Social and personal identities were examined for samples of college graduate students in three culturally different groups: Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican National. Four identities were explored in terms of salience, frequency, and valence: religious, family, gender, and peer. No differences were found between the groups on religious and gender identities. As predicted, both the Mexican National and Mexican-American groups scored family higher than did members of the Anglo-American group. Peer responses were not analyzed because there was insufficient data.
Three incidental questions were also explored: the salience of consensual versus subconsensual identities; sex difference regarding family and gender identities; and declared religious faith and family and gender identities. For all three cultural groups, and for both sexes, family emerged as the most prominent identity. Gender is the second most important identity, followed by religious and peer identities respectively. Of the incidental questions, the most important finding was that whereas most of the previous research using the same instrument found consensual identities predominant, subconsensual responses were predominant in this study. There were no male-female differences either within or across groups. Such findings raised a question about whether previous cross-cultural studies of sex role could, in fact, comment meaningfully on cultural differences.

This was an exploratory study using a small number of subjects (seven men and women in each group) which were not randomly selected. Therefore, the findings were severely qualified.
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An Exploratory Study of Social and Personal Identity of Selected Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican National College Students

Introduction

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine possible differences between social and personal identity of three culturally different groups of college students. Specifically, the study was designed to determine the valence, frequency, and salience of the subjects' responses to a standardized instrument as a means of establishing the centrality and identity configurations of the groups.

The Concept of Identity

According to social psychologists of the symbolic interactionist school of thought (treated later), the concept of identity refers to the location of an individual in social space (Goffman, 1959; Stone, 1962; Strauss, 1959). As such, this social space is composed of status and a variety of roles which a society provides its members. Furthermore, the selective internalization and integration of society's definition of people forms the structure of self-concept.

Stone (1962:63) suggested that identity establishes
what and where the person is in social terms:

When one has identity, he is situated—that is, cast in the shape of a social object by the acknowledgment of his participation or membership in social relations.

Similarly, Kuhn and McPartland (1954) proposed that the consistency of self-concept is derived from social affiliations. Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert (1973) concluded that a person may (and usually does) have several identities depending on the variety of social relations in which he/she engages. Some identities are more important than others, depending on the degree to which an individual is committed to them, the amount of the "self" that is encompassed by them, and the number of social situations in which they are relevant. The structure of the self, nonetheless, can be viewed as the hierarchical organization of a person's identities (cf. Gordon, 1968; Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; McCall and Simmons, 1966).

While identity can be conceptualized in these terms, it would seem, however, more proper to label it as "social identity," as distinguished from "personal identity" (cf. McCall and Simmons, 1966; Sarbin, 1970). Whereas social identities are derived from a person's group memberships and roles, and are expressed through broad social categories such as occupation, sex, religion, and family (Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1974), personal identity, on the other hand, usually refers to self-
definitions in terms of unique characteristics such as conscious sense of individual identity, unconscious striving for a continuity of personal character and the unconscious synthesis of self with group ideal and group identity (Erik Erikson, 1959:60). This distinction between social identities and personal identities is essentially the same as the consensual and subconsensual categories defined by Kuhn and McPartland (1954).

Rationale

The present investigation examined identities expressed by graduate college students from three cultures: Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican National. The primary questions this study sought to answer were: What are the most important social affiliations for these groups? Do these social affiliations differ across the cultures tested? Are these social affiliations structured differently?

This study focused on four well established affiliations: family, gender, peer, and religious (Wellman, 1971; Hill, 1959; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973; Wagner, 1977). While these four affiliations are important for all cultures, this study attempted to determine the degree of similarity or difference both across and within three cultural groups; whether members of these cultural groups would identify themselves similarly or differently regarding their location in major institu-
tions, groupings, and value systems. Possible differences in identity configurations among the subjects, if they occur, could be determined in terms of the frequency and rank order of these identities.

In the past, Latin-American and Anglo-American societies were seen as differing both in values attached to family, religion, and gender relations, and in the degree to which they had undergone industrialization-urbanization (Thomas and Weigert, 1971). Furthermore, the Latin societies were described as more "Traditionalistic" on these characteristics than the industrialized-urbanized Anglo-American. Although the cultural groups chosen for this study can be viewed as ethnically different (Mexican-American and Mexican National versus Anglo-American), the industrialized-urbanized criterion was not applicable to these subjects, since all of them came from comparable industrialized-urbanized environments. One might assume that while the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups share a comparable industrialized-urbanized environment, that is not the case for their Mexican-American counterpart, generally stereotyped as an agrarian-rural group. Because of the fact that all of the subjects in this study (the three groups) were either part-time or full-time graduate college students, it was assumed that the Mexican-American group also reflected the industrialized-
urbanized criterion. Thus, the hypotheses of this study take into account presumed ethnic differences and the industrialized-urbanized similarities.

Religion. Religious and family identities have been thought to be more central in "traditional" cultures, where more of the person's life revolves around these basic institutions. However, the extent to which a culture becomes less religious is the extent to which individuals relate less of their self-concept to religious institutions, and, to some extent, the family (Thomas and Weigert, 1971; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973; Wellman, 1971; Hill, 1959; Maratz, 1976; Smith, 1976; Phillips, 1976). If it is true that the Mexican-American group is more traditionalistic than the Anglo-American or Mexican National groups, then it could be predicted that the importance of religious identity would be higher for the Mexican-American group than for the Anglo-American and Mexican National counterparts.

Family. The institution of family, unlike religion, may well be less susceptible to influence by a minority position within a foreign culture. Ethnic identification of family may be sufficiently strong to allow the argument that there would be great similarity between the Mexican-American and Mexican National groups as compared to the Anglo-American group. This would be more obvious when the ethnic minority is isolated from
the foreign culture. Thus it may be predicted that the centrality of family identity would be higher for both Mexican-American and Mexican National subjects than for the Anglo-American respondents.

**Gender.** A common general stereotype is that some cultures are more male-dominated than others. For example, a widely held view is that Latin cultures are more male-dominated, that men are more "macho," than are North American or American cultures (Hill, 1959; Thomas and Weigert, 1971; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973). Hill, Stykos, and Back (1959), for example, in their study of Puerto Rican families, concluded that there were sharper distinctions between masculine and feminine behavior than in the United States; they argued that the cultural complex associated with the Latin concept of **machismo** expresses the sexual polarization in these societies. Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, in their study of high school adolescents in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Mexico (1973), draw from the Hil et. al. study in their prediction that "...we would expect 'male' and 'female' to be more central identities in Merida and San Juan than in New York, St. Paul, and Minneapolis" (p. 478). And, while the hypothesis was only partially supported by positive responses by males, a summary conclusion of the study stated that for both cultural groups, as well as for both sexes,
gender emerges as the most prominent identity as compared to family, peer, and religious (p. 483).

Note that the studies which establish the importance of gender utilize adolescent populations. It might well be expected that gender would be the preoccupation of adolescents, compared to family, religious, or peer affiliations. Generalizations based on studies using adolescent populations may not be representative of the culture as a whole. Because this study uses adult subjects, there is the opportunity to explore sex-role differences or similarities across cultural groups.

Whereas previous studies may have found a male and a female response to gender identity in the cultures tested, such findings fail to establish and understand the differences of sex-roles between cultures. Furthermore, by confusing gender identification with role definition (function), such research findings enhance stereotypical misconceptions. It was predicted in this study that there would not be significant differences concerning gender identity among the cultures tested—a prediction to be stated as the null of Hypothesis II in the following section.

Peer. A reasonable argument is that peer groups become more important in a culture as the culture becomes secularized. In effect, peer groups become the surrogate family and the substitute for religion (Bronfenbrenner,
1970; Riesman, 1950; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973). However, this expectation would not be applicable to the subordinate Mexican-American culture, for it is viewed as a culture that derives its strength and identity from traditional values. Therefore, the prediction of this study was that peer identities would be more important to the Anglo-American and Mexican National respondents than for the Mexican-American group.

If the rationale for these predictions is valid, i.e., that the different assimilations of individuals into the social structures and values systems which solidify and perpetuate these affiliations (identities) result in different identity configurations, then it is expected that these identity hierarchies will vary by cultural group as predicted.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. Religious identity will be scored higher by the Mexican-American group than by the Mexican National or Anglo-American group. The null hypothesis is that there will be no differences between the Mexican-American group and the combined Mexican National and Anglo-American group.

Hypothesis II. The centrality of family identity will be higher for both the Mexican-American and Mexican National groups than for the Anglo-American group. The null hypothesis is that there will be no differences
between the combined Mexican-American and Mexican National group and the Anglo-American group.

**Hypothesis III.** There will be differences on gender scores between ethnic groups. The null hypothesis is that there will be no gender identity differences between the groups.

**Hypothesis IV.** The Mexican National and Anglo-American groups will rate peer identities higher than the Mexican-American group. The null hypothesis is that there will be no differences between the combined Mexican National and Anglo-American group and the Mexican-American group.

**Incidental Questions**

**Consensual-Subconsensual Dichotomy.** Both theory and research suggest that consensual identities are more salient components of the self than are subconsensual identities (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; Kuhn, 1960; Driver, 1969; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973). This study analyzed the consensual-subconsensual responses and compared findings with the previous research.

**Male-Female Differences.** The small number of respondents per group (fourteen each), limited this researcher from making an in-depth comparison of male-female responses. Yet, the extensive and relevant research done concerning male-female differences (Wellman, 1971; Thomas and Weigert, 1971; Hill, 1959; Maratz, 1976; Smith,
1976; Phillips, 1976), and the fact that the sampling of individuals chosen for this study was subdivided into an equal number of males and females, provided the justification for the following question: Is there a male-female difference in the declared affiliations to family and gender of these respondents, both within and across groups?

**Religious Faith and Social Identity.** Several researchers (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; Driver, 1969; Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Riesman, 1950) suggest that the attitudes and behaviors of individuals vary according to their religious affiliation. This study compared family and gender responses with declared religious affiliations.

**Summary**

This study sought to discover the differences between social and personal identity of three culturally different groups of college graduate students. Using an open-ended instrument (TST) to reveal four well established affiliations (family, gender, peer, and religious), an attempt was made to determine the most important social affiliations for each group; to identify the differences in social affiliations across cultures; and determine whether or not the social affiliations are structured differently.

Three incidental questions were also explored: the salience of consensual versus subconsensual identities;
sex difference regarding family and gender identities; and declared religious faith and family and gender identities.
Method

Data for this study were gathered between 20 June and 20 August 1981 from forty-two individuals who represented three culturally different groups of college graduate students. A standardized instrument was used to assess personal versus social affiliations. The groups of individuals, instrument, methods of data collection, and statistical procedures are described in this section.

Subjects

Forty-two respondents participated in the study, representing three culturally different groups: fourteen Anglo-Americans; fourteen Mexican-Americans; and fourteen Mexican Nationals. For the purposes of this study, a Mexican National was defined as a person of Mexican origin whose place of nationality and permanent residency is Mexico; in this case, graduate foreign students from Mexico. The subjects (Ss) were between 21 and 38 years old. The mean age for these groups were: Anglo-American, 32.4; Mexican-American, 32.4; and Mexican National, 27.2. The sample was comprised of students from two geographical locations, Corvallis and Woodburn, Oregon. All of the Ss were comparable in terms of education and economic status.
Instruments

Twenty Statements Test. The Twenty Statements Test (TST) (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) was designed to elicit statements which reveal social identities. Such statements can then be assessed for attitudes about such identities, categorized as to frequency, valence, and salience. Respondents are asked to provide twenty answers to the question, "Who am I?" within a five minute period of time.

The theoretical basis for the TST holds that the self-definitions of greatest significance are those made by the respondent (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; Newcomb, 1950). This assertion rests on two key assumptions: that (1) the person knows who he/she is (i.e., that this information is accessible to consciousness), and (2) he/she is able to communicate this knowledge. The strong cognitive orientation of the symbolic interaction tradition places heavy emphasis on both of these assumptions.

TST Translation. The translation of the TST instrument into Spanish was done by the researcher and submitted to two professional interpreters for their concurrence with the translation.

Personal Information Sheet. A "Personal Information" sheet was collected from all Ss. The items included were name, age, sex, marital status, birthplace, education, and religion (see Appendix C).
A letter of acknowledgement and reminder was sent, along with the TST, to all Mexican National Ss. The letter reminded Ss of the telephone conversation (see p. 17) and reminded them to fill out the questionnaire (TST) (see Appendix C).

Response Coding

The responses to the TST were first categorized as either consensual or subconsensual. Using Kuhn's (1960) distinction, consensual identities were defined as statements which referred to publicly identifiable status, roles, and categories in society. Attributes perceived as unique to the person or statements whose meaning depended on the person's subjective experience were coded as subconsensual. For example, the consensual answers include such words as "student," "girl," "daughter," and "Methodist." The subconsensual category includes such terms as "happy," "intelligent," and "attractive."

Along with the consensual-subconsensual designation, four more specific identity groupings were identified: (1) religious identities, which were references to religious affiliation or the expression of an attitude toward religion, religious objects, or religious practice (e.g., "I am Christian," "I believe in God," "I go to church," "God is dead"); (2) family identities, which were references to family position, behavior, attitude
toward family or any of its members (e.g., "I am a son," "I hate my father," "I want to have a large family"); (3) gender identities, which were statements which indicate the respondent's sex (e.g., "I am a boy," "I have a good build"); and (4) peer identities, which were references to membership in one's age group (e.g., "I am a teenager," "I have many friends," "I am a graduate student").

These identities were scored for frequency of occurrence, valence, and salience, the three indicators of the importance and centrality of an identity. Frequency was determined by the number of times an identity was mentioned by a respondent. Valence refers to the respondent's expressed evaluation of an identity, as either positive, neutral, or negative. Salience, or the relative position of an identity in the hierarchy of identities, was established by the order in which it was expressed. Specifically, the first of the twenty statements mentioned received a salient score of twenty, while the statement mentioned last received a salient score of one. In addition, the identities' final salience score for the given individual was determined by the number of times an identity was mentioned—that is, the sum of the scores given to an identity. The rationale for this procedure was that while the single score given to an identity was determined by its hier-
archical position, extra consideration should also be
given to the number of times an identity was mentioned
(e.g., a subject's second response is the only one coded
as a family identity, receiving a salience score of
nineteen; while another subject's eleventh and tenth
responses are both coded as family identities, for a
total salience score of twenty-one).

Scoring

Response Coding. Three individuals were selected
for the purpose of coding the subjects' responses to the
TST. All three coders were females between the ages of
32 and 35. All have credentials in Education and work
in public education. Two of the coders are fluent in
Spanish. The forty-two TST responses were coded by
each of the three coders.

The Anglo-American and Mexican-American Ss' re-
sponses were written in English, and the Mexican National
Ss responses were written in Spanish. The Mexican
National responses were translated by the researcher into
English, and the translations were given to the coder
not proficient in Spanish. The translated versions
were also given to the Spanish speaking coders to insure
that the translation would not affect codings.

Coder Training. Coders were allowed to become
acquainted with the TST instrument by responding to the
questionnaire themselves. Once they had completed the
questionnaire, they were given a sample of a TST completed by a graduate teaching assistant in the Department of Speech Communication at Oregon State University. They were then asked to write, in the margin, whatever comments they had concerning that individual's responses to the TST. Upon collecting this first sample of the TST, the coders were encouraged to verbally exchange their impressions of the questionnaire itself. After this exchange of perceptions, the criteria for the coding of the questionnaires was introduced. Once again, discussion was encouraged to insure that the same criteria would be utilized during the actual coding. Finally, the coders participated in practice rounds consisting of coding followed by discussion. This process was repeated with five practice instruments completed by graduate teaching assistants and faculty in the Department of Speech Communication. During the training, intercoder reliability was checked by utilizing the codings for the last three practice questionnaires. The intercoder reliability during the training process was determined by using a formula suggested by Miller (1951, pp. 111-13). All categories of codings exceeded the 95 percent agreement which Miller suggests are acceptable.

**Intercoder reliability.** A Multiple Linear Regression Analysis (Hebber, et al., 1979) was used to estab-
lish the agreement between coder judgments. The codings of consensual and subconsensual responses of all forty-two Ss were used in the analysis, yielding these results:

Consensual responses: $N = 2174$ $R = .607$ $P < .001$
Subconsensual responses: $N = 6333$ $R = .477$ $P < .05$

These results gave strong indication that intercoder reliability had been attained.

Procedure

Data Collection. Participation by respondents in this investigation was voluntary. The process of the enlisting of Ss, however, varied by group.

For the Mexican-American Ss, letters were sent to the Woodburn Center for the Migrant Summer School Program to explain something about the study, and to set a date for a meeting of explanation and administration of the instrument and the personal information forms. The original plan was to make a presentation followed immediately by collection of data. However, when the presentation was made—Friday afternoon of the fourth week in July—the majority of the group preferred to take the test home and return them the following Monday. Only seven males returned completed forms. The first seven complete instruments submitted by women were selected. There were, then, fourteen Ss who comprised the Mexican-American group.

For the Mexican National Ss, the first step was to
obtain a list of Mexican National foreign graduate students from the Foreign Student Office at Oregon State University. The list was obtained, current enrollment later verified with the Registrar's Office, and contact with each potential S was made by telephone by this researcher. There were thirty-four persons contacted by telephone; ten declined to participate; six were subsequently excluded because they did not follow instructions concerning the completion of the instruments. Of the remaining eighteen, seven women completed the instrument. The first seven complete instruments submitted by males were selected. Fourteen Ss, therefore, comprised the Mexican National group.

The Anglo-American Ss were contacted personally by the researcher and/or one of the coders. Most of the graduate students who comprised this group were recruited from a graduate Education class during the third week of Summer term, 1981. Some of them completed the TST immediately following class, while some others took the tests home and brought them back to the class the following week. The first seven completed instruments returned by males and the first seven completed instruments returned by females were selected to constitute the Anglo-American group.

Note that the size of the groups was arbitrarily established by the number of males available in the
Mexican-American group, and by the number of females available in the Mexican National group. The decision to establish balance of sex within the groups, and equality of number across the groups, was made at the time on the assumption that such balance would allow application of a greater variety of statistical treatment options.

Statistical Treatment. The following statistical techniques were used for the analyses of the data: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis; T-Test for Matched Pairs; and Chi Square. All statistical analyses were performed by utilizing the TRS-80, Model III computer (Family Resource Management, Oregon State University), with programs designed by Stephen W. Hebber, as described in the "User Instruction Manual for Advanced Statistical Analysis" (1979, pp. 63-114). The various tests used are identified in the Results section which follows.
Results

The statistical procedures relevant to the hypotheses of this study were computed. The results, along with incidental findings, are reported.

Identity Patterns in Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican National College Graduate Students.

Religious Identity. The first hypothesis of this study was that religious identity would be scored higher by the Mexican-American group than by the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups. The inter-group differences in frequency and valence of identity designations, and their respective percentage scores, can be found in Table 1. The Chi Square analysis of the frequency of religious identity of the groups can be found in Table 2. It can be seen from the table that the Chi Square ($X^2$) score is not significant: $X^2 = .073$ (P > .05).

While the frequency of religious responses for the Mexican-American group was in the predicted direction, the difference between groups was not significant (P > .05).

The mean scores for religious responses in terms of saliency for the groups can be found in Table 3.

The Chi Square analyses of the valency of the responses are reported in Table 4. The analyses of positive and negative responses indicate no statistically
Table 1

Inter-Group Differences in Frequency and Valence of Identity Designations, and their Respective Percentage Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.500</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.625</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.875</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.625</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.500</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32 = 100%  66.5 = 100%  29 = 100%
### Table 2

Chi Square Analysis of the Frequency of Religious Identities of the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Anglo-American/Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Religious Responses</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 0.073

Degrees of Freedom = 1

Probability of Chance = 0.05
### Table 3

**Identity Salience Means by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: IS = Identity salience values of the responses*
Table 4

Chi Square Analyses of Positive and Neutral Valence of Religious Identities for the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Anglo-American/Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Responses (+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Religious Responses (+)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>= .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>= 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Chance</td>
<td>=&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Religious Responses (0) | 6                | 4                              | 10    |
| Non-Religious Responses (0) | 274              | 276                           | 550   |
| Total                  | 280              | 280                           | 560   |
| Chi Square             | = 2.75           |                                 |       |
| Degrees of Freedom     | = 1              |                                 |       |
| Probability of Chance  | => .05           |                                 |       |
significant differences: (+) $X^2 = .01 (P > .05)$ and
(0) $X^2 = 2.75 (P > .05)$. In summary, none of the analyses
lent support to the prediction.

**Family Identity.** The second hypothesis of this
study predicted that the centrality of family identity
would be higher for both the Mexican-American and Mex-
ican National groups than for the Anglo-American group.
The inter-group differences in frequency and valence of
identity designations, and their respective percentage
scores, can be found in Table 1 (p. 22). The Chi Square
analysis of the frequency of family identity for the
groups is found in Table 5. The Chi Square score for
frequency of family identity is significant: $X^2 = 6.26
(P < .05)$. Both the frequency of family designations
for the Mexican-American and Mexican National groups
and the analysis of the frequency of scores lend sup-
port to the prediction.

The groups’ mean scores for saliency of family
designations can be found in Table 3 (p. 24). These
scores lend support to the prediction.

The Chi Square analyses of the valency of the re-
sponses are reported in Table 6. As the table indicates,
(+) $X^2 = 20 (P < .01)$ and (0) $X^2 = 56 (P < .001)$, both of
which are statistically significant. In summary, all
analyses lent support to the prediction.

**Gender Identity.** Hypothesis III stated that there
Table 5
Chi Square Analysis of the Frequency of Family Identities of the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican-American/Mexican National</th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Responses</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Responses</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 6.26
Degrees of Freedom = 1
Probability of Chance = .05
Table 6
Chi Square Analyses of Positive and Neutral Valence of Family Identities for the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American/Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Responses (+)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Religious Responses (+)</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>= 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>= 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Chance</td>
<td>= &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Religious Responses (0)   | 7              | 30                                | 37    |
| Non-Religious Responses (0)| 273            | 250                               | 523   |
| Total                     | 280            | 280                               | 560   |
| Chi Square                | = 56           |                                   |       |
| Degrees of Freedom        | = 1            |                                   |       |
| Probability of Chance     | = < .001       |                                   |       |
would be differences between the ethnic groups on gender identification. The inter-group differences in frequency and valence of identity designations, and their respective percentage score, can be found in Table 1 (p. 22). The Chi Square analysis of the frequency of gender identity for the groups can be found in Table 7. It can be seen from the table that the $X^2$ score is not significant: $X^2 = 2.45 (P > .05)$. This analysis lends support to the null hypothesis.

The groups' mean scores for saliency of gender designations can be found in Table 3 (p. 24).

The Chi Square analysis of the valency of the responses are reported in Table 8. It can be seen that the result is not statistically significant: $X^2 = 2.20 (P > .05)$.

In summary, both of the analyses lent support to the null hypothesis.

**Peer Identity.** The final Hypothesis of this study stated that the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups would rate peer identities higher than the Mexican-American group. As Table 1 (p. 22) indicates, there was insufficient data to allow meaningful analysis. Table 1 reveals there was only one response from the Anglo-American Ss; a coders' average of 3.5 responses for the Mexican-American Ss; and no responses for the Mexican National Ss.
Table 7

Chi Square Analysis of the Frequency of Gender Identities of the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Responses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gender Responses</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 2.45
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Probability of Chance = .05
Table 8

Chi Square Analysis of Positive and Neutral Valence of Gender Identities for the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 2.20

Degrees of Freedom = 2

Probability of Chance = .05
Incidental Findings

Consensual-Subconsensual Categories. The first incidental question proposed an analysis of the consensual-subconsensual responses across the religious, family, gender, and peer identities. In all cases, the subconsensual identities received both higher frequency and saliency than those received by consensual identities (Table 9). The T-Test for Matched Pairs Technique was used to assess the significance of difference between consensual and subconsensual mean scores within the three groups. The results are reported in Table 10: Anglo-American, $t = 10.27 \ (P<.0001)$; Mexican-American group, $t = 7.70 \ (P<.001)$; and Mexican National group, $t = 12.45 \ (P<.0001)$. These results are significant.

The Chi Square technique was used to analyze the frequency of the consensual and subconsensual responses across the groups. As reported in Table 11, the $X^2$ results are statistically significant: $X^2 = 7.37 \ (P<.05)$.

Male-Female Differences. Male and female differences both within and across groups were analyzed regarding declared affiliations to family and gender. Both the T-Test for Matched Pairs and the Chi Square technique were used to analyze the data. The T-Test for Matched Pairs analyses for the three groups on family identity are reported in Table 12. The results were:
Table 9
Consensual and Subconsensual Identity Salience by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS  N</td>
<td>IS  N</td>
<td>IS  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>701 49</td>
<td>885 71</td>
<td>588.5 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsensual</td>
<td>2117 213</td>
<td>1944 202</td>
<td>2272.5 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2818 262</td>
<td>2829 273</td>
<td>2861.0 268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: IS = Identity salience values of the responses;  
N = Number of responses
Table 10
T-Test Analyses of the Groups' Consensual and Subconsensual Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>δ</th>
<th>σδ</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglo-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>.0001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsensual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.0001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two-tailed test
Table 11

Chi Square Analysis of the Groups' Frequency of the Consensual and Subconsensual Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensual Responses</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subconsensual Responses</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 7.371

Degrees of Freedom = 2

Probability of Chance = .05
### Table 12

**T-Test Analyses of the Groups' Male and Female Responses to Family Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>GD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglo-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7148</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two-tailed test*
Anglo-American, \( t = 0.547 \ (P > .05) \); Mexican-American, \( t = 0 \ (P > .05) \); and Mexican National, \( t = 1.486 \ (P > .05) \). The T-Test for Matched Pairs analyses for the three groups on gender identity are reported in Table 13. The results were: Anglo-American, \( t = 1.698 \ (P > .05) \); Mexican-American, \( t = 1.33 \ (P > .05) \); and Mexican National, \( t = 0.548 \ (P > .05) \). The T-Test for Matched Pairs Analyses on family and gender identities are reported on Table 14. The results were: family, \( t = 1 \ (P > .05) \); gender, \( t = 1.706 \ (P > .05) \). None of the results proved to be statistically significant.

The Chi Square analysis of male and female responses regarding family across the groups is reported in Table 15. As the analysis reported in the table indicates, \( \chi^2 = 0.216 \ (P > .05) \). The Chi Square analysis of male and female responses concerning gender identity is reported in Table 16. The result is: \( \chi^2 = 3.19 \ (P > .05) \). For the Chi Square analyses of male and female responses, no statistically significant differences were found.

**Declared Religious Faith and Social Identity.** The Ss declared their religious affiliations as follows: Catholic, 21; Christian, 1; Jewish, 1; Lutheran, 1; Presbyterian, 1; Protestant, 5; Seventh-Day Adventist, 1; and None, 10. Those Ss who declared Catholic, Protestant, and no religious affiliation were selected to test whether or not the groups would differ in family and
Table 13

T-Test Analyses of the Groups' Male and Female
Responses to Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>ting</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglo-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two-tailed test
Table 14

T-Test Analyses Across the Groups on Family and Gender Identities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>GDB</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* two-tailed test
Table 15
Chi Square Analysis of Male and Female Responses to Family Identity Across the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = .216
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Probability of Chance = .05
Table 16
Chi Square Analysis of Male and Female Responses to Gender Identity Across the Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-American</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Mexican National</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 3.19  
Degrees of Freedom = 2  
Probability of Chance = .05
Gender identity responses. As Table 17 reports, the Chi Square technique was used, yielding this result:

\[ x^2 = 9.307 \ (P \leq .05) \]. This result was statistically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>&quot;None&quot;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 9.306

Degrees of Freedom = 2

Probability of Chance = .01
Discussion

The implications and discussion of the various analyses of both the predictions made and the incidental findings are included in this section.

Hypotheses

**First Hypothesis.** Hypothesis I predicted that religious identity would be scored higher by the Mexican-American group members than by the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups. It should be remembered that the centrality of an identity is established by its frequency, saliency, and valency. Moreover, valency is further divided into positive, neutral, and negative responses. The results of the various analyses relevant to Hypothesis I mean that there is only partial support for the prediction made. Specifically, while the frequency of religious responses by the Mexican-American group was in the predicted direction, there was no statistically significant difference across groups.

The saliency scores are similarly ambiguous. Specifically, whereas the identity salience (IS) score of 53 for the Mexican-American group is considerably larger than the IS score of 8 by the Mexican National group, the score of 76 for the Anglo-American group is yet greater than either one of the other two. The sample sizes and selection do not allow use of statistical tools which
would locate the source of the difference with inferential
statistics. But assuming that the samples are at least
somewhat representative, then the differences between the
two Latin cultures and the Anglo culture cannot be made
on the basis of ethnicity. That is, if ethnicity is
indeed a significant determinant of the differences,
then one could not reasonably argue that Mexican-
Americans and Mexican Nationals are ethnically the same.
One of the studies cited in this research reports sim-
ilarities between cultures which are ethnically similar
(Gecas, et. al., 1973), and cross-cultural literature
abounds with inferences of ethnic similarity. These
tend to blur the important distinction between ethnicity
and culture.

Assuming, again, that the samples in this study
are at least partially representative of the cultures
which they represent, how might one reasonably account
for the finding that religion is more central to the
Mexican-American than for the Mexican National? The
Mexican-American people are a subordinate group within
a society which rates religion as more central than
either the Mexican-American or Mexican National groups.
It is reasonable to argue that the Mexican-American
culture is adopting the values of the dominant American
culture. The environment, in this case, is a far stronger
influencing factor than is ethnicity.
While there was no support for the first hypothesis based on the statistical analyses, the frequency scores of the groups' religious affiliation are in the direction of support of the prediction (i.e., Anglo-American, 6; Mexican-American, 7; and Mexican National, 1). The same trend is apparent in the neutral responses about religion: Anglo-American, 4; Mexican-American, 6; and Mexican National, 0. If these trends are reflections of the larger populations represented, then a study of adequate numbers would produce significant results. And what might it mean for Mexican-Americans to rate religion as central to their lives, but neutral? It might mean, again, that they are adopting a dominant value of the majority of the culturally and ethnically different society in which they live, but with little positive meaning associated with that value. These speculations raise questions for further research.

Second Hypothesis. As it can be seen, both the positive and neutral analyses relevant to the prediction of Hypothesis II support the prediction—namely, that Mexican-Americans and Mexican Nationals would score higher on family identity than Anglo-Americans. As proposed, the institution of family, unlike religion, appeared to be less susceptible to influence by a minority position within a foreign culture. Clearly, this became more obvious when the ethnic minority (Mexican-American) is isolated from
the foreign culture (Anglo-American). Furthermore, on frequency the Mexican-American group scored almost three times as much as the other two groups, and on neutral responses, scored twice as much. It would appear that in the case of salience (the hierarchical position of the responses), family occupies a very important role for the Mexican-American group compared to the other two groups—which were remarkably similar in responses. The data are that Mexican-Americans score higher on family identity than the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups. The raw data show that the Mexican National group scored higher than the Anglo-American group on two of the indicators (frequency and positive valence).

Third Hypothesis. Hypothesis III predicted there would be differences between the ethnic groups on gender identifications. That hypothesis was not supported. It should be remembered that the prediction of this study concerning gender identity was manifested in the null hypothesis—that is, that "there would not be significant differences concerning gender identity among the cultures tested" (p. 7). Both the analysis of frequency and the analysis of the valency of the responses lend support to the null hypothesis. Hence, these findings do not support the notion of the Latin ethnic groups' gender dominance.

The high saliency score on gender of the Mexican-American group members might be the result of this min-
ority groups' yielding to the Anglo-American culture's stereotype that Latin peoples are more male-oriented or "macho." If a minority and subordinate group is constantly bombarded by this stereotype, the group might adopt the view. However, the frequency of negative saliency responses is interesting in this regard: first, neither the Anglo-American nor the Mexican National groups reported negative valence for gender identity, while the Mexican-American group reported three. Second, if the three negative responses are indeed indicative of a negative association with gender identity, and the high saliency for gender is also accurate for the Mexican-American group, it may mean an attempt to counter the white majority culture's stereotype; findings might mean that the Mexican-American groups are sensitive to the gender stereotype, and have negative attitudes about it. Obviously, these are speculations based on scant evidence, but they do raise interesting questions for further research.

**Fourth Hypothesis.** The last hypothesis of this study predicted that the Mexican National and Anglo-American groups would rate peer identities higher than the Mexican-American group. The hypothesis could not be tested because of insufficient data. That is unfortunate because the questions concerning the relationship of peer identity and urbanization-industrialization,
relative to family, religious and gender identities, are provocative. Clearly, a larger, more representative sample is needed for empirical research in this area.

Incidental Findings

Consensual-Subconsensual Identities. Prior research with the TST has generally established the predominance of consensual identities. In this study subconsensual identities received higher saliency. The disparity between prior research findings and the findings of this study may have to do with age differences. With the exception of two studies (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; and Driver, 1969) which utilized college students and adults, most research has used adolescents. However, the type of Ss who provided the data for this study were more likely the reason for the difference. It may be that college graduate students are far more likely to reflect subconsensual responses because of their ease of handling verbal abstractions. The influence of language choice on the coding process may be of interest to further researchers concerning the validity of categories of the TST and other open-ended response forms.

Male-Female Differences. The results of the analysis of sex differences in the declared affiliations to family and gender are both clear and interesting. The analyses both within and across groups clearly indicated no difference between the male and female responses.
Interestingly, there were less than half as many responses about gender made by females in the Mexican-American group as compared to the responses made by the females in the other two groups. That is, there were almost twice as many gender responses by the females in the other two groups as gender responses by the male members. The data may indicate that gender is not an issue in Mexico as it is in the United States.

One might expect that the frequency of female responses about family would be greater than for the males. And, in fact, they were--37 as contrasted with 26. But the difference was not significant as analyzed.

There are suggestions in the literature that cultures whose gender scores are high reflect "sexual polarization," and in the case of Latin cultures, indicate "macho" attitudes (Hill, et. al., 1959; Gecas, et. al., 1973). First, the word "macho" in Spanish means male animal. Applied to humans, then, it would mean "male animal behavior." The first question that needs addressing is how gender scores on the TST or any other sex role identification test could, in fact, indicate "sexual polarization" and animal-like behavior (when dealing with Latin cultures). The typical gender statements made by the Ss in this study were, "a noisy woman," "a male," "out-door man," "handsome," "a funny lady," and "I have a good appearance." How any such
statements could indicate evidence of "machismo" is beyond the understanding of this researcher. And the "sexual polarization" conclusion is similarly strange.

In the studies cited above, gender identity was the most often response as compared to family, peer, and religious responses. In this study, gender was second highest—except for the Anglo-American Ss. The frequency by groups is interesting, in fact, in regard to the "polarization" notion: the Anglo-American identity configuration was, in rank order, gender, family religious, and peer; and for Mexican Nationals, family, gender, religious, and peer (see Table 1, p. 22). While it may be that Anglo-Americans are more "polarized" on the issue of sex roles than the other two cultural groups, such polarization is not indicated by the Ss' responses about sex roles.

Religious Faith and Social Identity. Three groups emerged based on declared religious affiliation: Catholic, Protestant and no affiliation. The social identity scores for family and gender were analyzed using Chi Square. There were 21 Ss who declared "Catholic." These Ss scored 42 family and 21 gender responses. There were 5 Ss who declared "Protestant." These Ss scored 1 family and 14 gender responses. And, finally, 10 Ss declared no affiliation. There were 6 family and 12 gender responses by this group. Only those subjects who specifically identified themselves as "Protestant" were included. There-
fore, those who declared affiliation to the Seventh-Day Adventist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Christian churches, although also Protestants, were excluded. Clearly, the centrality of family identity was higher for the Catholic group, while gender was the most central identity for the other two groups. That is, while the average family identity response per Catholic was 2, the average for Protestant was .20, and .60 for the non-affiliated group.

Clearly, the generally held view that family is important to Catholics, regardless of cultural group, is borne out by the data. In this regard, the make-up of the groups is interesting: of the Anglo-American group, there were four Protestants, three Catholics, and three "none"; for the Mexican-American group, there were ten Catholics, no Protestants, and two "none"; and for the Mexican National group, there were eight Catholics, one Protestant and 5 "none." Predictably, there is the greatest religious diversity among the Anglo-American group.

One final indication of the influence of the Anglo culture on the Mexican-American group can be found in religious affiliation. The responses of this group were: Catholic, 10; Lutheran, 1; and Seventh-Day Adventist, 1. The declared affiliations of the Mexican National group were Catholic, 8; Protestant, 1; and "none," 5. It may
be that in a "Protestant ethic culture," when one flees from religion it is often flight into another religion, while if one flees from religion in a Latin culture, the flight may, in fact, be from religion altogether.

Limitations

There are three areas of limitations which qualify the results and the interpretations of this study. The limitations result from the subjects utilized, and the method of generating the data. These limitations are explicated below.

**Subjects.** The results and interpretation of this study were limited by both the number and type of subjects utilized. There are four important limitations which do not allow meaningful generalizations to be made as a result of this study:

First, the sample size is small. Fourteen men and women who comprise each of the three cultural groups of graduate students is not an adequate number to represent those groups.

Second, all of the subjects were drawn from a small geographical area. While this limitation undoubtedly affects the Anglo-American and Mexican-American representation more than the Mexican National group, most of the members of the latter group were from Mexico City.

Third, the Ss were not drawn randomly from the populations they were intended to represent. Therefore,
even if the sample size was larger and drawn from areas where the cultural groups are found, there would be no assurance of representation without random selection.

Fourth, all of the Ss in the study were graduate students. While graduate students are probably not representative of their cultures anywhere, cross-cultural studies utilizing graduate students pose particular problems. For example, there are probably fewer per capita Mexican-Americans than the other two groups, and fewer Mexican Nationals than Anglo-Americans—which may mean that the Anglo-American group is more representative of that culture than the other two. Also it may be that graduate students studying in a foreign country are least likely of any category of people to represent their general culture; they may be among the most internationalized or "multiply-cultured" people. The most potentially limiting factor of all may be the use of graduate students for a study based solely on data generated by a paper and pencil test; it may be that graduate students are among the most sophisticated groups in their ability to use language abstractions, to respond in unique ways, and to anticipate the purposes of a study and distort the results in some manner.

Paper and Pencil Test. The results of this study were based solely on data generated by a paper and pencil test. There are two inherent problems which potentially
qualify the results and interpretations.

First, all standardized tests create categories within which all responses must be placed. The test used in this study organized the responses of the Ss into different categories of abstractions: (1) all responses were categorized as either family, peer, religious, or gender identities; (2) all responses were either categorized as consensual or subconsensual; (3) all responses were either categorized as consensual or subconsensual; (4) all responses were coded for salience, based on the order that responses were expressed; and (4) the valence of all responses was determined by categorizing them as positive, neutral, or negative. Regardless of the rationale, validity, and reliability of responses, imposed categories organize a particular reality which distorts to some extent the intention or reality of the individual responding. And regardless of the strength of any theoretical rationale--the symbolic interactionist position in this case--there are contending theoretical positions.

Second, paper and pencil tests measure a portion of reality. The behaviors directly represented are reading and writing, and inferences about the larger realm of human behavior are, finally, only inferences. In cross-cultural studies which draw their data from paper and pencil tests, large segments of populations are excluded because of illiteracy. This is an important limitation in this study, affecting the interpre-
tation of results for both the Mexican-American and Mexican National groups particularly.

**Testing Environment.** There were three different settings for data collection which resulted because three different cultural groups were tested, and availability dictated different settings or contexts. As reported in the Method section, data were collected under three different conditions. The instrument used for data collection may be vulnerable to differences in the context, and statements about self designations may be "particularly influenced by the conditions in which the statements are made" (Gecas, 1972; Gecas, Thomas, and Weigert, 1973, p. 484).

**Summary**

This was an exploratory study of the identity structures of Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican National college graduate students. For all three cultural groups, and for both sexes, family emerges as the most prominent identity when salience, valence and frequency are considered. Gender is the second most important identity, followed by religious and, considerable down the scale, peer identity.

Of the incidental findings, perhaps the most important finding regarding consensual-subconsensual identities was the difference between the responses of the Ss studied and previous research. Most of the previous
research using the TST instrument found consensual identities predominant, while subconsensual responses were predominant in this study.

There were no male-female differences in social identities either within or across groups. The discussion primarily centered on the conclusions of several studies concerning the meaning of sex role identities as indications of cultural differences. The findings of this study provide no basis for such inferences, and the question is raised about whether studies of sex role identities could, in fact, comment meaningfully on cultural differences.

The finding that family identity is central to persons who declared themselves Catholic, in comparison to those who declared either Protestant or no religious affiliation, appeared to support the view that family is important to Catholics--regardless of cultural group. Also, the religious affiliations of the Mexican-American group appeared to point to the influence of Anglo-American culture on that group.

Finally, the limitations of this study (subjects, selection procedure, and testing context) are severe. Therefore, the generalizations and inferences drawn from this study should be carefully qualified.
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Definition of Terms

Below is a summary of the terms previously defined in the text.

Consensual identities - those statements which refer to publicly identifiable roles, status, and categories (e.g., "student," "girl," "daughter," "Methodist")

Family identities - references to family position, behavior, attitude toward family or any of its members (e.g., "I am a son," "I hate my father," "I want to have a large family")

Frequency - the number of times an identity was mentioned by a respondent

Gender identity - statements which indicate the respondent's sex (e.g., "I am a boy," "I have a good build")

IS - identity salience values of the responses

Peer identities - references to membership in one's age group (e.g., "I am a teenager," "I am a graduate student")

Religious identities - references to religious affiliation or the expression of an attitude toward religion, religious objects, or religious practice (e.g., "I am Christian," "I believe in God" "I go to church," "God is dead")

Salience - the relative position of an identity in the hierarchy of identities as established by the order in which it was expressed

Subconsensual identities - those statements perceived as unique to the person or statements whose meaning depended on the person's subjective experience (e.g., "happy," "intelligent," "attractive")
Twenty Statements Test - a measuring instrument developed by Manford Kuhn and designed in the symbolic interactionist tradition to elicit statements which reveal social identities

Valence - a respondent's expressed evaluation of an identity as either positive, neutral, or negative
APPENDIX B
Appendix B

The TST and Relevant Research

This study used a projective, open-ended instrument to measure social and personal identities of three culturally different groups. There have been two other cross-cultural studies using the same instrument—the Twenty Statements Test (TST). These two studies are abstracted below. The rationale and description of the TST is also abstracted in this section.

Development of the TST

Manford H. Kuhn and Thomas S. McPartland ("An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes," American Sociological Review, 19:68-77, 1954) made the suppositions that (1) human behavior is organized and directed, and (2) that the organization and direction are supplied by the individuals' attitudes toward himself. Kuhn and McPartland concluded that it is of crucial significance in social psychology to identify and measure self-attitudes. Their research was intended to provide an initial demonstration of the advantages of empirical research which treats the self based on self-attitudes. While constructing and standardizing the Twenty Statements Test (TST), the researchers had to carefully consider the kinds of information obtained. Would people provide statements helpful in identifying themselves and their
identities--internalized and organized? Or would they be inclined to hide their significant self-attitudes behind innocuous and conventional fronts? As symbolic interactionists, Kuhn and McPartland guessed the latter; they had seldom, if ever, asked direct questions regarding self-attitudes, and had tended to assemble self-attitudes of those they were studying from diverse kinds of statements and behavior "through the use of long and dubious chains of inference." (p. 68)

Kuhn had earlier attempted to identify and measure self-attitudes among groups of Amish, Mennonite, and Gentile school children (p. 68), and had made the assumption that self-attitudes could be studied in a direct manner by collecting statements of role references and role avoidance, role expectations, models for the self, and the like. While such an investigation yielded results which corresponded to the cultural differences involved, it was concluded that the self-statements which the children gave were specific to the role situations asked for and therefore general self-attitudes still had to be ("somewhat tenuously") inferred from them.

Kuhn and McPartland concluded that it might be profitable to construct a test which was aimed directly at self-attitudes. The device that they used consisted of a single sheet of paper headed by the following
instructions:

There are twenty numbered blanks on the page below. Please write twenty answers to the simple question "Who am I?" in the blanks. Just give twenty different answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about logic or 'importance.' Go along fairly fast, for time is limited.

The TST was given to 288 under-graduate students an the State University of Iowa. The number of responses per respondent varied from the twenty requested to one or two--with the median being seventeen responses. Subsequently, the responses were dealt with by a form of content analysis. They were first categorized either as consensual or subconsensual references. Consensual statements refer to groups and classes whose limits and conditions of membership are matters of common knowledge (e.g., "student," "girl," "husband," "Baptist," "from Chicago," "pre-med," "studying engineering"). Subconsensual statements refer to groups, classes, attributes, traits, or any other matters which would require interpretation by the respondent to be precise or to place him/herself relative to other people (e.g., "happy," "interesting," "bored," "pretty good student," "too heavy," "good wife"); that is, statements without positional references, or with references to consensual classes "obscured by ambiguous modifiers" (p. 70). And when the content was dichotomized in this way, several
features emerged:

First, from the order of responses on the page it became evident that respondents tended to exhaust all of the consensual references they would make before, if any at all, subconsensual responses were made. That is, having once begun to make subconsensual references, respondents tended to make no more consensual references—assuming they had made some previously. This ordering of responses held as long as the respondent made several responses.

Second, the number of consensual references made by respondents varied from twenty to none, and the number of subconsensual references made by respondents varied similarly. In the analysis of this research, responses were dichotomized either as consensual or subconsensual, with "no-response" included in the latter category. Hence, an individual's "locus score" was simply the number of consensual references he/she made on the TST.

The evidence provided by the TST ("self-attitude test") and by its application to known groups (such as religious organizations) led Kuhn and McPartland to propose the following:

(1) the consensual (more directly socially anchored) component of the self-conception is the more salient component; that is, "consensually supported self-attitudes are at the top of the hierarchy of self attitudes."
(2) persons vary considerably in the volume of consensual and subconsensual components in their self-conceptions. Stated in terms of the language used in their research, "people have locus scores which range from 0 to 20. The variable involved here is one which we can correlate with a wide variety of other attitudes and behaviors" (p.70).

(3) the variations indicated in 1) and 2) above can be established and measured by the empirical techniques of attitude research—specifically, the Gutman scaling technique. This, gives a dual advantage in that it furthers the presumption that the locus variable is a unitary one and also in that it facilitates the further manipulation of values of the variable with respect to other quantitative problems.

Finally, they proposed that, in order to complete a "comprehensive personality test" on this basis, there is a need to know, in addition to the subject's subjective identifications in terms of statuses, their roles; role preferences and avoidances, and role expectations; their areas of self-threat and vulnerability; their self-enhancing evaluations; their patterns of reference-group election ("negative others" as well as "positive others"); and probably their self-dissociated attitudes.
Cross-Cultural Application of TST

Although the Twenty Statements Test had been used since 1951 (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; Kuhn, 1964; Kemper, 1966--Driver, 1966, p. 341), in studies of the general adult population, businessmen, students, the professions, and other populations, in order to learn how self-conceptions vary and how they are related to changes in age, the reference set, and other social variables, it had not been assessed in terms of its cross-cultural adequacy in eliciting self-conceptions. Yet, such an evaluation was important both because self-theory had not been viewed as having subcultural or cultural boundaries and because the users of the TST implicitly suggested its rather general applicability.

Edwin D. Driver ("Self-conception in India and the United States: A Cross-Cultural Validation of the Twenty Statements Test," The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 10 (Summer): 341-54, 1969) conducted research aimed at determining the validity of the TST when used in India, a society whose cultural system differed substantially from that of the United States. The data for the study were collected in 1966, involving interviews with a stratified sample of 440 adults residing in a large city, small town, and three small and contiguous villages in South India. Except for the use of interviews rather
than questionnaires, the researcher replicated as closely as possible the procedures of Kuhn and McPartland. The TST responses were content analyzed by the "Beta system" devised by Kuhn (1954), which requires placement of each statement of a respondent in one of the five categories: (1) social groups and classification (the statuses and roles of the subject); (2) ideological beliefs (his explanations of the cosmos, life, society--and his part in them); (3) interests (approach and avoidance with respect to social objects--the familiar adience-abience of the psychologist); (4) ambitions (status and role intentions; anticipations and expectations respecting positions in the social system); and, (5) self-evaluations ("a kind of pride or mortification over the way the subject imagines he appears to others who matter to him").

The second part of the content analysis involved assigning the statements to either the consensual group or the subconsensual group. In establishing the two groups, the researcher merged together statements of self-evaluation, ideological beliefs, ambitions, and interests to form the subconsensual reference. Both the five and the two-fold systems of classifying the responses were necessary in order to show the unique characteristics of the India protocols and to examine the cross-cultural validity of the claims made for the TST.

It was proposed that in order to confirm the vali-
dity of the TST, the India data had to support the propositions made by Kuhn and McPartland (p. 75); the findings of the study supported the cross-cultural applicability of the TST.

Specifically, concerning the general pattern of responses, the total responses per respondent ranged from one for two persons to twenty for 121 persons, with the median number being 12.3 (the median was 17.0 in the Kuhn and McPartland study). The pattern of consensual responses proved to be more salient than the sub-consensual one (16.9% of the total responses), however, the strength of the pattern for the India respondents was much less than it was for Kuhn and McPartland's from the United States. The coefficient of reproducibility was .903, while the coefficient of reproducibility was .77 for the Indian sample. The data also confirmed the proposition that persons having majority, i.e., dominant, group affiliation have relatively high locus scores. Using education as an index to majority group affiliation, the researcher found that the highly educated--the dominant group--had appreciably higher scores than those having less education and those without any education (Kuhn and McPartland used religion as an index).

The conclusions gathered by Driver proposed that "the TST is a valid instrument for eliciting self-conceptions in different cultural settings." However,
the one proposition which was not supported ("not a crucial one insofar as validation is concerned") and whose non-verification suggests that self theory, as presented by Kuhn, needs to be modified so as to view consensual ("social system") references as central in only some cultural systems rather than universally.

In addition to assessing the cross-cultural validity of the TST, these data allowed Driver to make comparisons of self-conception in India and the United States. Such comparisons underlined many similarities regarding anchorage in both consensual and subconsensual types of objects and also the vivid contrast between the societies with respect to emphasis on self-evaluation and involvement with groups.

Viktor Gecas, Darwin L. Thomas, and Andrew J. Weigert ("Social Identities in Anglo and Latin Adolescents," *Social Forces*, Vol. 51: 477-84, June, 1973) in their study, examined identities expressed by adolescents in three different societies: the United States, Puerto Rico, and Mexico. The fundamental questions asked by the researchers were: What are the most important identities for adolescent males and females in our society? Are they different from the identity structures of Latin adolescents? How do the identity configurations of Catholic adolescents differ from those of Protestants?

The Latin-American and Anglo-American societies
selected in this research were seen as differing both in values attached to family, religion, and heterosexual relations, and in the degree to which they had undergone industrialization-urbanization. The Latin societies were described as more traditionalistic on the mentioned characteristics than the industrialized-urbanized United States. Consequently, adolescent identities that developed in these two different social and cultural contexts were expected to vary in the following manner:

(1) religion and family identities would have greater importance in the more "traditional" societies.

(2) gender identities should be predominant in those societies which accentuate sex-roles differences over those in which it is less pronounced.

(3) peer groups may have increased in importance in American society as religion and family have decreased as sources of self-confirmation and identity.

The Twenty Statements Test (TST), designed by Kuhn and McPartland (1954) to get at the self-attitudes of individuals was the measure of social identities (the rules for this procedure has been previously explained). Their findings suggested that for both males and females in Latin and Anglo cultures gender emerged as the most prominent identity. Religious identities were more frequent for Catholic adolescents. The strongest cultural difference was found with respect to negative religious
identities; these were significantly more frequent for Anglo adolescents. Positive gender and family identities were more frequent for Latin adolescents, while peer identities were slightly more common self-designations for Anglos. These tendencies were generally in the expected direction.

This study is dealt with in some detail in the body of the thesis.
APPENDIX C
In the space provided below please give twenty answers to the question, "Who am I?" Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write rapidly for time is limited.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
En el espacio provisto abajo por favor escriba veinte respuestas a la pregunta, "Quién soy yo?" Conteste como si estuviera dando las respuestas a usted mismo, y no a otra persona. Escriba rápido ya que el tiempo está limitado.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.
INFORMACION PERSONAL

Nombre__________________________________________
Edad__________________________________________
Sexo__________________________________________
Estado Civil____________________________________
Lugar de Nacimiento_____________________________
Educación_______________________________________
Religión________________________________________

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name__________________________________________
Age__________________________________________
Sex__________________________________________
Marital Status__________________________________
Birthplace_____________________________________
Education_______________________________________
Religion________________________________________
Estimado______________________:

Estos son los formularios que quedé de mandarle durante la conversación telefónica que tuvimos. Cada uno de ellos tiene instrucciones específicas que le permitirán llenarlos. De antemano le agradezco su cooperación y me pongo a su disposición para cualquier proyecto que desee llevar a cabo.

Atentamente,

Jorge Espinosa