

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8302550

**Torres, Marcia G.**

**CHARACTERISTICS AND COPING STYLES OF YOUNG HISPANIC  
MOTHERS INVOLVED IN EDUCATION AND/OR WORK: A DESCRIPTIVE  
PROFILE**

*City University of New York*

**Ph.D.**

**1982**

**University  
Microfilms  
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**Copyright 1982**

**by**

**Torres, Marcia G.**

**All Rights Reserved**



CHARACTERISTICS AND COPING STYLES OF YOUNG HISPANIC MOTHERS  
INVOLVED IN EDUCATION AND/OR WORK: A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE

by

MARCIA G. TORRES

A dissertation submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Psychology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy, The City  
University of New York.

1982

© COPYRIGHT BY  
MARCIA G. TORRES

1982

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

6/23/82  
date

L. J. Gould  
Chairman of Examining Committee

[Signature]  
date

[Signature]  
Executive Officer

Laurence J. Gould, Ph. D.

Sally J. Andrade, Ph. D.

Anderson J. Franklin, Ph. D.  
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Dedico esta obra a la memoria de  
mis padres

Dolores Munguía Macías de Torres  
Emilio Torres Ramirez

y

a la nueva generación de La Familia.

## Abstract

### CHARACTERISTICS AND COPING STYLES OF YOUNG HISPANIC MOTHERS INVOLVED IN EDUCATION AND/OR WORK: A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE

by

Marcia G. Torres

Advisor: Professor Laurence J. Gould

The objective of this study was to develop a profile of young Hispanic mothers who were enrolled in school and/or employed in the labor force. This consisted of their general characteristics, their educational, occupational, and motherhood experiences (actual accomplishments, attitudes, ideals, aspirations, expectations, role models and environmental barriers in each category). Subjects' sense of individual control over their lives as well as their family role attitudes were also explored.

The sample consisted of all mothers (44 Hispanics, 114 Blacks, and 181 Whites) who were employed and/or enrolled and who were interviewed in the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Participation. The original survey used a national sample of American youth between the ages of 14 and 22. It oversampled for Hispanic, Black, and White lower socioeconomic status youth.

All questions relating to the areas of interest to the present study were drawn from the National Longitudinal Survey list of items. Chi-Square analysis was used to determine significant response differences across the three

groups. Additionally Chi-Square analysis with Bonferroni Protection was applied where appropriate. Although responses from all three groups were examined, the main focus of the study was maintained on the Hispanic group.

Through its cross-cultural perspective the study supported more recent research which indicates that young women facing the considerable responsibilities of motherhood do aspire to achieve. The results did not support the assumptions in the literature that Hispanic women are more rigid about family roles than are women from other cultures, nor that Hispanic women have a more externalized sense of control. The findings did add support to the hypothesis that Hispanic women face external barriers some of which they share with the other two cultures, others only with Blacks, and still others they carry alone (e.g., language, stressors of immigration, etc).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work upon which this dissertation is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 99-1-1566-33-3 of the Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency. Much of the basic computation and analyses were performed at the Hispanic Youth Employment Research Center of the National Council of La Raza, Washington, D. C. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Edward T. Rincon and the HYERC staff for their assistance. Research support funds from the Office of Advanced Research in Hispanic Education, The University of Texas at Austin, are also acknowledged with gratitude.

Each one of the individuals who served on my dissertation committee has significantly participated in a number of important aspects of my professional life. My associations with Dr. Andrade and Dr. Gould extend the farthest into the past. With each of them I have enjoyed a variety of opportunities to work on a number of professionally interesting and stimulating projects. I consider this a special opportunity to express my appreciation to them.

My association with Dr. Franklin and Dr. Wachtel began with my initiation to the doctoral program. I have enjoyed

many stimulating conversations as well as formal classes with these professors particularly in the areas of research and social issues.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Neal Ryan of the New York Psychiatric Institute for invaluable assistance particularly on the statistical intricacies of this dissertation.

Finally, I come to Dr. Arthur Arkin whose wisdom, elegance, sensitivity, and generosity graced much of my learning experience at the Psychological Center. I will treasure many memories that I have of him.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .   | 1    |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .                                |      |
| A. Women: Motherhood and Achievement<br>Motivation . . . . .          | 9    |
| B. Hispanic Women: Motherhood and<br>Achievement Motivation . . . . . | 22   |
| 1. General Characteristics . . . . .                                  | 23   |
| 2. Psychological Issues . . . . .                                     | 32   |
| a. Self Concept . . . . .   | 32   |
| b. Locus of Control. . . . .  | 38   |
| c. Educational and Work<br>Aspirations . . . . .                      | 39   |
| d. Attitudes About Family Roles. . .                                  | 43   |
| 3. External Barriers . . . . .  | 48   |
| a. Educational Settings. . . . .                                      | 49   |
| b. World of Work . . . . .  | 52   |
| C. Summary of the Literature Review. . . . .                          | 54   |
| III. PROCEDURE . . . . .  | 58   |
| A. Selection of the Sample . . . . .                                  | 59   |
| 1. National Longitudinal Survey. . . . .                              | 59   |
| 2. Achievement-Oriented Hispanic<br>Mother Sample . . . . .           | 60   |
| 3. Cross-Cultural Sample . . . . .                                    | 61   |
| B. Method of Analysis. . . . .  | 61   |

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| IV. RESULTS . . . . .                                  | 63   |
| A. General Characteristics . . . . .                   | 65   |
| 1. Employment/Enrollment . . . . .                     | 66   |
| 2. Culture and Language. . . . .                       | 68   |
| 3. Religiosity . . . . .                               | 72   |
| 4. Age . . . . .                                       | 78   |
| 5. Family Size and Marital Status. . . . .             | 78   |
| B. Education . . . . .                                 | 81   |
| 1. School Enrollment and Achievement . . . . .         | 81   |
| 2. School Aspirations and Expectations . . . . .       | 84   |
| 3. School Attitudes. . . . .                           | 91   |
| 4. Role Models for School Achievement . . . . .        | 99   |
| C. Occupation. . . . .                                 | 99   |
| 1. Occupational Aspirations and Expectations . . . . . | 101  |
| 2. Occupational Attitudes. . . . .                     | 104  |
| 3. Occupational Barriers . . . . .                     | 121  |
| 4. Occupational Role Models. . . . .                   | 128  |
| D. Motherhood. . . . .                                 | 138  |
| 1. Actual Family Size. . . . .                         | 138  |
| 2. Ideals, Aspirations and Expectations. . . . .       | 138  |
| 3. Role Models for Motherhood. . . . .                 | 141  |
| E. Other Psychological Factors . . . . .               | 142  |
| 1. Family Role Attitudes . . . . .                     | 142  |
| 2. Sense of Individual Control . . . . .               | 146  |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| V. DISCUSSION . . . . .                                 | 150  |
| 1. Summary of the Hispanic Mother<br>Profile . . . . .  | 150  |
| 2. Relation to Other Research . . . . .                 | 155  |
| 3. Recommendations for Research<br>and Policy . . . . . | 156  |
| APPENDIX A . . . . .                                    | 160  |
| REFERENCES . . . . .                                    | 173  |

LIST OF TABLES

|  | <u>Table</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------|-------------|
| <b>A. General Characteristics</b>  |              |             |
| NLS Background Information . . . . .                                     | 1            | 67          |
| Country of Birth . . . . .   | 2            | 67          |
| Residence at Age 14. . . . .   | 3            | 70          |
| Language Other Than English Spoken<br>at Home During Childhood . . . . . | 4,5          | 70,71       |
| First or Only Racial/Ethnic Origin . . . . .                             | 6            | 73          |
| Religion in which Respondent<br>was Raised . . . . .                     | 7            | 74          |
| Present Religious Affiliation. . . . .                                   | 8            | 75          |
| Frequency of Religious Attendance. . . . .                               | 9            | 76          |
| Age. . . . .   | 10           | 77          |
| Number of Children . . . . .   | 11           | 79          |
| Marital Status . . . . .   | 12           | 79          |
| <b>B. Education</b>  |              |             |
| <b>Achievement</b>   |              |             |
| School Enrollment. . . . .   | 13           | 82          |
| Highest Grade Completed. . . . .   | 14           | 83          |
| High School Diploma. . . . .   | 15           | 85          |
| <b>Aspirations &amp; Expectations</b>                                    |              |             |
| Highest Grade Respondent<br>would like to complete . . . . .             | 16           | 86          |
| Highest Grade Respondent<br>Expects to Complete. . . . .                 | 17           | 86          |
| School Barriers. . . . .   | 18           | 88          |
| School Attitudes . . . . .   | 19           | 90          |
| <b>Role Models</b>   |              |             |
| Highest Grade Completed<br>by Respondent's Mother . . . . .              | 20           | 92          |
| Highest Grade Completed<br>by Respondent's Father . . . . .              | 21           | 92          |
| Number of Living Siblings. . . . .                                       | 22           | 94          |
| Number of Siblings Currently<br>attending or Enrolled . . . . .          | 23           | 95          |
| Highest Grade Completed<br>by Oldest Sibling. . . . .                    | 24           | 96          |
| Highest Grade Completed<br>by Most Recent Spouse. . . . .                | 25           | 96          |
| Highest Grade Closest Friend<br>Would Like to Complete . . . . .         | 26           | 98          |

|  | <u>Table</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------|-------------|
| C. Occupation  |              |             |
| Achievement  |              |             |
| Occupation at Current Job . . . . .                                    | 27           | 100         |
| Class of Worker at Current Job. . . . .                                | 28           | 100         |
| Aspirations and Expectations   |              |             |
| Occupational Expectations<br>in 5 Years. . . . .                       | 29           | 102         |
| Expected Ability to Achieve<br>Occupational Aspiration at 35 . . . . . | 30           | 103         |
| Work Attitudes   |              |             |
| Work Commitment . . . . .  | .31-36       | 105         |
| Work Benefits . . . . .  | .37-56       | 108         |
| Work Satisfaction . . . . .  | .57-59       | 119         |
| Barriers: Problems Getting Good Job                                    |              |             |
| Various Problems. . . . .  | .60-63       | 123         |
| Discrimination. . . . .  | .64-67       | 126         |
| World of Work . . . . .  | .68-76       | 129         |
| Role Models  |              |             |
| Occupation of Longest Job<br>During 1978-Mother/Stepmother . . . . .   | .77,78       | 133         |
| Occupation of Longest Job<br>During 1978-Father/Stepfather . . . . .   | .79,80       | 135         |
| Occupation-Most Recent Spouse . . . . .                                | .81,82       | 136         |
| D. Motherhood  |              |             |
| Actual Family Size. . . . .  | 83           | 139         |
| Ideals, Aspirations, Expectations                                      |              |             |
| Number of Children considered<br>Ideal for a Family. . . . .           | 84           | 139         |
| Number of Children Desired. . . . .                                    | 85           | 139         |
| Total Number of Children That<br>Respondent Expects to Have . . . . .  | 86           | 140         |
| Motherhood Role Model: Number of<br>Siblings. . . . .                  | 87           | 140         |
| E. Other Psychological Factors   |              |             |
| Family Role Attitudes . . . . .  | .88-95       | 143         |
| Sense of Individual Control . . . . .                                  | .96-95       | 147         |

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a striking pattern in the United States population growth rates. The Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment projected the following growth patterns between 1980 and 1990: Whites 7.5%, Blacks 12.2%, and Hispanics 28.0% (The Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, 1980). Given these figures, one would expect the complexion of the U. S. job market to be changing accordingly, i.e., to include larger numbers of Blacks and Hispanics. This is not, however, the case. For example, while Hispanic and Black young people comprise 19.7% of the youth population, they represent 29.4% of unemployed youth. The Task Force identified four groups which have particular difficulties in the critical school-to-work transition: women, dropouts, minorities, and youth from poor families. The Task Force also pointed out that individuals who belong to two or more of these groups have a higher chance to be unemployed.

These facts are particularly important in that 74% of the national total of Hispanic women is comprised primarily of Mexican American and Puerto Rican women who exist in highly stressful economic circumstances and who have limited possibilities for any upward mobility due to their lack of education and job opportunities (Andrade, 1982).

(Brown, Rosen, Hill, and Olivas, 1980) summarized data from the U. S. Department of Commerce and documented that, of the employed population age 14 and over in 1977, the Hispanic female subgroup had the lowest median income, the highest percent of income below \$5,000, and the lowest percent with income over \$25,000. Furthermore other Commerce Department data showed that Hispanic females' school non-enrollment rates jumped from 12.2% at ages 16-17 to 39.6% at ages 18-19. Thus, it is obvious that to be Hispanic and female is to be at significantly high risk for less education, higher unemployment rates, and lower pay.

Within social science research up to the present time, two different perspectives have been utilized to conceptualize the life experiences of Hispanic women. The predominant view has consisted of focusing on the intrapsychic, familial and cultural group characteristics which have been viewed as making members of this group "less educable" and "less employable." This view has frequently labeled Hispanic women as highly motivated to marry and have children and as non-desirous of upward mobility in terms of college or employment. Such a culturally oriented interpretation is seen in the following conclusion about Mexican American women:

Women still find their major role and validation in their families, as wives and especially as mothers. Higher education and careers are still alien to many Mexican-American women. Even a working wife is considered an embarrassment by most Mexican-American men. (Moore, 1970, pp. 116-117)

Within this research orientation there has also been a tendency to portray the Mexican American woman as significantly pathological in her psychological development. For example, (Kiev, 1968) suggested that the Mexican American female develops complex psychological problems because of the unrealistic standards set for her by her parents and culture. Kiev concluded that she develops certain "characteristic feminine traits": self-belittlement, depressive trends, and a strong masochistic tendency.

In response to these kinds of studies and interpretations, a second perspective has emerged in the social sciences. For more than a decade, Hispanic scholars, human service providers and social scientists have identified major flaws in the social sciences' interpretation of Hispanic families (Montiel, 1970; Murillo, 1971; Romano-V., 1968; Sotomayor, 1971; Suarez, 1973; Vaca, 1970). Hispanic feminists have undercut stereotypes about Hispanic women and have challenged both social scientists and Hispanic men to acknowledge the realities of Hispanic women's history, their oppressed social situation and their participation in Hispanic communities (Baca Zinn, 1975; Chapa & Andrade, 1976; Cotera, 1976; Miranda King, 1978; Nieto-Gomez, 1973).

In her discussion of social science research on Chicano families, Baca Zinn (1979) concludes that its most serious conceptual and empirical shortcoming has been the reduction

of family dynamics to crude accounts of cultural values alone. This interpretation can be generalized to a large proportion of Hispanic family research. The implicit assumption of the investigators' definition of research issues and the interpretation of resultant findings is that Hispanic culture determines much, if not all, of the attitudes and behaviors of Hispanic men, women, and children.

The investigators who have sought to develop an alternative paradigm for the study of Hispanic families have expanded their analyses to include issues which are social, institutional and economic in nature. they have attempted to examine issues such as the ravages of discrimination, poverty and racism. In a review of previous research on the Mexican American, Staton concluded:

Many factors such as religion, social status, class, language, education, employment, physical and social mobility, acculturation, and assimilation are not appropriately considered in the literature presently available. Consequently, empirical research which considers such factors must be undertaken before a true description and understanding of the Mexican-American family can be obtained. (Staton, 1972, p. 329)

At this point, there has been significant basic documentation of the effects of these more environmental or ecological variables, as well as the diversity among Hispanics. See, for example, the studies in Melville (1980, Baca Zinn (1980), Portes and Bach (1980), and Achor (1978).

To summarize, the psychocultural perspective of the Hispanic female has relied almost exclusively on intrapsychic and cultural interpretations. Using these two orientations, this perspective has attempted to explain the Hispanic woman's experiences in her family, at school and on the job. Its lack of success and narrowly oriented models must be challenged empirically and confronted with more conceptually sound theories of Hispanic family development. Such an orientation has been clearly articulated by a more contemporary, interdisciplinary group of researchers as outlined above. The limited amount of information available on Hispanic adolescents, particularly with respect to young Hispanic women's concerns in the area of marriage, reproduction and other options (Andrade 1981-a and 1981-b), underscores the importance of this research project. An impressive amount of data has been made available from the Department of Labor and through the conduit of the Council of La Raza's Hispanic Youth Employment Research Center. The data from the National Longitudinal Survey uniquely lends itself to the process of exploring and analyzing critical factors affecting the educational and employment needs of adolescent Hispanic women, both from a psychological and an ecological perspective.

Within the general grouping of Hispanic females, there has been one particular facet of their experience which has been discussed at length in the literature that of the

maternal role. This facet for Mexican American women has been documented by such objective data as the fact that Mexican-origin women tend to have about 47 percent more children than other women (Bradshaw & Bean, 1972), an extremely high percentage of Mexican American women do not complete high school, and the median age of Mexican-origin women is 21.3 years (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980).

Such statistical findings have been followed by a barrage of interpretations, usually concluding that at the core of these facts lies a limiting, and, by its essence, deficient culture which produces and fosters anti-intellectual attitudes in its females. For example, Clark (1959) described Mexican American residents of a poverty-stricken barrio in northern California as believing that "...child-bearing is both a privilege and an obligation of married women." One of the frequently mentioned cultural concepts to which social scientists have referred in the past is the concept of "familism," i.e., the Mexican American woman is viewed as defining herself almost exclusively in a maternal role (Andrade, 1980).

Certainly, how any female defines her choices concerning her potential reproductive and nurturing role appears to come into direct conflict with her educational and/or work aspirations. This is particularly true when her children are very young and have more dependency needs. This subject is critical for women in general, but it is

especially so for the Hispanic female given the "super-mother" composite stereotype which dominates social science research, "...the unceasingly self-sacrificing, dedicated, ever fertile woman totally without aspiration for self or initiative to do other than reproduce" (Andrade, in press). It is important to keep in mind that many of the studies which created this image were done in rural settings, and almost all of them investigated lower-class samples. The contribution of broader-based and more objective data to this area of research is critical.

Based on the above, the objective of this dissertation was , therefore, to examine in a more detailed manner the characteristics of young Hispanic women who stay in school and/or seek employment while simultaneously carrying out a maternal role. The sample used in this study was the group of Hispanic females, ages 14-22 in the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey who had children and were enrolled in school and/or employed in the labor force. Responses were tabulated to determine what were the characteristics which these young women had in common utilizing frequency distributions and mean comparisons. The final product was a descriptive profile of the young Hispanic mother participating in the educational process and/or the world of work. Information about Black and White mothers was also included in order to provide a cross-cultural perspective for the Hispanic mother profile. Additionally, the characteristics

of the Hispanic mothers were contrasted with the images found in current research and concomitant psychological theories about this population. Based on these comparisons recommendations were made concerning future theoretical as well as policy-related research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Enrolled and/or employed Hispanic mothers belong to a number of minorities. They are rare among Hispanic females in general (4.4%) and represent a minority among Hispanic mothers (29.0%) according to the National Longitudinal Survey preliminary findings. In a broader sense they belong to the Hispanic population - certainly this group has been controversial within and outside of psychological research arenas. They are also members of another important political minority - women. Their multiple group memberships are significant to keep in mind when examining their characteristics, developing their profile, and most importantly when interpreting their attitudes and behaviors.

The review of the literature for this dissertation emphasizes the two major group identities: Women and Hispanics. The changing trends in research for each of these categories were examined in an effort to understand the significance of these changes and condense what is actually known about the dissertation sample population at this time.

#### A. Women: Motherhood and Achievement Motivation

The multiple facets of motherhood and achievement motivations are not the exclusive domain of the Hispanic woman. All reproductively and intellectually capable women must consciously or unconsciously come to terms with the potential

dilemmas, satisfactions, and frustrations which the dual role represents. Before delving into the literature on the Hispanic woman, it is necessary to summarize the main issues which have been identified in the literature with respect to women's dilemmas in relation to achievement and motherhood.

Through a series of logical arguments and associations, achievement has traditionally been attributed to the male, just as nurturance has been attributed to the female of the species. Achievement has been linked with aggression, penetration, independence, competition, action, and worldly accomplishment; whereas nurturance has been linked with passivity, dependence, penetrability, masochistic receptivity, a sense of inferiority, and sheltered motherhood. This was certainly Freud's early viewpoint in that he described the world as the exclusive domain of the male whose power and authority was literally and symbolically a natural consequence of his phallus. All other psychological experiences including the psychosexual development of the female were seen as reactions to this "reality" (Freud, 1925).

Freud considered that the female's psychosexual development was very similar to that of the male through the oral and anal stages. During these periods both males and females could approach life actively, aggressively, creatively, and narcissistically. At the oedipal stage, however, the male and female experiences began to diverge. The boy's desire to possess the mother and kill off the father was tempered

by his fear of being castrated by the all-powerful figure of the male parent. The boy would psychologically cope with this dilemma by beginning to identify with the power and aggression which he attributed to his father. In this manner he would move on from this stage taking with him a solid male identity and a need to demonstrate competitive "masculine" traits the rest of his life (Freud, 1925).

The female, on the other hand, had a more complex time of it during this stage. According to Freud, at this time her psychic attention was focused on the "missing organ." She would become acutely aware of her "castrated state," would begin to envy the boy for what she perceived as his superior endowment (and her corresponding clitoral inferiority) and would begin to hate and reject her mother for having cheated her of a penis (Freud, 1933).

In Bonaparte's paper on the development of masochism and passivity in the female, she describes the essence of feminine development in the following manner:

From the biological standpoint, nevertheless, the ideal adaptation of woman to her erotic function involves the functional suppression of the active, and even of the passive, clitoris in favor of the vagina, whose role is that of purely passive reception. (Bonaparte, 1934)

In the same article Bonaparte quotes and concurs with the Spanish biologist Marañón whose statement was prototypic of the theoretical attitudes of the time:

The Spanish biologist, Marañón, was in the right when he compared woman to a male organism arrested in its development half-way between the

child and the man--arrested, that is to say, precisely by the inhibitory influence exercised by the apparatus of maternity, which is subjoined to and exists in a kind of symbiosis side by side with the rest of her delicate organism.  
(Bonaparte, 1934)

Thus, although the two main issues of this dissertation achievement motivation and motherhood, were frequently dealt with simultaneously early on, they were considered mutually-exclusive from both the biological as well as the psychological standpoint.

During this period Freud's seminal work on psychosexual development and sex-related differences remained relatively unchallenged. Most of the theoretical pieces were further elaborations of his basic concepts. However, a new orientation began to emerge in the minds of the "culturalists". These theorists began to focus more attention on the influences of social and cultural phenomena and their interaction with biological and psychodynamic factors. Thompson and Horney brought their own experiences and "common sense" as women, as well as female analysts, to expand upon a theory which Freud himself referred to as male-oriented (Freud, 1925).

Horney concurred with the logic of Freud's theory of male development. However, one of her most noteworthy contributions was her reinterpretation of the concept of the origin of the woman's sense of "inferiority". Horney considered that this was not primarily the result of a sense of clitoral inferiority on the part of the female but rather

a product of the male's envy of the female's reproductive role:

But from the biological point of view woman has in motherhood, or in the capacity for motherhood a quite indisputable and by no means negligible physiological superiority. This is most clearly reflected in the unconscious of the male psyche in the boy's intense envy of motherhood. We are familiar with this envy as such, but it has hardly received due consideration as a dynamic factor. When one begins, as I did, to analyze men only after a fairly long experience of analyzing women, one receives a most surprising impression of the intensity of this envy of pregnancy, childbirth, and motherhood, as well as of the breasts of the act of suckling. (Horney, 1926)

In relation to the male's corresponding sublimation of this dynamic, she added:

Is not the tremendous strength in men of the impulse to creative work in every field precisely due to their feeling of playing a relatively small part in the creation of living beings, which constantly impels them to an overcompensation in achievement? (Horney, 1926)

Further, she considered that penis envy, that is, the woman's wish to be a man was actually a defense against earlier and more conflicted libidinal wishes for the father. This psychodynamic was further reinforced by what Horney described as the reality-based and obviously privileged position of men in society. With reference to the possible sublimation of the female's earlier libidinal wishes toward the father, Horney concluded:

Owing to the hitherto purely masculine character of our civilization, it has been much harder for women to achieve any sublimation that would really satisfy their nature, for all the ordinary professions have been filled by men. This again must have

exercised an influence upon women's feelings of inferiority, for naturally they could not accomplish the same as men in these masculine professions and so it appeared that there was a basis in fact for their inferiority. (Horney, 1926)

Thus, the culturalists began to examine external obstacles (e.g., lower wages, parental pressures, the significant other's interpretation of the woman's struggle to succeed as evidence of her lack of love for him or as a slur on his manhood), as well as intra-psychic dynamics. Coles (1974) described Horney's contribution in the following way:

Horney speaks of an 'interaction of psychic and social factors' and her sense of 'interaction' is subtle and knowing: it is not a matter of 'deep' or 'internal' forces being tangentially affected by 'superficial' or 'external' ones, but rather the extraordinarily complex development of each person's life -- a time, a place, a particular family, a situation in a given society, all of that becomes for a given person the basis for countless assumptions, fantasies, wishes, fears, tensions, urges, and on and on. (Coles, 1974)

Although Freud frequently spoke in terms of a dicotomy, masculine-active and feminine-passive, he too was leary of such a simplified way of conceptualizing the issues. He, in fact, proposed a concept of innate biological, as well as psychological, bisexuality in all human beings. Unfortunately this was not the general impression that came across in most of his writing. Horney's special contribution, therefore, was to present a more female-oriented alternative interpretation of female psychosexual development and to further

advance the examination of the complex interaction between psychic and social factors.

The most recent phase of work on women's achievement and motherhood motivations has been carried out in the past fifteen years. The nature/nurture controversy continues in this area of study just as it has in all others. However, a growing number of theorists have become interested in gathering data in a more eclectic way and have attempted to integrate the findings in order to arrive at a more profound understanding of these complex phenomena.

This period of research has also been characterized by more empirically-based, larger-sample studies. However, the topics (e.g., biological determinants, motives to achieve, ego development and self esteem, dependence, passivity, aggression, and the motive to nurture and reproduce) are still the same.

Although many individuals have contributed in small or large part to this work, the two who stand out are Judith Bardwick and Matina Horner.

Bardwick (1971) identified the motives to achieve and to affiliate as two important, if not pivotal, motives in a woman's life. She defined the first as the desire to "independently accomplish something according to some internal sense of excellence". She defined the second as the need to receive and give love. She stated:

In women one must look at the relationship between affiliation and achievement motives and

consider to what extent achieving behaviors derive from achievement or other motives and whether achieving is perceived as a probable threat to affiliation. (Bardwick, 1971)

Because these two motives have historically been dicotimized as masculine and feminine, it is essential that the differential patterns of male and female development be discussed. Biological studies continue to explore behavioral differences which seem to correlate with male and female hormones. Although there is a substantial amount of literature in this area, it is sufficient to mention the general findings here: 1) Testosterone, a male hormone, seems to be correlated with more aggression behavior; 2) Progesterone, a female hormone, seems to be correlated with nurturing, peaceful, patient behavior in females (Benedek, 1959); 3) Females also produce testosterone, though it is not secreted in large amounts (Jaffe, et al. 1968).

Thus, although the evidence is incomplete, there is some indication that there are sex-linked behavioral tendencies which are biologically wired in before birth; however, it is important to note that hormones of the opposite sex are also present, though they produce significantly lower levels of secretions. This data, of course supports Freud's concept of bisexuality.

In infancy and early childhood a number of factors begin to impact upon the child's already sex-linked behavioral tendencies. Kagan and Lewis observed children up to thirteen months of age. Their study reflected that psychologically

girls developed more rapidly than boys (and they maintain this "edge" through the first years of school). This was observed as early as six months of age. Compared with the boy immediately after birth and soon thereafter, the girl demonstrates greater motoric passivity, more sensitivity, longer fixation time to visual stimuli, earlier language development, and greater field dependency (Kagan & Lewis 1965).

Almost immediately in the child's life Bardwick (1971) adds, the variable of differential parental reinforcement enters into the picture. She expresses her "Biocultural" theory of female development in the following manner:

The girl is constitutionally less likely to gratify impulses in activity that the parents find offensive, such as aggression or masturbation. In addition, she is better able to make accurate assessments of the demand of people in the environment and to behave so as to minimize stress. She will, earlier than the boy, cope with discord verbally. As a result of her own behavior potentials there is less parental-cultural stress on girls to give up infantile behaviors. Dependency upon adults, which later forms part of the feminine role but which is part of the normal disposition of infants and young children, will be permitted. Because of the lack of external stress and lack of internal impulses, she will develop fewer internal controls over impulses. She will have a more diffuse body image and a self-concept still linked through dependency, to the evaluation of others. She will have a higher need for approval and acceptance, and a greater motoric passivity. The lack of internal ego controls and an independent concept of self leads to dependent sense of self esteem. This makes her more amenable to cultural patterning, to more conformist behavior, to better school achievement. (Bardwick, 1971)

Studies of children in nursery and elementary levels supported Bardwick's hypotheses and began to demonstrate the

impact of this affiliative motive in females even in relation to the aspirational motive. Crandal & Robson (1960) studied children from three to eight years of age and found that achievement efforts were the same for both sexes; however, girls lacked confidence, looking for help and approval and would withdraw from tasks at which they had failed, avoided possible repeated failures more often than the boys.

Crandall, Kallovsky & Preston (1962) replicated the above results and added that girls valued intellectual accomplishment, expected to fail, took the blame for intellectual failure (whereas boys projected it) and the brighter the girl, the less expectations she had of being successful on intellectual tasks. Sears (1962) found that affiliation rather than achievement needs correlated with academic success. This was supported by Tyler, Rafferty & Tyler (1962).

At an early age there are a number of family dynamics taking place in the home which Bardwick (1971) considers critical in the development of achievement and affiliation motives for women. While the boy is beginning to feel pressure to become independent and to achieve from his father, he is usually the recipient of unconditional love and approval from his mother. Usually, the girl is also the recipient of the latter and perhaps even more evenly from both parents. However, she rarely experiences pressure from either parent to achieve or become independent. Bardwick

(1971) summarized the dynamics of this stage in the following manner:

Since mothers tend to be warm and affectionate, since mastery skills is perceived as less critical for girls than boys, since female achievement is controversial, and since the importance of interpersonal gratification is constantly emphasized in the lives of most girls, we should expect relatively few girls to have developed a strong need to achieve. Moreover, if these data are consistent with other personality information, we should expect to find that girls tend to fuse the need to achieve with the need to affiliate, using achievement as a means of securing acceptance and love. (Bardwick, 1971)

As the young woman gets closer to the dating age she seems to fall farther and farther behind in the realm of achievement motivation. The young woman becomes convinced that if she clearly excels she will suffer socially, she will be perceived as less feminine, and will have fewer chances to date, marry, and eventually perform the maternal role. The circumstances become very different for her as she enters high school. Whereas prior to this time her achievement was closely tied to affiliative reinforcements, she now receives a completely different environmental message. These are the social and psychological dilemmas which according to Bardwick, are behind a young woman's tendency to hold herself back, frequently to choose unchallenging professions, and to underutilize her college degree after earning it.

Horner (1970) did extensive research in this area, in order to explore why the Atkinson Theory of Achievement

Motivation did not apply to women. She found that a most important element, the strength of the woman's fear of success, needed to be taken into account. This fear which is not typically found in men, is based on the woman's expectancy that her achievement will be followed by negative consequences, including social rejection and the loss of her femininity:

The more successful or independent a woman becomes, the more afraid society is that she has lost her femininity and therefore must be a failure as a wife and mother. She is viewed as a hostile and destructive force in society. On the other hand, the more successful a man is in his work (as reflected in his high status, salary, and administrative powers --all of which are in keeping with his masculinity), the more attractive he becomes as a spouse and father. Whereas men are unsexed by failure (Mead 1949), women seem to be unsexed by success. (Bardwick 1970)

Thus, a woman who fully uses her intellect and her competitive capacities literally pays the price of increased anxiety and later on reduces her chances of being perceived as a desirable mate and mother. The woman is consequently placed in a dilemma of either being deprived of her mind or her body, so to speak--of her intellectual or her biological contribution. Horner sums up this dynamic in the following manner:

Despite the prevalence of these values in most middle-class American homes, femininity and individual achievement continue to be viewed as two desirable but mutually exclusive ends. The cultural attitudes toward appropriate sex roles have truly limited the horizons of women. (Horner, 1971)

Given this data women still must make a choice between being perceived as feminine, nurturing, maternal and more desirable candidates for the wife-mother role and denying their intellect and competitiveness or being perceived as castrating, aggressive, and unfeminine and denying their nurturing instincts.

Bardwick believes that the woman who combines achievement and affiliative needs "...will probably be motivated to return to the work force ten to fifteen years after marriage."

Bardwick briefly mentions another kind of female student which she describes as closer to the "masculine model" who is academically competitive and is successfully achieving. She represents a small portion of the population at this time and there are relatively few studies on her. She is motivated to achieve, "social success be damned." She plans to marry, have children and work. However, Bardwick comments that this student does not seem to have a realistic concept of the problems involved. She states, however:

Perhaps in a microcosm I am beginning to see a new feminine pattern emerging in which interpersonal success and traditional behaviors remain important while the achievement success becomes equally important. (Bardwick, 1971)

Thus, there has been quite an evolution in the theoretical understanding of women from the earliest of Freud's writings to the most recent work by Horner and Bardwick, among others. The movement has taken theory from an early position of women's inferiority in all psychological and biological realms to the acknowledgement of the obvious

element of creativity involved in the maternal role as well as the women's intellectual and achievement-oriented capacities. Theory still assumes the position, however, that the women's success-oriented efforts are, at the core, a manifestation or redirection of her basic affiliative needs (with the exception of Bardwick's "rare new masculine model" women). Based on these studies one should expect to find affiliative needs to dominate the motivations of the females in the National Longitudinal Survey, with few exceptions.

#### B. Hispanic Women: Motherhood and Achievement Motivations

The literature review on young Hispanic women's achievement motivations and their experiences in the mother role yields little data specifically exploring these issues. It yields even less information if one is particularly interested in ethnographic interviews. There are, however, a significant number of studies in which attempts are made to dissect Hispanic mother-child interaction particularly in relation to the development of low self-esteem, external locus of control and field dependence, and low levels of academic achievement which are frequently attributed to Hispanic children (among other racially and culturally different children in the United States). The focus of these studies has been to attempt to discover how the Hispanic mother, family, and culture each works to constrict the occupational and intellectual pursuits of the Hispanic child as well as to foment inflexible sex roles in him/her (e.g., Diaz-Guerrero 1976, Kiev 1968, Stanton 1972).

Although the psychological literature has little to report on the specific subject of this dissertation, it does provide some background information on the broad areas which have been selected for this study. This part of the literature review, therefore, is organized in three parts: 1) The general characteristics and background of the Hispanic mother who works and/or studies; 2) Her inner or psychological world including self concept, locus of control, her aspirations and expectations in relation to school, work, and family roles (including motherhood); and, 3) The Hispanic mother's perceptions of external barriers to her educational, economic, and occupational development.

#### General Characteristics

Of the estimated 14.6 million persons of Spanish origin living in the United States, approximately 67% are found in four states: California (4.5 million), Texas (2.9 million), New York (1.6 million), and Florida (.8 million). Eighty-one percent of this group resides in metropolitan areas (United States Bureau of the Census, 1980). Approximately half of this group is female, the largest percentage of which is Mexican American (58%). Of the four categories of Hispanic women, the Mexican American and the Puerto Rican groups have the youngest median age (21.4 and 20.7 respectively), while the Cuban group has the oldest (33.5). Of the available information, the Mexican American group has the highest percentage of women who at age 25 have completed

four years of high school. The Puerto Rican and Mexican American groups have the lowest percentage of women who have completed four or more years of college. These two groups also have the highest level of unemployment. By a slim margin (in relation to the Puerto Rican female), the Mexican American female has the lowest median income of women with an income (Brown, Rosen, Hill & Olivas 1980).

In addition to noting the problems of each of the groups in relation to one another, it is important to point out that if this group as a whole is compared with non-Spanish origin females, the former experiences more severe economic and employment problems across the board (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). In order to appreciate fully the profoundness and severity of the problems faced by Hispanic females, it is important to note that the non-Hispanic origin females are themselves significantly worse off in every category than are their White male counterparts. An example of this is that in 1976 the annual median earnings of women who worked full-time year round were \$8,099, only 60% of the annual median earnings for working men. Furthermore 26% of these women earned less than \$6,000, as compared with 9% of working men; while only 7% of the women, in contrast to 42% of the men earned \$15,000 or more (Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1976).

Another relevant fact is that the proportion of the sex differential attributed to pure discrimination (that is, after controlling for education, experience, and other factors which might tend to cause productivity differences between men and women) has been estimated at between 29% and 43% of male earnings (Sawhill, 1973).

Preliminary findings of the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Participation (N. L. S.) provided more focused information about the young Hispanic female, 14 through 21 years of age. Hispanic females had lower labor force participation rates than did either Black or White females. Among the Hispanic groups, the Chicano and Puerto Rican groups had the lowest rates. In relation to unemployment rates, the Hispanic female group as a whole had an intermediate employment status between that of Blacks and Whites.

There were also significant differences among the Hispanic subgroups with the Puerto Rican and Chicano groups approximating the Black group's experience and the Cuban group approximating the status of the Whites more closely (U. S. Department of Labor Report, 1980, p. 12).

In relation to the immigration and assimilation experience, the National Longitudinal Survey reported that 30% of Hispanic youth were born outside the country. Among Puerto Rican youth, 40% were born outside the mainland. General drop-out rates among youth between the ages

of 20 and 22 were 36% for the foreign born Hispanics and 20% for the native born. However, the unemployment rates were 20% for the foreign born Hispanics, as opposed to 25% for the native born.

Hispanic youth had a higher drop-out rate (38%) than either the Blacks (28%) or Whites (15%). Hispanic youth lived in rural settings less frequently than either Blacks or Whites. They frequently lived independently with a spouse and/or child: Hispanics (24%), Whites (19%), and Blacks (15.8%) (U. S. Department of Labor, 1980, p.3).

The percentage of Hispanics reporting Spanish as the language they spoke as children ranged from 72% for Mexican Americans to 95% for Cubans. Current usage is, however, much lower: Mexican Americans (47%), Puerto Ricans (72%), and Cubans (87%).

Each of the countries of origin to which each of the Hispanic groups is connected has had a unique and complex politico-national history with the United States which has influenced the entry experience of each of the groups. The different processes have produced certain critical differences, as well as similarities, which need to be noted.

Mexican Americans have had a multi-faceted relationship with the United States throughout history. For many people of this group, the United States came to them rather than their immigrating to the United States. The controversial acquisition of massive Mexican territories in the 19th

century initiated an extraordinarily complex cross-cultural process for Mexican people who were already living in what is now the Southwest region of the United States. More public focus, has been given to the immigration waves of largely poor, less educated Mexican laborers who have crossed the Mexico-United States border into this country and who have been periodically deported depending on the economic climate of the country. Thus, the general impression of the Mexican immigrant is that of a "Wet Back" the "Illegal Alien." The reality lies in the range of experiences of individual Mexican Americans, varying from entitled landowners whose lands were invaded, to the very poor migrant who represented a cheap expendable agricultural labor force (Dieppa & Montiel, 1978).

Puerto Ricans have had the official status of citizenship for some time. However, the political and economic relationship of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the the United States mainland is a highly charged and controversial one. At present, the essence of this controversy is the struggle between Puerto Rico's being fully independent of the United States, as opposed to having the rights, priveleges and the status of full statehood.

Cubans, on the other hand, entered the United States legal refugees after Batista was overthrown in 1959. In general, they arrived with a higher level of education and

socioeconomic status than other Hispanic immigrants, and they were also recipients of more organized and more generous government programs to facilitate their transition into the United States than any other Hispanic group (Dieppa & Montiel, 1978, p.3). In her analysis of the women of Dade County, Rodriguez (1980) reported that the majority of Cuban women immigrants arrived in the United States as adolescents. They came for political reasons, and they had a higher level of education than did other Hispanic female immigrants. They now have the highest participation rate in the United States labor market of all Hispanic females (45% of all Cuban females are in the labor force, 26% of Puerto Rican females, and 42% of Mexican American females). Cuban females have the lowest unemployment rate: Cubans (9%), Puerto Ricans (12%). Mexican Americans (11%). Rodriguez commented that this first wave of Cubans was much like the United States middle class in many ways and that the more recent arrivals of the 1980s might be quite different (Rodriguez, 1980).

The second wave of Cubans seems to be perceived by United States society in a markedly different manner. In a recent article in the New York magazine (Daly, 1981) entitled "Los Bandidos Take The Town: Castro's Outcasts Shoot Up New York," the criminal activities of the newly arrived Cubans are described. The article states that of the 124,789 refugees on the "Freedom Flotilla" of 1980, the State Department reported that 24,000 had criminal records.

Additionally, it is probable that the priorities of the Reagan Administration will not be including supportive services for this group's transition as did other administrations for the first wave of Cuban refugees.

The fourth group of Hispanics is made up of Central and South American people. The exact number of these immigrants is unclear. Their immigration experiences are quite varied, but there are certain commonalities. Some came as political and economic refugees or were professionals seeking economic mobility. However, Cohen (1977) points out that approximately two-thirds of the Central and South American immigrants are women who have come to the United States to improve their families' standard of living. This group is described as leaving their children behind, frequently with the grandmother while they develop a base here. Although they plan to bring their children to the United States, this process is frequently considerably delayed because of their own undocumented status. As a consequence many of the children are not reunited with their mothers until late adolescence. The psychological complications of these situations in and of themselves represent another major study.

One of the relatively common socio-cultural elements which bind Hispanics together is Catholicism, particularly as it was imported into the cultures by the early Spanish colonists. There are African-Indian combinations and

interpretations of Catholicism which have varying degrees of influence in each of the different groups (Dieppa & Montiel, 1978).

Researchers have found a number of interesting and relevant factors concerning religion and Hispanics. For example religiosity was found to have a positive correlation with positive self concept in Hispanic females (Smith 1979). Edgerton (1971) found that Spanish-speaking Mexican Americans adhered more to formal religious values than did English-speaking Mexican Americans in a study which was conducted in East Los Angeles.

There have also been some studies which have explored the correlation of religiosity and/or religious affiliation and achievement motivation. In a study conducted by Bronson and Meadow (1968) with Protestant and Catholic Mexican American respondents, the authors found that achievement motivation was equal for both groups when they used the Rinon Scale. However, when they used the McClellan Four Need Achievement Scale, the Protestants showed more activistic-individualistic future-oriented achievement goals that did the Catholic Mexican Americans. The authors concluded that certain Protestant values such as stewardship, individual responsibility, asceticism, and self-discipline were responsible for the attitude differences (Bronson & Meadow, 1968). In another study in which Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic ethnics were

compared, Featherman (1971) concluded that religio-ethnic values were not as important in explaining differential socioeconomic achievement of the religio-ethnic subgroups as was education after the variation due to the handicaps and benefits of social origins had been removed.

To summarize this section, there are more than 14 million Hispanic Americans on the United States mainland. The largest groups are Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans with the first two groups having the highest unemployment rates, the lowest education and being the youngest groups. Half of the Hispanic population is female and indicators reflect that this subgroup is economically and educationally more disadvantaged than its White counterpart who in turn is more disadvantaged than its White male counterpart.

A large percentage of the Hispanic population has had a personal experience with the immigration process. Each of the subgroups comes from a country which has had unique cross-national relations with the United States. This in turn has impacted differentially upon the individual immigrant's boundary crossing experience. The majority of the Hispanic group retains the Spanish language, as well as its predominant Catholicism with some Afro-Indian variations, depending on country of origin.

Psychologically, the Hispanic population as a whole has been described as having low self-esteem, external locus of control, field dependence, and low achievement

motivation. Hispanics have been described as belonging to a particularly traditional, autocratic, male-dominated, family and cultural system. The profile developed from the survey data will either support or negate such an image.

### Psychological Issues

Self Concept Although this dissertation does not specifically investigate the self concept of Hispanic mothers, other issues which are measured here have been historically linked to this construct. For this reason a brief review of the topic will provide an introduction to this section of the literature review.

Research on the self concept is only approximately 20 years old. The work carried out in the last 10 years on culturally different groups has frequently taken environmental factors into consideration. Cota-Robles (1971) identified the following negative psychological consequences of discrimination against Hispanics: A concern with the negative implications of ethnicity, denial of ethnic group membership, withdrawal, passivity, clowning, self-hatred, and aggression against their own group. A longitudinal study carried out by Fu (1979) showed that "Euroamericans" had a more positive self concept than did Blacks who were better off in this respect than Hispanics. The author hypothesized that the differences were due to different sociocultural environments as well as differences in accessibility to opportunities.

Similarly, Padilla and Ruiz (1973) observed that the negative self concept of Hispanics, considered intrapsychic in nature prior to this time, seemed to be significantly exasperated by such environmental factors as length of time in the United States. Dworkin (1965) reported evidence which supported the hypothesis that Mexican Americans born in the United States had significantly more negative attitudes about themselves than did Mexican or foreign-born Mexican Americans. Siegel (1957) reported that as the length of stay in Philadelphia increased for Puerto Ricans, so did the frequency of mention of "discrimination" as what was least liked about Philadelphia. In addition to specific perceptions of discrimination in the interpersonal social areas, the respondents in this study also referred to unemployment as one of the greatest problems they faced after leaving Puerto Rico. Additional studies cited by Padilla and Ruiz address other consequences of majority group prejudices and institutional racism such as inferior schools.

More positively, Peñalosa (1970) suggested that in the late 1960s, Mexican Americans were undergoing a process of enhanced self-esteem. Padilla (1973) suggested that this socially dynamic phenomenon could well be the result of the Chicano and Puerto Rican "movimientos" of the time.

Other studies have attempted to identify the separate components involved in the development of the negative self

concept of Hispanic students with surprising results. Larned and Muller (1979) studied Mexican American and Anglo American students in grades 3-8 and produced no evidence of different developmental patterns between the two groups in self esteem as they progressed through grades. The authors hypothesized that this was due to the unique characteristics of the community they studied which had a large Mexican American population. Carter (1968) summarized interaction between intrapsychic issues (low self esteem) and interpersonal issues (discrimination and negative expectations) with the following comment:

Nothing supported the belief that Mexican students saw themselves more negatively than did Anglo students. However, it was very obvious that teachers and administrators believed them to be inferior and to conclude they saw themselves that way. (Carter, 1968, p.218)

These studies indicate that the development of the self concept is a complex process with a number of intervening variables involved. This is relevant when one considers the societal development of a pseudo-negative self concept in Hispanics as a group and the corresponding development of a pseudo-positive self concept in Whites.

There are very few studies on the development of Hispanic women's self concept. One of them was conducted by Sink (1978) in which the self concept of Mexican American adolescents was measured. The findings reflected that the males in the study consistently had a higher

level of self esteem than did the females. In contrast, Rosello (1980) found that when comparing mainland and island Puerto Ricans, in both groups the females had higher self esteem than did the males. The author concluded that self concept was affected by a number of variables and that an assumption of uniformity regarding self concept was fallacious.

Hiskiki (1969) found less favorable "self" and "ideal self" concepts among California Mexican American sixth grade girls than among Georgia non-Mexican American subjects. Additional data revealed a larger correlation between self concept and academic achievement for Mexican American girls than for the others. Mexican American girls also had sufficient "self esteem" to perform well in school and to plan for higher education.

In the area of self concept and achievement, Gaston (1972) found no relationship between self concept and achievement among an economically disadvantaged group of young women enrolled in a federal training program. All four ethnic groups (Blacks, Caucasians, Spanish Americans, and Indians) had a lower self concept than the established norms of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. She reported that the groups' levels of self concept fell in the following order from high to low: Blacks, Caucasians, Spanish Americans, and Indians. She stated that the low self concept seemed to be linked in this study with socioeconomic status rather than any other factor.

Some of the discrepancies in earlier research findings were analyzed by Terrazas (1980), in her study of the self concept of Mexican American adolescent females. First, she pointed out the theoretical error of equating academic achievement and/or aspirations to the total self concept of the individual. Terrazas discussed a number of phenomenological theorists' positions (particularly those of Rosenberg and Coopersmith) who have developed a more refined approach to the analysis of the self concept. They consider that only one component within the self concept cluster directly interrelates with achievement.

Terrazas went on to discuss the many technical problems involved and not yet resolved in measurement of self concept. She also discussed the problems overlooked by researchers working with culturally different populations. Specifically she referred to the culture of schools as a truly potent confounding variable:

Traditionally, the educational system in the United States has emphasized an Anglo core culture and its values. The concept of the 'melting pot' of America is a myth. It does not exist in the schools (Ramirez et al., 1977 Mercer, 1978) and this is because any culture or values other than the Anglo core culture and its values is not seen as equal, is excluded and therefore does not become a part of the core culture. Thus when studies on the self concept of Mexican Americans focus on educational achievement, the findings tend to indicate that Mexican American children and adolescents have a negative self concept. Mexican American children and adolescents are being examined within an Anglo institutional setting which has Anglo expectations and often

the instruments used are Anglo normed; thus, Mexican-American children tend to score lower on educational tests (Mercer, 1978) and on self concept measures. (Terrazas, 1980, p. 5)

In her study of the self concept of adolescent Mexican American females, Terrazas used a sample of 124 subjects and the following instruments: The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSE), the Adjective Check List (ACL), the Adolescent Bicultural Inventory (ABI), and the Sociocultural Questionnaire. She found that the self concepts of Mexican American adolescent females in her sample were just as positive as would be expected in a general population.

The construct of the self concept has been an illusive and troublesome conceptualization in psychology, the measurement of which has produced a multitude of problems for the discipline. Studies which have attempted to explore the self concept of the culturally different have been plagued with confounding variables which until recently had not been taken into consideration. Finally research on Hispanic females is faced with more complex interactions of confounding variables. In general one can conclude the following: there seems to be some correlation between one component of the self concept and motivational aspirations. Low self concept is linked with low socioeconomic status. Hispanic females have low socioeconomic status. Problems of self concept are exasperated by environmental stressors, such as discrimination, inferior schools and unemployment. Based on such findings one would expect that the Hispanic

females in the survey would have low aspirations in relation to work and school and would perceive the environment to be discriminatory.

Locus of Control Another closely related set of factors which has intrigued researchers in relation to the psychological experience of individuals in general and of females in particular are the concepts of locus of control and field dependence. Field dependence, has traditionally been attributed to "minority groups" and women. Britain (1974) in a study of 72 Cuban and United States adolescents found significant main effects for sex and culture: U. S. males were more field independent than U. S. females, they in turn were more so than Cuban males and they in turn were more so than Cuban females.

In a similar study, Kagan (1976) concluded that field dependence explained the Anglo American/Mexican American school achievement gap. Mexican American children were seen as significantly more field dependent than Anglo American children. Kagan additionally concluded that this was a function of their closeness to the traditional Mexican culture.

Díaz-Guerrero (1975) proposed that Anglo Americans are motivated by power and achievement, while Mexicans are influenced by affiliation and love. He further noted that Mexican laborer's motivating needs ranged in intensity from hunger to belonging.

Figueroa (1980) examined this dimension across White, Hispanic, and Anglo groups of low socioeconomic status and found no differences. Another interesting paper along these lines was one written by Arroyo (1974) in which the Farah Strike in El Paso, Texas was analyzed. Most of the strikers were Chicanas of low socioeconomic status and poorly paid jobs. Through this study an image of Chicana workers emerged as active struggling women, certainly not fitting their previous social science image.

In the same year Carillo (1974) studied the locus of control of 25 Chicanas and 25 Anglo females. She found no difference between the two groups: both had high ratings on external locus of control.

One can conclude from these studies that although results are mixed, the predominant portrayal of the Hispanic female is that of a field dependent person with an external locus of control due to her sex and her culture. This is particularly reflected in studies which have not taken socioeconomic status into account.

Educational and Work Aspirations Attitudes about roles and related aspirations are key factors to consider in the exploration of the psychological experience of Hispanic female. An earlier section of this review included some theoretical expositions on the subject of the female's basic passivity and masochism. With reference to the Hispanic female this non-aspirational female model was

combined with the cultural notions of the time to produce conceptualizations which included rigid sex role expectations, socialized traits of self-belittlement, passivity, and conflict about security and sexual satisfaction. The strong belief of the research was that all of these factors were conditioned by social, family and cultural (religion and Mexican traditions) experiences, particularly for the Mexican and Mexican American female (Kiev, 1978). There are a number of more recent empirical studies which have explored these issues among Hispanics in general and among Hispanic women in particular and have produced some interesting findings.

In a study of the occupational orientations of 914 Anglo, Black, and Mexican American high school students in Galveston Texas, Crawford (1975) found that Blacks had higher educational aspirations than did Mexican Americans, but both groups had higher aspirations than did Anglos in relation to educational and occupational goals.

Lafitte's study (1974) of 148 students of diverse cultural backgrounds reflected that females valued altruism and supervisory relationships; males valued independence, economic returns, and intellectual stimulation. Blacks valued economic returns, more than any other group and Mexican Americans valued "way of life" and then security most highly.

Cross (1971) reported that high ability women showed abundant aspirations when not faced with the instruction to be "realistic." One might interpret this finding to mean that the high ability woman is being held back by her fear of success as Horner described it; however, in the case of the Hispanic female, Samaniego (1980) found in her study of 60 Hispanic females and a comparable group of White college women, that that particular sample of Hispanic women did not exhibit a motive to avoid success.

In one of the rare studies specifically on the young mother, Cooney (1978) found that of the three groups whose living arrangements she studied (Puerto Ricans, non-Hispanic Blacks, and non-Hispanic Whites) the group most likely to have a female head of household was the Puerto Rican group. Secondly, in her analysis, the criteria used by these mothers to select a particular living arrangement for themselves and their children were: preferences, options available, what they could afford, and their desire to be in a better economic position in the future by continuing their education and/or acquiring work experience.

Cooney (1975) also reported that the presence of children was more of a deterrent for Anglo mothers who considered working than it was for Mexican American and Black mothers.

In a study of the relationship of maternal employment and ethnic origin to the sex role perceptions of Cuban American and Anglo female adolescents, Lord (1980) found that Cuban adolescents aspired to employment after marriage and children in contrast to Anglo adolescents who most frequently planned to discontinue employment once the first child was born. This led Lord to hypothesize that Cuban American adolescents of upper socioeconomic status are less traditionally feminine and more oriented toward outside employment than their values would indicate; however, they still retain traditional values of marriage and motherhood.

Stone (1971), in a study of 89 male and 87 female students (Mexican American and Anglo American 11th graders of lower and middle socioeconomic status) found that scholastic performance and future educational and vocational goals were more closely related to socioeconomic status than to racial background. Cooney (1975) reported this in her study of differences between Mexican American and Anglo American females; labor market participation rates. She suggested that "familism" seemed to be declining in the Mexican American population.

Thus it appears that in the past 10 years, researchers have produced richer findings on the work and educational aspirations of the culturally different and of women. Constrictions formerly perceived in the Hispanic female and

attributed to her gender and to her culture have not held up in more recent research. Additionally, socioeconomic status has been found to be related to aspirations and performance in all groups. Specifically, results show that the culturally different have high aspirational levels and that young Hispanic mothers reflect behaviorally their interest in advancing in work and school if they can. One would therefore assume that some of these variations in school and work aspirations and expectations would be reflected in the profile of the young Hispanic mother sample.

Attitudes About Family Roles Much has been written about family roles and "familism" or "traditionalism" of Hispanic families. This section will present major studies on these topics and the three main orientations used by researchers and theorists to examine the experience of the Hispanic female in relation to her family role.

In a 1955 survey of 294 Mexican males and females in Mexico City Diaz-Guerrero (1975) concluded that the concept of the "superiority of the male" was the result to an "existential value system" present in the culture and that neurosis-provoking conflicts in the Mexican are internal conflicts caused more by clashes of values than by clashes of the individual with reality. Folan and Weigard (1968) stated that the female in Mexican society gains status through marriage, and only by remaining married and having children does she assure her maintenance of this status.

In her assessment of the "traditional role" of Mexican American females described in the literature Senoir (1977) found that they were described as having lower self esteem, being more field dependent, having a less well defined psychic sense of self, being less competitive and more prosocial and having lower levels of scholastic achievement. Senoir also pointed out a variety of limitations in these studies.

Finally, in order to explain how there were a few Hispanic females who made it in the world of work and education in spite of the awesome burdens of their culture and gender. Knowlton (1965) stated; "The more educated and acculturated Spanish American families tend to emulate the nuclear family model of the Anglo American." This interpretation of the data reflects the tendency to attribute elements that are considered negative or problematic to that which is foreign or which has less political power (e.g., the intrinsic problems in other cultures or women's unresolved internal issues) and to claim success as truly coming forth from that which is known and most familiar--in this case the Anglo way of life.

The second orientation which researchers assumed in the exploration of this issue was to include other variables which could effect the behavioral patterns in Hispanic family role relations. Langner (1965) compared lower, middle, and upper class women in Mexico and concluded that

higher socioeconomic status women more frequently voiced egalitarian attitudes in relation to sexual equality. Tharp (1968) explored this question with 84 Mexican American wives in Tucson, Arizona, and found that the more "acculturated" the family, the greater the role change was toward more egalitarian compassionate marriage patterns. Tharp found this to be true across levels of education and length of United States residency but not necessarily across income and occupational levels.

Baca-Zinn (1980) suggested that rather than seeing Mexican American traditional roles as determinants of conjugal roles and seeing changes in these roles as products of acculturation, there could be other important factors influencing role changes. Her study found that as women acquired extradomestic resources, they achieved greater equality in conjugal decision making without having to sacrifice ethnicity in other realms of family life. A study which further explored this dimension was Richmond's (1976) work in which he studied 120 intact Cuban immigrant families in Florida. He found that wives' contribution of resources was not as important as were the joint efforts, that is, the level of resources that the couple brought into the home together.

Other work reflects that the question of family roles is not as clear cut or static as it was once thought to be. For example Hawkes and Taylor (1975) studied 76 Mexican

and Mexican American female California migrants. Their findings suggested that either the dominance-submission patterns were less universal than was previously assumed, that they never existed but were the ideal, or that they were undergoing radical changes. Fletcher (1979) discovered another interesting dimension of sex role expectations in her study of Anglo and Chicano 9th graders in southern New Mexico. Although she found Chicanos to be more "traditional" in general than Anglos, she also found that males had more traditional role expectations than females in both groups. Ginorio (1979) also reported that Puerto Rican females in New York were more "acculturated" in relation to gender roles (i.e., they showed more flexibility in the role) than were Puerto Rican males in New York. Carrillo (1977) in her study of 96 high school Chicano and Anglo students of both genders from low socioeconomic status groups in San Francisco found no differences on the value orientation schedule (egalitarian sex roles). Finally, Asunción-Lande (1980) discussed the current status of Mexican American women who struggle with those issues which most women confront and concurrently attempt to maintain their own cultural group values. She described them in the following manner: Mexican American women are "...becoming more assertive in communicating both their ethnic and social identity. They are determined to enter mainstream American society on their own terms." (Asuncion-Lande, 1980)

A third orientation used for the purpose of understanding Hispanic family role relations and dynamics is represented by researchers who go one step beyond examining the relationship between environmental stressors, i.e., prejudice, and the dynamics of Hispanic families, and thus begin to examine the positive adaptiveness involved in some of these behaviors.

In a review of research on Chicano families, Montiel (1973) commented on studies which attributed anti-acculturation and assimilation attitudes and practices to the Chicano family:

The following child-rearing practices are viewed in the literature as factors that hamper acculturation and assimilation: parents indulge male children, which limits their desire to achieve; do not encourage independence, teach their children lax habits; do not stress education; are oriented to the present; speak only Spanish; and think too much about their own misfortunes. (Montiel, 1973, p.25)

As an example of research activities using a more positive orientation, Keefe, Padilla & Carlos (1979) examined the characteristics and functions of the large cohesive kin group which has frequently been observed among Mexican Americans and concluded that it is indeed a viable source of emotional support.

In her study of 666 Mexican Americans and 340 Anglo Americans, Keefe (1978) found that the majority of Mexican Americans were blue collar, semiskilled or unskilled, with an average of nine years of schooling, 40% had been born

in Mexico. They were more stable, had more kin in the town and interacted more. The "traditional family" did not break down with urbanization, acculturation, or socioeconomic mobility. Keefe hypothesized that discrimination by the majority Anglo culture reinforced kin ties in Mexican Americans. Baca-Zinn (1975) commented that the concept of familism has operated as a mechanism of cultural resistance during periods when political resistance was not possible. She considers that "el movimiento" of the 1960s and thereafter has had an integrating effect by guarding family members from the oppression and hostility of Anglo society.

To summarize then, in addition to psychological internal experiences, sociological and economic factors are crucial in understanding role relations in Hispanic (as well as other culturally different ) families. Role relations do not appear to be static but rather changing in response to environmental and attitudinal changes. Many of these behaviors are actually quite positive adaptations. Lastly, there is no one description of family role relations and attitudes which will encompass all Hispanic families. The profile developed from the survey, therefore should reflect these variations.

#### External Barriers

This section will review studies which provide evidence for the existence of external barriers which block the progress of the Hispanic female. First, studies which discuss

Hispanics' attitudes and perceptions of the environment will be presented. Second, studies which demonstrate the existence of systemic problems with which Hispanics and other culturally different people must contend will be summarized.

Educational Settings Examining the issue from an attitudinal perspective, Ramirez (1971) studied the school attitudes of low socioeconomic status junior and senior high school students. He found that Mexican Americans expressed less positive views toward education than did Anglo Americans. that Mexican Americans scored higher on power and rejection than did Anglos, that Mexican American males scored higher on succorance toward females and on aggression toward "domineering" females, and that Mexican American females scored higher on autonomy than Anglo females. These findings were interpreted by the author to be the result of differences between the value orientations of the two groups.

Reilly (1976) explored the high dropout rate of Chicano students. A questionnaire was administered to 17 male and 23 female Mexican American dropouts. The subjects reported that teachers and counselors were not interested in them, that they did not feel free to talk over problems with teachers, that they had lost interest, that they experienced teachers to be prejudiced, and that they needed to work because their family income was low. Another result indicated that these students had average grades. The finding

concerning financial problems was confirmed by Eagle (1977) who reported that a major problem identified by 1,000 students in a Bronx community college was financial in nature, particularly among Blacks, Hispanics, females, and night students.

Thus, Hispanic students report negative experiences in their school efforts. The natural question which psychology would pose is: do these students bring negative attitudes which become self-fulfilling prophecies, or are they accurately perceiving the manifestations of environmental barriers? The question is a somewhat impossible one for research to resolve clearly, but the purpose of this section is to summarize the information currently available in the literature from both perspectives. The following are studies which examine the problem from a more systemic orientation.

In an effort to explore external barriers in education which effect Hispanics, Luckey (1975) demonstrated that Mexican American females and White and Black males received the greatest number of teacher referrals to special education classes. High socioeconomic status referrals differed as a function of the behavior of a student. However, at the low socioeconomic status level, referrals did not differ from the original pattern among the groups regardless of behavior. This study provided a hint of the higher stress

variables with which Mexican American females contend early in their education.

Mirande and Enriquez (1979) discussed the double problem of sex-race stereotyping which creates an "unspoken curriculum" for the Chicana, particularly in college. This is exasperated by a lack of adequate vocational counseling for Chicanas.

In contrast to Mirande and Enriquez's "unspoken curriculum" Salinas (1975) examined the actual written curriculum, that is, the stereotypes of Hispanic women as they are portrayed in Hispanic, Hispanic American, and Anglo literature. Findings were that the portrayal of Hispanic women has had two clear cut directions: she is either a "good woman," that is, one who can do or think no evil, who is pure, understanding, kind, weak, passive, needing protection, but having an inner strength and a capacity to endure suffering; or, she is a "bad woman," evil, seductive, perverted, excessive in passion and love, "condemned by all and in the end severely punished by death or suicide."

Thus, the literature reflects that there is equal evidence on each side of the attitudinal-systemic question. Hispanic students do have more negative attitudes about school. However, there is solid evidence about the continued existence of systemic issues that justify female Hispanic students' realistically negative attitudes toward school.

World of Work There have been a number of studies on the external stressors faced specifically by minorities and women, including Hispanic women, in the world of work. Carliner (1977) analyzed the economic status of minority groups and found that low occupational achievement resulted from differentially lower quality of education and labor market discrimination. Baker and Levenson (1976) in their analysis of 1,000 Black, Puerto Rican, and White female graduates who had completed the same curriculum, found that Blacks and Puerto Ricans earned considerably less upon entering the work force than did Whites; that they had an initial unemployment rate which was five times as high as Whites; and that their earnings improved minimally in five years. Factors that were found to be problematic included the women's race, the location of their job, and their access to employment with greater earning potential. Wiber (1975) analyzed color, ethnic, and sex inequalities in employment, occupational achievement, occupational mobility, and earnings. In a national cross ethnic-comparison of individuals with the same level of education and training, he found that differences were low but did indeed exist. He also found that sex discrimination was high, and ethnic discrimination was the next most problematic barrier.

Baker (1975), in her study of job opportunities for Black and White working-class women, presented data which

supported the contention that school and state employment referral and placement services restricted rather than expanded the labor market opportunities available to minority women in particular.

Seggar (1973) examined the representation of "World of Work" on television and found that there was an underrepresentation of women, that minorities were the most likely to suffer from stereotyped images, and that ethnic groups of small numbers tended to be portrayed homogeneously.

Mirande and Enriquez (1979) suggested that certain facts needed to be kept in mind when discussing the Chicana's high level of unemployment. As one example, they pointed out that regardless of her educational accomplishments, she tends to receive low wages.

Gonzalez (1974) suggested that Chicanas are doubly discriminated against as members of an ethnic-cultural minority and as females. Nieto-Gomez (1975) in a report on Chicanas in the labor force described the Chicana as primarily a poorly paid worker with little or no job opportunities. She concluded that racist-sexist stereotypes worked as barriers reinforcing the image of the Chicana as a nurturing, passive, and submissive woman, good only for menial employment. She considered that much more data were necessary in order to understand fully the employment situation of the Chicana.

In relation to the specific situation of Hispanic mothers, extraordinarily little is known concerning their employment experiences. Tienda (1982) reports, however, that disproportionately low labor force participation rates are found among women with young children and among those who speak Spanish, in contrast to other women who speak English predominantly. An interesting though unfortunate correlary to this is a fact presented by Polizer and Ramirez (1975). They reported that there was relative downgrading by both Mexican American and Anglo American 3rd and 12th graders of English spoken with a Spanish accent.

Thus it would seem that Hispanic females' perceptions of external barriers to their educational and occupational development, are based on their ability to perceive accurately a non-supportive environment rather than existing as a result of an internal paranoid and self-limiting phantasy life projected onto basically neutral settings.

### C. Summary of the Literature

The main focus of this review of related research was the Hispanic woman's aspirations for achievement in education and the labor force particularly in combination with her reproductive role. Few studies examined the achieving Hispanic mother. In reality social scientists have relied on a composite drawn from concepts and methodologically limited studies of women and of Hispanic culture.

In general, women were portrayed early on as actually being or as perceiving themselves as biologically inferior to men. Their ultimate reason for being was the maternal function which would symbolize the final resolution of their penis envy. During this era of Freudian predominance, women's educational or professional achievement motivations were considered as abnormal masculine behaviors and dismissed as such.

The culturalist movement reinterpreted the woman's reproductive power as an object of envy on the part of men and the men's consuming drive to achieve in the world was actually a reaction on their part to this female power.

More recently, women's achievement motivation has been more thoroughly examined. Although the presence of their motivation to achieve outside the home has been acknowledged, the core of their motivation is still viewed as psychologically rooted in their primordial affiliative needs, and as a consequence of their external locus of control the biological roots of which are wired in at birth as a result of their sex. This basic affiliative need which motivates them can also hold them back, forming the basis of their fear of success.

In relation to their cultural background, Hispanic women have been portrayed as essentially non-achievement oriented. Their cultural reason for being is again to be mothers as well as subservient wives to their husbands.

They have been portrayed as the major socializing agents of the family, and as dominated by a culture which by reason of its values works to constrict the occupational and intellectual pursuits of its children and to foment inflexible sex roles in them.

In a parallel process to the research on women, research on Hispanics has also taken a significant turn in the past 15 years. Other variables affecting Hispanic women's achievement motivations, such as the effects of socioeconomic status, language differences, poor role models in mass media, limited job opportunities, stress of immigration, etc., have been acknowledged and controlled for in investigations.

Still, however, extraordinarily little is known about the achieving Hispanic mother. One important fact is that although disproportionately low labor force participation rates have been found among Spanish-speaking women with young children, other studies on Hispanic mothers have demonstrated that they are definitely motivated to better their economic situation through work and school. Additionally, some Hispanic mothers seem to be more motivated to work than are comparable Anglo mothers.

One concludes from this review of the literature that very little is known about the specifics of young Hispanic women's achievement motivations. Basic hypothesis-generating research is critically needed to explore their

general characteristics and their psychological experiences including their attitudes about family roles, family formation, as well as their aspirations and expectations for education and work. It was with this intent that the following research study was designed.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

The purpose of this investigation was to gather more factual information about young, achievement-oriented Hispanic mothers. For the purposes of this dissertation achieving Hispanic mothers have been defined as those who are enrolled in school and/or are working. Two products were developed with this goal in mind. The first was a profile of the subjects describing the following dimensions: 1) their general characteristics (e.g. age, country of birth, linguistic background, marital status), 2) data about their educational, occupational, and maternal experiences (including accomplishments, ideals, aspirations, expectations, and environmental barriers), and 3) an analysis of the subjects' locus of control and their attitudes about family roles.

The second product was a cross-cultural (Hispanic, Black, and White) analysis of variables for mothers who worked and/or studied. This step has been included only in order to explore whether the findings of the Hispanic mother profile were specific to the Hispanic group or not. Both procedures were defined as hypothesis-generating. The final product was a set of variables which as a result of this investigation provide a more realistic set of hypotheses concerning the subject.

### A. Selection of the Sample

#### National Longitudinal Survey Sample

The sample which was used in this study consisted of the entire population of Hispanic mothers who were working and/or in school and who were interviewed in the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Participation (NLS) sponsored by the Department of Labor. In order to understand the potential significance of the Hispanic mothers subsample, it is important to describe the characteristics of the NLS sample as a whole. In total, 12,686 youth aged 14-22 years were interviewed in the first half of 1979. The majority of these respondents were selected from over 70,000 households screened for eligible youth. They came from 160 different standard metropolitan statistical areas and counties and were selected to provide a nationally representative sample. The sample was stratified by sex in order to yield approximately equal numbers of men and women. Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black and non-Hispanic, non-Black poor youth were oversampled. The sample was, therefore, composed of the following: 2002 Hispanic youth (999 males, 1003 females), 3174 non-Hispanic Black youth (1606 males, 1568 females), and 7510 non-Hispanic, White youth (3793 males, 3717 females).

### Achievement-Oriented Hispanic Mother Sample

The number of Hispanic females with children who worked and/or who attended school was 44. Although this may appear to be a small number, it is actually a representative sample of a small universe of subjects with these characteristics on a nationwide basis for the following reasons: 1) the thoroughness of the sampling procedure used with the original NLS, 2) the high dropout rate of Hispanics (higher than Blacks or Whites and nearly double that of all youth), 3) the fact that more Hispanic youth are or have been married than either Blacks or Whites, and 4) finally, the fact that the Hispanic female has one of the lowest rates of employment in the nation.

Given these realities, it is very probable that the achieving Hispanic mother is a relatively rare and geographically dispersed phenomenon in this society. For these reasons the NLS data are ideal for gathering preliminary factual information, admittedly from a "macro-psychological" perspective rather than a "micro-psychological" one. Taking into consideration the extraordinary nature of these women in society, their geographic dispersion and the fact that to a great degree they seem to have become objects of, and repositories for psychological mythology, this approach is an optimal starting point for research in the area.

### Cross-Cultural Sample

For the second part of the study an analysis was made of Hispanic, Black, and White working and/or enrolled mothers. All respondents from the NLS who fit this description were included. This consisted of a total sample of 44 Hispanic mothers, 114 Black mothers, and 181 White mothers. The purpose of this step was to provide a cross-cultural context for the Hispanic mother profile.

### B. Method of Analysis

The procedure used to handle the data consisted of selecting variables (single responses or clusters) from the original NLS questionnaire of 2,000 items which provided the specific information relevant to the research topic. A list of the actual NLS items used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

The second procedure of the study consisted of a cross-cultural analysis of all the variables. For the purposes of this dissertation a response rate of 70% for each of the three groups was considered minimally acceptable for each of the items. Exceptions were made only if an item would provide particularly interesting or relevant information. Although the data from all three cultural groups was gathered and presented, the primary focus of this study remained on the Hispanic working and/or enrolled mother.

The final product of the study was therefore, a descriptive profile of young Hispanic mothers participating in the educational process and/or the world of work. This profile was cross-culturally examined to emphasize differences, if they could be demonstrated, which were specific to the Hispanic culture. The profile in turn was contrasted with the images of the subjects as they are portrayed currently in the literature. Through the above mentioned procedures, this study was designed to provide more well-grounded hypotheses for future research on this population.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the Hispanic, Black, and White working and/or studying mothers' subsample analysis. The cross-cultural comparisons are presented first as a preliminary step in identifying cultural characteristics which are exclusive to the Hispanic mother who works and/studies. Based on these findings the Hispanic mother profile will follow.

The determination of the significance of the differences across cultures was executed through Chi-Square analyses. Additionally, for those items which had a significant difference, three two-culture sub-analyses were executed using Chi-Square analysis with Bonferroni protection. Because of the small sample size of the Hispanic group and the large number of choices usually given for each variable in the original survey, an additional problem arose. An important factor which needed to be considered was a strategy to contend with the fact that most of the original tables would have a number of cells the frequency of which was lower than five. This is frequently considered a problem when using Chi-Square analysis.

The issue was researched, and a number of strategies were found to deal with the situation. The first suggestion was to collapse categories whenever possible in order to

raise the expected cell frequencies to the desired level. When this was not feasible it was found that the following conventions are used: When the number of degrees of freedom for a particular matrix are less than two, that is when the matrix is a two-by-two, Yates' Correction for continuity is applied (Alder & Roessler, 1968, p.215). With reference to this particular analysis, when there were only two original or collapsed responses on an item this procedure was applied to the two-culture sub-comparisons. On matrices which had degrees of freedom greater than one and small cell sizes, one cell with an expected cell frequency of less than five was considered acceptable (Richmond, 1964, p. 300; Snedecor & Cochran, 1967, p. 228).

Thus, whenever possible matrices with more than two degrees of freedom were collapsed, so that no more than one cell would have an expected cell frequency of less than five, In this way the usefulness of the Chi-Square analysis was preserved. Secondly, on matrices which had two original or collapsed responses, the Yates' Correction was applied to the three, two-culture sub-comparisons. Thirdly, with the matrices on which too much pertinent information would be lost if categories were collapsed, the decision was made to present them as they were without statistics, that is, exclusively for descriptive purposes. The final decision was, therefore, to make each matrix as

"worthy" of Chi-Square analysis as possible while preserving the optimal information which this unique data base can provide.

#### A. General Characteristics

In total 6,288 females between the ages of 14 and 22 were interviewed for the National Longitudinal Survey. Of these 1,003 (16.0%) were Hispanic, 1,568 (24.9%) were Black, and 3,717 (59.7%) were White. A relatively small percentage of Hispanic females, 15.1% (152) reported that they had children as did 20.6% (323) of the Blacks, and 11.6% (430) of the Whites. Of these mothers 29% (44) of the Hispanics, 35.3% (114) of the Blacks and 42.1% (181) of the Whites reported that they worked and/or studied.

Thus the sample population which will be described in the following pages consists of all Hispanic, Black, and White employed/enrolled mothers of young children in the NLS. It is important to keep in mind that although this sample includes every female with the above-mentioned characteristics within the NLS sample, the NLS itself specifically over-sampled Hispanic, non-Hispanic, non-Black, and non-Hispanic, non-Black poor youth. Thus, the results and the interpretations of these results will reflect the experiences, attitudes, and decisions of a subsample drawn from a larger sample of subjects of lower socioeconomic status.

Table 1 reflects that Hispanic mothers are only slightly more likely to stay at home with their small children than are Blacks (6% difference) and they in turn slightly more likely than Whites (7% difference). Overall it is important to note that in each group more young mothers than not stay at home with their very young children, although in each group a substantial percentage either chooses to or finds it necessary to work and/or study.

#### Employment/Enrollment Status of Sample

The next logical question, or course is what is the break down of work and study for each of the groups. Fifteen (34.1%) Hispanic mothers reported school enrollment status, as did 59 (51.8%) of Blacks and 44 (24.3%) of whites. In this sample 35 (79.5%) of Hispanic mothers reported that they currently held a job, as did 80 (70.2%) of Black mothers and 136 (75.1%) of White mothers. Based on the above information it can be concluded that in all of the groups the mothers were more likely to be employed (70%+) than enrolled. Interestingly enough, the Hispanic mothers were the most likely to be employed followed by the Whites and then Blacks. The Black mothers were clearly more likely to be attending school than were Hispanic mothers and White mothers, and White mothers were the least likely.

These results support findings concerning the more frequent integration of the work role and the role of

TABLE 1<sup>a</sup>

## Background Information

Total Number of Females in National Longitudinal Survey: 6288

|  | Hispanic       | Black          | White          |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Number of Females by Culture               | 1003<br>(16.0) | 1568<br>(24.9) | 3717<br>(59.7) |
| Number of Mothers by Culture               | 152<br>(15.2)  | 323<br>(20.6)  | 430<br>(11.6)  |
| Number of Mothers who do Not Work or Study | 108<br>(71.1)  | 209<br>(64.7)  | 249<br>(58.0)  |
| Number of Mothers who do Work and/or Study | 44<br>(29.0)   | 114<br>(35.3)  | 181<br>(42.1)  |

TABLE 2<sup>a</sup>

## Country Of Respondent's Birth

|                      | Hispanic     | Black         | White         |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| In The United States | 31<br>(70.5) | 110<br>(96.5) | 174<br>(96.1) |
| Another Country      | 13<br>(29.5) | 4<br>(3.5)    | 7<br>(3.9)    |
| Totals               | 44           | 114           | 181           |

 $X^2=38.81$   $P<0.01$ 
 $X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:
Hispanic/White (H/W) 25.73,  $P<0.01$ Hispanic/Black (H/B) 19.78,  $P<0.01$ 

Black/White (B/W) 2.47, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

motherhood by Hispanic than White mothers. These results also add the dimension of the Black mother who seems to be more highly motivated in education. The difference between Hispanic and Black experiences leads to a number of speculations concerning the reasons behind lower school enrollment rates for Hispanics. One area which needs to be explored consists of the block which Hispanics perceive and/or experience in education. Specifically I am referring to the issue of language being an impediment that is specific to the Hispanic group. This would be more of a problem in a school setting than, for example, in a factory situation where a repetitive job requires little understanding of language. An additional problem which is an offshoot of this issue is a more limited understanding of the mechanisms of an academic bureaucracy, including the all-important office of financial aid. The speculations are based on the hypotheses that linguistic differences and immigration are specifically more a part of the Hispanic mothers' direct life experiences than the other two groups.

#### Culture, Place of Birth and Language

With reference to place of birth, the data summarized on Table 2 reflect the following: although the majority of Hispanic mothers were born in the United States (70.5%), the rest (29.5%) had personally gone through the immigration experience. This is a significantly higher frequency

than either of the other two groups (Blacks: 3.5%, Whites 3.9%). Additionally, by examining the responses to the question "Where did the respondent live at age 14?" (see Table 3), we see that the great majority of the Hispanic mothers who immigrated did so after the age of 14 (10 out of 13). That is, most of these young women contended with the stresses of immigration which would include leaving familiar places and psycho-social support systems and arriving in a country that is culturally and linguistically very different, as well as frequently hostile, to culturally different people. Additionally, they faced a school system with different structures and expectations as well as the formidable problem of learning English. Finally, it is important to note that in addition to the 29.5% of Hispanic mothers who reported that they were born outside of the United States, another 59.1% reported that their home life in childhood included the significant cultural experience of Spanish language utilization (see Tables 4 & 5). In total this means that 88.6% of the Hispanic mothers had this linguistic experience.

In relation to racial/ethnic origin the groups again are significantly, if predictable, different. The Hispanic subgroups that are most highly represented in this sample were: Mexican American (43%), Mexican (9%); other Hispanic (14%), Puerto Rican (4.5%) and Cuban (4.5%). Of the Black mothers, 96% identified themselves as "Black." Whites

TABLE 3<sup>a b</sup>

## Where Respondent Lived At Age 14

|                      | Hispanic     | Black         | White         |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| In the United States | 34<br>(77.3) | 113<br>(99.1) | 179<br>(98.9) |
| In Another Country   | 10<br>(22.7) | 1<br>(0.9)    | 2<br>(1.1)    |
| Totals               | 44           | 114           | 181           |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated

TABLE 4<sup>b c</sup>Language Other Than English Spoken  
in the Home During Childhood

|                           | Hispanic     | Black         | White         |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Another Language Reported | 39<br>(88.6) | 4<br>(3.5)    | 23<br>(12.7)  |
| None Reported             | 5<br>(11.4)  | 110<br>(96.5) | 158<br>(87.3) |
| Totals                    | 44           | 114           | 181           |

$\chi^2=158.06$   $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=98.46,  $P<0.01$

H/B=111.9,  $P<0.01$

B/W= 6.05,  $P<0.02$

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

<sup>c</sup>This is a created variable developed from items on the NLS.

TABLE 5<sup>a b</sup>

## Other Language Spoken At Home During Childhood

|         | Hispanic    | Black       | White        |
|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Spanish | 39<br>(100) | 1<br>(25.0) | 5<br>(21.7)  |
| French  | 0<br>(0)    | 2<br>(50.0) | 2<br>(8.7)   |
| Other   | 0<br>(0)    | 1<br>(25.0) | 13<br>(56.5) |
| Totals  | 39          | 4           | 23           |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

identified with a variety of mostly European backgrounds (see Table 6).

### Religiosity

With reference to religious background, more than 80% of the Hispanics reported that they were raised as Catholics; 70%+ of the Blacks reported that they were brought up as Baptists; and Whites reported a variety of religious affiliations in childhood but more than 55% specifically reported Protestant (including Baptist) backgrounds. The pattern remained the same for "present religious affiliation" with a low rate of shift towards "non-affiliation" with some cultural differences (see Tables 7 & 8). Blacks shifted at a lower rate (3.4% difference) than did Hispanics (9.1%) or Whites (10.6%).

In relation to frequency of religious attendance (see Table 9) the findings were: with reference to frequent religious attendance, "monthly plus", Hispanic mothers (50%) fell between the Blacks (68%) and the Whites (35%). The pattern was the same when any two groups were compared and in each of the response categories. However, there was a significant difference only between Blacks and Whites.

Thus, the Black group could be described as the most religious and the White group as the least religious if attendance and maintenance of religious beliefs can, in combination, be interpreted to reflect such. These findings

TABLE 6<sup>a b</sup>

## Racial-Ethnic Origin Of Respondent

|                        | Hispanic     | Black         | White        |
|------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| None                   | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)      | 2<br>(1.1)   |
| Black                  | 0<br>(0)     | 108<br>(94.7) | 0<br>(0)     |
| Scottish or English    | 1<br>(2.3)   | 1<br>(0.9)    | 58<br>(32.4) |
| French                 | 1<br>(2.3)   | 0<br>(0)      | 18<br>(10.1) |
| German                 | 2<br>(4.5)   | 1<br>(0.9)    | 17<br>(19.6) |
| American Indian        | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)      | 15<br>(8.4)  |
| Irish                  | 1<br>(2.3)   | 1<br>(0.9)    | 17<br>(9.5)  |
| Cubano, Latino         | 2<br>(4.5)   | 0<br>(0)      | 0<br>(0)     |
| Mexican                | 9<br>(20.5)  | 0<br>(0)      | 0<br>(0)     |
| Mexican American       | 19<br>(43.2) | 0<br>(0)      | 1<br>(0.6)   |
| Puerto Rican           | 2<br>(4.5)   | 0<br>(0)      | 0<br>(0)     |
| Other Hispanic/Spanish | 6<br>(13.6)  | 0<br>(0)      | 0<br>(0)     |
| American               | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(0.9)    | 24<br>(13.4) |
| Other                  | 1<br>(2.3)   | 2<br>(1.8)    | 9<br>(5.0)   |
| Totals                 | 44           | 114           | 179          |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering.

TABLE 7<sup>a b</sup>

## In What Religion Was Respondent Raised

|                  | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| None             | 2<br>(4.5)   | 3<br>(2.7)   | 10<br>(5.6)  |
| Baptist          | 2<br>(4.5)   | 82<br>(72.6) | 57<br>(32.0) |
| Other Protestant | 1<br>(2.3)   | 10<br>(8.8)  | 45<br>(25.3) |
| Catholic         | 36<br>(81.8) | 7<br>(6.2)   | 43<br>(24.2) |
| Other            | 3<br>(6.8)   | 11<br>(9.7)  | 23<br>(12.9) |
| Totals           | 44           | 113          | 178          |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 8<sup>a b</sup>

## Present Religious Affiliation

|                  | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| None             | 6<br>(13.6)  | 7<br>(6.1)   | 29<br>(16.2) |
| Baptist          | 0<br>(0)     | 73<br>(64.0) | 43<br>(24.0) |
| Other Protestant | 2<br>(4.5)   | 13<br>(11.4) | 41<br>(22.9) |
| Catholic         | 34<br>(77.3) | 8<br>(7.0)   | 44<br>(24.6) |
| Other            | 2<br>(4.5)   | 13<br>(11.4) | 22<br>(12.3) |
| Totals           | 44           | 114          | 179          |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 9<sup>a</sup>

## Frequency of Religious Attendance

|                                 | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not At All                      | 8<br>(18.2)  | 11<br>(9.6)  | 48<br>(26.5) |
| Infrequently                    | 14<br>(31.8) | 25<br>(21.9) | 69<br>(38.1) |
| Monthly                         | 7<br>(15.9)  | 17<br>(14.9) | 8<br>(4.4)   |
| Two to Three Times per<br>Month | 3<br>(6.8)   | 27<br>(23.7) | 16<br>(8.8)  |
| Weekly Plus                     | 12<br>(27.3) | 34<br>(29.8) | 70<br>(22.1) |
| Totals                          | 44           | 114          | 181          |

$X^2=41.07$ ,  $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= 8.96, not significant  
 H/B= 8.03, not significant  
 B/W=37.03, P 0.01

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 10<sup>a</sup>  
Respondent's Age

|          | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 14 to 17 | 6<br>(13.6)  | 13<br>(11.4) | 9<br>(5.0)   |
| 18       | 6<br>(13.6)  | 13<br>(11.4) | 18<br>(9.9)  |
| 19       | 6<br>(13.6)  | 20<br>(17.5) | 30<br>(16.6) |
| 20       | 8<br>(18.2)  | 26<br>(22.8) | 50<br>(27.6) |
| 21       | 17<br>(38.6) | 35<br>(30.7) | 57<br>(31.5) |
| 22       | 1<br>(2.3)   | 7<br>(6.1)   | 17<br>(99.4) |
| Totals   | 44           | 114          | 181          |

$\chi^2=11.05$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

do support the notion that a majority of Hispanics are Catholic, but they do not support the idea that Hispanics are the most "religious" group.

#### Age

In the category of age, no significant differences were found among any of the groups. The mean ages for these mothers were: Hispanics: 19.55, Blacks: 19.60, and Whites: 19.96. This places all three groups solidly in the middle range of the age possibilities represented in the NLS which is 14-22 (see Table 10). Thus, this sample of mothers does not fit the common image of very young teenaged mothers in any of the cultural groups, and it does not fit the image of motherhood taken up at a particularly early age by Hispanics.

#### Family Size and Marital Status

With reference to family size, no significant differences were found in the cross-cultural comparison. More than 70% of each group had only one child. The Hispanic group did have a slightly higher response rate in the "2+ children" category (see Table 11). This did set them apart from the other two groups by approximately a 10% difference; however, this was not significant. One could speculate from this data that although these Hispanic mothers do have a slightly higher rate of reproduction, the non-significance of the differences may mean that they are

TABLE 11<sup>a</sup>

## Number of Children Respondent Has

|             | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| One         | 27<br>(71.1) | 87<br>(82.1) | 135<br>(81.3) |
| Two or More | 11<br>(28.9) | 19<br>(17.9) | 31<br>(18.7)  |
| Totals      | 38           | 106          | 166           |

$\chi^2=0.38$ , not significant

TABLE 12<sup>a</sup>

## Respondent's Marital Status At Present

|                       | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Presently Married     | 28<br>(63.6) | 80<br>(26.3) | 113<br>(62.4) |
| Divorced or Separated | 2<br>(4.5)   | 9<br>(7.9)   | 26<br>(14.4)  |
| Never Married         | 14<br>(31.8) | 75<br>(65.8) | 42<br>(23.2)  |
| Totals                | 44           | 114          | 181           |

$\chi^2=51.54$ ,  $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=46.90,  $P<0.01$

H/B=92.44,  $P<0.01$

B/W=51.05,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

not reproducing at as high a rate as is currently attributed to Hispanics.

The data reflected significant differences with reference to marital status between Hispanics and Blacks and between Blacks and Whites; however, the difference between Whites and Hispanics was not significant. Thus, the extremes on this item were Hispanics and Blacks, with Hispanics and Whites having a high and very similar frequency of being presently married (63.6% & 62.4% respectively) and Blacks having a low rate on this item (26.3%). At the other end of the spectrum, Blacks had a significantly higher frequency of never having been married (65.8%), when compared with Hispanics (31.8%) and Whites (23.2%). This data is presented on Table 12.

In the divorced/separated category, Whites had twice the percentage rate than did Blacks and three times the rate of Hispanics.

To summarize the findings of this item, Hispanic and White mothers tended to be currently married twice as often as were Blacks. White mothers tended to be separated or divorced almost twice as often as were Blacks and almost three times as often as were Hispanics. Finally, Black mothers tended to be unmarried twice as frequently as Hispanics and Whites. From this data one could attribute these differences to "issues of culture." However, one of the ambiguities of this item is that it does not provide

information about couples who live together and in such a way provide mutual support. This is a factor which is important to keep in mind given the fact that the phenomenon of unmarried couples living together is becoming less unusual in this society.

## B. Education

### School Enrollment and Achievement

To begin this section on education the actual achievement level of each group in this category will be summarized. Fifteen (34%) Hispanics, 59 (51.8%) Black, and 44 (24.3%) White mothers reported that they were enrolled in school at the time of their interview (see Table 13). The data clearly reflects that the Black mothers are the most frequently enrolled in school, the Hispanics are less so and the White mothers are the least frequently enrolled. A significant difference was, however, found only between the two extremes, the Blacks and Whites. Additional significant differences were found among the groups in relation to highest grade completed. The direction of the differences were consistent with the findings in Table 13 with reference to Black behavior. At the higher level (college) Blacks had the highest percentage rate (14.2%), they were followed by Whites (8.3%) who in turn were followed by Hispanics (6.8%). At the level of high school completion, Blacks and Whites were very close (50.4% and 51.7% respectively) while

TABLE 13<sup>a b</sup>

## Grade Attending At Present

|  | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Enrolled in Eighth Grade<br>or High School | 6<br>(13.6)  | 22<br>(19.3) | 10<br>(5.5)   |
| Enrolled in College                        | 2<br>(4.5)   | 16<br>(14.0) | 8<br>(4.4)    |
| Enrolled in Vocational<br>Program          | 7<br>(15.9)  | 21<br>(18.4) | 26<br>(14.4)  |
| Did Not Report Enrollment                  | 29<br>(65.9) | 55<br>(48.2) | 137<br>(75.7) |
| Totals                                     | 44           | 114          | 181           |

$\chi^2=29.99$ ,  $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= 3.79, not significant

H/B= 5.06, not significant

B/W=29.00,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Variable created from NLS information.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 14<sup>a</sup>

## Highest Grade Completed

|                       | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Grades 1 to 11        | 27<br>(61.4) | 40<br>(35.4) | 72<br>(40.0) |
| Completed High School | 14<br>(31.8) | 57<br>(50.4) | 93<br>(51.7) |
| Some College          | 3<br>(6.8)   | 16<br>(14.2) | 15<br>(8.3)  |
| Totals                | 44           | 113          | 180          |

$X^2=11.17$ , P 0.05

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection all non-significant.

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

Hispanics were nearly 20 percentage points lower. When reviewing the lowest category on this item (grade one-eleven) it became clear that the Hispanic mothers were lost by the U.S. educational system primarily at this level; 61.4% of them had only completed grades within this range when compared with 35.4% of Blacks and 40% of Whites. Table 15 specifically explored whether the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent and reflected the same pattern: 76% of the Blacks had achieved this level in contrast to Whites (73.7%) and Hispanics (44.7%). Hispanics were significantly different from the first two groups.

#### School Aspirations and Expectations

Interesting differences and similarities were found when comparing the achievement levels described above with the aspirations and expectations of the cultural groups (see Tables 16 and 17). No significant differences were found among the three groups, although the Blacks had an edge on the other two groups in every category beyond high school. At the Bachelor's level the Blacks were most closely followed by the Hispanics; at the Master's level they were followed more closely by the Whites. It is important to note that no group actually perceived it as feasible to acquire a Master's degree above the 8% level. The majority of these mothers believed they would not earn the Bachelor's degree (Hispanics 78%, Blacks 68.4%,

TABLE 15<sup>a</sup>

## Has a High School Diploma or Equivalent

|        | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| No     | 21<br>(55.3) | 16<br>(17.4) | 45<br>(26.3)  |
| Yes    | 17<br>(44.7) | 76<br>(82.6) | 126<br>(73.7) |
| Totals | 38           | 92           | 171           |

$\chi^2=19.63$ ,  $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=10.76,  $P<0.01$

H/B=17.13,  $P<0.01$

B/W=2.20, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 16<sup>a</sup>

## Highest Grade Would Like To Complete

|                         | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Grade 1 to 12           | 23<br>(52.3) | 34<br>(29.8) | 81<br>(44.8) |
| 1 to 3 years of college | 6<br>(13.6)  | 22<br>(19.3) | 34<br>(18.8) |
| Bachelor's Degree       | 13<br>(29.5) | 47<br>(41.2) | 52<br>(28.7) |
| Master's Degree         | 2<br>(4.5)   | 11<br>(9.6)  | 14<br>(7.7)  |
| Totals                  | 44           | 114          | 181          |

$\chi^2=10.66$ , not significant

TABLE 17<sup>a</sup>

## Highest Grade Thinks She Will Complete

|                         | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Grade 1 to 12           | 21<br>(51.2) | 44<br>(38.6) | 106<br>(58.9) |
| 1 to 3 years of college | 11<br>(26.8) | 34<br>(29.8) | 39<br>(21.7)  |
| Bachelor's Degree       | 8<br>(19.5)  | 28<br>(24.6) | 27<br>(15.0)  |
| Master's Degree         | 1<br>(2.4)   | 8<br>(7.0)   | 8<br>(4.4)    |
| Totals                  | 41           | 114          | 180           |

$\chi^2=12.50$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

and Whites 80.6%). Additionally, it is important to note that all three groups had noticeably higher aspirations for the Bachelor's degree and beyond (Hispanics 34.1%, Blacks 50.9%, and Whites 36.5%) than their expectations (Hispanics 21.9%, Blacks 31.6%, and Whites 19.4%). Thus, the group which had the highest gap between aspirations and expectations were the Blacks with 19.3% difference, followed by Whites with 17.1% difference and then Hispanics with 14.1% difference. This gap between higher aspirations and lower expectations held across cultures. Since it is a cross-cultural issue, the results can either be interpreted as due to the internal experiences of women psychologically holding themselves back and/or external blocks with which they contend in their lives. Although the NLS data do not provide information about environmental issues in detail (e.g., quality of schools, teacher attitudes, etc.), it does provide some information concerning the reasons given by respondents for having left school. As is reflected in Table 18, many of the respondents gave "completion of degree" as the reason for having left school (Hispanics 28.5%, Blacks 60.5%, Whites 45.2%) Blacks gave this reason more frequently. Marriage, pregnancy and home-related responsibilities were given more frequently by Hispanics (42.9%) than by Whites (28.7%) or Blacks (18.4%). With reference to school-related reasons, the White mothers seemed to dislike school more

TABLE 18<sup>a b c</sup>

## Why Did the Respondent Leave School?

|                       | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Received Degree       | 10<br>(28.6) | 46<br>(60.5) | 71<br>(45.2) |
| Getting Married       | 5<br>(14.3)  | 2<br>(2.6)   | 18<br>(11.5) |
| Pregnancy             | 7<br>(20.0)  | 7<br>(9.2)   | 23<br>(14.6) |
| Did Not Like School   | 2<br>(5.7)   | 4<br>(5.3)   | 15<br>(9.6)  |
| Poor Grades           | 0<br>(0)     | 2<br>(2.6)   | 0<br>(0)     |
| Home Responsibilities | 3<br>(8.6)   | 5<br>(6.6)   | 4<br>(2.5)   |
| Good Job-Work         | 1<br>(2.9)   | 2<br>(2.6)   | 3<br>(1.9)   |
| Financial Problems    | 3<br>(8.6)   | 2<br>(2.6)   | 6<br>(3.8)   |
| Entering Military     | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(2.6)   | 3<br>(3.8)   |
| Expelled-Suspended    | 1<br>(2.9)   | 1<br>(1.3)   | 0<br>(0)     |
| School Too Dangerous  | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(0.6)   |
| Moved Away            | 1<br>(2.9)   | 0<br>(0)     | 5<br>(3.2)   |
| Other Reasons         | 2<br>(5.7)   | 4<br>(5.3)   | 8<br>(5.1)   |
| Totals                | 35           | 76           | 157          |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Black response rate less than 70%.

<sup>c</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering.

frequently (9.6%) than did either Blacks (5.3%) or Hispanics (5.7%). The last item that produced a noteworthy response referred to financial problems. In this category Hispanics had a higher response frequency (8.6%) than did Blacks (6.6%) or Whites (3.8%). Although this particular table does not provide statistically analyzable data, it does provide basic information about the experiences of these mothers as they themselves reported them, and as such, the information can be used to begin to form some hypotheses about their experiences.

#### School Attitudes

As Table 13 showed, Hispanic mothers of the sample tended to drop out of school during high school at a higher rate than did the other two groups. For this reason another important dimension to explore was the mothers' school attitudes at this educational stage. The NLS interviewed mothers who were enrolled up through high school at the time of the survey. This consisted of 6 Hispanics, 22 Blacks and 10 Whites in total. The information presented in Table 19 summarizes the findings. There were no pronounced differences among the three groups with reference to attitudes about high school. The majority in each of the groups reported having positive attitudes in all of the dimensions presented to them on this item. The item which received the most negative response from all three groups was that schools were

TABLE 19<sup>a b</sup>  
School Attitudes

|   |                                  | Hispanic      | Black        | White         |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Easy To Make<br>Friends at<br>School?       | Very or Some-<br>What True       | 5<br>(83.3)   | 20<br>(90.9) | 10<br>(100.0) |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True        | 1<br>(16.6)   | 2<br>(9.1)   | 0<br>(0)      |
| Teachers Help<br>With Personal<br>Problems? | Very or some-<br>What True.      | 5<br>(83.3)   | 18<br>(81.8) | 9<br>(90.0)   |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 1<br>(16.6)   | 4<br>(18.2)  | 1<br>(10.0)   |
| Most Classes<br>Are Boring?                 | Very or some-<br>what True.      | 2<br>(33.3)   | 12<br>(55.5) | 4<br>(40.0)   |
|   | Not True/<br>Not True.           | 4<br>(66.7)   | 10<br>(45.5) | 6<br>(60.0)   |
| I Don't Feel<br>Safe in<br>School.          | Very or Some-<br>what True.      | 0<br>(0)      | 2<br>(9.1)   | 1<br>(10.0)   |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 6<br>(100.0)  | 20<br>(90.9) | 9<br>(90.0)   |
| Teachers<br>Know Sub-<br>jects Well?        | Very or Some-<br>what True.      | 5<br>(83.3)   | 18<br>(81.8) | 10<br>(100.0) |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 1<br>(16.6)   | 4<br>(18.2)  | 0<br>(0)      |
| You Can Get<br>Away With<br>Anything?       | Very or Some-<br>what True.      | 2<br>(33.3)   | 5<br>(22.7)  | 1<br>(10.0)   |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 4<br>(66.7)   | 17<br>(77.3) | 9<br>(90.0)   |
| Freedom to<br>Learn at<br>School?           | Very or Some-<br>what True.      | 5<br>(83.3)   | 17<br>(77.3) | 7<br>(70.0)   |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 1<br>(16.6)   | 5<br>(22.7)  | 3<br>(30.0)   |
| Good Job<br>Counseling<br>at School?        | Very or Some-<br>what True.      | 5*<br>(100.0) | 16<br>(72.7) | 7<br>(70.0)   |
|   | Not too True/<br>Not True.       | 0<br>(0)      | 6<br>(27.3)  | 3<br>(30.0)   |
| Satisfaction<br>with School?                | Very or Some-<br>what Dissat.    | 1<br>(16.6)   | 4<br>(18.2)  | 3<br>(30.0)   |
|   | Very or Some-<br>what Satisfied. | 5<br>(83.3)   | 18<br>(81.8) | 7<br>(70.0)   |
| Totals Except for *                         |                                  | 6             | 22           | 10            |

<sup>a</sup>Descriptive Table, No Statistics Calculated.

<sup>b</sup>Respondents limited to those in grade school and high school.

perceived as boring. Although the school attitudes item as a whole could not be analyzed statistically due to cell-frequency problems, it had particular relevance because negative school attitudes have frequently been linked with poor school performance particularly with reference to minorities.

### Role Models

Another variable which has frequently been considered important in relation to school achievement is the dimension of role models. With reference to the respondents' mothers as role models for education, the data reflected that these Hispanics' experiences were significantly different from Blacks and Whites. The majority of these Hispanic respondents' mothers did not go beyond eighth grade (58.3%) whereas the majority of Black and White respondents' mothers made it into high school (64.2% and 71.0% respectively, Table 20).

With reference to the respondents' fathers' educational experiences the pattern was similar. Fifty percent of the Hispanics' fathers did not go beyond eighth grade, whereas the fathers of Black and White respondents went to high school 60.9% and 60.2% respectively, Table 21.

With reference to siblings as role models, first of all 100% of the Hispanics, 97.4% of the Blacks and 95.6% of the Whites reported that they had siblings. Of these 65.9% of the Hispanics reported that they were currently

TABLE 20<sup>a</sup>

## Mother's Education

|                    | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0 to 8th Grade     | 21<br>(58.3) | 28<br>(25.7) | 28<br>(16.6)  |
| 9th to 12th Grade  | 14<br>(38.9) | 70<br>(64.2) | 120<br>(71.0) |
| College and Beyond | 1<br>(2.8)   | 11<br>(10.1) | 21<br>(12.4)  |
| Totals             | 36           | 109          | 169           |

$\chi^2 = 28.58$   $P < 0.01$

$\chi^2$  of Subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=28.92,  $P < 0.01$   
 H/B=13.28,  $P < 0.01$   
 B/W= 3.50, Not Significant

TABLE 21<sup>a</sup>

## Father's Education

|                    | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0 to 8th Grade     | 18<br>(50.0) | 26<br>(29.9) | 43<br>(25.9)  |
| 9th to 12th Grade  | 16<br>(44.4) | 53<br>(60.9) | 100<br>(60.2) |
| College and Beyond | 2<br>(5.6)   | 8<br>(9.2)   | 23<br>(13.9)  |
| Totals             | 36           | 87           | 166           |

$\chi^2 = 12.54$   $P < 0.05$

$\chi^2$  of Subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=8.62,  $P < 0.01$   
 H/B=13.28,  $P < 0.01$   
 B/W= 3.50, Not Significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses=% of respondents answering this item.

enrolled in school, as did 82.9% of the Blacks and 78.6% of the Whites. A major problem with this item was that it did not provide information concerning whether the siblings were of school age or not. It did, however, tell whether the respondent had a sibling who modeled school enrollment behaviors at the time of the interview. The data showed that although Hispanics and Blacks had a higher frequency of reporting that they had siblings than did Whites, their frequency rates for siblings who attended school were both significantly lower than Whites (Tables 22 & 23).

Table 24 presented the same problem as did the previous one, but it did not provide information about minimum achievement levels of siblings at the time of the interview. Interestingly enough, there were no significant differences on this item across cultures, and at least 20% of each group of respondents had siblings who had completed some college or more. It is important to note that Hispanics and Blacks had an overall response rate that was slightly lower than 70%, that is, 68.2% and 66.9% respectively and that Whites had 71% on this particular item.

The next role model explored by the NLS was the respondent's spouse (see Table 25). The first element to be noted on this item was the low response rate for Blacks (21%) in contrast to those for Hispanics (68.2%) and Whites (76.8%). The information from this table must

TABLE 22<sup>a</sup>  
Number of Living Siblings

|              | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Zero         | 0<br>(0)     | 3<br>(2.6)   | 8<br>(4.4)   |
| One          | 7<br>(15.9)  | 7<br>(6.1)   | 22<br>(12.2) |
| Two          | 4<br>(9.1)   | 10<br>(8.8)  | 24<br>(13.3) |
| Three        | 6<br>(13.6)  | 13<br>(11.4) | 49<br>(27.4) |
| Four or More | 27<br>(61.4) | 81<br>(71.1) | 78<br>(43.1) |
| Totals       | 44           | 114          | 181          |

$\chi^2=27.46$   $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of Subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
H/W= 7.97, Not Significant  
H/B= 5.15, Not Significant  
B/W=22.71.  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 23<sup>a</sup>

## Number of Siblings Currently in School

|           | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Zero      | 15<br>(34.1) | 19<br>(17.3) | 37<br>(21.6) |
| One       | 11<br>(25.0) | 24<br>(21.8) | 59<br>(34.5) |
| Two       | 6<br>(13.6)  | 22<br>(20.0) | 37<br>(21.6) |
| Three     | 4<br>(9.1)   | 11<br>(10.0) | 23<br>(13.5) |
| Four Plus | 27<br>(61.4) | 81<br>(71.1) | 78<br>(43.1) |
| Totals    | 44           | 110          | 171          |

$X^2=28.88$   $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= 7.76, Not Significant

H/B= 6.76, Not Significant

B/W=23.84,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering this item.

TABLE 24<sup>a</sup>

## Highest Grade Completed by Oldest Sibling

|                    | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 0 - 8th Grade      | 5<br>(16.7)  | 7<br>(8.6)   | 5<br>(4.1)   |
| 9th - 12th Grade   | 18<br>(60.0) | 57<br>(70.4) | 89<br>(73.6) |
| College and Beyond | 7<br>(23.3)  | 17<br>(21.0) | 27<br>(22.3) |
| Totals             | 30           | 81           | 121          |

$\chi^2=6.14$  Not significant

TABLE 25<sup>a b</sup>

## Highest Grade Completed by Most Recent Spouse

|                    | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0 - 8th Grade      | 7<br>(23.3)  | 2<br>(5.3)   | 8<br>(5.8)    |
| 9th - 12th Grade   | 17<br>(56.7) | 26<br>(68.4) | 109<br>(78.4) |
| College and Beyond | 6<br>(20.0)  | 10<br>(26.3) | 22<br>(15.8)  |
| Totals             | 30           | 38           | 139           |

$\chi^2=13.36$   $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=10.41,  $P<0.01$

H/W= 2.21, not significant

B/W= 2.22, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Response rates for Black and Hispanic groups were less than 70%.

be complemented with the information presented in Table 12 concerning marital status. As the reader will recall, Blacks had a significantly lower frequency for being married. Table 25, therefore, reflected that there was a more frequent absence of such a potential educational model for the Black mothers. Beyond this important factor, the data reflected that there were significant differences between the Hispanic and White experiences in that Hispanic spouses tended to have completed lower levels of education than did Blacks or Whites. As an example of this, at the 0-8th grade level the results were: Hispanics (23.3%), Blacks (5.3%), and Whites (5.8%). In the "college plus" category, Hispanics and Blacks had a higher frequency than did Whites (20%, 26.3%, and 15.8% respectively; see Table 25).

The final role model in education from the NLS was the respondent's closest friend. It is important to note that this item (Table 26) explored aspirations rather than achievement, and, as such, it could only be compared with Table 16 which was the only other aspirational item in this section. No significant differences were found across the groups in this category. The Blacks, however, again had a slight positive edge over Hispanics and Whites in the college and beyond category. A second interesting finding was that when Table 16 (respondent's aspirations) was compared with this table, the respondents themselves

TABLE 26<sup>a</sup>

|                              | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0 - 12th Grade               | 20<br>(54.1) | 49<br>(44.2) | 105<br>(59.7) |
| 1st - 3rd Year of College    | 4<br>(10.8)  | 20<br>(18.0) | 16<br>(9.1)   |
| Bachelor's Degree and Beyond | 13<br>(35.2) | 42<br>(37.8) | 55<br>(31.3)  |
| Totals                       | 37           | 111          | 176           |

$\chi^2=8.41$  Not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

had higher educational aspirations than did their closest friends.

### C. OCCUPATION

#### Occupational Achievement

As was noted in the first section of this chapter, from this sample, 35 (79.5%) Hispanics, 80 (70.2%) Blacks, and 136 (75.1%) Whites were working at the time of the interview. That is, Hispanic mothers in this sample were the most likely to be working, whereas Whites were the least likely and Blacks were in between. The data on Table 27 which summarized the responses of the mother reflected that at least 94% of each group was concentrated below the professional, managerial/administrative level. They were fairly evenly distributed among the three remaining job categories with little difference among the three cultures.

With reference to "Class of Worker" the data on Table 28 reflected that 80%+ of each group worked in private industry with little difference among them. In relation to government jobs, however, there were some differences, in that Blacks (16.3%) participated more frequently than Whites (11.8%) and Hispanics (5.7%).

Hispanics were the most likely to be "self employed" (11.4%) whereas Blacks were the least likely (0%) and Whites fell in between (4.4%). From this data we see that

TABLE 27<sup>a</sup>

| Occupation at Current job   |              |              |              |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
| Prof., Technical & Kindred Workers, Managers, Administrators except Farm.   | 2<br>(5.7)   | 4<br>(5.0)   | 7<br>(5.1)   |
| Sales, Clerical, & Unskilled Workers  | 13<br>(37.1) | 31<br>(38.8) | 48<br>(35.3) |
| Craftsmen, Kindred Workers, Operatives except Transportation.   | 9<br>(25.7)  | 19<br>(23.8) | 27<br>(19.9) |
| Transportation & Equipment Operatives, Laborers, Farmers, Farm Managers, Foremen, Service Workers, & Private Household Workers. | 11<br>(31.4) | 26<br>(32.5) | 54<br>(39.7) |
| Totals  | 35           | 80           | 136          |

$\chi^2=1.79$  not significant.

TABLE 28<sup>a b</sup>

| Class of Worker at Current Job |              |              |               |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|                                | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
| Private Company                | 29<br>(82.9) | 67<br>(83.8) | 114<br>(83.8) |
| Government                     | 2<br>(5.7)   | 13<br>(16.3) | 16<br>(11.8)  |
| Self-employed                  | 4<br>(11.4)  | 0<br>(0)     | 6<br>(4.4)    |
| Totals                         | 35           | 80           | 136           |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

at this age and within the common circumstances of motherhood which these young women share, all three groups tended to have non-managerial jobs with little differentiation. Most worked for private industry, and Hispanics had the lowest participation rate in government jobs.

#### Occupational Aspirations and Expectations

From Table 29 we see that all three groups aspire to jobs with more responsibility within five years, with the Blacks leading the way at the professional/managerial level (37.5%), as compared with Hispanics (25%) and Whites (18.4%). It is important to note how frequently "minority aspirations" were higher than those of the "mainstream group". The group which was the least likely to be satisfied with the idea of remaining at the current level of employment were the Blacks (9.4%) who were followed by the Hispanics (25%), and then the Whites (29.9%). It is important to note that the majority of the mothers in the Black and Hispanic groups aspired to have either professional or "white collar" jobs.

With reference to the respondents' expected ability to achieve, their occupational aspirations at age 35 (Table 30), all three groups were very close to considering their chances excellent. The Hispanics were less strong in the "good" category but were the most optimistic in the "fair" category. It is important to note that none of

TABLE 29<sup>a</sup>

## Occupational Expectations in Five Years

|   | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Prof., Technical & Kindred<br>Workers, Manager, Admins-<br>tratos except Farm.  | 8<br>(25.0)  | 36<br>(37.5) | 27<br>(18.4) |
| Sales, Clerical, &<br>Unskilled Workers.  | 11<br>(34.4) | 28<br>(29.2) | 39<br>(26.5) |
| Craftsmen, Kindred Workers,<br>Operatives except Trans-<br>portation.   | 1<br>(3.1)   | 8<br>(8.3)   | 23<br>(15.5) |
| Transportation & Equipment<br>Operatives, Laborers, Farm-<br>ers, Farm Managers, Foremen,<br>Service Workers, & Private<br>Household Workers. | 4<br>(12.5)  | 15<br>(15.6) | 14<br>(9.5)  |
| Same as Now   | 8<br>(25.0)  | 9<br>(9.4)   | 44<br>(29.9) |
| Totals  | 32           | 96           | 147          |

$X^2=26.77$   $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= 4.69, not significant

H/B= 6.80, not significant

B/W=23.84,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

TABLE 30<sup>a</sup>

## Expected Ability to Achieve Occupational Aspirations at 35

|           | Hispanic     | Black        | White        |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Excellent | 6<br>(18.8)  | 20<br>(19.2) | 26<br>(18.3) |
| Good      | 11<br>(34.4) | 48<br>(46.2) | 61<br>(43.0) |
| Fair      | 12<br>(37.5) | 26<br>(25.0) | 40<br>(28.2) |
| Poor      | 3<br>(9.4)   | 10<br>(9.6)  | 15<br>(10.6) |
| Totals    | 32           | 104          | 142          |

$\chi^2=2.25$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

the three groups of mothers produced a high response rate in the "poor" category.

From this section our developing hypotheses would be different from those frequently presented in the past in the social science literature on Hispanic mothers. In these results they expressed ambition for more professional and white collar employment and a solid optimism about reaching their occupational goals in the future.

#### Occupational Attitudes

With reference to work attitudes the NLS explored three areas with these mothers: work commitment, work benefits, and work satisfaction. With reference to work commitment there were few items in which there were significant differences among the three groups. The items about which there was little ambivalence were: "Respondent would seek more education if unable to support family" with 92%+ positive responses from each group; "Respondent would enter a training program if unable to support the family" again with 95%+ positive responses from each group; and "Respondent would shoplift if unable to support family" with 95.5%+ negative responses from each group.

Other alternative solutions produced more of a variety of responses such as "Respondent would go on welfare if unable to support family." The majority of each of the

## Work Commitment Tables

Table 31<sup>a</sup>

|   |     | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|---|-----|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Respondent would seek more education if unable to support family? | Yes | 41<br>(95.3) | 109<br>(95.6) | 166<br>(92.2) |
|   | No  | 2<br>(4.7)   | 5<br>(4.4)    | 14<br>(7.9)   |
| Totals  |     | 43           | 114           | 180           |

$X^2=1.58$ , not significant

Table 32<sup>a</sup>

|   |     | Hispanis     | Blacks       | Whites        |
|---|-----|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Respondent would go on welfare if unable to support family? | Yes | 11<br>(25.6) | 45<br>(39.5) | 59<br>(32.6)  |
|   | No  | 32<br>(74.4) | 69<br>(60.5) | 122<br>(67.4) |
| Totals  |     | 43           | 114          | 181           |

$X^2=3.04$ , not significant

Table33<sup>a b</sup>

|  |     | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|--|-----|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Respondent would enter a training program if unable to support family? | Yes | 41<br>(95.3) | 111<br>(97.4) | 174<br>(96.7) |
|  | No  | 2<br>(4.7)   | 3<br>(2.6)    | 6<br>(3.3)    |
| Totals   |     | 43           | 114           | 180           |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 34<sup>a</sup>

|  |     | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Respondent would apply for food stamps if unable to support family | Yes | 20<br>(48.8) | 75<br>(68.2) | 98<br>(54.1) |
|  | No  | 21<br>(51.2) | 35<br>(31.8) | 83<br>(45.9) |
| Totals   |     | 41           | 110          | 181          |

$\chi^2=7.22$   $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= 2.01, not significant  
 H/B= 4.02, not significant  
 B/W=23.84,  $P<0.01$

Table 35<sup>a b</sup>

|  |     | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|--|-----|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Respondent would shoplift if unable to support family? | Yes | 2<br>(4.5)   | 4<br>(3.5)    | 3<br>(1.7)    |
|  | No  | 42<br>(95.5) | 110<br>(96.5) | 176<br>(98.3) |
| Totals   |     | 44           | 114           | 179           |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

groups responded negatively to this item, and the Hispanics were the most retiscent about accepting this as an alternative. On the item "Respondent would apply for food stamps if unable to support family" there were significant differences only between Blacks and Whites, with the Whites less willing to take such an alternative. The Hispanics were in the middle with no significant differences in relation to either group and closely divided within themselves.

The last item which asked whether the respondent would work if she could comfortably live without working produced interesting and significant responses, again particularly between Blacks and Whites. The Blacks (82.1%) were in the lead with positive responses, but they were closely followed by Hispanics (72.7%) and Whites who lagged behind considerably with a positive response rate of only 27.1%. These findings, particularly the last item supported the hypothesis that Hispanic females are more interested in integrating the work and the mother role even when there is no economic pressure. This data provided important information about who consistently aspires to achieve.

The work benefits tables (37-58) provided information concerning the conditions of the work environment as the respondents described them. Some were objective questions which had nothing to do with respondent's perceptions;

Table 36<sup>a</sup>

|   |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|---|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Respondent would<br>work if could<br>live without<br>working? | Yes    | 32<br>(72.7) | 92<br>(82.1) | 49<br>(27.1)  |
|   | No     | 12<br>(27.3) | 20<br>(17.9) | 132<br>(72.9) |
|   | Totals | 44           | 112          | 181           |

$X^2 = 93.26$   $P < 0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=30.07, not significant  
 H/B= 1.19, not significant  
 B/W=81.86,  $P < 0.01$

Work Benefits Tables<sup>a b</sup>

Table 37

|                                      |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Employer offers<br>health insurance? | No     | 22<br>(71.0) | 39<br>(50.6) | 70<br>(54.3) |
|                                      | Yes    | 9<br>(29.0)  | 38<br>(49.4) | 59<br>(45.7) |
|                                      | Totals | 31           | 77           | 129          |

$X^2 = 3.81$ , not significant

Table 38<sup>a b</sup>

|                                    |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Employer offers<br>life insurance? | No     | 24<br>(80.0) | 47<br>(60.3) | 85<br>(67.5) |
|                                    | Yes    | 6<br>(20.0)  | 31<br>(39.7) | 41<br>(32.5) |
|                                    | Totals | 30           | 78           | 126          |

$X^2 = 5.94$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>These items do not have 70% response rate for Blacks.

others were more subjective. Most of these tables were slightly below the 70% cut off point if the overall sample numbers were used. However, if the working mothers were considered exclusively, the response rates were nearly 100%. Most of the items were not significantly different across cultural groups. However, on items which were more objective in nature (for example the items: employer offers health insurance, life insurance, paid vacations, etc.), Hispanics responded negatively 20 percentage points more frequently than did either of the other two groups.

With reference to more subjective questions (e.g., "opportunity to do a number of different things on the job"), the responses were fairly evenly distributed among the different possibilities. Slight positive skewing was noted on the following items: opportunity to deal with other people at the job, quality of feedback from the job, job giving a chance to do one's best, opportunity to do the whole job, physical surroundings of the job, skills learned on the job would be valuable for getting a better job, job is dangerous, exposure to unhealthy conditions, job security, friendliness of co-workers, and competence of supervisor. Negative skewing across the cultures was noted for: opportunity to do a number of different things, opportunity for independent thought or action, and good pay (Hispanics and Blacks were slightly more negative on this item.) On the following items little skewing was

Table 39<sup>a b</sup>

|                                   |     | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Employer offers<br>paid vacation? | No  | 15<br>(48.4) | 21<br>(26.9) | 52<br>(40.9) |
|                                   | Yes | 16<br>(51.6) | 57<br>(73.1) | 75<br>(59.1) |
| Totals                            |     | 31           | 78           | 127          |

$\chi^2=5.94$ , not significant

Table 40<sup>a</sup>

## Opportunity to do a Number of Different Things on the Job

|                 | Hispanics   | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 8<br>(21.6) | 19<br>(22.1) | 20<br>(12.2) |
| Not too much    | 9<br>(24.3) | 22<br>(25.6) | 42<br>(25.6) |
| Moderate amount | 8<br>(21.6) | 21<br>(24.4) | 47<br>(28.7) |
| Quite alot      | 5<br>(13.5) | 13<br>(15.1) | 45<br>(27.4) |
| Maximum amount  | 7<br>(18.9) | 11<br>(12.8) | 10<br>(6.1)  |
| Totals          | 37          | 86           | 164          |

$\chi^2=16.40$   $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=10.71,  $P<0.01$

H/B= 8.14, not significant

B/W=10.62, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>These items do not have 70% response rate for Blacks.

Table 41<sup>a</sup>

## Opportunity to Deal with Other People at the Job

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 4<br>(10.8)  | 13<br>(15.1) | 14<br>(8.5)  |
| Not too much    | 7<br>(18.9)  | 13<br>(15.1) | 19<br>(11.6) |
| Moderate amount | 6<br>(16.2)  | 11<br>(12.8) | 22<br>(13.4) |
| Quite alot      | 13<br>(35.1) | 32<br>(37.2) | 70<br>(42.7) |
| Maximum amount  | 7<br>(18.9)  | 17<br>(19.8) | 39<br>(23.8) |
| Totals          | 37           | 86           | 39           |

$X^2=5.17$ , not significant

Table 42<sup>a</sup>

## Opportunity for Independent Thought or Action at the Job

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 10<br>(27.0) | 16<br>(18.6) | 22<br>(13.4) |
| Not too much    | 8<br>(21.6)  | 21<br>(24.4) | 40<br>(24.4) |
| Moderate amount | 9<br>(24.3)  | 23<br>(26.7) | 45<br>(27.4) |
| Quite alot      | 5<br>(13.5)  | 18<br>(20.9) | 38<br>(23.2) |
| Maximum amount  | 5<br>(13.5)  | 8<br>(9.3)   | 19<br>(11.6) |
| Totals          | 37           | 86           | 164          |

$X^2=5.62$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 43<sup>a b</sup>

## Opportunity to Develop Close Friendships at Work

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 2<br>(5.4)   | 8<br>(9.3)   | 18<br>(11.0) |
| Not too much    | 9<br>(24.3)  | 13<br>(15.1) | 26<br>(15.9) |
| Moderate amount | 10<br>(27.0) | 16<br>(18.6) | 39<br>(23.8) |
| Quite a lot     | 13<br>(35.1) | 31<br>(36.0) | 59<br>(36.0) |
| Maximum amount  | 3<br>(8.1)   | 18<br>(20.9) | 22<br>(13.4) |
| Totals          | 37           | 86           | 164          |

Table 44<sup>a</sup>

## Opportunity to do the Whole Job

|                 | Hispanics   | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 6<br>(16.2) | 7<br>(8.1)   | 14<br>(8.5)  |
| Not too much    | 7<br>(18.9) | 8<br>(9.3)   | 12<br>(7.3)  |
| Moderate amount | 9<br>(24.3) | 18<br>(20.9) | 28<br>(17.1) |
| Quite alot      | 8<br>(21.6) | 29<br>(33.7) | 67<br>(40.9) |
| Maximum amount  | 7<br>(18.9) | 24<br>(27.9) | 43<br>(26.2) |
| Totals          | 37          | 86           | 164          |

$\chi^2=11.59$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 45<sup>a</sup>

## How Much Broad Significance Does the Job Have?

|                 | Hispanics   | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 7<br>(18.9) | 16<br>(18.6) | 8<br>(4.9)   |
| Not too much    | 7<br>(18.9) | 17<br>(19.8) | 28<br>(17.1) |
| Moderate amount | 9<br>(24.3) | 18<br>(20.9) | 40<br>(24.4) |
| Quite alot      | 9<br>(24.3) | 17<br>(19.8) | 59<br>(36.0) |
| Maximum amount  | 5<br>(13.5) | 18<br>(20.9) | 29<br>(17.7) |
| Totals          | 37          | 86           | 164          |

$X^2=19.21$   $P<0.05$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=9.56, not significant  
 H/B=1.16, not significant  
 B/W=16.78,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 46<sup>a b</sup>

## Quality of Feedback From Job

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Minimum amount  | 3<br>(9.1)   | 6<br>(7.1)   | 8<br>(5.1)   |
| Not too much    | 0<br>(0)     | 12<br>(14.3) | 8<br>(5.1)   |
| Moderate amount | 12<br>(36.4) | 18<br>(21.4) | 30<br>(19.0) |
| Quite alot      | 10<br>(30.3) | 33<br>(39.3) | 69<br>(43.7) |
| Maximum amount  | 8<br>(24.2)  | 15<br>(17.9) | 43<br>(27.2) |
| Totals          | 33           | 84           | 158          |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 47<sup>a</sup>

## The Job Gives You a Chance to do Your Best

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 5<br>(15.2)  | 8<br>(9.4)   | 9<br>(5.7)   |
| Not too true    | 7<br>(21.2)  | 15<br>(17.2) | 32<br>(20.3) |
| Somewhat true   | 10<br>(30.3) | 37<br>(43.5) | 69<br>(43.7) |
| Very true       | 11<br>(33.3) | 25<br>(29.4) | 48<br>(30.4) |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=4.97$ , not significant

Table 48<sup>a</sup>

## Are the Job's Physical Surroundings Pleasant?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 1<br>(3.0)   | 5<br>(5.9)   | 9<br>(5.7)   |
| Not too true    | 5<br>(15.2)  | 13<br>(15.3) | 26<br>(16.5) |
| Somewhat true   | 16<br>(48.5) | 41<br>(48.2) | 68<br>(43.0) |
| Very true       | 11<br>(33.3) | 26<br>(30.6) | 55<br>(34.8) |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=1.17$ , not significant

Table 49<sup>a</sup>

## The Skills You are Learning Would be Valuable

## Getting a Better Job?

|                  | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not all all true | 6<br>(18.2)  | 12<br>(14.1) | 22<br>(13.9) |
| Not too true     | 5<br>(15.2)  | 20<br>(23.5) | 32<br>(20.5) |
| Somewhat true    | 10<br>(30.3) | 20<br>(24.7) | 32<br>(30.4) |
| Very true        | 12<br>(36.4) | 32<br>(37.6) | 56<br>(35.4) |
| Totals           | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=1.92$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 50<sup>a b</sup>

## Is The Job Dangerous?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 20<br>(60.6) | 50<br>(58.8) | 73<br>(46.2) |
| Not too true    | 6<br>(18.2)  | 19<br>(22.4) | 45<br>(28.5) |
| Somewhat true   | 6<br>(18.2)  | 12<br>(14.1) | 27<br>(17.1) |
| Very true       | 1<br>(3.0)   | 4<br>(4.7)   | 13<br>(8.2)  |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

Table 51<sup>a</sup>

## Exposed to Unhealthy Conditions?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 20<br>(60.6) | 50<br>(58.8) | 87<br>(55.1) |
| Not too true    | 6<br>(18.2)  | 21<br>(24.7) | 28<br>(24.1) |
| Somewhat true   | 5<br>(15.2)  | 9<br>(10.6)  | 19<br>(12.0) |
| Very true       | 2<br>(6.1)   | 5<br>(5.9)   | 14<br>(8.9)  |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=1.88$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 52<sup>a</sup>

## The Pay is Good?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 7<br>(21.2)  | 15<br>(17.6) | 18<br>(11.4) |
| Not too true    | 10<br>(30.3) | 18<br>(21.2) | 25<br>(15.8) |
| Somewhat true   | 12<br>(36.4) | 39<br>(45.9) | 78<br>(49.4) |
| Very true       | 4<br>(12.1)  | 13<br>(15.3) | 37<br>(23.4) |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=9.82$ , not significant

Table 53<sup>a</sup>

## The Job Security is Good?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 3<br>(9.1)   | 9<br>(10.6)  | 17<br>(10.8) |
| Not too true    | 9<br>(27.3)  | 13<br>(15.3) | 15<br>(9.5)  |
| Somewhat true   | 11<br>(33.3) | 34<br>(40.0) | 48<br>(30.4) |
| Very true       | 10<br>(30.3) | 29<br>(34.1) | 78<br>(49.4) |
| Totals          | 33           | 85           | 158          |

$\chi^2=12.68$ ,  $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=9.17, not significant  
 H/B=2.26, not significant  
 B/W=6.05, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 54<sup>a b</sup>

## Are Your Co-workers on the Job Friendly?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 1<br>(9.1)   | 1<br>(1.2)   | 2<br>(1.3)   |
| Not too true    | 0<br>(0)     | 3<br>(3.6)   | 6<br>(3.9)   |
| Somewhat true   | 8<br>(24.2)  | 26<br>(31.0) | 47<br>(30.7) |
| Very true       | 24<br>(72.7) | 54<br>(64.3) | 98<br>(64.1) |
| Totals          | 33           | 84           | 153          |

Table 55<sup>a b</sup>

## Is Your Supervisor Competent in His Job?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 1<br>(3.0)   | 3<br>(3.6)   | 4<br>(2.6)   |
| Not too true    | 3<br>(9.1)   | 4<br>(4.8)   | 6<br>(4.0)   |
| Somewhat true   | 4<br>(12.1)  | 30<br>(35.7) | 45<br>(29.8) |
| Very true       | 25<br>(75.8) | 47<br>(56.0) | 96<br>(63.6) |
| Totals          | 33           | 84           | 151          |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 56<sup>a</sup>

Are There Good Chances for Promotion at Your Job?

|                 | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not at all true | 6<br>(18.2)  | 15<br>(18.8) | 39<br>(24.8) |
| Not too true    | 7<br>(21.2)  | 20<br>(25.0) | 33<br>(21.0) |
| Somewhat true   | 9<br>(27.3)  | 29<br>(36.3) | 47<br>(29.9) |
| Very true       | 11<br>(33.3) | 16<br>(20.0) | 38<br>(24.5) |
| Totals          | 33           | 80           | 157          |

 $X^2=4.17$ , not significant

## Work Satisfaction Tables

Table 57<sup>a</sup>

Would the Respondent Take Another Job?

|                                    | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Respondent would take another job  | 28<br>(80.0) | 72<br>(88.9) | 116<br>(74.8) |
| Respondent would keep the same job | 6<br>(17.1)  | 8<br>(9.9)   | 38<br>(24.5)  |
| Respondent would not work          | 1<br>(2.9)   | 1<br>(1.2)   | 1<br>(0.6)    |
| Totals                             | 35           | 81           | 155           |

 $X^2=8.63$ , not significant<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 58<sup>a</sup>

## How Hard Would it be to Find a Comparable Job?

|                     | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Extremely difficult | 3<br>(8.3)   | 23<br>(27.1) | 36<br>(22.1) |
| Somewhat difficult  | 25<br>(69.4) | 48<br>(56.5) | 77<br>(47.2) |
| Not difficult       | 8<br>(22.2)  | 14<br>(16.5) | 50<br>(30.7) |
| Totals              | 36           | 85           | 163          |

$\chi^2=11.74$   $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W=6.41, not significant

H/B=5.29, not significant

B/W=5.89, not significant

Table 59<sup>a</sup>

## Respondent's Attitude to Her Current Job

|                       | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Likes it very much    | 12<br>(32.4) | 21<br>(24.7) | 61<br>(37.4) |
| Likes it somewhat     | 20<br>(54.1) | 46<br>(54.1) | 76<br>(46.6) |
| Dislikes it somewhat  | 5<br>(13.5)  | 13<br>(15.3) | 18<br>(11.0) |
| Dislikes it very much | 0<br>(0)     | 5<br>(5.9)   | 8<br>(4.9)   |
| Totals                | 37           | 85           | 163          |

$\chi^2=6.41$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % respondents answering item.

noted: opportunity to develop close friendships at work, the broad significance of the job, and chances for promotions.

With reference to general work satisfaction items (Tables 57-59), 80% or more of each group of respondents reported that they would take another job. From 69% to 47% felt that it would be somewhat difficult to find a comparable job, with Hispanics being the most concerned and Whites being the most optimistic. Each group expressed that they liked their jobs fairly well or very much (78% or more).

In summary, the data reflected that attitudes and perceptions about the job were similar cross-culturally, and that more often than not they were positive. However, although many respondents from the three groups were interested in finding new positions, Hispanics were the most conservative about estimating the probability of finding comparable jobs. These findings have a contribution to make to the literature which states that employment problems frequently are the consequence of the subjects' negative attitudes.

#### Occupational Barriers

In the previous section the data began to reflect more environmental issues faced by these mothers in the form of work benefits or the lack of them. In this section data which reflect external factors that may block the

progress of those mothers will be described. Specifically the mothers were asked about two possible problems: transportation and English. With reference to the former (see Table 60), 60% or more of each of the groups did not consider transportation a problem, and there were not significant differences across cultures. With reference to English as a problem (see Table 61), 86% of each of the groups did not consider this a problem. Not unexpectedly, the Hispanic group did consider it more of a problem (14%) than did Blacks (3.6%) and Whites (2.2%). Additionally, the mothers were asked if there were other problems causing difficulties in getting a good job (see Table 62). Of the groups, 53.5% of the Hispanics, 35.5% of the Blacks, and 40.2% of the Whites responded positively. The specific problems identified by the mothers can be seen in Table 63.

In relation to other problems which stood in the way of these mothers getting a better job, all three groups felt that they lacked experience. Blacks and Hispanics more frequently reported this than did Whites. Lack of education was the second most frequently mentioned barrier for all three groups. Hispanics fell between Whites and Blacks in this category. The third highest specifically named issue for Hispanics was child care. They seemed to share this problem more with White mothers than with Black. The findings reflected that in addition to problems of discrimination, Hispanic mothers had a

## Problems Getting a Good Job

Table 60<sup>a</sup>

|                                   |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Lack of transportation a problem? | No     | 26<br>(60.5) | 71<br>(64.0) | 120<br>(67.0) |
|                                   | Yes    | 17<br>(39.5) | 40<br>(36.0) | 59<br>(33.0)  |
|                                   | Totals | 43           | 111          | 179           |

$\chi^2=0.76$ , not significant

Table 61<sup>a b</sup>

|                                    |        | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Difficulty with English a problem? | No     | 37<br>(86.0) | 106<br>(96.4) | 175<br>(97.8) |
|                                    | Yes    | 6<br>(14.0)  | 4<br>(3.6)    | 4<br>(2.2)    |
|                                    | Totals | 43           | 110           | 179           |

Table 62<sup>a</sup>

## Any Other Difficulties Causing Problems?

|                     |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|---------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Any other problems? | No     | 20<br>(46.5) | 71<br>(64.5) | 107<br>(59.8) |
|                     | Yes    | 23<br>(53.5) | 39<br>(35.5) | 72<br>(40.2)  |
|                     | Totals | 43           | 110          | 179           |

$\chi^2=4.18$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 63<sup>a b c</sup>

|                          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Lack of experience       | 10<br>(43.5) | 17<br>(43.6) | 26<br>(37.1) |
| Lack of education        | 5<br>(21.7)  | 6<br>(15.4)  | 19<br>(27.1) |
| Lack of training         | 0<br>(0)     | 6<br>(15.4)  | 3<br>(4.3)   |
| Lack of ability          | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(2.6)   | 2<br>(2.9)   |
| Illiterate               | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(2.6)   | 0<br>(0)     |
| Health problems          | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(1.4)   |
| Poor appearance          | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(2.6)   | 1<br>(1.4)   |
| Lack of childcare        | 2<br>(8.7)   | 1<br>(2.6)   | 7<br>(10.0)  |
| Family responsibilities  | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)     | 1<br>(1.4)   |
| Don't know where to look | 1<br>(4.3)   | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)     |
| Lack of available job    | 0<br>(0)     | 0<br>(0)     | 2<br>(2.9)   |
| Other                    | 5<br>(21.7)  | 6<br>(15.4)  | 8<br>(11.4)  |
| Totals                   | 23           | 39           | 70           |

<sup>a</sup> Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup> Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

<sup>c</sup> Number of subjects on this table is the result of a skip pattern from a previous table.

number of other problems with which to contend (one of them being English) and of the ones specifically mentioned the most potent in order of importance were: lack of experience, education, and child care.

In relation to discrimination (Tables 64-67) the data showed that in race, nationality, and age these Hispanic women experienced more stress than did either of the other two groups. Predictably so, racial discrimination was very similarly experienced by Blacks. Interestingly enough the most potent stressor at this stage of life, which cut across races and went beyond sex discrimination, was the issue of age.

The above data, therefore, reflect that Hispanic as well as Black mothers feel discriminated against. Of course the perennial question in psychology is whether these are attitudes of the women which become self-fulfilling prophecies, or are they a reflection of harsh reality with which the young mothers must contend. The best method to explore this further is to compare such findings as the ones presented here with studies which examine discriminatory processes in large institutions.

Another important factor which could be a barrier in terms of acquiring a good job is having or not having essential information about the world of work. The NLS posed a number of questions to the respondents which explored their knowledge about the nature of different jobs.

## Discrimination Tables

Table 64<sup>a</sup>

|                                  |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Racial discrimination a problem? | No     | 36<br>(83.7) | 93<br>(83.8) | 175<br>(97.8) |
|                                  | Yes    | 7<br>(16.3)  | 18<br>(16.2) | 4<br>(2.2)    |
|                                  | Totals | 43           | 111          | 179           |

$X^2=20.41$   $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=11.69,  $P<0.01$   
 H/B= 5.48, not significant  
 B/W=17.16,  $P<0.01$

Table 65<sup>a</sup>

|  |        | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|--|--------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Nationality discrimination is a problem? | No     | 38<br>(88.4) | 100<br>(90.1) | 178<br>(99.4) |
|  | Yes    | 5<br>(11.6)  | 11<br>(9.9)   | 1<br>(0.6)    |
|  | Totals | 43           | 111           | 179           |

$X^2=16.70$   $P < 0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=12.22,  $P<0.01$   
 H/B= .00, not significant  
 B/W=12.84,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 66<sup>a</sup>

|                                  |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Sex discrimination<br>a problem? | No     | 38<br>(88.4) | 96<br>(86.5) | 148<br>(82.7) |
|                                  | Yes    | 5<br>(11.6)  | 15<br>(13.5) | 31<br>(17.3)  |
|                                  | Totals | 43           | 111          | 179           |

$\chi^2=1.28$ , not significant

Table 67

|                                    |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Age discrimina-<br>tion a problem? | No     | 24<br>(55.8) | 80<br>(72.1) | 107<br>(59.8) |
|                                    | Yes    | 19<br>(44.2) | 31<br>(27.9) | 72<br>(40.2)  |
|                                    | Totals | 43           | 111          | 179           |

$\chi^2=5.67$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents who answered item.

For this group of mothers the results were the following: White mothers were consistently (with one exception only) the most accurate in determining the nature of each of the jobs. The exception was the "economist". The difference, however, on this item was not significant. The Hispanics were the next group to describe consistently and accurately the nature of the jobs, also with one exception (medical illustrator). This exception too was not significant. Most of the responses of all three groups were accurate with the 70% range with two exceptions: "medical illustrator" which produced a range within the forties for Blacks and Hispanics and the sixties for Whites and "machinist" which produced a range from 30% to 60% across the groups (Tables 68-76). Thus it becomes clear that the group which most needs information of the nature of different jobs is the Black group. The Hispanics followed and then the Whites. All three groups of mothers showed a need to learn more about the nature of jobs given that most of their responses were only within the 70% correct response range.

#### Occupational Role Models

The impact of role models is an issue which has become well known in the literature. As in education, the NLS provided some information concerning occupational role models in the form of a few questions concerning whether or not the respondents' role models (mothers, fathers, and

## World of Work Tables

Table 68<sup>a</sup>

|                              |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Hospital orderly's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers   | 29<br>(72.5) | 81<br>(71.7) | 158<br>(88.3) |
|                              | Incorrect<br>answers | 11<br>(27.5) | 32<br>(28.3) | 21<br>(11.7)  |
|                              | Totals               | 40           | 113          | 179           |

$X^2=14.22$ ,  $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=5.31, not significant  
 H/B=1.12, not significant  
 B/W=11.74,  $P<0.01$

Table 69<sup>a</sup>

|                                    |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Department store<br>buyer's duties | Correct<br>answers   | 31<br>(75.6) | 73<br>(64.0) | 140<br>(78.2) |
|                                    | Incorrect<br>answers | 10<br>(24.4) | 41<br>(36.0) | 39<br>(21.8)  |
|                                    | Totals               | 41           | 114          | 179           |

$X^2=7.27$   $P<0.05$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= 5.31, not significant  
 H/B= 1.12, not significant  
 B/W=11.74,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 70<sup>a</sup>

|                                   |                    | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Key punch<br>operator's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers | 28<br>(71.8) | 73<br>(65.2) | 124<br>(70.5) |
|                                   | Incorrect          | 11<br>(28.2) | 39<br>(34.8) | 52<br>(29.5)  |
|                                   | Totals             | 39           | 112          | 176           |

$X^2=1.07$ , not significant

Table 71<sup>a</sup>

|                                   |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Fork lift<br>operator's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers   | 29<br>(74.4) | 69<br>(62.7) | 148<br>(84.1) |
|                                   | Incorrect<br>answers | 10<br>(25.6) | 41<br>(37.3) | 28<br>(15.9)  |
|                                   | Totals               | 39           | 110          | 176           |

$X^2=16.83$   $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=1.46, not significant  
 H/B=1.25, not significant  
 B/W=15.73,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents who answered item.

Table 72<sup>a</sup>

|                                    |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Medical<br>illustrator's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers   | 19<br>(46.3) | 54<br>(47.8) | 113<br>(64.6) |
|                                    | Incorrect<br>answers | 22<br>(53.7) | 59<br>(52.2) | 62<br>(35.2)  |
|                                    | Totals               | 41           | 113          | 175           |

$\chi^2=9.85$ , not significant

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=3.91, not significant  
 H/B= .00, not significant  
 B/W=7.27,  $P<0.01$

Table 73<sup>a</sup>

|                       |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Machinist's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers   | 19<br>(47.5) | 34<br>(31.2) | 112<br>(63.3) |
|                       | Incorrect<br>answers | 21<br>(52.5) | 75<br>(68.8) | 65<br>(36.7)  |
|                       | Totals               | 40           | 109          | 177           |

$\chi^2=27.96$   $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= 2.77, not significant  
 H/B= 2.72, not significant  
 B/W=26.52,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 74<sup>a</sup>

|                       |           | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Dietician's<br>duties | Correct   | 28<br>(71.8) | 69<br>(61.6) | 142<br>(79.3) |
|                       | Incorrect | 11<br>(28.2) | 43<br>(38.4) | 37<br>(20.7)  |
|                       | Totals    | 39           | 112          | 179           |

$\chi^2=10.84$   $P<0.01$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= .67, not significant  
 H/B= .41, not significant  
 B/W=9.98,  $P<0.01$

Table 75<sup>a</sup>

|                       |           | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Economist's<br>duties | Correct   | 31<br>(81.6) | 81<br>(72.3) | 141<br>(80.6) |
|                       | Incorrect | 7<br>(18.4)  | 31<br>(27.7) | 34<br>(19.4)  |
|                       | Totals    | 38           | 112          | 175           |

$\chi^2=3.04$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 76<sup>a</sup>

|                       |                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Assembler's<br>duties | Correct<br>answers   | 29<br>(72.5) | 72<br>(64.9) | 140<br>(78.7) |
|                       | Incorrect<br>answers | 11<br>(27.5) | 39<br>(35.1) | 38<br>(21.3)  |
|                       | Totals               | 40           | 111          | 178           |

$\chi^2=6.65$ ,  $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W= .40, not significant  
 H/B= .47, not significant  
 B/W=5.96,  $P<0.01$

## Occupational Role Models Tables

Table 77<sup>a</sup>

Was the Respondent's Mother/Step Mother Employed In 1978?

|        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Yes    | 17<br>(38.6) | 67<br>(58.8) | 111<br>(61.3) |
| No     | 27<br>(61.4) | 47<br>(41.2) | 70<br>(38.7)  |
| Totals | 44           | 114          | 181           |

$\chi^2=7.57$   $P<0.05$

$\chi^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:  
 H/W=6.53,  $P<0.01$   
 H/B=4.39, not significant  
 B/W= .10, not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering items.

spouses) were employed during 1978. These items provided limited information about the employment histories of each of these individuals, but they do provide information about the status of occupational role models for the respondents around the time of the interview.

As we see in Table 77, White mothers, followed closely by Black mothers, were the least frequently employed. Table 78 provides information about the level of occupations which these mothers had. Although this is a descriptive table, the third and least skilled category was the most frequently filled by Hispanics (88.2%), then Blacks (79.1%), and lastly (56.8%) Whites. The highest level, as would be expected, had the reverse relationship, with Whites at 13.5%, Blacks at 6% and Hispanics at 5.9%.

With reference to employment of father, the data in Table 79 reflected that Whites and Hispanics had a very similar frequency of rate of employment (72.9% and 72.7% respectively) and that Blacks had 58.8%. With reference to types of jobs, Table 80 indicates that White and Hispanic fathers more frequently had higher-status jobs (both 25%) than did Blacks (13.6%).

Finally in relation to spouses, Whites had the highest employment rate (73.5%); they were followed by Hispanics (63.6%) and then Blacks (33.3%). On this particular category the comparison of type of occupation across

Table 78<sup>a b</sup>

## Respondent's Mother's/Stepmother's Longest Occupation in 1978

|   | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Prof. technical & kindred workers, managers, administrators except farm.  | 1<br>(5.9)   | 4<br>(6.0)   | 15<br>(13.5) |
| Sales, clerical, & unskilled workers  | 1<br>(5.9)   | 10<br>(14.9) | 33<br>(29.7) |
| Craftsmen & kindred workers operatives, laborers, farmers, farm managers, foremen, service workers, & private household workers | 15<br>(88.2) | 53<br>(79.1) | 63<br>(56.8) |
| Totals  | 17           | 67           | 111          |

Table 79<sup>a</sup>

## Was Respondent's Father/Stepfather employed During 1978?

|        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Yes    | 32<br>(72.7) | 66<br>(57.9) | 132<br>(72.9) |
| No     | 12<br>(27.3) | 48<br>(42.1) | 49<br>(27.1)  |
| Totals | 44           | 114          | 181           |

$X^2=7.80$   $P<0.05$

$X^2$  of the subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= .03, not significant

H/B=2.37, not significant

B/W=6.50,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 80<sup>a b</sup>

## Respondent's Father/Stepfather's Longest Occupation in 1978

|  | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Prof. technical & kindred workers, managers, administrators except farm.   | 8<br>(25.0)  | 9<br>(13.6)  | 33<br>(25.0) |
| Sales, clerical, & unskilled workers.  | 1<br>(3.1)   | 6<br>(9.1)   | 13<br>(9.8)  |
| Craftsmen & kindred workers operatives, laborers, farmers, farm managers, foremen, service workers & private household workers | 23<br>(71.9) | 51<br>(77.3) | 86<br>(65.2) |
| Totals   | 32           | 66           | 132          |

$X^2=5.11$ , not significant

Table 81<sup>a</sup>

## Was the Respondent's Spouse Employed in 1978?

|        | Hispanic     | Black        | White         |
|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Yes    | 28<br>(63.6) | 38<br>(33.3) | 133<br>(73.5) |
| No     | 16<br>(36.4) | 76<br>(66.7) | 48<br>(26.5)  |
| Totals | 44           | 114          | 181           |

$X^2=47.01$   $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= 1.24,  $P<0.01$

H/B=10.77, not significant

B/W=44.64,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 82<sup>a b</sup>

## Longest Occupation Held by Respondent's Spouse During 1978

|  | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Prof. technical & kindred workers, managers, administrators except farm.   | 2<br>(6.7)   | 2<br>(5.3)   | 10<br>(7.3)   |
| Sales, clerical & unskilled workers.   | 1<br>(3.3)   | 3<br>(7.9)   | 4<br>(2.9)    |
| Craftsmen & kindred workers operatives, laborers, farmers, farm managers, foremen, service workers & private household workers | 25<br>(83.3) | 33<br>(86.9) | 119<br>(86.9) |
| Did not work   | 2<br>(6.7)   | 0<br>(0)     | 4<br>(4.0)    |
| Totals   | 30           | 38           | 137           |

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

cultures was more similar than it was on either of the above two categories with a relatively low rate of employment in the highest-status category (Hispanics 6.7%, Blacks 5.3%, and Whites 7.3%). The majority of all three groups was at the low end of the job status scale, with the following rates in the third category: Hispanics (83.3%) Blacks (86.8%), and Whites (86.9%).

#### D. MOTHERHOOD

##### Actual Family Size

With reference to family size (Table 83) the data reflected that the three groups had a similar pattern for having one child. The Hispanic had a slightly higher frequency for having two or more children than did Whites or Blacks; still the rates for each of the groups were not significantly different.

##### Ideal, Desired, and Expected Children

When comparing ideal, desired, and expected number of children (Tables 84, 85, and 86) in the 5 or more children category, Hispanics were slightly above Blacks and Blacks slightly above Whites in considering this to be the ideal. For all three groups, however, the frequencies and percentages for 5+ children were low (Hispanics 9.1%, Blacks 8.8%, and Whites 4.4%). In the desired categories, Hispanics tended to desire more children than either Blacks or Whites; although the differences were not significantly different. None of the groups actually

## Motherhood Tables

Table 83

## Number of Children Respondent Has Had

|             | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| One         | 27<br>(71.1) | 87<br>(82.1) | 135<br>(81.3) |
| Two or more | 11<br>(28.9) | 19<br>(17.9) | 31<br>(18.7)  |
| Totals      | 38           | 106          | 166           |

$\chi^2 = .38$ , not significant

Table 84

|                             |           | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Ideal number<br>of children | 0-2       | 21<br>(47.7) | 62<br>(54.9) | 111<br>(61.3) |
|                             | 3-4       | 19<br>(43.2) | 41<br>(36.3) | 62<br>(34.2)  |
|                             | 5 or more | 4<br>(9.1)   | 10<br>(8.8)  | 8<br>(4.4)    |
|                             | Totals    | 44           | 113          | 181           |

$\chi^2 = 4.73$ , not significant

Table 85<sup>a</sup>

|                                  |           | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Desired<br>number of<br>children | 0-2       | 25<br>(56.8) | 81<br>(71.1) | 120<br>(66.7) |
|                                  | 3-4       | 14<br>(31.8) | 30<br>(26.3) | 54<br>(30.0)  |
|                                  | 5 or more | 5<br>(11.4)  | 3<br>(2.6)   | 6<br>(3.3)    |
|                                  | Totals    | 44           | 114          | 180           |

<sup>a</sup> Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

Table 86<sup>a b</sup>

|                                   |        | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Expected<br>number of<br>children | 0      | 8<br>(18.2)  | 28<br>(25.0) | 35<br>(19.4)  |
|                                   | 1 - 2  | 24<br>(54.5) | 73<br>(65.2) | 113<br>(62.8) |
|                                   | 3 - 4  | 12<br>(27.3) | 9<br>(8.0)   | 28<br>(15.6)  |
|                                   | 5 +    | 0<br>(0)     | 2<br>(1.8)   | 4<br>(2.2)    |
|                                   | Totals | 44           | 112          | 180           |

Table 87<sup>a</sup>

|  |    | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|--|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Number of<br>siblings<br>respondent<br>has | 0  | 0<br>(0)     | 3<br>(2.6)   | 8<br>(4.4)   |
|  | 1  | 7<br>(15.6)  | 7<br>(6.1)   | 22<br>(12.2) |
|  | 2  | 4<br>(9.1)   | 10<br>(8.8)  | 24<br>(13.3) |
|  | 3  | 6<br>(13.6)  | 13<br>(11.4) | 49<br>(27.4) |
|  | 4+ | 27<br>(61.4) | 81<br>(71.1) | 78<br>(43.1) |
| Totals                                     | 44 | 114          | 181          |              |

$X^2=27.46$ ,  $P<0.01$

$X^2$  of subcomparisons with Bonferroni Protection:

H/W= 7.97, not significant

H/B= 5.15, not significant

B/W=22.71,  $P<0.01$

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

<sup>b</sup>Descriptive table, no statistics calculated.

expected to have five children over the 2.2% level. In the 3 to 4 children category, the Hispanic ideal was higher than that of Blacks or Whites; the desirability was similar to Whites and only slightly higher than Blacks. Hispanic mothers did expect to have three or four children more frequently than did the other two groups (Hispanics 27.3%, Blacks 8.0%, Whites 15.6%).

In the 0 to 2 children category Hispanics fell below Blacks and Whites in considering this the ideal. They were the least likely to consider 0 to 2 children desirable. Their expectations reflected the same pattern. Their actual rate of reproduction, however, was similar at this stage to Blacks and Whites, and statistically speaking, the groups were not significantly different in any of the four tables. Based on the above data the hypothesis can be made that although Hispanic females may idealize and desire more children, their actual reproduction at the time of the interview did not reflect this proportionately.

#### Role Models for Motherhood

The NLS item which explored the number of siblings that the respondent had provided basic information about their "role models" for motherhood (family size). Table 87 summarizes the results. Hispanics were the least likely of the three groups to have no siblings (0%). They were followed by Blacks (2.9%) and then Whites (4.4%). They

were the most likely to have one sibling (15.6%) when compared with Whites (12.2%) and Blacks (2.6%). Hispanics and Blacks were very similar in their pattern of having two siblings (9.1% and 8.8% respectively). Whites, however, were the most likely to have two siblings (13.3%). They were followed by Hispanics (13.6%) and then by Whites who were the most likely with 43.1%. Significant differences were found only between Hispanics and Whites. The data demonstrated across cultures that these mothers came from families which were larger than the national norm. Most of the respondents in each group reported having three or more siblings. Thus all had role models for slightly larger than average families.

#### E. Other Psychological Factors

##### Family Role Attitudes

The NLS interviews posed a series of questions to the respondents which addressed themselves to role relationships in the the family. The responses produced an interesting pattern for this group as a whole, that is, as women; and, for each group in relation to the other two.

First of all, as a whole, the majority of women's responses on each item was in the direction of "non-traditional roles" for women in the family. The lowest percentage rate of non-traditional responses for any item was 59.1%, and most of the responses were in the 70 to 80 percentiles. It is important to keep in mind that this is

## Family Roles Tables

Table 88<sup>a</sup>

|                                    |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|------------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| A woman's place<br>is in the home. | Disagree | 35<br>(79.5) | 98<br>(86.7) | 145<br>(80.6) |
|                                    | Agree    | 9<br>(20.5)  | 15<br>(13.3) | 35<br>(19.4)  |
| Totals                             |          | 44           | 113          | 180           |

$X^2=2.13$ , not significant

Table 89<sup>a</sup>

|   |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|---|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Wife with<br>family has<br>no time for<br>outside work. | Disagree | 32<br>(72.7) | 93<br>(83.8) | 141<br>(78.8) |
|   | Agree    | 12<br>(27.3) | 18<br>(16.2) | 38<br>(21.2)  |
| Totals  |          | 44           | 111          | 179           |

$X^2=2.56$ , not significant

Table 90<sup>a</sup>

|  |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| A working<br>wife feels<br>more useful | Disagree | 13<br>(29.5) | 30<br>(26.5) | 59<br>(32.5)  |
|  | Agree    | 31<br>(70.5) | 83<br>(73.5) | 121<br>(67.2) |
| Totals                                 |          | 44           | 113          | 180           |

$X^2=1.29$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 94<sup>a</sup>

|                                     |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Men should<br>share house-<br>work. | Disagree | 7<br>(15.9)  | 15<br>(13.3) | 32<br>(17.8)  |
|                                     | Agree    | 37<br>(84.1) | 98<br>(96.7) | 148<br>(82.2) |
|                                     | Totals   | 44           | 113          | 180           |

$\chi^2=1.05$ , not significant

Table 95<sup>a</sup>

|  |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Women are<br>happier in<br>traditional<br>roles. | Disagree | 26<br>(59.1) | 83<br>(74.8) | 126<br>(70.4) |
|  | Agree    | 18<br>(40.9) | 28<br>(25.2) | 53<br>(29.6)  |
|  | Totals   | 44           | 111          | 179           |

$\chi^2=3.72$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % respondents answering item.

Table 91<sup>a</sup>

|  |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|--|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Working wives<br>lead to juvi-<br>nile delin-<br>quency. | Disagree | 32<br>(72.7) | 95<br>(85.6) | 135<br>(75.0) |
|  | Agree    | 12<br>(27.3) | 16<br>(14.4) | 45<br>(25.0)  |
|  | Totals   | 44           | 111          | 180           |

$\chi^2=5.41$ , not significant

Table 92<sup>a</sup>

|  |          | Hispanics    | Blacks        | Whites        |
|--|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Both parents<br>need to work<br>due to infla-<br>tion. | Disagree | 7<br>(57.9)  | 13<br>(11.5)  | 36<br>(20.0)  |
|  | Agree    | 37<br>(84.1) | 100<br>(88.5) | 144<br>(80.0) |
|  | Totals   | 44           | 113           | 180           |

$\chi^2=3.63$ , not significant

Table 93<sup>a</sup>

|                                   |          | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Traditional<br>roles are<br>best. | Disagree | 26<br>(61.9) | 76<br>(67.3) | 117<br>(65.4) |
|                                   | Agree    | 16<br>(38.1) | 37<br>(32.7) | 62<br>(34.6)  |
|                                   | Totals   | 42           | 113          | 179           |

$\chi^2=.40$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

not simple a random sample of women but rather a select group of women who have taken up the mothering role at a relatively young age and who are married more frequently than the general population. Therefore, they are living the actual dynamics of family life and out of this experience they still produce non-traditional views.

Cross-culturally, these mothers' responses did not produce a single significant difference. This, of course, is an interesting finding given the nature of this subsample and the difference which does exist between these real life findings and the portrayal of Hispanic women's values in the literature.

#### Sense of Individual Control Versus Luck

The NLS also included questions which were designed to explore the individual respondent's feeling of personal control as opposed to luck or chance in her life. In general the results reflected that on the great majority of these items most of the mothers expressed a sense of personal control over luck or chance in their lives. Again, recalling the contents of the literature on women from Freud to Bardwick, women have been portrayed as having an external locus of control. As can be seen from reviewing the data in Tables 96-99, this is not the case with this cross-cultural group of women.

In relation to inter-group comparisons the results were not significantly different. This fact is important

## Sense of Individual Control V Luck Tables

Table 96<sup>a</sup>

|                | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| In control     | 31<br>(72.1) | 69<br>(60.5) | 119<br>(65.7) |
| Not in control | 12<br>(27.9) | 45<br>(39.5) | 62<br>(34.3)  |
| Totals         | 43           | 114          | 181           |

$X^2=1.99$ , not significant

Table 97<sup>a</sup>

|                         | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Respondent's plans work | 24<br>(55.8) | 48<br>(42.1) | 86<br>(47.5) |
| Matter of luck          | 19<br>(44.2) | 66<br>(57.9) | 95<br>(52.5) |
| Totals                  | 43           | 114          | 181          |

$X^2=2.45$ , not significant

Table 98<sup>a</sup>

|                      | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites        |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Luck is not a factor | 37<br>(86.0) | 93<br>(81.6) | 155<br>(85.6) |
| Flip a coin          | 6<br>(14.0)  | 21<br>(18.4) | 26<br>(14.4)  |
| Totals               | 43           | 114          | 181           |

$X^2=.22$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

Table 99<sup>a</sup>

|                       | Hispanics    | Blacks       | Whites       |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Luck plays a big role | 21<br>(48.8) | 55<br>(48.2) | 83<br>(45.9) |
| Luck plays no role    | 22<br>(51.2) | 59<br>(51.8) | 98<br>(54.1) |
| Totals                | 43           | 114          | 181          |

$\chi^2 = .22$ , not significant

<sup>a</sup>Figures in parentheses = % of respondents answering item.

again because of the way minorities in general, and particularly Hispanic women, are portrayed in the literature. Additionally, it is worth noting that although the differences were not statistically different, the Hispanic group did express the highest sense of control of any of the groups.

CHAPTER V  
DISCUSSION

This study was originally conceived as a preliminary exploratory study from a cross-cultural perspective of young Hispanic mothers who are enrolled and/or employed. There were a number of goals involved. The first was to gather basic information about these mothers directly from them using a survey which could provide a national sample population. The second goal was to summarize the findings and contribute a profile of these Hispanic mothers, the characteristics of which could be compared with previous findings on the subject within the social science literature. The third goal was to make recommendations for policy and research based on the findings. A summary of the above-mentioned goals will follow in this chapter.

A. Summary of the Hispanic Mother's Profile

Differences which were statistically supported can be summarized in two statements. Hispanics were significantly different from both of the other groups on the following dimensions: birth, language spoken in the home in childhood, marital status, the lack of a high school diploma, the highest grade completed by mother and father, and the occupational expectations in five years. Secondly, Hispanics shared the following dimensions with Blacks which

were significantly different from Whites: the number of siblings who were enrolled in school and the reported experience of discrimination due to nationality and/or race.

However, a much more complete representation of Hispanic mothers can be generated by looking beyond those characteristics which statistically differentiated them from the other cultures. In the following section a summary will be presented of the differences which were noteworthy from the data generated by this study.

First of all, in the section which described general characteristics it was found that when groups were compared, the Hispanic females had a frequency of motherhood which was between that of Blacks and Whites (Hispanics 15%, Blacks 21%, and Whites 21%). When comparing mothers cross-culturally, the Hispanic mothers had the lowest frequency of employment and/or enrollment in school (Hispanics 29%, Blacks 35%, and Whites 42%). However, when comparing the employed/enrolled groups of mothers cross-culturally, Hispanics were the most likely to be working (Hispanics 80%, Blacks 70%, Whites 75%).

With reference to culture, nationality, and language, the data showed that the majority of the Hispanic mothers in the subsample had been born in the United States (71%). Of the immigrants (29% of the total), the majority (10 out of 13) came to the United States after they were 14. A total of 89% of the Hispanics spoke Spanish in their homes

in childhood. In relation to racial/ethnic background, the Hispanic group was 43% Mexican American, 9% Mexican, 14% self identified as "other Hispanic," 4.5% Puerto Rican and 4.5% Cuban.

With reference to religion, 80% of the Hispanics reported that they were raised as Catholics, and most reported that they continued to practice Catholicism at the time of the interview. Hispanics tended to go to church more frequently than Whites but less than Blacks.

Hispanics had a mean age of 20 which was the same as that of Blacks and Whites. The majority of them had mothered one child and a very small percentage of them had had two or more. They tended to be married (64%), a frequency which was similar to that of Whites. Finally, Hispanics were the least likely of the three groups to be divorced.

In relation to education they had an intermediate frequency for being enrolled in school (Hispanics 34%, Blacks 52%, Whites 24%). However, only 39% of the Hispanic mothers completed more than the eleventh grade. This was the lowest frequency of the three groups. Linked with this was the lowest rate of obtaining a high school diploma or its equivalent (Hispanics 45%, Blacks 76%, Whites 74%). With reference to educational aspirations Hispanic mothers were not significantly different from the other two groups. Of the Hispanic mothers, 34% wanted to obtain a Bachelor's

degree or more (Blacks 51%, Whites 37%); but their expectations were lower (Hispanics 22%, Blacks 32%, Whites 19%).

Hispanic mothers most frequently gave marriage, pregnancy and home-related responsibilities for having left school (Hispanics 43%, Blacks 29%, Whites 18%).

With reference to school attitudes in the limited sample of mothers attending high school or below, the Hispanic mothers were very positive as were the other two groups. The item with the most negative responses was about feeling bored in school, only 67% disagreed. (However the other two cultures seemed even more bored!)

Hispanic mothers' role models for education were significantly different from the other two groups. A total of 58% of the Hispanic respondents' mothers and 50% of their fathers did not go beyond eighth grade. Black and Whites mothers and fathers had significantly more education. In the Hispanic group 66% had siblings who were enrolled at the time of the interview. Blacks and Whites had significantly higher frequencies for this item. Hispanic spouses also had lower levels of education than the other two groups. This pattern was not repeated in relation to the highest grade the closest friend of the respondent wanted to complete. Still more than 50% of them fell below the college level. However, the closest friends of the White mothers had more limited aspirations.

respondents were: lack of experience, education and child care.

With reference to problems of a discriminatory nature, the Hispanics shared a concern about age discrimination with the other two groups. Discrimination based on nationality and race were shared only with Blacks.

On "world of work" items in the NLS, the Hispanic mothers were less accurate than Whites but more accurate than Blacks in identifying the nature of a variety of jobs; still, they did demonstrate a need to learn more about the subject.

With reference to role models for work, The Hispanic respondents' mothers were the least frequently employed in 1978 of the three groups. They also tended to have the lowest level of jobs. The respondents' fathers' employment rates, however, were similar to that of White fathers and their job status was also similar. Finally, spouse employment rates for the young Hispanic mothers were second highest at 64% surpassed only by that of the young White mothers; spouses.

On the subject of motherhood, there were no significant differences across groups for having one child. The rate for Hispanics was 70%. They had a somewhat higher though not significantly different rate for having more than one child as compared with the other two groups. Hispanic mothers also had a higher frequency for idealizing

and desiring a somewhat larger number of children than did the other two groups, but they did not actually expect to have them at a proportionate rate.

With reference to role models for family size, Hispanics were in an intermediate position between the other two groups for having four siblings, and they were the least likely to have no siblings at all. Finally, they shared with the other two groups the characteristic of coming from larger than average families.

In the family role attitudes items Hispanics, as well as the other two groups, demonstrated a strong trend in the direction of non-traditional responses. Hispanic mothers had the strongest sense of overall personal control of any of the three groups, though the differences were not significant and the overall trend of the three groups was definitely in the direction of a sense of personal control.

#### B. Relation to Other Research

Through its cross-cultural perspective the study supported more recent research which indicates that young women facing the considerable responsibilities of motherhood do aspire to achieve. It also confirmed that there is a cross-cultural gap between achievement and aspirations for these young mothers. It did not, however, support the contention that this gap is a consequence of rigid sex role attitudes or of an external sense of control. According

to these women, the strongest barriers which they faced were: lack of education and experience, transportation problems, age discrimination for all, and racial and nationality discrimination, language problems, and home responsibilities for some.

The results did not support the assumptions in the literature that Hispanic women are more rigid about family roles than are women from other cultures. They did however, support Lord's findings Hispanic women are more interested in combining motherhood with outside employment than White women. The results did not support the assumption that Hispanic women have a more externalized sense of control than other cultures. In fact the results of this study demonstrate that the Hispanic group of enrolled and/or employed young mothers was the least "luck-oriented" of the three.

Finally, the findings did support the hypothesis that Hispanic women face external barriers some of which they share with the other two cultures, others only with Blacks, and still others they carry alone (e.g., language, stressors of immigration, etc).

### C. Recommendations for Research and Policy

The purpose of this study was to provide a more subject-generated overview of the young Hispanic mothers' experiences. As such it is only a starting point from which more indepth

Of the group of Hispanic mothers, 50% worked, a percentage which was higher than either of the other two groups. For this groups of working Hispanic mothers, 94% had non-managerial level jobs and 80% or more worked in private industry as did comprable frequencies of the other two groups. They had the lowest participation in government jobs and the highest in self-employment. They had high aspirations for professional levels of work in the future, as did Blacks. Their expectations to achieve their occupational goals in the future were positive.

Their work commitment was also strong. They were very positive about training as an alternative to take if they could not support their families as were the other two groups. The Hispanics were also interested in continuing to work even when it was not economically necessary. This was more frequently true for Hispanics than for the other two groups.

With reference to work benefits in items that were more objective, Hispanics reported many fewer benefits available at the job than did the other two groups. There was little difference among the groups on the other items.

On the subject of occupational barriers, 40% of the Hispanics considered transportation a problem. A similar percentage of the other two groups considered this a problem as well. Of the Hispanics 14% considered that English was a problem. Additional problems identified by these

and specific research should emerge. An examination of the Hispanic mother profile shows that there are a number of critical points which need further exploration. The gap between aspirations when compared to dropout rates needs to be studied carefully with a larger sample of interviewees. A more open-ended interview could be beneficial in order to gain insight into the wide range of special circumstances and barriers which young Hispanic mothers face and to explore what, if any, common personal dynamics they bring to such situations.

Secondly, research in the area of cross-cultural relations in school systems, as well as employment settings, continues to be absolutely crucial. The work of organizational systems analysis is, relatively speaking, a young component of psychology, and its methodology needs refinement. This type of exploration is particularly important for a more realistic understanding of cross-cultural relations.

Thirdly, the continuation of research in the area of healthy bicultural development is required as well. For groups which value the maintenance of a separate cultural identity while simultaneously participating in a larger society, this is particularly important. It is even more important to those groups which have experienced discrimination and exploitation in this country. In the past decade or so there were a small number of attempts made

to develop bicultural educational models. Some of these were highly successful in assisting immigrants, as well as native-born Hispanics, to consolidate their biculturalism from a psychological and sociological frame of reference. The careful study of those models which were successful in order to replicate them efficiently is also a critical task for future research.

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY QUESTIONS

APPENDIX A<sup>a</sup>ORIGINAL NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY ITEMS AND NUMBERS (NLS)  
AND CORRESPONDING HISPANIC MOTHER PROFILE TABLE NUMBERS (HMP)

In what country were you born?

In the United States?

In some other country? (NLS 5, HMP 2)

Now let's talk about when you were 14 years of age. Where were you living then? (NLS 9, HMP 3)

What language was that (referring to previous question about language other than English spoken in respondent's home in childhood)?

Spanish?

French?

German?

Other (specify)? (NLS 7, HMP 4,5)

What is your origin or descent?

Black Afro-American, or Negro

Chinese

English

Filipino or Philipino

French

German

Greek

Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Indian-American, or Native American

Indian-Asian

Irish

Italian

Japanese

Korean

Latino or Spanish Descent

Cuban

Mexican or Mexicano

Mexican-American

Puerto Rican, Puertorriqueno, or Borincano

Other Latino, Hispano, or Latin-American Descent

Polish

Portuguese

Russian

Scottish

Vietnamese

Welsh

Other (Specify)

If volunteered: American

or

None

(NLS 64, HMP 6)

<sup>a</sup>Detailed instructions for interviewer are not included.

What was the highest grade of regular school--that is, elementary school, high school, college, or graduate school--that your (most recent) (husband/wife) ever completed?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| None       | 11th grade          |
| 1st grade  | 12th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 3rd grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 6th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 8th year of college |
| 10th grade | (NLS 83, HMP 25)    |

Now think about your best or closest friend. What is the highest grade or year of regular school that this friend wants to complete?

|            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1st grade  | 1st year of college        |
| 2nd grade  | 2nd year of college        |
| 3rd grade  | (Associate's Degree)       |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college        |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college        |
| 6th grade  | (Bachelor's Degree)        |
| 7th grade  | 5th year of college        |
| 8th grade  | (Master's Degree)          |
| 9th grade  | More than 5 years of       |
| 10th grade | college..(Law Degree,      |
| 11th grade | PH.D., M.D., LLD, DDS, JD) |
| 12th grade | (NLS 183, HMP 26)          |

What kind of work were you doing for this job? (refers to previous question) What kind of work were you doing for the most hours last week?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 396-399, HMP 27)

Were you...

An employee of a private company, business, or an individual for wages, salary, or commission, or...

A government employee, or...

Self employed in own business, professional practice, or farm, or...

Working without pay in family business or farm?

(NLS 400, HMP 28)

What kind of work do you think you would be doing (in 5 years)?

If volunteered: Same as present job, or...

Occupation, or...

Don't know

(NLS 1395, HMP 29)

First, in what religion were you raised?

Protestant, "Christian", no denomination known, or  
non-denominational church

Baptist

Episcopalian

Lutheran

Methodist

Presbyterian

Roman Catholic

Jewish

Other (Specify)

or

None, no religion (NLS 1616, HMP 7)

What is your present religion, if any?

Protestant, "Christian", no denomination known, or  
non-denominational church

Baptist

Episcopalian

Lutheran

Methodist

Presbyterian

Roman Catholic

Jewish

Other (specify)

or

None, no religion (NLS 1617, HMP 8)

In the past year, about how often have you attended  
religious services --

More than once a week

About once a week

Two or three times a month

About once a month

Several times a year or less

Not at all (NLS 71, HMP 9)

First, when were you born? And that makes you \_\_\_ is that  
correct? (NLS 4, HMP 10)

How many children altogether have you ever given birth to  
at any time, not counting babies who were dead at birth?  
\_\_\_ (NLS 100, HMP 11)

Are you presently married, widowed, divorced, separated,  
or have you never been married?

Presently married

Widowed

Divorced

Separated

Never married--including annulments (NLS 72, HMP 12)

What grade or year of school is that (referring to previous question concerning current regular school enrollment)?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| 1st grade  | 11th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 12th grade          |
| 3rd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 4th grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 6th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 10th grade | 8th year of college |

(NLS 105, HMP 13)

Is respondent currently enrolled in grades 9-12?

(NLS 133, HMP 13)

Is respondent currently enrolled in college?

(NLS 164, HMP 13)

What is the highest grade or year of regular school that you have completed and got credit for?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| 1st grade  | 11th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 12th grade          |
| 3rd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 4th grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 6th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 10th grade | 8th year of college |

(NLS 121, HMP 14)

Do you have a high school diploma or have you ever passed a high school equivalency or GED test? (NLS 129, HMP 15)

What is the highest grade or year of regular school, that is, elementary school, high school, college, or graduate school that you would like to complete?

|           |                      |
|-----------|----------------------|
| 1st grade | 1st year of college  |
| 2nd grade | 2nd year of college  |
| 3rd grade | (Associate's degree) |
| 4th grade | 3rd year of college  |
| 5th grade | (Bachelor's degree)  |
| 6th grade | 4th year of college  |
| 7th grade | (Bachelor's degree)  |
| 8th grade | 5th year of college  |
| 9th grade | (Master's degree)    |

|            |                           |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 10th grade | More than 5 years of      |
| 11th grade | college,, (Law degree,    |
| 12th grade | Ph.D., M.D., LLD, DDS, JD |

(NLS 183, HMP 16)

What is the highest grade or year of regular school, that is, elementary school, high school, college, or graduate school that you would like to complete?

|            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1st grade  | 1st year of college        |
| 2nd grade  | 2nd year of college        |
| 3rd grade  | (Associate's degree)       |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college        |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college        |
| 6th grade  | (Bachelor's degree)        |
| 7th grade  | 5th year of college        |
| 8th grade  | (Master's degree)          |
| 9th grade  | More than 5 years of       |
| 10th grade | college..(Law degree,      |
| 11th grade | Ph.D., M.D., LLD, DDS, JD) |
| 12th grade | (NLS 182, HMP 16)          |

As things now stand, what is the highest grade or year you think you will actually complete?

|            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1st grade  | 1st year of college        |
| 2nd grade  | 2nd year of college        |
| 3rd grade  | (Associate's degree)       |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year or college        |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college        |
| 6th grade  | (Bachelor's degree)        |
| 7th grade  | 5th year of college        |
| 8th grade  | (Master's degree)          |
| 9th grade  | More than 5 years of       |
| 10th grade | college..(Law degree,      |
| 11th grade | Ph.D., M.D., LLD, DDS, JD) |
| 12th grade | (NLS 183, HMP 17)          |

What is the main reason you left at that time (referring to previous question inquiring about why respondent is not currently enrolled)?

- Received degree, completed course work
- Expelled or suspended
- Getting married
- Pregnancy
- School too dangerous
- Lack of ability, poor grades
- Other reasons didn't like school
- Home responsibilities
- Offered good job, chose to work
- Financial difficulties, couldn't afford to attend
- Entered military
- Moved away from school
- Other (specify) (NLS 119, HMP 18)

What was the highest grade or year of regular school that your mother ever completed?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| None       | 11th grade          |
| 1st grade  | 12th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 3rd grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 6th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 8th year of college |
| 10th grade |                     |

(NLS 32, HMP 20)

What was the highest grade or year of regular school that your father ever completed?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| None       | 11th grade          |
| 1st grade  | 12th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 3rd grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 6th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 8th year of college |
| 10th grade |                     |

(NLS 46, HMP21)

How many of them (refers to previous question, which inquires about siblings) are currently attending or enrolled in regular school?

Enter number \_\_\_ or None (NLS 60, HMP 22,23)

What is the highest grade or year of regular school that (he/she) (refers to oldest living brother or sister) has ever completed?

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| None       | 11th grade          |
| 1st grade  | 12th grade          |
| 2nd grade  | 1st year of college |
| 3rd grade  | 2nd year of college |
| 4th grade  | 3rd year of college |
| 5th grade  | 4th year of college |
| 6th grade  | 5th year of college |
| 7th grade  | 6th year of college |
| 8th grade  | 7th year of college |
| 9th grade  | 8th year of college |
| 10th grade |                     |

(NLS 62. HMP 24)

What do you think your chances are of getting into this type of work (refers to previous question)? Do you think they are excellent, good, fair or poor? (NLS 1383, HMP 30)

Suppose at age 35 that you and your (husband/wife) (If not presently married: if you are married,) could not earn enough money by working to support your family; please tell me whether you probably would or probably would not do each of the following things. -- would you probably do that or probably not do that?

|  | Probably<br>would do<br>that | Probably<br>would not<br>do that | Don't<br>know |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|

- a. Get more education if you were paid enough to live on while learning
- b. Go on welfare
- c. Enter a job-training program if you were paid enough to live on while in training
- d. Apply for food stamps
- e. Shoplift

If, by some chance, you (and your (husband/wife)) were to get enough money to live comfortably without working, do you think you would work anyway?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 1384-1389, HMP, 98)

Does your employer make \_\_\_\_\_ available to you? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

- A. Medical, surgical, or hospital insurance that covers injuries or major illnesses off the job?
- B. Life insurance that would cover your death for reasons not connected with your job?
- C. Paid vacation? (NLS 411-413, HMP 37-39)

We would like to know what kinds of opportunities this job offers you. (First/Next), how much opportunity does this job give you \_\_\_\_\_ --a minimum amount, not too much, a moderate amount, quite a lot, or a maximum amount?

- 1. To do a number of different things
- 2. To deal with other people
- 3. For independent thought or action
- 4. To develop close friendships i your job
- 5. To do a job from beginning to end-- that is, the chance to do the whole job? (NLS 414-418, HMP 40-44)

How much does your job give you the feeling that the job itself is very significant or important in the broader scheme of things--a minimum amount, not too much, a moderate amount, amount, quite a lot, or a maximum amount? (NLS 419, HMP 45)

If no to B (Is respondent self employed?): How much does your job give you the feeling that you know whether or not you are performing your job well or poorly--a minimum amount, not too much, a moderate amount, quite a lot, or a maximum amount? (NLS 421, HMP 46)

We would like to know how well or poorly each of the following statements describes your job. Think of your present job, would you say this is very true, somewhat true, not too true, or not at all true?

1. You are given a chance to do the things you do best.
2. The physical surroundings are pleasant.
3. The skills you are learning would be valuable in getting a better job.
4. The job is dangerous.
5. You are exposed to unhealthy conditions.
6. The pay is good.
7. The job security is good.
8. Your co-workers are friendly.
9. Your supervisor is competent in doing the job.
10. The chances for promotion are good.

(NLS 422-431, HMP 47-56)

I'd like to get some idea of the kind of job you'd most like to have. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would you do?

Take another job?

Keep the same job?

If volunteered: Would not work at all.

(NLS 439, HMP 57)

If you were to leave your current job, how difficult do you think it would be to find another job that was just as good? extremely difficult, somewhat difficult, or not at all difficult? (NLS 440, HMP 58)

How do you feel about the job you have now? Do you like it very much, like it fairly well, dislike it somewhat, or dislike it very much? (NLS 441, HMP 59)

We're trying to find out the main reasons why many young people your age have trouble getting a good job. Have any of the following things ever caused you any problems in getting a good job?

- a. Lack of transportation? Has it caused you any problems getting a good job?
- b. Discrimination on the basis of race?
- c. Discrimination on the basis of nationality?
- d. Discrimination on the basis of sex?
- e. Discrimination on the basis of age?
- f. A problem with English?

(NLS 218-223, HMP 60,61,64-67)

Have any other things ever caused you problems in getting a good job? \_\_\_\_\_ (NLS 224, HMP 62)

If yes (As a response to NLS 224) what other things have ever caused you problems in getting a good job?

|                      |                                    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| _____                | Employers don't like my appearance |
| _____                | Lack of child care                 |
| _____                | Other family responsibilities      |
| Lack of experience   | Don't know where to look           |
| Lack of education    | Lack of available jobs             |
| Lack of Training     | Other (specify)                    |
| Lack of Ability      |                                    |
| Can't read or write  |                                    |
| Problems with health | (NLS 225-229, HMP 63)              |

Next I'd like your opinion about the kind of work that people in certain jobs usually do. For each occupation on this card there are three descriptions of jobs duties. Will you please tell me which description you think best fits each job? Be sure to read all of the possible answers before you decide.

- a. Hospital orderly...
  - Helps to take care of hospital patients
  - Orders food and other supplies for hospital kitchens
  - Works at hospital desk where patients check in
  - Don't know
- b. Department store buyer
  - Selects the items to be sold in a section of a department store
  - Checks on the courtesy of sales people by shopping at the store
  - Buys department stores that are about to go out of business
  - Don't know
- c. Key punch operator
  - Operates a machine which sends telegrams
  - Operates a machine which punches holes in cards used in computers
  - Operates a cordless telephone switchboard and pushes switch keys to make telephone connections
  - Don't know
- d. Fork lift operator
  - Operates a machine that makes a certain kind of agricultural tool
  - Operates a freight elevator in a warehouse or factory
  - Drives an electrical or gas powered machine to move material in a warehouse or factory
  - Don't know

- e. Medical illustrator
  - Hands tools and equipment to a surgeon during an operation
  - Demonstrates the use of various types of medicines
  - Draws pictures that are used to teach anatomy and surgical operating procedures
  - Don't know
- f. Machinist
  - Makes adjustments on automobile, airplane, and tractor engines
  - Repairs electrical equipment
  - Sets up and operates metal lathes, shapers, grinders, buffers, etc.
  - Don't know
- g. Dietician
  - Waits on tables in a restaurant
  - Suggests exercises for persons who are overweight or sick
  - Plans menus for hospitals and schools
  - Don't know
- h. Economist
  - Prepares menus in a hospital, hotel or other such establishment
- i. Assembler
  - Puts together and fixes machines used on an assembly line
  - Takes broken parts off an assembly line and sends them to scrap area
  - Works on a production line putting parts together
  - Don't know (NLS 208-216, HMP 68-76)

What kind of work was she (Mother) doing? During 1978, what kind of work did she do the longest? \_\_\_\_\_  
 What were some of her main activities or duties?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 36, HMP 77,78)

What kind of work was he (father) doing? During 1978, what kind of work did he do the longest? \_\_\_\_\_  
 What were some of his main activities or duties?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 50, HMP 79,80)

What kind of work did your (most recent) (husband/wife) do?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ What were (his/her) main activities or  
 duties?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 85, HMP 81,82)

How many children altogether, have you ever given birth to  
 not counting babies who were dead at birth?

(NLS 100, HMP 83)

Now I'd like to ask you your opinions and expectations about  
 family size.

1A. First, what do you think is the ideal number of children  
 for a family?

1B. How many children do you want to have?

3. Altogether, how many (more) children do you expect to  
 have? \_\_\_\_\_ (NLS 97,98,101; HMP 84-86)

How many (living) brothers and sisters do you have? \_\_\_\_\_

(NLS 59, HMP 87)

We are interested in your opinion about the employment of  
 wives. I will read a series of statements and after each  
 one I would like to know whether you strongly agree, agree,  
 disagree, or strongly disagree.

- a. A woman's place is in the home, not in the office or  
 shop.
- b. A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities  
 doesn't have time for outside employment.
- c. A working wife feels more useful than one who doesn't  
 hold a job.
- d. The employment of wives leads to more juvenile delin-  
 quency.
- e. Employment of both parents is necessary to keep up with  
 the high cost of living.
- f. It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is  
 the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care  
 of the home and family.
- g. Men should share the work around the house with women,  
 such as doing dishes, cleaning, and so forth.
- h. Women are much happier if they stay at home and take  
 care of their children. (NLS 1200-1207, HMP 88-95)

Pair one:

1. What happens to me is my own doing, or
2. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over  
 the direction my life is taking

Pair two:

1. When I make plans I am almost certain that I can make  
 them work, or
2. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead, because

many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

Pair Three:

1. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck, or
2. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

Pair Four:

1. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me, or
2. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

(NLS 1192,1194,1196,1198, HMP 96-99)

## REFERENCES

- Achor, S. Mexican Americans in a Dallas barrio. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1978.
- Alder, H. L. & Roessler, E. Introduction to probability and statistics. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1968.
- Andrade, S. J. Contraceptive use by adolescents: What do we know about Chicanas? Unpublished manuscript, 1981-a.
- Andrade, S. J. Why it's difficult to plan sex education or family planning services for Hispanic teenagers: The non-existent data base. Unpublished manuscript, 1981-b.
- Andrade, S. J. Family roles of Hispanic women: Assumptions, empirical findings and implications for research. In R. E. Zambrana (Ed.), Work, family, and health: Latina women in transition. Bronx, New York: Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University, Special Report #2, 1982.
- Andrade, S. J. Family planning practices of Mexican Americans. In M. B. Melville (Ed.), Twice a minority: Mexican American women. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1980.
- Andrade, S. J. Social science stereotypes of the Mexican American woman: Policy implications for research. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, in press.
- Arroyo, L. E. Industrial and occupational distribution of Chicana workers. In R. Sanchez (Ed.), Essays on la mujer. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center, University of California, 1977.
- Asunción-Landé, N. C. Problems and strategies for sexual identity and integration: Mexican-American women on the move. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1979, 3, 497-506.
- Baca Zinn, M. Chicano family research: Conceptual distortions and alternative directions. The Journal of Ethnic Studies, 1979, 7, 59-71.
- Baca Zinn, M. Employment and education of Mexican-American women: The interplay of modernity and ethnicity in eight families. Harvard Educational Review, 1980, 50, 47-62.

- Baca Zinn, M. Political familism: Toward sex role equality in Chicano families. Aztlán, 1975, 6(1), 13-26.
- Baker, S. H. & Levenson, E. Earning prospects of Black and White working-class women. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1976, 3(2), 123-149.
- Baker, S. H. Job opportunities of Black and White working-class women. Journal of Social Problems, 22(4), 510-533, 1975.
- Bardwick, J. M. (Ed.). Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.
- Bardwick, J. M. Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Benedek, T. F. Psychosexual functions in women. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.
- Bonaparte, M. Passivity, masochism and femininity. In J. Strouse (Ed.), Women and analysis. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1974.
- Bradshaw, B. S. & Bean, F. D. Some aspects of the fertility of Mexican Americans. IN C. F. Westoff & R. Parke, Jr. (Eds.), Demographic and social aspects of population growth (Vol. I, Research Reports of the U. S. Commission of Population Growth and the American Future). Washington D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Britain, S. D. & Abad, M. Field-independence: A function of sex and socialization in Cuban and American adolescents. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, 1974, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 741).
- Bronson, L. & Meadow, A., The need achievement orientation of Catholic and Protestant Mexican-Americans. Revista Interamericana de Psicologia, 2, No.3, 159- 68, 1968.
- Brown, G. H., Rosen, N. L., Hill, S. T., & Olivas, M. A. The condition of education for Hispanic Americans. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Carlner, G. Ethnic minorities in American labor markets. National Institute of Education (DHEW), Publication No. BBB 06621, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, March, 1979.

- Carrillo Beron, C. A comparison of Anglo and Chicano women. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1974.
- Carillo Beron, C. Changing adolescent sex-role ideology through short term bicultural group process. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1977.
- Carter, T. P. The negative self concept of Mexican American students. School and Society, 1968, 96, 207-209.
- Chapa, E. & Andrade, S. La mujer Chicana: An annotated bibliography. Austin: Chicana Research & Learning Center, 1976.
- Clark, M. Health in the Mexican-American culture. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Cohen, L. M. The female factor in resettlement. Journal Of Research, Manpower Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, 14 (6), 27-30, 1977.
- Coles, R. Karen Horney's flight from orthodoxy. In J. Strouse (Ed.), Women and analysis, New York: Grossman publishers, 1974.
- Cooney, R. S. Changing labor force participation of Mexican American wives: A comparison with Anglos and Blacks. Social Science Quarterly, 1975, 56, 252-261.
- Cooney, R. S. Variations in living arrangement among young currently unmarried mothers: A comparison of Puerto Ricans, non-Spanish Blacks and non-Spanish Whites. Bronx, New York: Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University, 1978.
- Cota-Robles de Suárez, C. Skin color as a factor of racial identification and preference of young Chicano children. Aztlán, 1971, 2, 107-150.
- Cotera, M. P. Diosa y hembra: The history and heritage of Chicanas In the U. S., Austin, Texas: Statehouse Printing, 1976.
- Crandall, V., Katkovsky, W. & Preston, A. Motivational and ability determinants of young children's intellectual achievement behaviors. Child Development , 33, 643-251, 1962.
- Crandall, V. & Rabson, A. Children's repetition choices in an intellectual achievement situation following success and failure. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 97, 161-168.

- Crawford, H. B. Educational and occupational aspirations and expectations of Galveston high school students. June, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 101 910).
- Cross, P. K. The Undergraduate woman. American Association for Higher Education Research Report No. 5, March 1971.
- Daly, M. Los bandidos take the town. New York Magazine, October 26, 1981, 14, No.44, 67-73. New York: New Groups Publications Inc., 1981.
- Diaz-Guerrero, R. Neurosis and the Mexican family structure. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1955, 112 (6), 411-417.
- Diaz-Guerrero, R. Psychology of the Mexican: Culture and Personality. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.
- Dieppa, I. & Montiel, M. Hispanic families: An exploration In M. Montiel (Ed.), Hispanic families: Critical issues for policy and programs in human services. Washington, D. C.: National coalition of Hispanic Mental health and Human Organizations, 1978.
- Dworkin, A. G. Stereotypes and self images held by native-born and foreign-born Mexican-Americans. Sociology and Social Research, 1965, 49 No.2, 214-224.
- Eagle, N. Student opinion survey, 1976. Research Report, Bronx Community College May 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 148 433).
- Edgerton, R. & Karno, M. Mexican-American bilingualism and the perception of mental illness. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1971, 24, No.3, 286-290.
- Featherman, D. The socioeconomic achievement of White religio-ethnic subgroups: Social and psychological explanations. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, NO.20, 207-222.
- Felice, L. G. Mexican American self-concept and educational achievement: The effects of ethnic isolation and socioeconomic deprivation. Social Science Quarterly, 1973, 53, No.4.
- Figuroa, R. A. Field dependence, ethnicity and cognitive styles. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1980, 2, 35-42.

- Fletcher, P. L. A comparison of adolescent sex-perceptions among male and female Anglo and Chicano ninth graders in southern New Mexico. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40 (6), 3083-A.
- Folan, W. J. & Weigard, P. C. Fictive widowhood in rural and urban Mexico, Anthropologia, 1968, 10(1), 119-128.
- Freud, S. Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes (1925). In J. Strouse (Ed.), Women and analysis. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1974.
- Freud, S. Femininity (1933). In J. Strouse (ed.), Women and analysis. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1974.
- Fu, V. R. A longitudinal study of the self-concepts of Euro-American, Afro-American, and Mexican-American pre-adolescent girls. Child Study Journal, 1979, 9(4), 279-288.
- Gaston, M. M. Group counseling as a means of changing the self-concept of the economically disadvantaged. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 72-30755.
- Ginorio, A. B. A Comparison of Puerto Ricans in New York with native Puerto Ricans and native Americans on two measures of acculturation: Gender role and racial identification. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40(2), 983-B.
- Gill, L. & Spilka, B. Some nonintellectual correlates of academic achievement among Mexican-American secondary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, No.3, 144-149.
- Gonzalez, S. The Chicana perspective: A design for self-awareness. March 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130 809).
- Hawkes, G. & Taylor, M. Power and structure in Mexican and Mexican-American farm labor families. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 3(4), 807-811.
- Hishiki, P. C. Self concepts of sixth grade girls of Mexican-American descent. California Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 20, No.2, 56-62.
- Hispanic Youth Employment Research Center. Socioeconomic-demographic highlights of Hispanic Americans, (Paper Distributed at the Hispanic Youth Employment Research Center Research meeting), Washington D. C. May, 1982.

- Horner, M. Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In J. M. Bardwick (Ed.), Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.
- Horney, K. The flight from womanhood: The masculine-complex in women as viewed by men and by women. In J. Strouse (Ed.), Women and analysis. New York: Grossman, 1974 (originally published in 1926).
- Kagan, S. Field dependence, development of cognitive abilities and acculturation among Anglo American and Mexican American children: A symposium. (Paper presented at the western psychological association annual meeting), Los Angeles, April, 1976.
- Kagan, J. & Lewis, M. Studies of attention in the human infant. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1965, 11, No.2, 95-127.
- Keefe, S. E. Survival of the extended family in urban life: The Mexican American case (National Institute of Mental Health Publication No. BBB 05628, Rockville, Maryland, September, 1978).
- Keefe, S. E., Padilla, A. M. & Carlos, M. L. The Mexican-American extended family as an emotional support system. Human Organization, 1979, 38, 144-152.
- Kiev, A. Curanderismo: Mexican-American folk psychiatry. New York: Free Press, 1968.
- Knowlton, C. S. Changes in the structure and roles of Spanish-American families of Northern New Mexico. 1965 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 013 153).
- Lafitte, P. C. Work values of university students: An analysis by ethnic groups and sex. Master's Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 144 849).
- Langner, T. S. Psychophysiological symptoms and the status of women in two Mexican communities. IN J. M. Murphy & A. H. L. Leighton (Eds.), Approaches to cross-cultural psychiatry. New York: Cornell University Press, 1965, 360-392.
- Larned, D. T. & Muller, D. Development of self-concept in Mexican-American and Anglo students. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1979, 1, No.2, 179-185.

- Lord, C. B. The relationship of maternal employment and ethnic origin to the sex-role perception of Cuban American and Anglo-American female adolescents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41, 1406-A.
- Luckey, R. E. Factors influencing difficult special education referral recommendations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, No. 76-4405.
- Mead, M. Male and female. New York: Morrow Publishers, 1949.
- Melville, M. B. (Ed.). Twice a minority: Mexican American women. St Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1980.
- Miranda King, L. Puertorriqueñas and Hispanics in the United States. (Paper presented at the sixth annual conference of ethnic and minority studies), April, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164 634).
- Mirande, A. & Enriquez, E. La Chicana The Mexican American woman. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Montiel, M. The Chicano family: A review of research. Journal of Social Work, March, 1973, 22-31.
- Montiel, M. The social science myth of the Mexican American family El Grito, 1970, 3, 56-63.
- Moore, J. W. Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Murillo, N. The Mexican American family. In N. N. Wagner & M. J. Haug (Eds.), Chicanos: Social and psychological perspectives. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1971.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H. Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K, & Bent, D. H., SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences, Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Nieto-Gomez, A. Chicanas in the labor force. Encuentro Femenil, 1975, 1 (2), 28-33.
- Nieto-Gomez, A. The Chicana -- Perspectives for education. Encuentro Femenil, 1973, 1, 34-61.
- Padilla, A. M., Ruiz, R. A. & Rice A. Perception of self and future achievement among children of different ethnic backgrounds, Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

- Padilla, A. M. & Ruiz, R. A. Latino mental health: A review of the literature. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Penalosa, F. Recent changes among the Chicanos. Sociology and Social Research, 1970, 55, 47-52.
- Politzer, R. L. & Ramirez, A. G. Judging personality from speech: A pilot study of the attitudes toward ethnic groups. California Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 26, 16-26.
- Portes, A. & Bach, R. L. Immigrant earnings: Cuban and Mexican immigrants in the United States. International Migration Review, 1980, 14, 315-341.
- Ramirez, M. III. Mexican-American cultural membership and adjustment to school. Journal of Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 141-148.
- Reilly, R. D. An analysis of some of the causes of the drop out rate of Mexican-American students in Nampa School District No. 131. Master's Thesis, Boise State University, Idaho, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 373).
- Richmond, M. L. Beyond resource theory: Another look at factors enabling women to affect family interaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 257-266.
- Richmond, S. Statistical analysis, second edition, New York: The Ronald Press, 1964.
- Rodriguez, M., Vila, M., & Mayra, E. The emerging Cuban woman of Dade county. (Paper presented at the conference on the special needs of Hispanic women in the Northeast region: Fordham University), New York City, 1980.
- Romano-V., O. The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican American. El Grito, 1968, 2, 13-26.
- Rosello, J. M. Puerto Rican Youth: A study in self-concept. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41(2), No. 699-B.
- Salinas, J. The Chicana image. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Popular Culture Association) 1975 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 106 032).
- Samaniego, S. The motive to avoid academic and vocational success in Hispanic American women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1980.

- Seggar, J. F. & Wheeler, P. World of work on TV: Ethnic and sex presentation in TV drama. Journal of Broadcasting, 1973, 17, 201-214.
- Senour, M. N. Psychology of the Chicana. In J. L. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Siegel, A. I. The social adjustments of Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia. Journal of Social Psychology, 1957, 46, 99-110.
- Sink, C. R. The influence of sex and the writing of esteem journals on the self-esteem of young Mexican-American adolescents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39(5), 2523-B.
- Smith, C. B., Weigert, A. J. & Thomas, D. L. Self-esteem and religiosity: An analysis of Catholic adolescents from five cultures. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 18(1), 51-60, 1979.
- Snedecor, G. W. & Cochran W. G. Statistical methods, sixth edition. Ames Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1980.
- Sotomayor, M. Mexican-American Interaction with social systems. In M. M. Mangold (Ed.), La Causa Chicana. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1971.
- Staton, R. D. A comparison of Mexican and Mexican-American families. The family coordinator, 1972, 21, 325-330.
- Stewart, D. Early learning in the family: A report of research in progress. Journal of Character Potential, 6(1), 171-176.
- Stone, P. C. & Ruiz, R. A. Race and class as differential determinants of underachievement and underaspiration among Mexican-Americans. (Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association), September, 1971 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 612).
- Suarez, C. C. Sexual stereotypes -- Psychological and cultural survival. Regeneración. 1973, 2, 17-21.
- Terrazas, O. E. The self concept of Mexican-American adolescent females. Unpublished dissertation, Wright Institute, graduate School of Psychology, 1980.

- Tharp, R. G., Meadow, A., Lennhoff, S. G. & Satterfield, D. Changes in marriage roles accompanying the acculturation of the Mexican wife. Journal of Marriage and the Family 1968, 30(3), 404-412.
- Tienda, Marta. Hispanics in the labor market: an overview of recent evidence. La Red, No. 50, January, 1982.
- Tyler, F. B., Rafferty, J. & Tyler, B. Relationships among motivations of parents and their children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 101, 69-81.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. A statistical portrait of women in the U. S.: 1978. (Current Population Reports: Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 100). Washington, D. C. : U. S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Money Income & poverty status of families and persons in the U. S.: 1976. (Current Population Reports: Special Studies, Series P-60, No. 114). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- U. S. Department of Labor. A profile of Hispanic youth: 1980. (Youth Knowledge Development Report No. 10-2) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- U. S. Department of Labor. Manpower report of the President: April 1975. (U. S. Department of Labor new release No. 77-792). Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, September 14, 1977.
- Vaca, N. C. The Mexican-American in the social sciences. El Grito, 1970, 3. 3-24.
- Valdez, D. The influences of the Mexican-American family socialization process on children's educational and occupational aspirations. Unpublished association paper, University of Notre Dame, No. 0000-1941, 1961.
- The Vice President's Task Force on Youth Unemployment. A summary report: Washington, D. C.: The White House, 1980.
- Wilber, G. L. et al. Minorities in the labor market. Vol. I: Spanish Americans and Indians in the labor market. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor Publication No. BBB 132219, 1977.
- Williams, B. Why migrant women make their husbands tamales. 1975 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 333).