3 percent.
The regression equations using Integration as the indicator of assimilation appear to have much better fits than the ones using indicators of Civic Assimilation. The six item measure of Integration (Table 15) had an $R^2$ of .219, which was considerably higher than the $R^2$'s presented above for the equations using Civic Assimilation. The associations between Integration and Spanish, Familism, Possibility of Interaction and Perception of Prejudice were statistically significant. On the other hand, only Familism was statistically significant with the indicators of Civic Assimilation.

When sex differences were examined for these equations (Tables 21 and 26), the ones using indicators of Civic Assimilation tended to have the highest $R^2$'s in the male subsample. The highest $R^2$'s for males were found in the equations using Mexican American Organization and Log Mexican American Organization as the measures of Civic Assimilation, .119 and .159 respectively. The comparable $R^2$'s for females were .039 and .037. The sex differences in the $R^2$'s of Mexican American Organization were not statistically significant. However, the sex differences in the $R^2$'s of Log Mexican American were statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. Using Frequency as the indicator of Civic Assimilation, the male subsample has an $R^2$ of .217 in the equation that included Anglo Frequency. This $R^2$ was the highest among all the equations using Civic Assimilation indicators. The comparable $R^2$ for females was only .088. It should be noted that the Ns in these regressions were low.

Using Integration as the measure of Structural Assimilation, the male subsample had an $R^2$ of .205 (Table 15). However, females had an $R^2$ of .282. This $R^2$ was the highest obtained in the entire analysis,
including all equations of both Civic and Structural indicators. Additionally the difference in $R^2$'s between males and females was statistically significant at the .01 level of probability.

Thus, the results presented here do tend to provide support for Gordon's contention that Structural Assimilation is a dominant type of assimilation and that it is stronger than Civic Assimilation. This support is based upon the differences in the proportions of explained variance, the number of statistically significant associations, and the size of the samples in the Structural and Civic Assimilation equations.

Discussion

Structural Assimilation

The analysis of the four hypotheses from Gordon's model of Assimilation reported herein has revealed two general findings. First, the original hypotheses were too broadly stated and benefited from a more focused examination of the specific measures of Structural Assimilation. Second, taking sex differences into account indicated that the assimilation process may affect men and women through different mechanisms.

Indicators. Of the two indicators of Structural Assimilation used, Integration was much better than Preference. Integration had statistically significant associations with the four independent indicators, Familism, Spanish, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice. Preference had statistically significant associations with only two of the independent indicators, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice. Also, the regression equations that used Integration as the measure of assimilation tended to explain more of the
variance than did the ones using Preference. Integration also deals with actual behavior which is more consequential than the attitudes of Preference.

**Cultural Heterogeneity.** For the two dimensions of Cultural Heterogeneity, Spanish and Familism, the results showed that the greater the amount of time and interaction a respondent desired with his family (Familism) and the more extensive the use of Spanish (Spanish) among Mexican American respondents, the less interaction (Integration) with Anglos. These results are in agreement with Gordon's contention that the greater the cultural differences between ethnic group, such as Mexican Americans, and the dominant group, the less (Structurally) assimilated the ethnic group will be. According to these findings, if Mexican Americans were to begin losing their use of Spanish or if the emphasis on family interaction were to diminish, *Ceteris paribus* they would begin to assimilate, at least in the structural realm. Since the findings regarding the Preference indicator of Structural Assimilation were not statistically significant, it is not worthwhile to speculate on the interpretation of those results.

**Value Consensus.** The second hypothesis examined in our study dealt with Gordon's contention of a positive association between Value Consensus and (Structural) Assimilation. Since American Traditionalism was the only measure of Value Consensus used, it was expected that the greater the agreement by Mexican Americans with ideal traditional American values, the more they would actually interact and the more they would prefer to interact with Anglos. Although these patterns were found,
there was no statistical support for this hypothesis with either measure of Structural Assimilation.

This lack of support for Gordon's hypothesis could be the consequence of several factors. One is that they could be due to chance alone. Another of the possible explanations is that the measure of American Traditionalism was too large. The thirteen items that comprised it may have been either strongly correlated with each other thus raising the problem of covariance, or they may also be weakly correlated with the items of the dependent variable. The lack of support might have also been due to our not capturing the values of the dominant society in our measure of American Traditionalism, as noted earlier. Another cause may have been the fact that the differences between Mexican Americans and Anglos in the traditional values used were not of a large magnitude. However, when considering these last two possibilities, it should be kept in mind that the results were substantively meaningful, i.e., the associations were in the expected directions. Another point to be kept in mind is that although there was no statistical support for the association between American Traditionalism and Structural Assimilation, neither was there evidence against it. Thus the possibility still exists that Value Consensus could find support using other measures, data sets, or comparative groups of Anglos and Mexican Americans.

Stereotyping. According to the third hypothesis, a large amount of stereotyping between groups would be an inhibiting factor to (Structural) Assimilation. It was thus expected that Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice would lead to less (Structural) assimilation. Based on the data examined, the less the possibility
Mexican American respondents believed in interacting with Anglos and the greater the amounts of stereotypes respondents believed Anglos had about them, the less they were expected to actually interact with Anglos (Integration) and the less they were expected to prefer to interact with Anglos (Preference). Since these were the relationships that had been posited by the third hypothesis, it is possible to conclude that this part of Gordon's model was supported.

These results have interesting implications for the future of assimilation among Mexican Americans. According to our findings, the maintenance of stereotypes results in lower amounts of contact between Mexican Americans and Anglos and in turn this reduced amount of contact leads to a greater degree of isolation between the groups which then serves to reinforce stereotyping. This process starts the cycle again, as was discussed above, this greater degree of stereotyping leads to greater isolation. This becomes a seemingly perpetual cycle to be broken only by an outside force. Gordon provides no answer to this dilemma. However, the only reasonable solution appears to be that an outside agent could by fiat or mandate break the cycle by reducing stereotypes, as inter-group contact does tend to have a dampening effect on them.

Sex Differences. The analysis of sex differences served two functions, methodological and substantive. The methodological concern was to determine whether the findings were reduced by sampling at the household level. To check for any biasing effect of the sampling technique on the results, the adult males were compared with adult females.
These subsamples could be regarded as being independent since the sample contained only one individual from each household. The substantive interest in looking at sex differences was to learn whether in fact such differences existed. The issue of sex differences and assimilation is only recently emerging in the literature.

The results of the analysis indicated that the sex differences were for the most part along the lines that had been expected. There were important differences in strength with females having the edge over males. This was evidenced in statistically significant larger B's and $R^2$'s for females relative to males in comparable equations. These differences were particularly true with Integration as the measure of Structural Assimilation. Additionally, since these results were generally along the lines that had been expected from two independent samples, it would appear that any ill effects resulting from the sampling were minimal.

In the equations which simultaneously included all the independent variables (Model 5), the largest percentage of explained variance of the entire analysis was found in the female subsample, .282 (using Integration as the dependent variable). This figure is particularly striking in light of the generally low percentages of explained variance that were found throughout our analysis.

The stronger relationships found in the female subsample in the associations between the measures of Structural Assimilation and Spanish, Familism, Possibility of Integration, and Perception of Prejudice suggest that females are indeed more sensitive to the assimilation process than
males. However, this may be a result of female roles in Mexican American and Anglo cultures being more similar to each other than those of males. Thus, Mexican American females would not have to change as much to assimilate, i.e., to become like Anglo females as would Mexican American males in becoming like Anglo males. Also, through the mother role, Mexican American females may have more exposure to assimilation pressures through contact with educational and recreational settings of their children. The children themselves may have an assimilating effect on their mothers. These findings are particularly noteworthy since the distribution of males and females on the dimensions of Structural Assimilation are similar.

Civic Assimilation

Indicators. The principal measures of Civic Assimilation, Organization, Log Organization, and Frequency were often a combination of contrasting measures of their Mexican American and Anglo components. When these principal measures were divided into the Mexican American or Anglo components, i.e., Mexican American Organization, Anglo Organization, Log Mexican American Organization, Log Anglo Organization, Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency, there was a resulting quantitative difference in the regression equations. These regression equations had more statistically significant associations in the expected directions than did those equations with the overall organization and frequency measures. An additional benefit from using the component measures is that substantive interpretation becomes clearer.
Cultural Heterogeneity. The only statistically significant associations were those between the Mexican American and Anglo components of Organization and Log Organization and the indicators of Cultural Heterogeneity, Spanish and Familism. Less extensive use of Spanish was significantly associated with a higher number of memberships in predominantly Anglo Organizations. However, the converse of this relationship, more extensive use of Spanish resulting in a higher number of memberships in Mexican American organizations although in the expected direction, was not statistically significant. These results may be due to the Spanish variable including too many different dimensions, some of which such as reading Spanish periodicals and/or listening to the radio or watching television programs may not be directly related to membership in Mexican American organizations. It appears that such extensive use of Spanish may be a sufficient but not necessary condition for membership in Mexican American organizations. Another possible explanation for this lack of significance with Spanish is that Mexican American organizations may be very diverse groups. Some of these organizations may encourage the use of Spanish by providing an accepting atmosphere in which Spanish can be spoken. On the other hand, other Mexican American organizations may use only English and may have an orientation towards Anglo culture.

Familism, or the extent to which there is a preference to interact with one's family, had statistically significant associations with both Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization. A greater preference for interaction with one's family was associated with greater
numbers of memberships in predominately Mexican American organizations and lower numbers of memberships in predominately Anglo organizations. These results also suggest that as a group, Mexican Americans do have a cultural disposition for placing a great deal of importance on their family. This is a source of a good deal of controversy in the social science literature. Also, since a lower emphasis on family interactions was associated with a greater number of memberships in predominately Anglo organizations, it may be concluded that the less the preference for interaction with the family, the more (Civic) assimilated Mexican Americans become. However, it should be noted that Familism measures preferences rather than actual behavior and that the two may sometimes diverge.

A trend does seem evident, in so far as those respondents who tended to use more Spanish and had greater preferences for interaction with the family were the ones who tended to become involved in predominately Mexican American organizations and thus be less (Civic) assimilated. It is to be expected that individuals will tend to seek companionship in those organizations that include other individuals similar to themselves. These organizations then have the additional function of reinforcing the cultural attributes of Spanish and Familism in their membership. Therefore, it is not surprising that individuals that have less extensive use of Spanish and/or lower preferences for interaction with their families would also tend to seek companionship with other individuals similar to themselves. Subsequently, these
organizations also reinforce in their membership the cultural patterns of less use of Spanish and less emphasis on Familism.

The results from the equations using Frequency and its components, Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency, as the indicators of Civic Assimilation were parallel to those which used Organization and Log Organization. The associations with the Cultural Heterogeneity indicators, Spanish and Familism, were the only ones that were statistically significant. Spanish was negatively associated with greater attendance at meetings of predominately Anglo organizations, i.e., the more extensive the use of Spanish, the less often the meetings of predominately Anglo organizations were attended. However, as was noted previously, the converse of this association, more extensive use of Spanish being associated with greater attendance of predominately Mexican American organizations, was in the expected direction, but was not statistically significant.

A possible explanation for this lack of significance is the point made above concerning the heterogeneity of Mexican American organizations. Nevertheless, the finding that the extent of use of Spanish was inversely related to a higher frequency of Anglo organization which in turn was associated with more (Civic) assimilation was expected from Gordon's contention regarding the inverse association between Cultural Heterogeneity and (Civic) assimilation.

The results examined here also indicated that a greater desire to interact with one's family (Familism) was associated with greater attendance of meetings of predominately Mexican American organizations.
The converse of this association indicated that a lower desire to interact with one's family was associated with greater attendance of meetings of predominately Anglo organizations. Both of these associations were statistically significant. This may be the consequence of participation with family members being easier in Mexican American organizations than Anglo ones. There may also be a greater likelihood of other family members belonging to the Mexican American organizations. Predominately Anglo organizations, on the other hand appear to be more oriented towards individual activities.

These results have similar interpretations to those noted above. It is not surprising that Mexican Americans who wanted to interact more with their families and who had more extensive use of Spanish as well as those who tended to interact less with their families and who had a lower use of Spanish would both be inclined to more often attend the meetings of those organizations that had as members other individuals similar to themselves. Subsequently, this process of differential association has a reinforcement consequence which helps Mexican Americans either retard or speed up assimilation.

Frequency may be regarded as a measure of strength of interest in an organization. It would thus be a stronger test of the Cultural Heterogeneity hypothesis than the organization variables. Therefore, since its associations with Spanish and Familism were statistically significant and in the same direction as the associations with the Organization variables, there is considerable support for the hypothesis.
Value Consensus and Stereotyping. The trend in the data for the association between Civic Assimilation and Value Consensus and Stereotyping indicated that the associations were in the directions expected from Gordon's scheme, however, they lacked statistical significance. American Traditionalism was negatively associated with the Mexican American components of the Civic Assimilation indicators and positively associated with the Anglo components. Thus the more the agreement with the traditional American values, the less the number of memberships in predominately Mexican American organizations, and the lower the frequency with which meetings of these organizations were attended. Conversely, the less the agreement with the traditional American values, the greater the number of memberships in predominately Anglo organizations, and the greater the frequency with which meetings of these organizations were attended. Thus, these results are in general agreement with that part of Gordon's scheme that posits that Value Consensus varies directly with (Civic) Assimilation. However, because the associations between these variables were not statistically significant, support for this hypothesis cannot be claimed. However, a better measure of Value Consensus might yield statistically significant results.

Nevertheless, the trends in the data were in agreement with the patterns observed previously. The less Mexican Americans were in agreement with Anglos social values, the more they tended to be members of Mexican American organizations and the more often they attended meetings of these groups. In other words, the more Mexican Americans are in
disagreement with the social values of the dominant society, the less they will be assimilated.

Both of the indicators of Stereotyping, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice, had positive associations with the Mexican American components of the Civic Assimilation indicators and negative ones with the Anglo components. These associations were in the expected direction and thus indicate that the greater the number of stereotypes that are held by Mexican Americans, the fewer predominately Anglo Organizations in which they are members, and the less frequently they attend the meetings of these organizations, i.e., the less (Civic) Assimilated they were.

Conversely, a greater number of stereotypes was associated with a greater number of memberships in predominately Mexican American organizations and a greater frequency of attendance at meetings of these organizations. The results, like those with Value Consensus and Civic Assimilation, were in agreement with Gordon's hypothesis indicating that stereotypes are inversely related to (Civic) assimilation. Although they were not statistically significant, the findings were in the expected direction. Therefore, it is possible that these relationships could be found statistically significant using other data sets or other measures of Value Consensus.

Sex Differences. The differences between the male and female subsamples were not as great nor as straightforward with Civic Assimilation as they had been with Structural Assimilation. The sex differences were not consistent with all of the measures of Civic Assimilation.
With the Mexican American and Anglo components of the Organization and Log Organization measures (Table 21), the only sex differences that appeared were in the equations that contained all the independent variables. The associations between Mexican American Organization and Anglo Organization and their log counterparts with Familism were all in the expected directions and statistically significant for the male subsample. For Familism, the associations were in the expected direction but not statistically significant. These results suggest that for males the greater the preference for interaction with the family, the more they tended to belong to predominately Mexican American Organizations and the less they belonged to Anglo ones. However, since the pattern of significant sex differences were not consistent with those reported earlier in other models, this interpretation must be made cautiously.

The associations of the other indicator of Cultural Heterogeneity, Spanish, with Mexican American Frequency and Anglo Frequency tended to be in the expected direction and statistically significant for the male subsample. For females, the associations were in the expected direction and not statistically significant. The interpretation of these results is that the more extensive use of Spanish by males, the less often they will attend meetings of predominately Anglo organizations and the more often they will attend those of predominately Mexican American organizations. This may be a function of Spanish-speaking males seeking the companionship of other individuals similar to themselves. This explanation is also applicable to those males attending predominately Anglo organizations.
The association between preference for interaction with one's family and the frequency of attending predominately Anglo meetings were all in the expected direction, negative, and significant for both males and females. However, in the regression equation that included all of the independent indicators, this association was in the expected direction for both, but significant only for males. This would suggest that the more preference there is for interaction with one's family the less (Civic) assimilated males are. However, the sex differences with Civic assimilation should be interpreted with care since there appears to be a statistical interaction taking place between the independent indicators and there is no theoretical basis for expecting such an association. Therefore, the findings regarding sex differences in Civic Assimilation are inconclusive.
CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Assimilation of ethnic groups in the United States has attracted the attention and interest of sociologists since the early 1920's with Robert E. Park. The assimilation of Mexican Americans has only become the focus of sociological inquiry within the last two decades. Before this time Mexican Americans had been virtually ignored by the social sciences. However, this recent interest has been demonstrated mostly in theoretical approaches.

Mexican Americans have been in contact with Anglo society for generations, and they still remain a relatively unassimilated group based on criteria such as culture, and structure. Thus, the process of assimilation needs to be better understood. One of the most widely used theories of assimilation is Milton Gordon's. It is a large complex multi-dimensional theory with many hypothetical relationships which have not been tested in a systematic empirical manner.

Hypotheses about Assimilation

Gordon's most recent (1978) Theory of Assimilation includes as the dependent variable not only the seven types of Assimilation but also the Degree of Assimilation, the Degree of Conflict, as well as Degree of Access to Societal Rewards. The independent variables of his theory included eight Societal variables, five Interaction process variables and
three Biosocial development variables. The extremely broad range of variables of this theory precludes any one systematic test of the entire theory. This paper was limited to those four hypotheses which could be tested with the data used here. Three of these hypotheses involved relationships between dependent and independent variables. The fourth hypothesis tested here examined the relative strength of two dependent variables, Structural versus Civic Assimilation.

Hypothesis 1 - Cultural Heterogeneity

There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of cultural heterogeneity that exists between groups and the amount of assimilation. This hypothesis touches on the entire gamut of cultural traits that a group might have. Gordon uses culture to refer to the totality of learned behavior traits and beliefs such as language and religion. Basically, it maintains that the more culturally distinct the ethnic group is from the dominant group, the less complete the process of assimilation is. The underlying assumption of this hypothesis is that that more cultural characteristics groups have in common, the more complete the process of assimilation.

Hypothesis 2 - Value Consensus

There exists a direct relationship between the amount of value consensus that exists between the groups and the amount of assimilation. This hypothesis concerns itself with the degree of similarity of values, beliefs, and ideologies between the ethnic group and the dominant group. It assumes that the greater the degree of similarity between the two
groups, the greater the number of common areas on which the ethnic and
dominant groups can meet. This has the result of facilitating assimila-
tion. In turn, the greater this number of common areas, the greater the
ease of assimilation.

Hypothesis 3 - Stereotyping

There exists an inverse relationship between the amount of
stereotyping occurring between the groups and the amount of assimilation.
This hypothesis assumes that stereotypes can be held by both the dominant
and the ethnic group. The greater the intensity of stereotyping, i.e.,
the greater the number and poignancy of stereotypes, between the groups,
the less complete assimilation will be for the ethnic group. The under-
lying assumption of this hypothesis is that a greater intensity of
stereotypes creates a greater social distance between groups. This
social distance, in turn, has an inhibiting effect on assimilation.
Hence, stereotypes inhibit assimilation through the social distance be-
tween the groups.

Hypothesis 4 - Civic versus Structural Assimilation

Structural Assimilation is a stronger type of assimilation than
is Civic Assimilation. This hypothesis views Structural Assimilation as
being one of the two conceptually main types of assimilation (the other
being Cultural). An underlying assumption of this hypothesis is that
the other five types of assimilation in Gordon's theory, Marital, Identifi-
cational, Civic, Attitude Receptional, and Behavior Receptional, are of
secondary importance. This hypothesis asserts that these other types of
assimilation will necessarily follow only after Structural Assimilation had occurred.

Summary of Research Findings

The relative lack of assimilation by Mexican Americans was traced through three very different historical periods. Four hypotheses from Gordon's Theory of Assimilation were tested on Quality of Life survey data collected in five states. Additionally, the sex differences of the associations within each of the hypotheses were examined for both methodological purposes and to determine if Mexican American females were more affected by assimilation pressures than Mexican American males.

History

The relations between Mexican Americans and Anglos were traced through three historical periods: Conquest and Conflict (settlement to 1850's); Partial Accommodation (1850's to 1930's); and Towards Cultural Pluralism (1940's to present). In the Conquest and Conflict period, Mexican Americans underwent a transformation from being an indigenous group while Anglo settlers moved in, to a conquered group, as the Anglo settlers took control. During this time period, both groups were at loggerheads and there was no assimilation.

In the Partial Accommodation period, group relations were not as inimical as they had been in the previous one. There was sufficient cultural assimilation taking place to allow a certain amount of accommodation to each other. However, the Mexican American population was still very similar to Mexicans in language, culture, etc.
In the third time period examined, Towards Cultural Pluralism, Mexican Americans underwent an important rural to urban transformation. They also prospered economically during this time period, but since everyone else did also, there was little relative social mobility. Although Mexican Americans had some cultural assimilation after these transformations, Mexican Americans had, for the most part, not assimilated structurally.

Economic and demographic data were presented as a current profile of the assimilation of Mexican Americans today. The underlying assumption here was that if Mexican Americans had been assimilated into the dominant society, their economic and demographic profiles would be very similar to those of the dominant society. The profiles these data yielded indicated that, for the most part, there were important differences between Mexican Americans and the dominant society. From this the conclusion was reached that Mexican Americans are still not assimilated.

Hypothesis 1 - Cultural Heterogeneity

For this hypothesis, two dimensions of culture--language and family--were examined. The measures of these dimensions, Spanish and Familism, were statistically significant factors affecting the degree of Interaction with the dominant group by the Mexican American respondents. However, with the other measure of Structural Assimilation, preference for interaction, the associations with Spanish and Familism were not statistically significant, although they were in the expected direction. Therefore, there was statistically significant support for Gordon's
cultural heterogeneity hypothesis with Structural assimilation. Hence, the more similar the ethnic group is to the dominant groups with respect to cultural aspects, e.g., language and family, the more Structurally Assimilated it is.

Support was also found for the cultural heterogeneity hypothesis using Civic Assimilation. The cultural factors, Spanish and Familism, were statistically significant in their associations with all the indicators of Civic assimilation. These indicators were number of memberships in Mexican American and Anglo organizations and the frequency of attendance of these meetings. Hence, the greater the similarity is between the ethnic and dominant groups with respect to these cultural dimensions, the greater the number of memberships in Anglo organizations and the greater the frequency of attendance at these meetings. This greater similarity between the groups also resulted in a lower number of memberships in Mexican American organizations and lower frequency of attendance at meetings of these organizations. These results were indicative of less Civic assimilation. The type of organization, e.g., Mexican American or Anglo, was a crucial distinction to be made, as the associations with these were in opposite directions.

Hypothesis 2 - Value Consensus

The measure of Value Consensus employed here, American Traditionalism, failed to obtain statistically significant associations with either Structural or Civic Assimilation. None of the associations with any of the measures of the dependent variables were statistically
Although it was not possible to claim support for Gordon's theory, the evidence examined here did not discredit Gordon's hypothesis either. Therefore the results obtained here were inconclusive.

Hypothesis 3 - Stereotyping

Two measures of Stereotyping, Possibility of Integration and Perception of Prejudice, were used in the testing of this hypothesis. All the associations with the different measures of Structural and Civic assimilation were in the expected directions. However, only the associations between these two measures with Structural Assimilation were statistically significant. None of the Civic assimilation ones were significant. Here also the evidence did not contradict (but only failed to provide support for) the stereotyping hypothesis with Civic assimilation. Thus, there was support for Gordon's stereotyping hypothesis only with Structural Assimilation. Hence, the greater the stereotyping existing or believed to exist between the ethnic and the dominant group, led to less Structural assimilation for the ethnic group.

Hypothesis 4 - Civic versus Structural Assimilation

Structural Assimilation was found to be a better type of Assimilation than Civic based on the number of statistically significant associations and the strength of these associations. These findings were thus consistent with Gordon's assertion about Structural Assimilation being one of the two main types of Assimilation.
Sex Differences

The sex differences were examined here for two purposes, a methodological one and a substantive one. The methodological aspect involved determining if the sampling techniques at the household level seriously affected the results. To test this, the adult male and adult female subsamples were examined separately. This resulted in subsamples with only one person from each household. Therefore, it was possible to consider them as independent samples. The results indicated that males and females had very similar results when the type of assimilation was Civic. However, the female subsample tended to have statistically significantly stronger associations between Structural assimilation and the independent variables than did the male subsample. This might have been due to the females having more contact through their children with socializing agents such as education and recreation. Also, the greater contact with their children, may of itself facilitate assimilation for Mexican American females.

Hence, the results indicated that females were slightly more affected by assimilation pressures than were males. They also indicated that any biases resulting from sampling at the household levels were minimal.

Some Questions for Future Research

The present study has aided the field of race relations by initiating the movement towards empirically testing theories of race relations. Gordon's theory was the specific focus of the present study. However, there are other models of assimilation and group relations that
should also be empirically tested. A preponderant aspect of the present study is that it used a sample of Mexican Americans. Gordon's theory should be applied to samples of other ethnic groups.

The test conducted here was by no means an exhaustive treatment of Gordon. There are many aspects of Gordon's theory that could not be dealt with here. The number of variables and lack of attention to operationalization of variables make this model an extremely difficult one to test. Examples of this difficulty were evident in the present study. In the present test, only two of the seven types of Assimilation were tested. Thus there are five more still to be tested. Also, most of the societal, interaction and biosocial development variables were not examined.

The variables that were tested here, Value Consensus, Cultural Heterogeneity, and Stereotyping, still have dimensions that need to be tested. There are other values, cultural traits, and stereotypes such as beliefs related to working and religion, that still need to be tested. The dimensions that were used here could also bear a more thorough examination. Other dimensions of Spanish, e.g., when learned relative to English, and how much formal education in Spanish, and Familism, e.g., actual and ideal family roles, still need to be examined. Even the specific measures used here, would benefit from a more detailed analysis of the individual items to increase the accuracy of measurement of the indices. This is particularly true of American Traditionalism. The employment and education measures of Structural Assimilation also need examination.
The present research has also raised some questions concerning the sex differential. The examination of sex differences was here limited to adult males and females. Sex differences also need to be examined for a multi-generational and multi-household structure sample. An analysis taking into account basic controls such as income, and education is also imperative.

Generalizability was a critical concern here, as the sample was taken only from selected sites in their respective states. A representative sample of each state would be an important followup. The present sample was also limited to Mexican Americans, and would bear replicating with an accompanying Anglo sample, as well as with other ethnic groups. Finally, a study with a larger, more complete sample would permit a greater amount as well as more detailed analysis.

**Concluding Remarks**

The primary purpose of this work has been a vanguard one that traced the resistance of Mexican Americans to assimilation through history up to the present day. For the contemporary period, four hypotheses from Milton Gordon's Assimilation Theory were presented and empirically tested. These were tested on survey data from five different states, and thus applied to a wide spectrum of Mexican Americans. This empirical testing of Gordon has not been done elsewhere. The present study contributed to the study of Assimilation by: 1) focusing on empirical aspects of assimilation, 2) empirically testing portions of a major model of assimilation, 3) demonstrating that Mexican Americans have remained relatively unassimilated throughout their history, 4)
empirically testing the Value Consensus hypothesis and assimilation,
5) empirically testing the Cultural Heterogeneity hypothesis and assimilation, 6) empirically testing the Stereotyping hypothesis and assimilation, 7) examining the sex differential in assimilation, and 8) contributing to the body of research literature of Mexican Americans.

This has been the first step of empirically testing a model of Assimilation on Mexican Americans. It is hoped that this study will serve to orient other researchers in the field of race relations, and to further the empirical analysis of Gordon's theory.
APPENDIX A

INTEGRATION

We would like to have some information about your actual present contacts with Anglos in the local community. Please answer the following question. Do you interact regularly with Anglos in the following situations:
(Check only one answer for each statement.)(Card R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularly Interact With Anglos</th>
<th>Doesn't Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do (1)</td>
<td>Don't (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In the neighborhood?_____   _____   _____
2. In church?_____            _____   _____
3. As close friends?_____     _____   _____
4. In stores (shopping)?_____  _____   _____
5. In work?_____              _____   _____
6. In school?_____            _____   _____
7. Your children playing?_____ _____   _____

Nos gustaría tener información de sus contactos actuales con los anglos en la comunidad local. Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas.

¿Tiene contacto regularmente con anglos en las siguientes situaciones? (Marcar (✓) solamente un lugar por cada declaración.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacto regular</th>
<th>No Aplica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si (1)</td>
<td>No (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ¿En la vecindad (barrio)? _____   _____   _____
2. ¿En la iglesia? _____            _____   _____
3. ¿Cómo amigos íntimos? _____     _____   _____
4. ¿En tiendas (haciendo compras)? _____   _____   _____
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contacto regular</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sí (1)</td>
<td>No (2)</td>
<td>No Aplica (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>¿En el trabajo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>¿En la escuela?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>¿Cuándo juegan sus niños?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PREFERENCE

Now we would like to know some things about how you feel about group relations in this community. Please answer the following questions.

If it were possible, would you prefer: (Read this statement prior to each item.)

(Circle one number for each statement.)

Mexican Americans OR Mexican Americans and Anglos
Only

1. To go to church with 1 2

2. To have my children attend school with 1 2

3. Outside of school, to have my children play with 1 2

4. To live in a neighborhood with 1 2

5. To have close, personal friendships with 1 2

6. To buy from stores owned by 1 2

7. To have your children date 1 2

Nos gustaría saber que siente Ud. acerca de las relaciones de grupo en esta comunidad. Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas.

Si fuera posible, Ud. preferiría: (Lea esta declaración antes de cada oración.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>De origen mejicano</th>
<th>De origen Meji-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mexican American,</td>
<td>cano y Americanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano) solamente</td>
<td>(Anglos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Circule un número para cada oración)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Ir a la iglesia con los**
   - 1
   - 2

2. **Tener sus hijos yendo a la escuela con los**
   - 1
   - 2

3. **Que fuera de la escuela, sus hijos jugaran con los**
   - 1
   - 2

4. **Vivir en un barrio con los**
   - 1
   - 2

5. **Tener buena amistad personal con los**
   - 1
   - 2

6. **Comprar en tiendas propiedad de los**
   - 1
   - 2

7. **Que sus hijos salieran con las hijas**
   - 1
   - 2

8. **Que sus hijas salieran con los hijos**
   - 1
   - 2
APPENDIX C

ORGANIZATION

We would like to get some information about the formal organizations and clubs you belong to, such as church, unions, service clubs, fraternities, sport groups, and so on. A formal group will normally have officers and dues.

1. What formal groups or organizations do you belong to?

2. How many members are of Mexican American background?

Nos gustaría obtener alguna información acerca de las organizaciones formales y clubes a los que Ud. pertenece, tales como iglesias, sindicatos, asociaciones, hermandades, grupos deportivos y demás. Un grupo formal normalmente tiene oficiales y cuotas.

1. ¿A qué grupos formales u organizaciones pertenece Ud.?

2. ¿Cuántos de los miembros son de origen Mexico-Americano?
APPENDIX D

WORK

Please tell me how important each of these characteristics of your job is to you.

From the numbers shown below select the one that best describes your level of importance with each of the following things about your job and place it in the blank following each statement.

Levels of Importance

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The work is interesting, stimulating, and gives a sense of accomplishment. 
   #___

2. The work provides a challenge. 
   #___

3. The job provides plenty of prestige. 
   #___

4. The job provides plenty of opportunity for advancement. 
   #___

5. The employment is regular, steady, and dependable. 
   #___

6. All employees are treated fairly, and are given an equal chance. 
   #___

7. Co-workers are friendly, enjoyable, and interesting. 
   #___

8. The job provides enough flexibility in schedule (weeks, days, hours of work) to not interfere seriously with leading an enjoyable life and responsibilities. 
   #___

9. Total income from employment is satisfactory. 
   #___

10. The rate of pay per hour of work is satisfactory. 
    #___

11. The job is free of safety or health hazards. 
    #___
Thinking of your current job, how would you rate your satisfaction with the following characteristics.

From the numbers shown below select the one that best describes your level of satisfaction with each of the following things about your job and place it in the blank following each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) (6) (4) (2) (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely Satisfied | Satisfied | Mixed | Dissatisfied | Extremely Dissatisfied

1. The work is interesting, stimulating, and gives a sense of accomplishment.  
   #

2. The work provides a challenge.  
   #

3. The job provides plenty of prestige.  
   #

4. The job provides plenty of opportunity for advancement.  
   #

5. The employment is regular, steady, and dependable.  
   #

6. All employees are treated fairly, and are given an equal chance.  
   #

7. Co-workers are friendly, enjoyable, and interesting.  
   #

8. The job provides enough flexibility in schedule (weeks, days, hours of work) to not interfere seriously with leading an enjoyable life and responsibilities.  
   #

9. Total income from employment is satisfactory.  
   #

10. The rate of pay per hour is satisfactory.  
    #

11. The job is free of safety or health hazards.  
    #
Por favor dígame que tan importantes son cada una de estas características de su trabajo.

Usando la Escala de Importancia que sigue, escoga el número que mejor describa su nivel de importancia para cada cosa y escriba el número en la línea que sigue cada declaración.

**ESCALA DE IMPORTANCIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Mixto</td>
<td>Importante</td>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importancia</td>
<td>Importancia</td>
<td>Importante</td>
<td>Importante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. El trabajo es interesante, estimulante, y dá la sensación de cumplimiento. #

2. El trabajo proporciona una demanda. #

3. El trabajo proporciona prestigio en abundancia. #

4. El trabajo proporciona suficientes oportunidades para avanzar. #

5. El empleo es regular, seguro y digno de confianza. #

6. Todos los empleados son tratados justamente y les dan oportunidad igual. #

7. Los compañeros del trabajo son amigables, divertidos, e interesantes. #

8. El trabajo proporciona flexibilidad en horario (semanas, días, horas de trabajo) que no interfiere seriamente con tener una vida divertida, ni con las responsibilidades. #

9. El sueldo total es satisfactorio. #

10. La cantidad de sueldo por hora es satisfactorio. #

11. El trabajo no es peligroso. #
Pensando en su trabajo actual, ¿cómo valoraría su satisfacción de las siguientes características?

Usando la Escala de Satisfacción que sigue, escoga el número que mejor describa su nivel de satisfacción para cada cosa y escriba el número en la línea que sigue cada declaración.

**ESCALA DE SATISFACCIÓN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente Insatisfecho Insatisfecho Mixto Satisfecho Satisfecho Extremadamente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. El trabajo es interesante, estimulante, y dá la sensación de cumplimiento. 
   #
2. El trabajo proporciona una demanda. 
   #
   #
4. El trabajo proporciona suficientes oportunidades para avanzar. 
   #
5. El empleo es regular, seguro y digno de confianza. 
   #
6. Todos los empleados son tratados justamente y les dan oportunidad igual. 
   #
7. Los compañeros del trabajo son amigables, divertidos, e interesantes. 
   #
8. El trabajo proporciona flexibilidad en horario (semanas, días, horas de trabajo) que no interfiere seriamente con tener una vida divertida, ni con las responsabilidades. 
   #
   #
10. La cantidad de sueldo por hora es satisfactorio. 
    #
11. El trabajo no es peligroso. 
    #
APPENDIX E

AMERICAN TRADITIONALISM
We would like to know how you feel about some important social issues in our country. Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

(Check only the most appropriate blank in each case.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private property is sacred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Duty comes before pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People should save money regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am tired of hearing people attack patriotism, morality, and other American values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Police should not hesitate to use force to keep order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The federal government should stay out of local and state affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women have the same right to a job career as men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use of marijuana should be legalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Competition creates excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex education of children should be done at home, not in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Too much attention is paid to minority groups today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. You should obey all laws whether you agree with them or not.

13. Religious beliefs need to be strengthened.
A nostros nos gustaría saber que siente Ud. acerca de algunos eventos sociales de importancia en nuestro país. Por favor díganos en qué medida está Ud. de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las declaraciones siguientes. (Marcar (✓) solamente un lugar por cada declaración)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremadamente de Acuerdo</th>
<th>De Acuerdo</th>
<th>En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Extremadamente En Desacuerdo</th>
<th>No estoy Seguro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. La propiedad privada es sagrada.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. El deber viene antes que el placer.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. La gente debe ahorrar dinero regularmente.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Estoy cansado de oír a la gente atacando al patriotismo, moralidad y otros valores americanos.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. La policía no debe resistir (titubear) al usar la fuerza para mantener el orden.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. El gobierno federal no debe meterse en los asuntos locales y del estado.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Las mujeres tienen el mismo derecho que los hombres de tener una carrera (profesión).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. El uso de la marihuana debe ser legalizado.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Competencia crea excelencia.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. La educación sexual de los niños debe ser en la casa y no en la escuela.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A los grupos minoritarios se les da demasiada atención.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Ud. debe obedecer todas las leyes aunque esté de acuerdo con ellas o no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremadamente</th>
<th>de</th>
<th>De</th>
<th>En</th>
<th>Extremadamente</th>
<th>No estoy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seguro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Creencias religiosas deben ser reforzadas.
APPENDIX F

SPANISH

Please answer the following questions about the use of Spanish in different situations.

Do you speak Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. Yes (How well? Very well ____, Good ____ , Not well ____ )
2. No

If you answered "No," go to Question 60. If you answered "Yes," you do speak Spanish, answer the following questions:

What language do you usually use when speaking with members of your family? (Circle one number.) (Card T)

1. English  2. Spanish  3. About the same amount of both

What language do you usually use when talking with your close friends in your neighborhood? (Circle one number.)

1. English  2. Spanish  3. About the same amount of both

What language do you usually use when speaking with others from outside the neighborhood (at work, at school, or when shopping for example)? (Circle one number.)

1. English  2. Spanish  3. About the same amount of both

What language do you usually use when speaking with fellow workers on the job? (Circle one number.)

1. English  2. Spanish  3. About the same amount of both  4. Do not work

Can you read Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. Yes (How well? Very well ____ , Good ____ , Not well ____ )
2. No
Can you write Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. Yes (How well? Very well ____, Good ____ , Not well ____)

2. No

Do you, or will you, encourage your children to learn Spanish well? (Circle one number.)

1. Yes 2. No

How many of the radio programs you listen to are broadcast in Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. None 2. Some 3. More-than-half 4. All

How many of the TV programs you watch are broadcast in Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. None 2. Some 3. More-than-half 4. All

How many of the magazines and newspapers which you read are in Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1. None 2. Some 3. More-than-half 4. All
Ahora, le quisieramos hacer unas preguntas sobre el uso de su idioma. Favor de contestar las siguientes preguntas sobre el uso del idioma español.

¿Habla Ud. español? (Circule un número.)

1. Si (¿Qué tan bien? Muy bien ____ , Bien ____ , No muy bien ____)
2. No

Si su respuesta es "no" siga a la pregunta 60. Si su respuesta es "si," que habla español, contesta las siguientes preguntas:

¿Qué idioma usa Ud. **generalmente** cuando habla con su familia? (Circule un número.)

1. inglés 2. español 3. casi mitad y mitad

¿Qué idioma usa Ud. **generalmente** cuando habla con los amigos de su barrio? (Circule un número.)

1. inglés 2. español 3. casi mitad y mitad

¿Qué idioma usa Ud. **generalmente** cuando habla con personas fuera de su barrio (en el trabajo, la escuela, de compras)? (Circule un número.)

1. inglés 2. español 3. casi mitad y mitad

¿Qué idioma usa Ud. cuando habla con los compañeros de trabajo? (Circule un número.)

1. inglés 2. español 3. casi mitad 4. No trabajo y mitad
¿Puede usted leer en español? (Encierre en un círculo un número.)
1. Si (¿Qué tan bien? Muy bien ___, Bien ___, No muy bien ___)
2. No

¿Puede usted escribir en español? (Encierre en un círculo un número.)
1. Si (¿Qué tan bien? Muy bien ___, Bien ___, No muy bien ___)
2. No

¿Ha animado usted o va a animar a sus hijos a que aprenden bien el español? (Encierre en un círculo un número.)
1. Si 2. No

¿Cuántos de los programas de radio que Ud. oye son en español? (Circule un número.)

¿Cuántos de los programas que Ud. ve en la televisión son en español? (Circule un número.)

¿Cuántas revistas y periódicos que Ud. leé son en español? (Circule un número.)
APPENDIX G

FAMILISM

We would like to know how important each of these things is to you. (Card G)

(Circle only one number for each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important To Me</th>
<th>Somewhat Important To Me</th>
<th>Important To Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Generally, I like our family to spend evenings together. 1 2 3

2. I want a house where our family can spend time together. 1 2 3

3. I want a location which would make it easy for relatives to get together. 1 2 3

4. I want a house with enough room so our parents could move in with us if they wanted to. (If parents are deceased, mark 9) 1 2 3 9

Quisieramos saber que tan importantes son estas cosas para usted. (Ponga un círculo alrededor de un número)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No es importante para mi</th>
<th>Algo importante para mi</th>
<th>Importante para mi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Generalmente, me gusta que nuestra familia pase juntos el anochecer. 1 2 3

2. Quiero una casa en la que nuestra familia pase algún tiempo juntos. 1 2 3

3. Quiero una localidad que sea fácil para reunirse los parientes. 1 2 3
4. Quiero una casa para que nuestros padres se puedan mudar con nosotros si así lo quieren. (si los padres han muerto, marque "9")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No es importante para mí</th>
<th>Algo importante para mí</th>
<th>Importante para mí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are ten statements about family members. Choose the answer that most accurately describes your family the way it actually is. There are no right or wrong answers.

(Circle only one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely False</th>
<th>More False Than True</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>More True Than False</th>
<th>Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Every family member looks out for himself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Each family member knows what he is to do and should do it without any help from others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The father puts his children before his job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teenagers help their parents with their work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The family is more important than its individual members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The mother makes sure that her family is happy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The parents stick up for their teenagers when the teen gets into trouble at school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The teenager defends his parents if his friends start calling his mother and father bad names.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The parents spank their children sometimes when they misbehave. | Definitely False | More False Than True | Undecided | More True Than False | Definitely True |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The teenagers do things with their family rather than on their own. | Definitely False | More False Than True | Undecided | More True Than False | Definitely True |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abajo hay diez declaraciones acerca de miembros de familia. Escoja la contestación que describa exactamente a su familia, la forma en que realmente es. No hay preguntas correctas o incorrectas. (Ponga un círculo alrededor de un número.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitivamente falso</th>
<th>Más falso que cierto</th>
<th>Indeciso</th>
<th>Más cierto que falso</th>
<th>Definitivamente cierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cada miembro de la familia ve colamente por él mismo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cada miembro de la familia sabe lo que debe de hacer y lo hace sin la ayuda de otros.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Para el padre, sus hijos están antes que su trabajo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Los adolescentes les ayudan a los padres con su trabajo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. La familia es más importante que sus miembros individuales.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. La madre se asegura de que su familia es feliz.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Los padres respaldan a los adolescentes cuando ellos se meten en problemas en la escuela.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Los adolescentes defienden a sus padres si sus amigos empiezan a decirles a su papa y mama nombres groseros.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitivamente</td>
<td>Más falso que cierto</td>
<td>Indeciso</td>
<td>Más cierto que falso</td>
<td>Definitivamente cierto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Los padres les pegan a sus hijos a veces cuando ellos no se portan bien.

10. Los adolescentes prefieren hacer cosas con su familia que individualmente.
People define the role of a good family member in many ways. Below are ten statements about family members. Choose the answer that most accurately describes your opinion about each statement. There are no right or wrong answers.

(Circle only one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely False</th>
<th>More False Than True</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>More True Than False</th>
<th>Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Every family member should look out for himself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Each family member should know what he is to do and should do it without any help from others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A good father puts his children before his job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teenagers should help their parents with their work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The family is more important than its individual members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A good mother makes sure her family is happy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A good parent sticks up for his teenage when the teen gets into trouble at school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A teenager should defend his parents if his friends start calling his mother and father bad names.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A parent who hits his children is a bad parent.

It is better for a teenager to things with his family, rather than out on his own.

(Circle only one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>definitely false</th>
<th>more false than true</th>
<th>undecided</th>
<th>more true than false</th>
<th>definitely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. A parent who hits his children is a bad parent.

10. It is better for a teenager to do things with his family, rather than out on his own.
La gente define la función de un buen miembro de familia de muchas formas. Abajo, hay diez declaraciones acerca de miembros de familia. Escoja la contestación que describe mejor su opinión acerca de cada declaración. No hay contestaciones correctas o incorrectas. (Ponga un círculo alrededor de un número.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitivamente falso</th>
<th>Más falso que cierto</th>
<th>Indeciso</th>
<th>Más cierto que falso</th>
<th>Definitivamente cierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cada miembro de familia debería ver por sí mismo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cada miembro de familia debería saber lo que está haciendo y debería hacerlo sin la ayuda de otros.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Para un buen padre, sus hijos están antes que su trabajo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Los adolescentes deberían ayudar a los padres con su trabajo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. La familia es más importante que sus miembros individuales.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Una buena madre se asegura de que su familia es feliz.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unos buenos padres respaldan a los adolescentes cuando ellos se meten en problemas en la escuela.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Enunciado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Un adolescente debería defender a sus padres si sus amigos empiezan a decirles a su papá y mamá nombres groseros.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Unos padres que golpean a sus hijos son malos padres.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Es mejor para el adolescente hacer cosas con su familia que individualmente.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

PERCEPTION OF PREJUDICE

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. (Circle one number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &quot;Anglos around here judge Mexican Americans by the worst type of Mexican Americans.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;Anglos around here don't like to be around Mexican Americans.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;Anglos around here don't like Anglo kids to play with Mexican American kids.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;Anglos around here never let you forget they are Anglo and you are Mexican American.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &quot;Anglos around here think they are cleaner than Mexican Americans.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Por favor díganos en qué grado está Ud. de acuerdo o desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones. (Indique las cuatro alternativas al entrevistado antes de las declaraciones. Circule uno para cada uno. FUERCE UNA RESPUESTA.)

1. "Los americanos (Anglos) de aquí juzgan a los de origen mexicano (Mexican-American, Chicano) por el peor tipo de ellos."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Tiende a estar de acuerdo</td>
<td>Tiende a estar en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Extremadamente en desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. "A los americanos (Anglos) de aquí no les gusta andar con los de origen mexicano (Mexican-American, Chicano)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Tiende a estar de acuerdo</td>
<td>Tiende a estar en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Extremadamente en desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. "A los americanos (Anglos) de aquí no les gusta que los niños americanos jueguen con los niños de origen mexicano (Mexican-American, Chicano)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Tiende a estar de acuerdo</td>
<td>Tiende a estar en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Extremadamente en desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. "Los americanos (Anglos) nunca le dejan olvidar que ellos son americanos y Ud. es de origen mexicano (Mexican-American, Chicano)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Tiende a estar de acuerdo</td>
<td>Tiende a estar en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Extremadamente en desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. "Los americanos (Anglos) piensan que ellos son más limpios que los de origen mexicano (Mexican-American, Chicano)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremadamente</td>
<td>Tiende a estar de acuerdo</td>
<td>Tiende a estar en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Extremadamente en desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

INTERACTION WITH ANGLOS

Which of the things mentioned below do you think are really possible now where you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Not Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For Mexican Americans and Anglos to attend church services together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For Mexican American and Anglo children to attend the same school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For Mexican American and Anglo children to play together outside of school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For Mexican Americans and Anglos to live close together in the same neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For Mexican Americans and Anglos to have close, personal friendships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To buy from stores owned by Mexican Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. For Mexican Americans and Anglo children to date.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

252
Dónde Ud. vive, ¿cuáles de las cosas mencionadas abajo son realmente posibles? (Circule un número para cada oración.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Posible</th>
<th>No es posible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Que los de origen Mejicano (Mexican American, Chicanos) y los Americanos (Anglos) atiendan los servicios religiosos juntos.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Que los niños de origen Mejicano (Mexican American, Chicanos) y los niños Americanos (Anglos) vayan a la misma escuela.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Que los niños de origen Mejicano (Mexican American, Chicanos) y los niños Americanos (Anglos) jueguen juntos fuera de la escuela.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Que los de origen Mejicano (Mexican American, Chicanos) y los Americanos (Anglos) vivan juntos en el mismo barrio.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Que los de origen Mejicano (Mexican American, Chicanos) y los Americanos (Anglos) tengan buena amistad personal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comprar en tiendas propiedad de Americanos (Anglos).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Que sus hijos salgan con las hijas de Americanos (Anglos).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Que sus hijas salgan con los hijos de Americanos (Anglos).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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