

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1996

The relationship between race socialization strategies and social affiliation in Latinos and whites

Desidoro Rojas Urias

Desidoro Rojas Urias

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Multicultural Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Urias, Desidoro Rojas and Rojas Urias, Desidoro, "The relationship between race socialization strategies and social affiliation in Latinos and whites" (1996). *Theses Digitization Project*. 4535.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/4535>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RACE SOCIALIZATION STRATEGIES
AND SOCIAL AFFILIATION IN LATINOS AND WHITES

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Desidoro Rojas Urias


June 1996

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RACE SOCIALIZATION STRATEGIES
AND SOCIAL AFFILIATION IN LATINOS AND WHITES


A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Desidoro Rojas Urias
June 1996


Approved by:



David Chavez, Chair, Psychology



Jean Peacock



Sanders McDougall

6/10/96
Date

ABSTRACT

This study conducted an exploratory analysis of Latino family socialization practices and individual and group identity formation and their intermediary role in social affiliation patterns. It was expected that Latinos would be more race conscious than Whites but that race socialization and identity formation processes would relate similarly to affiliation for both Latinos and Whites. Seventy students, 27 Latinos and 43 Whites attending the University of California, Riverside were used as a sample. The respondents were administered the four following instruments, some revised and some modified at the University: Demographic Information Checklist, The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Family Process Questionnaire, and Social Affiliation Scale. The results indicated that Latinos as a whole tended to be more ethnically oriented than Whites. Family socialization processes were found to be more influential to Latinos than Whites in determining affiliation patterns. Substantial similarities were found between Latinos and Whites in the way family socialization and ethnic identity relate to affiliation patterns. This study is relevant because variables are being identified that could be precursors to interracial strife as well as interracial harmony. The study also examines new instruments that implement a systematic view of socialization, identity, and affiliation patterns that could be very beneficial in future cross cultural research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Antes de todo quiero darles las gracias y mi madre Sara Rojas Urias y a mi padre Jose Herrera Urias por su apoyo y su consideracion. Sobre todo siempre estuvieron a mi lado cuando mas los necesitaba dandome la fuerza para seguir adelante con mis estudios. Aunque ya no estan aqui, en mi corazon yo se que estaran conmigo el dia que reciba mi diploma sin ellos nada de esto hubiera sido posible.

Quisiera tambien compartir mi exito con mis hermanos y hermanas y sus familias. Les dedico mi trabajo a mis sobrinos, Sara, Maricela, Rigoberto Jr., y Theresa Cervantes, Alfredo De La Torre, Christien Andrew Urias, Elonso Moreno, Elisha, y Andrew Vargas, Robert A. Salgado, ellos seran nuestro futuro y nuestra esperanza y espero que encuentren la misma lumbre que encendio mi curiosidad para la sabiduria.

Quiero darles las gracias a mis amigos Larry y Dominique Pena que siempre me dan mas que amor y siempre estan a mi lado. Les agradezco mas que lo que saben y siempre estaran en mi corazon. A mis amigos Carlos y Katherine Bolanos tambien les doy las gracias por sostenerme en sus rezos y pensamientos y sobre todo por estar a mi lado. I would like to show my appreciation to my roommate Richard Mar and his wife Larissa who helped finesse the art of kicking back in style.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my advisor David Chavez for his invaluable assistance and contribution to my academic success (David you will always be more than an advisor to me, you are truly a friend). To Sanders McDougall who helped me to see a different side of myself (thanks for helping me build confidence in myself Sandy). Thanks to Jean Peacock for her unreal zeal and energy as well as her expertise in cross-cultural research. Your contribution is greatly appreciated (Jean thanks for being real). My heartfelt thanks to the crew at UCR who took me under their wings and helped me to soar where eagles fear to tread. To Carolyn Murray who supported me unconditionally until my project was completed; without your help none of this would have been possible. To Richard Warden who contributed invigorating thought and consideration for this project and whose considerable help is greatly admired and appreciated. Finally to Maria Aguilar, your thought provoking conversations and consultations made the final product much better.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Socialization Process of Latinos.	2
Socialization as a Process.	3
The Historical Nature of Cross Cultural Research.	5
Latinos and Research.	7
Historical Roots of Identity Formation.	8
Group Identity (Ethnic and Racial Identity)	11
Black Identity Formation.	12
Race Socialization and Social Affiliation	13
Rationale for Study	16
METHOD	
Subjects.	18
Instruments	18
Demographic Information Checklist	19
The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure.	19
Social Affiliation Scale.	20
Family Process Questionnaire.	21
Procedure	22
RESULTS	
Overview of Analyses.	24
1. Ethnic Comparisons on Socialization Practices, Ethnic Identity, and Social Affiliation.	25

2. Correlations Among Socialization Practices,
Ethnic Orientation, and Social Affiliation
in Latinos and Whites. 29

3. The Contributions of Family Socialization
Practices and Ethnic Orientation to the
Prediction of Social Affiliation 35

DISCUSSION

Differences in Latinos and Whites 39

Race Saliency 40

Socialization Differences 41

Cultural Differences 42

Social Affiliation Patterns 42

Social Affiliation Differences and Similarities . . 43

New Instruments 48

Future Research 49

APPENDIX A: Informed Consent 51

APPENDIX B: College Demo 52

APPENDIX C: TMEIM. 53

APPENDIX D: Social Affiliation Scale 55

APPENDIX E: BFPQS. 58

REFERENCES. 69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. T-Test Comparing Latinos and Whites on Family Process Questionnaire, Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure, and Social Affiliation Scale Subscales 28

Table 2. Intercorrelations for Latinos Using the Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ), The Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), and the Social Affiliation Subscales 34

Table 3. Intercorrelations for Whites Using Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ), The Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), and the Social Affiliation Subscales 35

Table 4. Contributions of the Family Process Questionnaire, Independent of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, in Explaining Variance in the Social Affiliation Scale 37

INTRODUCTION

For many years much of the early research on Latinos' socialization practices centered around theoretical assumptions. Some of these notions considered Latino families to be traditionally patriarchal with a strong father figure and a submissive mother (Madsen, 1965; Ramirez, 1967). The early literature stereotyped Latinos in such a way as to suggest pathological origins in the pattern of male dominance and familism (Schumm et al. 1988). The literature assumed that whenever Latinos' were found to be different from Euroamerican cultural norms they were inferior (Martinez, 1986). These themes of inferiority were common throughout much of the literature on Latinos. These and other negative notions contributed much biased information to the knowledge pool. Recent studies have found the Latino family more equal when it comes to household chores. Investigators have also reported that Latinos' are egalitarian in their decision-making and action-taking, making them much less patriarchal than previously believed (Martinez, 1986).

In the present study an attempt will be made to obtain a more accurate view of Latino socialization practices, identity factors (individual and group identity) and affiliation patterns. The present exploratory study will attempt to determine which of the variables in socialization practices influence affiliation. This will be attempted by focusing on the complex interactions between identity forma-

tion (including group identity) and ethnic socialization practices. It is hoped that studies such as this will encourage further research of this highly neglected population.

Socialization Process of Latinos

Rueschenberg and Buriel (1989) report that Mexican American families show a great deal of diversity. In their study the authors view the Mexican American family from a systems perspective, and describe familial processes as adaptive and dynamic in the new social environment. A part of this adaptation includes the family functioning within the U.S. social systems including social institutions and the society at large. At the same time the researchers report that the families are able to retain many of their cultural characteristics. Using the family systems perspective the family is viewed as the main socializing agent in creating the behavior of the individuals within the family. The authors speculate that the Mexican American family is evolving in a bicultural direction with home life oriented towards the culture of origin and activities outside the home in the direction of Euroamericanism. Rueschenberg and Buriel suggest that Latino families have evolved differently than their European counterparts due to social-historical influences. The following literature review will focus on the main socialization components that influence the development of Latinos. There has been little prior research

into the formative processes that establish identity formation in underrepresented groups. The majority of underrepresented groups tend to live in large urban areas where many of today's most pressing problems exist. The problems associated with these areas are driven by economics and a social trend that has seen large urban ghettos develop as a result of white urban flight. The people that live and grow up under the stress of these deprived environments have had an impact on the fabric of society at large. There has been a dramatic increase in violence and antisocial behavior which has resulted in racial and cultural polarization. This in turn has created many new social pressures in these culturally diversified communities that are vying for limited resources.

Socialization as a Process

It is important that research continue into the complexities that influence the development of behavior which develops as a result of socialization processes within each cultural group. Among these complexities is the understanding of how each individual develops within the social system they are embedded. Martinez (1986) developed a model for the analysis of family socialization. The model that Martinez developed is divided into two main levels that are part of the socialization process. In the first level he looks at the interaction between the family, the individual child and the social systems in the society. In the second

level of analysis Martinez looks at the interaction between social relations and: cultural values, historical and demographic factors, geographical location, economic and political factors, discrimination, and finally language and education. As can be seen by the number of variables and the interactions that can take place this is a very complex model. According to Martinez, human beings are flexible as well as opportunistic and can adapt to different systems from early childhood. This social development is not only an individual one but is also tied into the cultural group that the individual belongs to.

One of the most important aspects of facilitating the understanding of these groups is the acculturative socialization processes that mold each cultural group. For the purpose of this study, the socialization process will be defined as the messages that each family communicates to it's members regarding the beliefs and values that are important to the family and to the cultural group as a whole. These messages illuminate cultural development and define the elements that are important within a particular nuclear family and within a particular cultural group. In order to conduct a meaningful study we must look at the dynamics that comprise the socialization process and the impact it has on group and individual behavior.

There are a multitude of reasons why many of our most socially potent issues are a by-product of our socializa-

tion. The way in which we learn to perceive the world has a direct impact on how we relate to our environment. The socialization process is the way in which we learn what to consider important and what takes primacy for us (including customs and values).

The Historical Nature of Cross Cultural Research

There have been consistent problems with most of the prior research conducted with underrepresented groups. One of the main problems has been the use of biased instruments that were normed on white Anglo Saxon populations (Baldwin, 1981, 1984). Research conducted cross culturally with these instruments brings to light problems with these instruments in terms of ethnic biases and cross cultural differences which affect responses to their items. Early research studies conducted with these instruments created many misconceptions including theory-driven assumptions that were based on deficit perspective models (for example, Madsen, 1965, & Sotomayor, 1971). These theoretical assumptions that were developed resulted in very biased stereotypical thinking. Many early researchers were guided into designing their studies and interpreting their data with the support of these false assumptions. Much of this early work created more problems than it solved and raised more questions than it answered.

Baldwin (1981, 1984) is one of many cross cultural psychologists that are highly critical of previous studies

that were based on theory driven assumptions extracted from instruments normed for Western Europeans. He contends that psychology, in general, is based on Eurocentric ideology because its philosophical basis, as well as its development, was Western European in origin. This presents a problem because it ignores the diverse historical and cultural influences that form the differences between cultural groups. Each group develops differently and therefore each group needs a psychology that takes into account the issues that are relevant to them.

Another critique of methodology often used in Western studies is presented by Banks (1992). He is critical of the theory and methodology employed by psychology and suggests that a large number of students and researchers of African descent feel that ideology employing Western Eurocentric research methodology is inherently intent on proving pernicious claims about African American people.

Another inherent problem that has been specifically associated with the study of identity formation within underrepresented groups criticizes the use of English only in the instruments utilized (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). The authors say that English is a second language to many of the subjects that are tested and this can adversely skew the results. They also describe a detailed summary of things that are usually overlooked when researchers undertake cross cultural research. Specific cultural domains,

such as language and acculturation levels, are often ignored because the instruments used do not measure these variables. There is still a large amount of current research that continues to be critical of non European cultures. These studies often use flawed methodology or data to support their findings.

In order to develop a better understanding of what is important to underrepresented groups, new criteria must be developed to address the questions that need to be answered. Utilizing specificity in examining social domains which constitute the social fabric within each ethnic social group will help in determining what is important to each group. The present exploratory project will focus on the initial socialization processes within the Latino community.

Latinos and Research

Latinos are one of many underrepresented groups that have been neglected in the literature. In general most of the work that has been done on this population is based on Mexican Americans which represent the largest segment of this population. There exists very little information specifically concerning socialization processes and identity formation in this group. Since the socialization factors of identity formation are the cornerstone of the symbiotic relationship that exists between personality and environmental factors, it is important that we focus on the development of the self in general.

Historical Roots of Identity Formation

Identity formation has been a very difficult construct to operationalize and test through empirical means. The original ideas on identity, like many ideas within the field of psychology, originated from philosophical roots (Baumeister, 1986). Philosophical thinkers such as Descartes, Hume, and Kant discussed basic conceptual issues concerning identity in their writings. These philosophers helped to establish a direction of thought that psychologists would follow later.

The discipline of psychology which emerged as an empirical "science" of the mind began to seriously investigate some of the philosophical notions at the turn of the century. The reason that identity has been such a difficult construct to develop lies in its fundamental makeup. Psychologists could not agree as to what the true self was or how to go about measuring and testing this phenomena.

Sigmund Freud in his early work described the mind (self) in terms of the conscious and the unconscious mind. He explored the driving forces of the self in order to explain overt behavior. Freud's conceptual ideas were the foundation for many personality theorists such as Erik Erikson (1986) who formulated a developmental approach of the topic. In addition, Erikson felt that, in the United States, because of its diverse cultures, many specific stressors would develop. In his book "Childhood and Soci-

ety" (1986) Erikson speaks to his concern of both loss of identity and the problem of fusing together such diverse polarities as those found in the American society. Based on Erikson's ideas, Marcia (1966), a developmentalist, further advanced the theoretical structure of Erikson's work. He developed a four stage structure for identity formation.

Baumiester (1986 a.), another psychologist that investigated identity formation extensively, developed a unique approach in his theoretical framework. He approached the study of identity through the analysis of social change with the use of historical accounts as well as the literature of the time. In this manner, he was able to understand and study the social changes that took place at the time and their effect on society at large. Baumierster investigated the origin of names, for instance, and explained how particular names were tied to occupations or other particular things that help identify a certain trait or characteristic. He also demonstrated how other social phenomena were responsible in shaping the self image for Western Europeans. Baumierster makes it quite clear in his writings that there is cultural specificity when it comes to the development of group identity, and, therefore, self identity. He states unequivocally that the process he describes is particular to a certain group of people and that other people in other cultures could have differing histories changing the social dynamics by which their identity was formed. In order to

identify the domains important to other cultures, the interdisciplinary approach formulated by Baumeister can be employed to identify the periods of change within a particular social structure as was done with the Western Europeans.

Baumeister (1986 b.), in another of his books, also discusses the private and the public self. The phenomena is discussed in terms of the existence of two distinct selves. The book describes the self that is called the private self as the entity that is sometimes called the little voice within us; the part of us that is not shared with others. This is the self that observes as the public self acts, sometimes it is described as the conscious mind. The other entity of the self described by Baumeister is the public self. This is the self that is exhibited when we are out in public, the self that is portrayed for other people (the self that everybody knows). The public self is described in Baumeister's book as a distinct and separate phenomena than the private self. While they both provide different actions for the individual, together they form the symbiosis that is the personality essence of the individual. Another important element of personality and identity formation is the socialization process that separates us as social and cultural groups. This is a very important element of the self and much has been written on the topic as the following section will attest.

Group Identity (Ethnic and Racial Identity)

Group identity is a phenomena that has been addressed by several disciplines. Researchers in the fields of sociology and anthropology have been interested in group behavior for many decades. One of the earliest models established by sociologists in the study of group behavior is known as the interactionist approach. This model focuses on a combination of the symbols and the meaning they share within a given social structure. These symbols are used in social interactions by individuals to identify their circumstances as a group. The symbols are also used by individuals within a given group to try to define and predict how others (in other groups) should behave. According to interactionist thought, self identity as well as group identity are two of many shared meanings of the self. As one of the many identities contained within the self, ethnic identity is the understanding shared by members of a particular ethnic group, the understanding of what it means to be African American or Chicano or whatever ethnicity it might be. The defining variable in the theory of symbolic interactionism is the social structure within a particular society. It provides the categories that contribute to the status differences and the creation of roles and counter roles.

White and Burke (1987) used the symbolic interactionist approach to develop a working model for ethnic identity. In their study their central focus is the relationship between

the ethnic identity and commitment, self-esteem, and salience. According to the results of their study, White and Burke suggest that identity is more salient for underrepresented groups because the identity of such groups is more threatened.

Black Identity Formation

There are various studies on Black identity formation, Baldwin (1981, 1984, 1985, 1987), for instance, has done comprehensive work in the field. In one of his major works Baldwin developed the notion of "Africentric" theory of Black personality. It is Baldwin's contention that there are specific dimensions which he says compose the African reality structure. Baldwin discusses race, cosmology, and specific social definitions that are all part of the reality structure. Baldwin and Bell (1985) also developed the African Self-Consciousness Scale (ASC Scale) which is an instrument developed specifically to tap African self-consciousness. Cheatham, Tomlinson, and Ward (1990) define African self-consciousness as "African Americans' self-awareness and consequent practices regarding their historical, cultural, linguistic, and philosophical origins as African-descended people". The ASC scale is culture specific and therefore measures values, norms, and standards that are specific to African Americans.

The research on identity formation is scarce for many of the underrepresented groups but especially for Latinos.

There was only one specific study that dealt with identity formation and that was a dissertation from 1984. There have been no follow up studies.

Race Socialization and Social Affiliation

There is much research that would be very relevant in understanding the influences of socialization and group socialization in general. Research into the influence that family socialization has on individual behavior as it relates to affiliation and behavior towards other groups would add needed information to the knowledge pool. The influence that family socialization practices has on interpersonal affiliation among different ethnicities has never been clearly defined in the literature. The research that has been previously undertaken in this area addresses interpersonal behavior in regards to ethnic socialization and ethnic attitude identity (Stevenson, 1994; Stokes, 1994), and ingroup/outgroup dynamics (Quattrone & Jones, 1980).

According to past research, a strong relationship exists between socialization and ethnic identity in Blacks (Stokes, 1994). In his study, Stevenson (1994) suggests that Black adolescents' acceptance of their racial socialization messages was related to, and predictive of, the subject's consideration for their own "blackness" as taught by their family. He found that the subjects' socialization could be directly predicted on the basis of the subject's racial perception and acceptance of their culture. This was

in accordance with the amount of the subject's exposure to socializing agents including the depth of involvement with the culture as well as the amount of internalization of the cultural norms (Stevenson, 1995). This is important because according to Stevenson, affiliative behavior for a black child is affected by the amount of exposure to African-American culture and the amount of internalization of that culture that has occurred. Affiliative behavior is defined as the pattern an individual develops in establishing social relationships with their own racial (cultural) group and with other groups.

Research into racial-identity formation has identified family socialization and environmental factors as intermediaries for interpersonal behavior of Black-Americans (Jackson, McCullough, & Gurin, 1988). In their study Jackson et al. found that self and group identity of African-Americans was directly affected by personal relationships. These relationships were usually forged early in life through family socialization as well as through peers. Stevenson (1994) suggests that black adolescents develop their affiliative behavior as a result of how they're taught racial awareness, religion, spirituality, and response to hostile societal influences. In another study on racial socialization and affiliative behavior it was found that sociodemographic variables such as location and community views

influenced black families (Thornton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990).

In social psychology the research that focuses on social interactions and interpersonal relations across ethnic groups is presented as a process of intra/intergroup favoritism and out-group ethnocentrism (Judd & Park, 1988). The explanation of in-group favoritism and out-group bias is consistently attributed to the lack of believed variability. In this view, heterogeneity is attributed to in-groups and homogeneity to out-groups. This is propagated in response to the existence of stereotypes which, in effect, creates a lack of interaction by in-group/out-group members (Quattrone & Jones, 1980). If there is no communication between groups because of perceived stereotypical behavior patterns then there is no chance that the barriers between the in-group and the out-group will ever be resolved. The intergroup theory of behavior suggests that categories are created by in-groups and out-groups by a need to bolster one's self-identity by depreciating others (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1982). Therefore social interaction and interpersonal affiliation would be discouraged by majority in-groups since it might dispel biases of out-groups. Crocker and Schwartz (1985) found a relationship between prejudice and self esteem as it relates to interpersonal interaction. Their findings showed that in-group members with low self-esteem had a tendency to more prejudice and had less inter-

action with out-groups. In another study, researchers determined that in-group favoritism was so pervasive that in-group members who were not prejudiced were inhibited from influencing prejudiced members in controlling in-group/out-group interaction (Perdue, Gurtman, Dovidio, & Tyler, 1990).

This study looked at affiliation from a new perspective. The literature that can be found on affiliation is limited in range and scope. The areas of ethnic socialization, ethnic identity and in/out-group behaviors, investigates affiliation as a result of race socialization only as it relates to racial identity and group behaviors. Affiliation however seems to have other components that have not been investigated such as family socialization influences. This study investigated specific socialization patterns within the Latino family to see how these patterns influence affiliation. Latinos were compared with Whites to explore whether these relationships are culturally dependent or culturally independent. Existing research looks at affiliation as a function of sociological factors, particularly in-group/out-group dynamics. The current study investigates psychological factors, particularly race socialization and identity as intermediaries to affiliation practices.

Rationale for Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct an exploratory analysis of Latino family socialization practices and individual and group identity formation and their relationship

to identity formation and affiliation patterns. In this study a White population of respondents was used as a comparison group.

It was hypothesized that Latinos would exhibit greater ethnic awareness and experience more ethnically driven behavior than the Whites. Ethnic awareness in this study was defined as the internalization of one's ethnic cultural group traits and knowledge of one's cultural and racial group values and norms. The subjects were compared on socialization practices, ethnic orientation, and social affiliation.

Secondly, correlations between the various subscales in the instruments employed in these analyses were calculated to determine how Latinos and Whites differ and how they are similar. It was hypothesized that Latinos would be stronger in identifying with their group and culture. Whites on the other hand would not have strong group affiliations with a "White culture".

The final hypothesis was that there is a relationship between race socialization practices and social affiliation which is independent of affirmation of ethnic identity; that is, the race socialization practices explain appreciable variance in social affiliation which cannot be explained by ethnic orientation. No cultural differences in these relationships were expected between Latinos and Whites.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects included seventy students, 27 Latinos (39%) and 43 Whites (61%) attending a Southern California university. The subjects were all volunteers but received experimental credit hours for their participation. The students ranged in age from 18-45 with a mean age of 20.54 and a standard deviation of 4.70. The mean age for Whites was 20.86 with a standard deviation of 5.57, the Latino sample had a mean age of 20.04 with a standard deviation of 2.86. The Latino sample consisted of 24 females (89%) and 3 males (11%) and the white sample had 33 females (77%) and 10 males (33%). (A chi-square analysis was conducted on the gender ratio between Latinos and Whites and found not to be significant.)

Instruments

Four instruments were administered to the subject population: A Demographic Information Checklist, The Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), Social Affiliation Scale, and the Family Process Questionnaire. Some of the instruments that were used were revised and modified at the University of California Riverside (UCR) for a previous study (Nelson, 1994). These were the Black Family Process Q-Sort (BFPQ) (Peacock 1994) which was converted to the Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ) and the Student Information Form (Astin, Panos, & Creager, 1966) which was convert-

ed to the Social Affiliation Scale (SAS). The instruments used allowed the researcher to assess interpersonal affiliation and family socialization in a systematic way. The instruments also allowed direct comparisons of family socialization and social affiliation. The three instruments which contain subscales or factors that were analyzed for this study (TMEIM, FPQ, and SAS) are all Lacerate-type scales, and thus respondents could potentially rate themselves high or low on any of the factors.

Demographic Information Checklist

The Demographic Information Checklist is a descriptive personal checklist used to elicit biographical information such as age, gpa, income, etc. These demographic variables can be measured in descriptive statistics for comparison between groups of students.

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM) was used to measure a student's ethnic identity within his/her own ethnic group and orientation towards other ethnicities. This scale was developed by Phinney (1992). Reliability alpha coefficients for a college sample on the subscales in TMEIM were as follows: Ethnic Identity (.90) and Other Group Orientation (.74). The reliability coefficients in this study's sample were similar, Ethnic Identity (.91) and Other Group Orientation (.81).

Social Affiliation Scale

The Social Affiliation (SAS) was adopted by Nelson (1994) from the Student Information Form (Astin, Panos, & Creager, 1966). This scale assesses the affiliation tendencies of an individual from previous high school experiences to a more recent college experience. This instrument was employed to gather information on individual participatory and self-reported affiliation patterns. Nelson (1994) did a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation on the SAS. The scree plot from the analysis as well as a detailed analysis of factor loadings determined that a three factor solution would best represent the eigenvalues found. Each factor in the SAS was limited to those items showing a minimum value of (.30) on one factor and no loadings over (.30) on any other factor.

Subscales for the SAS were developed from items pertaining to high school experiences and for those that took place during college. These were factor analyzed separately. In the subsection of the questionnaire for high school there were five items in factors one, two and three. In the equivalent items for college there were five items in factor one, six in factor two, and five in factor three. When the items were grouped for each factor, labels were given that identified the characteristics in each factor.

Essentially, the factors for both the high school and college scales were found to be similar. Parallel factors

for both high school and college were labelled as follows. Factor one, "Cross-Ethnic Socialization" defines people who are socialized to get along with all races and cultures. Factor two, "Ethnic Activities" defines activities that are an essential part of one's own race or culture. Factor three, "Discrimination" is defined here as perceptions of having been discriminated against.

The following cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained for the three factors: "Cross-Ethnic Socialization in High School" (.77), "Ethnic Activities in High School" (.31), "Discrimination in High School" (.37), "Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College" (.74), "Ethnic Activities in College" (.59), "Discrimination in College" (.66).

Family Process Questionnaire

The 100 item FPQ was revised by Nelson (1994) from the Black Family Process Q-Sort (Peacock 1994). This instrument was used to assess family socialization patterns and as well as family messages to students. A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was done for the Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ). The scree plot as well as analysis of factor loadings of the FPQ revealed a four factor solution to best represent the data. Each factor in the FPQ was limited to those items showing a minimum value of (.30) on one factor and no loadings over (.30) on any other factor. The four factors of the FPQ, contained twenty-two items for factor one, seventeen for factor two,

sixteen for factor three, and six for factor four.

Each factor was given a label in accordance with the descriptive content of the factors items. Factor one "Egalitarian Race Socialization" is defined as the teaching that all races are equal and should be loved and respected. Factor two "Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness" is defined as the teaching of how to get along with other races while appreciating the uniqueness of your own race. Factor three "Ethnic Pride Race Socialization" is defined as the teaching and expression of pride in one's own race or culture. Factor four "Racial Passivity/Denial" is defined as the teaching of ways to subdue or deny pride or membership in one's own race or culture.

The following cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained for the four factors; "Egalitarian Race Socialization" (.87), "Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness" (.82), "Ethnic Pride Race Socialization" (.84), "Racial Passivity/Denial" (.48).

Procedure

Four instruments were administered to the subject population: A Demographic Information Checklist, The Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure, Social Affiliation Scale, and The Black Family Process Questionnaire. Each subject was asked to complete the questionnaires at the Murray Black Family Research Laboratory at UCR. The students came in by

appointment and the researchers administered the instructions and questionnaires.

RESULTS

Overview of Analyses

The purpose of this study was to investigate Latino versus White family socialization practices, and racial identity formation, in relation to affiliation practices. As this was an exploratory study, concerning a topic about which there is a dearth of information, I decided to organize a set of analyses which progressed from simple to more complex and sophisticated follow-up analyses. Correspondingly, the first set of analyses simply investigated group differences between Latinos and White on the various subscales, using t-tests, as these allow a direct comparison of the two groups. The second set of analyses was more complex, concerning differences and similarities between Latinos and Whites in the correlations among the subscales. These analyses were deemed necessary because many of the most important group differences between Latinos and Whites might be found in the comparisons of separate correlations for these two groups. Finally, follow-up analyses based upon results of the earlier analyses were conducted; these were setwise regression showing the utility of the Family Process Questionnaire in predicting social affiliation. This analysis is a crucial one in that it shows that the Family Process Questionnaire, which was modified from the Black Family Process Q-Sort for the purpose of this study, can be used to improve predictions of important variables such as social

affiliation. Thus the Family Process Questionnaire is a potentially important new tool in the field of cross-cultural research, in that it measures the way in which the parents, of any ethnic background, teach their children to deal with various issues of race.

To summarize the analyses, were conducted in three stages. In stage one, a series of t-tests were conducted to examine ethnic differences in the scales used. In stage two, correlations among the subscales for the entire sample and by ethnic group membership, were examined, with the aim of assessing the hypothesis that socialization practices, ethnic orientation, and social affiliation are interrelated. In stage three, setwise regression was used to assess the strength of the relationships of ethnic orientation and race socialization practices to social affiliation; in particular, the power of race socialization to predict social affiliation, with the effects of ethnic orientation removed, were assessed.

1. Ethnic Comparisons on Socialization Practices, Ethnic Identity, and Social Affiliation.

Separate t-tests were conducted on each subscale of the Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ), The Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), and Social Affiliation Scale (SAS).

One FPQ scale exhibited a significant difference between Latinos and Whites. Latinos ($\bar{m} = 3.28$) scored higher

than Whites ($\bar{m} = 2.48$) on Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, unequal variance, $t(41.3) = 2.72$, $p < .01$. That is Latinos were found to be better at getting along with other races while appreciating the uniqueness of their own culture. None of the other subscales of the FPQ showed a significant difference between Latinos and Whites: For Egalitarian Race Socialization, $t(68) = -.60$; for Ethnic Pride Race Socialization, $t(68) = .94$; and for Racial Passivity/Denial, unequal variance, $t(40.7) = 1.57$.

One TMEIM scale Ethnic Identity exhibited a significant difference between Latinos and Whites. Latinos ($\bar{m} = 3.20$) scored higher than Whites ($\bar{m} = 2.73$) on Ethnic, $t(68) = 3.16$, $p < .01$. This indicates that as a group Latinos, compared to Whites, identify with their cultural group to a significant degree. The other subscale of the TMEIM Labeled Other Group Orientation did not show a significant difference between Latinos and Whites, $t(68) = -0.43$.

One SAS scale exhibited a significant difference between Latinos and Whites. For Discrimination in High School, Latinos ($\bar{m} = 1.53$) scored higher than Whites ($\bar{m} = 1.34$), unequal variance $t(40.9) = 2.35$, $p < .05$. This indicates that Latinos felt that they had been discriminated against to a significantly higher degree than Whites in high school. None of the other subscales of the SAS showed a significant difference between Latinos and Whites: Cross-Ethnic Socialization in High School, $t(67) = 1.10$; for

Ethnic Activities in High School, $t(68) = 1.23$; Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College, $t(68) = 1.24$; and Ethnic Activities in College, $t(68) = .83$; Discrimination in College, unequal variance $t(35.4) = 1.89$.

To summarize these results, Latinos showed greater ethnic awareness than Whites on several of the subscales employed in this study. All of the means for these analyses are found in Table 1.

Table 1.

T-Test Comparing Latinos and Whites on Family Process Questionnaire, Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure, and Social Affiliation Scale Subscales

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Latinos</u>		<u>Whites</u>		<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Egalitarian Race Socialization	6.95	1.09	7.16	1.29	-.60	.534
Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness	3.28	1.34	2.49	0.91	2.72	.010
Ethnic Pride Race Socialization	7.69	0.99	7.43	1.07	0.94	.348
Racial Passivity/ Denial	4.01	1.56	3.48	1.04	1.71	.090
Cross-Ethnic Socialization College	0.23	0.66	0.03	0.66	1.23	.221
Ethnic Activities College	0.00	0.54	-.10	0.57	0.57	.456
Discrimination College	0.08	0.82	-.26	0.41	1.98	.056
Cross-Ethnic Socialization High School	0.20	0.68	.02	0.69	1.09	.279
Ethnic Activities High School	0.04	0.52	-.11	0.47	1.27	.210
Discrimination High School	0.14	0.64	-.15	0.40	2.10	.042
Ethnic Orientation	3.11	0.68	2.73	0.54	3.16	.002

Table 1, continued

T-Test comparing Latinos and Whites on Family Process Questionnaire, Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure, and Social Affiliation Scale Subscales

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Latinos</u>		<u>Whites</u>		<u>T</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Other Group Orientation	3.26	0.32	3.29	0.28	-0.43	.670

2. Correlations Among Socialization Practices, Ethnic Orientation, and Social Affiliation in Latinos and Whites.

The purpose of this next phase of the analysis was to explore similarities and differences among Latinos and Whites in terms of how socialization practices, ethnic orientation, and social affiliation interrelate. Thus, correlations among the various subscales were computed separately for Latinos and Whites in order to examine whether the magnitude and pattern of these correlations show similar or dissimilar interrelationships among these variables. Numerous subscales showed significant interrelationships.

For Latinos, there were three significant correlations between FPQ and TMEIM subscales: Egalitarian Race Socialization with Other Group Orientation, $r(25) = .39, p < .05$; and Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness with both Ethnic Group Orientation, $r(25) = .40, p < .05$ and Other Group

Orientation, $r(25) = -.50, p < .01$. In the first correlation above, Latinos whose parents minimized the importance of racial differences showed respect and appreciation for other groups' unique cultural and racial traits. Also, for Latinos Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness was linked to both Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation; this indicates that high scorers on Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness were taught to be proud of their culture and tended to stay rooted within their own culture.

There were three significant correlations between FPQ and the SAS subscales: Egalitarian Race Socialization with both Cross Ethnic Socialization in High School, $r(25) = .48, p < .05$; and Ethnic activities in High School, $r(25) = .55, p < .01$; as well as Ethnic Pride Race Socialization with Ethnic Activities in High School, $r(25) = .61, p < .001$. Thus, the higher Latinos scored in terms of being socialized to minimize racial differences, the greater the degree to which they indicated participating in social activities with persons of other ethnic groups, as well as participating in ethnic activities, in high school. The correlation between Ethnic Pride Race Socialization and Ethnic Activities in High School demonstrates that greater ethnic pride in Latinos was associated with increased ethnic activities during high school.

There were three significant correlations between TMEIM and the SAS subscales: Ethnic Group Orientation with Dis-

crimination in High School, $r(25) = .38, p < .05$; and Other Group Orientation with both Cross-Ethnic Socialization in High School, $r(25) = .48, p < .05$; and Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College, $r(25) = .51, p < .01$. The correlation between Ethnic Group Orientation and Discrimination shows that, for Latinos, those who identify more strongly with their ethnic group are more likely to perceive discrimination. The correlations between Other Group Orientation and Cross-Ethnic Socialization demonstrate a consistent association between an appreciation of people of other ethnicities and actually forming friendships with those of other ethnic groups.

For Whites, there was one significant correlation between FPQ and TMEIM subscales: Ethnic Pride/Race Socialization with Ethnic Group Orientation, $r(41) = .33, p < .05$, indicating that Whites who reported greater ethnic pride tended to be more rooted in their ethnic group.

There were three significant correlations between FPQ and the SAS subscales: Egalitarian Race Socialization with both Ethnic Activities in High School, $r(41) = .34, p < .05$; and Discrimination in High School, $r(41) = -.40, p < .01$; as well as Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness with Discrimination in High School, $r(41) = .49, p < .001$. Thus, for Whites, the more egalitarian the manner in which they reported being socialized, the more ethnic activities they participated in during high school, and the less dis-

crimination they perceived. On the other hand, more discrimination was perceived by Whites who were socialized to be conscious of their own race and the differences between races.

There were four significant correlations for Whites, between TMEIM and the SAS subscales: Other Group Orientation had all four significant correlations with; Cross-Ethnic Socialization in High School, $r(41) = .51, p < .001$; and Ethnic Activities in High School, $r(41) = .46, p < .01$; also Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College, $r(41) = .55, p < .001$; and Discrimination in College, $r(41) = -.33, p < .05$. That is, being understanding of and oriented towards understanding other cultural groups was associated with forming relationships with those of other ethnic groups, and with participation in high school ethnic activities. Also, this trait was associated with not feeling discriminated against in college for Whites.

Comparison of the correlations between Latinos and Whites were made to assess where differences existed in these relationships. Two significant differences were found: The correlations of Ethnic Activities in High School with Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, $z = 2.35, p < .05$ and Discrimination in High School with Ethnic Group Orientation, $z = 2.17, p < .05$. In both cases, the correlations were positive for Latinos, but negative for Whites. The first result indicates that ethnic activities in high

school were more strongly associated with race consciousness for Latinos than for Whites. The second finding shows that being oriented toward one's own ethnic group was more strongly associated with feeling discriminated against in Latinos than in Whites.

To summarize, approximately half of the same correlations were significant for both ethnic groups (3/6 for Latinos, and 3/7 for Whites), showing considerable similarity in the way that social affiliation, racial identity, and socialization processes work in these two groups. On the other hand, two significant differences were found as well, in terms of how these variables interrelate for Latinos and for Whites. Thus, while some processes (i.e., Other Group Orientation and Cross-Ethnic Socialization in high school and college, Ethnic Activities and Egalitarian Race Socialization) appear to work the same way in both Latinos and Whites, others (i.e., Ethnic Activities in High School and Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, Discrimination in High School and Ethnic Group Orientation) are substantially different.

Table 2.

Intercorrelations for Latinos Using the Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ), The Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), and the Social Affiliation Subscales

Type of Scales	Social Affiliation Subscales					
	CESH	EAH	DH	CESC	EAC	DC
<u>FPQ Subscales</u>						
ERS	.48*	.55*	-.13	.07	.14	-.13
IP/RC	-.11	.30	.33	-.21	-.05	.28
EPRS	.33	.61**	-.18	.07	.03	.0
RP/D	.09	-.12	-.14	.02	-.14	-.24
<u>TMEIM Subscales</u>						
EGO	.11	.25	.38*	.16	.29	.30
OGO	.48*	.08	-.17	.51**	-.12	-.31

Note. Sample size was 27 for all correlations for the Latinos. ERS = Egalitarian Race Socialization; IP/RC = Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness; EPRS = Ethnic Pride Race Socialization; RP/D = Racial Passivity/Denial; EGO = Ethnic Group Orientation; OGO = Other Group Orientation; CESC = Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College; EAC = Ethnic Activities in College; DC = Discrimination in College; CESH = Cross Ethnic Socialization in High School; EAH = Ethnic Activities in High School; DH = Discrimination in High School.

*P < .05. **P < .01.

Table 3.

Intercorrelations for Whites Using Family Process Questionnaire (FPQ), The Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (TMEIM), and the Social Affiliation Subscales

Type Of Subscales DC	Social Affiliation subscale					
	CESH	EAH	DH	CESC	EAC	
FPQ Subscales						
ERS .00	.23	.34*	-.40*	.05	.17	-
IP/RC .07	-.16	-.29	.49**	.15	-.17	
EPRS .03	.13	.24	-.29	.10	.14	-
RP/D .03	-.02	-.06	.22	-.10	.10	
TMEIM Subscales						
EGO .02	-.00	.01	-.15	.07	.24	-
OGO .33*	.51**	.46*	-.11	.55**	.24	-

Note. Sample Size was 43 for all correlations for the Whites. ERS =Egalitarian Race Socialization; IP/RC = Inter-racial Protocol/Race Consciousness; EPRS = Ethnic Pride Race Socialization; RP/D = Racial Passivity/Denial; EGO = Ethnic Group Orientation; OGO = Other Group Orientation; CESC = Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College; EAC = Ethnic Activities in College; DC = Discrimination in College; CESH = Cross-Ethnic Socialization in High School; EAH = Ethnic Activities in High School; DH = Discrimination in High School.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

3. The Contributions of Family Socialization Practices and Ethnic Orientation to the Prediction of Social Affiliation.

Setwise regression analyses were conducted in order to perform a detailed analysis of the roles of family socialization practices and ethnic orientation in contributing to each subscale of the Social Affiliation Scale. In particu-

lar, it was my intent to demonstrate that the Family Process Questionnaire could be used cross-ethnically to improve the prediction of relevant outcome variables, in this case, social affiliation. Thus the analyses proceeded in two stages. In the first stage, the TMEIM subscales were entered as predictors of the SAS factor; in the second stage, the FPQ subscales were entered in order to assess their unique contribution to the prediction of social affiliation. Separate analyses were performed for Latinos and Whites. Twelve sets of regression analyses were performed overall, predicting each of the six factors of the SAS for Latinos and again, for Whites.

An analysis of effect sizes indicated that when used by itself to predict social affiliation, the TMEIM exhibited similar predictive capability in both Latinos and Whites; for Latinos, the average R -Square = .18; for Whites, the average R -Square = .17. However, when the FPQ was added to the model, the average unique contribution of the FPQ was greater for Latinos, R -Square = .14, than for Whites, R -Square = .09.

More detailed analyses of the results indicated that the addition of the FPQ resulted in a statistically significant increase in R -Square in two cases, one for Latinos, the other, for Whites. In particular, Ethnic Activities in High School for Latinos evidenced a significant increase in R -Square (from .07 to .55) with the addition of the FPQ, F

(4, 20) = 5.37, $p < .01$; for Whites, a significant increase in R-Square (from .03 to .29) was found for Discrimination in High School with the addition of the FPQ, $F(4, 35) = 3.15$, $p < .05$. See Table 4 for a summary of R-square with and without FPQ for each SAS subscale.

 Table 4.

Contributions of the Family Process Questionnaire, Independent of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, in Explaining Variance in the Social Affiliation Scale

Predictor of	Social Affiliation Subscale				
	CESH	EAH	DH	CESC	EAC
DC					
Social Affiliation					
Latinos					
TMEIM	.25	.07	.17	.29	.10
.18					
TMEIM and FPQ	.35	.55	.30	.32	.20
.20					
Independent					
Contribution of FPQ	.10	.48	.13	.03	.10
.02					
Whites					
TMEIM	.26	.22	.03	.29	.11
.11					
TMEIM and FPQ	.28	.30	.29	.41	.16
.14					
Independent					
Contribution of FPQ	.02	.08	.26	.12	.05
.03					

Note. TMEIM = The Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure; FPQ = Family Process Questionnaire; CESC = Cross-Ethnic Socialization in College; EAC = Ethnic Activities in College; DC = Discrimination in College; CESH = Cross-Ethnic Socialization High School; EAH = Ethnic Activities in High School; DH = Discrimination in High School.

An analysis of the specific FPQ subscales in the model predicting Ethnic Activities in High School for Latinos indicated that three FPQ subscales contributed substantially to the prediction of Ethnic Activities in High School.

These were Egalitarian Race Socialization, Beta = .46, $p < .10$, Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, Beta = .36, $p < .10$ and Ethnic Pride Race Socialization, Beta = .44, $p < .10$. Only one FPQ subscale, Interracial Protocol/Race Socialization, significantly impacted on Discrimination in High School for Whites, Beta = .40, $p < .05$. The fact that all of these relationships are positive indicates a direct relationship in each case, between high scores on the FPQ construct indicated, and the social affiliation factor being predicted. Thus, among Latinos in high school those who scored higher in Egalitarian Race Socialization, Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, or Ethnic Pride Race Socialization, tended to have a higher degree of Ethnic Activities in High School. For Whites, on the other hand, as Interracial Protocol/Race Socialization increased, so did perceptions of Discrimination in High School.

DISCUSSION

This study was an exploratory attempt to investigate the socialization and identity processes that either exacerbate or inhibit affiliation patterns in Latinos and Whites. To tease out which variables served as intermediaries it was important to investigate which socialization patterns influenced particular outcomes. In order to arrive at the answers to such questions it was important that the instruments used were asking the correct questions. Since this study was addressing the issue from a socialization process perspective, new instruments had to be utilized that would allow a systematic way to assess interpersonal affiliation and the intermediary variables associated with various outcomes.

Differences in Latinos and Whites

The results demonstrated some discernable differences between Latinos and Whites in several instances. The experimenter believes that these differences exist mainly as a result of the concept of racial saliency. In the literature White and Burke (1987) discuss why underrepresented groups tend to be aware of their ethnicity to a higher degree than the majority population. According to these authors saliency is brought about by the amount of animosity within one's environment. In other words the more danger there is in identifying with a certain group the more ingrained the thought is that one belongs to that particular group.

Race Saliency

The saliency of one's culture or race shapes perceptions of who one is and elicits relevant social relations with, and attitudes toward, others. The results of this study support this belief because Latinos are shown to be higher in discrimination which would make race a more salient issue for them. Latinos are also significantly higher in Ethnic Activities which would add support for the saliency argument.

The first analysis, demonstrated significant differences concerning ethnic awareness between Latinos and Whites. Specifically, Latinos were found to be altogether more ethnically aware. This result, while not surprising, is interesting nonetheless because it supports experimentally the belief that there are real differences in the way culture is experienced between Latinos and Whites. Specific differences were found in such areas as: Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness, Ethnic Group Orientation, College Discrimination, and High School Discrimination. The results indicate that for Latinos, race is a more salient issue than for Whites.

To more clearly explicate the differences found between Latinos and Whites, I will present some sample items from the scales on which these groups differed. The items in all the questionnaires are clear and explicit. In the subscale Interracial Protocol/Race Consciousness which is found in

the Family Process Questionnaire the following questions were asked: "Tells kids in the family how to act around people of other races" (Interracial Protocol), and "Reminds family members to remember that they are racially different" (Race Consciousness). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure subscale, Ethnic Group Orientation, has questions such as: "I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me" and "I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background". Items indicative of the subscale Discrimination (Social Affiliation Scale) include: "Heard faculty make inappropriate remarks about minorities" and "Felt pressure not to socialize with individuals from other racial/ethnic groups".

Socialization Differences

The major differences found among the two groups in this sample indicate that, to a great extent, Latinos and Whites are socialized differently and that race and cultural issues that result as part of the socialization process are more pertinent for Latinos than for Whites. Perhaps the multi cultural mix (German, Irish, English, etc.) within the White community makes it more difficult to identify the racial term White as one distinct entity. While some may argue that English is a shared language in this group there are Germans and various other groups that would argue differently. There is no continuous historical cultural homogeneity that could unify the White population as one

cultural entity.

Cultural Differences

In the United States the White population is composed of many European cultural groups who were enemies for much of their history. This makes the identification of a White culture other than by color a most difficult proposition. There could be some argument that "true American culture" belongs to White Americans but American culture is composed from the contribution of many cultural elements. If that is the case some of these questions would not elicit positive responses from the White population. Another reason maybe the fact that Whites are a majority and this may preclude them from having to place an emphasis on their race or cultural connections. Another reason may be the Whites are socialized to be individualistic and that may preclude them from identifying as a member of a White cultural or racial group.

Social Affiliation Patterns

One interesting related issue is that lower-class Whites that find themselves threatened by the status quo of the social structure have organized such groups as: The Skin Heads, The Ku Klux Klan, and several paramilitary groups under the tutelage of the Aryan Nations. It seems that these groups also find animosity directed towards them as a saliency provoking stimulus that creates a greater need for group affiliation and racial identity. These examples

demonstrate a very negative element in our society and the same type of mentality can be found in underrepresented groups. When social economic status becomes an added variable "Barrios" and "Ghettos" can also have very negative elements in the form of street gangs. This demonstrates that racial and cultural saliency perhaps has a tendency to unite groups with very negative elements when these groups are fighting for limited resources.

Social Affiliation Differences and Similarities

The interrelationships of the following variables: Socialization Practices, Ethnic Orientation and Social Affiliation were studied in order to investigate the different patterns of social affiliation and behavior found in both Latinos and Whites. There is no systematic differential in terms of the way these variables relate in Latinos and Whites. However there were two significant differences between Latinos and Whites in the correlations found. There was a difference in the correlations of ethnic activities in high school with interracial protocol/race consciousness. Latinos that were involved in racial group ethnic activities in high school were more conscious about their uniqueness; in other words they identified with their racial (cultural) group to a greater extent. The White students showed the reverse of this trend; the more they were involved with ethnic activities the less they identified with their racial group. This makes sense and as expected the Latino students

who became more aware of their roots therefore became more group oriented and unified, while the White students who became aware of other groups realized the idea of diversity and felt less group oriented.

There was a difference in the correlation between discrimination in high school and ethnic identity between Latinos and Whites. The more Latinos were discriminated against in high school the more they identified with being Latino. As the literature points out the more your group identity is greeted with hostility the more salient your identity becomes. The White students, on the other hand, were the reverse again; the more they were discriminated against in high school the less they identified with their group. It can only be speculated as to why this happened. The explanation that best makes sense is if the White students were discriminated against because they were involved with other racial groups in high school and their own racial group ostracized them because of this behavior. This however is only speculation.

Some of the correlations demonstrated similarities between Latinos and Whites. For instance, ethnic pride and ethnic group orientation showed a positive correlation for both groups although for the Latinos it was marginal. This seems reasonable; for Latinos, the more that ethnic pride is encouraged, the stronger the group tie becomes. The White student sample demonstrated the same results and this is

more difficult to explain because overall in this study Whites did not demonstrate strong tendencies to either racial unity (as one group) or ethnic pride (as one group). There is no explanation for this maybe the small size or the unequal representation of the sample or other mitigating circumstances created this unexpected result.

Another significant positive correlation for both groups that is closely tied to the previous one is other group orientation and egalitarian race socialization. The data here demonstrates the reverse aspect of the results found above and signifies that the more one is socialized to be egalitarian the more one identifies and dignifies the importance of other groups and thereby diversity.

The correlation of ethnic activities in high school and egalitarian race socialization are easy to explain for Latinos and Whites. These were activities that were attended during high school years and racial or ethnic activities did stimulate a pluralistic view of race and culture for both groups. For White students it makes perfect sense that ethnic activities would lead to a more egalitarian point of view. For instance if a White student attended ethnic activities of other racial and cultural groups this would instill a better understanding for them about other groups.

There was a positive correlation for interracial protocol and discrimination in high school for White students. This relationship can best be explained if race is a salient

issue. For White students this would most likely be found in a home where separatist and racist views are taught and valued. These students would be taught the stereotypical view of other groups as well as the approach most suitable for dealing with them. For Latinos this correlation was marginally positive. This could be a factor associated with mistrust. For instance if the parents have had a negative experience with other groups they would most likely pass on this experience as stereotypical behavior on the part of the other group. The child would then be taught not to trust or associate with members of this group for fear of negative consequences. Thus, for both groups, mistrust of other racial/cultural groups may lead to perceptions of discrimination, whether justified or not.

Cross ethnic affiliation overlaps with other group orientation in both high school and college samples for both Whites and Latinos. This is logical and easy to explain; when students affiliated with other groups the comfort level increased until they felt at ease. The more comfortable and at ease they became the stronger the belief was ingrained that other groups could be trusted. So students that had multiethnic group affiliations in high school continued to do so in college. This is the group of students who exhibit a greater understanding of other ethnic groups and serve to bridge the cultural gaps between the groups.

In the final analysis a comparison was made to distin-

guish the overall effect size Of the TMEIM and the FPQ in Latinos and Whites. The analysis determined that the TMEIM was equally important for both Latinos and Whites. The TMEIM is a measure of one's ethnicity or other group orientation, the fact that they're equal here indicates that social affiliation is tied into both groups on the basis of how they identify with their group as well as other groups. This means that the stronger the identity is towards their own group the least likely it is that they will affiliate with other groups. The results also indicate that exposure to other cultures increases the probability that the student will have a better outlook on other groups and thereby more likely to affiliate with them.

The FPQ was found to be more important to Latinos than to Whites. Since the FPQ is indicative of socialization practices the results indicate that socialization practices are prevalent to Latinos in determining their social affiliations. According to the literature, race and cultural issues are more salient to underrepresented groups as a result of the malice involved in being a member of such a group. The results indicate that for White students, social affiliation is not greatly determined by their socialization practices. The best explanation for this result is that for members of the White majority race becomes a less salient issue.

In a further breakdown of the FPQ it was found that the

greatest specific effect size differences between the two groups was in ethnic activities in high school for Latinos and discrimination in high school for Whites. The results are interesting in these two comparisons. For Latinos, ethnic activities in high school were driven by specific subscales of the FPQ such as: egalitarian race socialization, interracial protocol/race consciousness and ethnic pride. For Whites, discrimination in high school had one driving force from the subscales of the FPQ; interracial protocol/race consciousness. This finding corresponds to the aforementioned relationship between these two variables in Whites.

New Instruments

When this study was conducted several instruments were used that are new or that were modified from existing instruments (in particular, the Social Affiliation Scale, and the Family Process Questionnaire). In this study specific attention was paid to determine if the instruments used were asking the appropriate questions, and to assess their predictive utility in a specific setting. Cultural studies involve many grey areas where the information sought is usually found embedded in unique contextual situations. The more instruments that are developed and used to tease out the information needed the more precise the answers become. Given that the modified instruments appeared to be effective in demonstrating relationships among variables measured in

this study, it is my hope that others may use these instruments in other contexts.

In general this study is part of a continuation of studies that were developed to acquire more information on the socialization processes of underrepresented groups. The primary quest was to develop a Q-Sort measuring instrument that would be used to investigate socialization processes and their intermediary relationship to identity and personality development. As more information was sought the studies seemed to have developed a life and direction of their own. The more questions surfaced about specific things that were thought to be part of the socialization process the further interest seemed to bloom in various directions. It was also discovered that many of the questions that were brought up could not be answered with the experimental instruments that could be found. This problem had to be overcome so one of the primary functions of the laboratory in which this research took place was to find or develop instruments that could be used to extract answers from the most contextual situations.

Future Research

The interest generated by some of the preliminary inquiries into the socialization practices of underrepresented groups has opened the door for culturally related research issues such as the one presented here. Some of the completed work here at UCR is the development and refinement

of a Q-Sort instrument for the African American population. This instrument is currently being used to investigate the intermediary effects of race socialization on such factors as, educational outcomes, personality development, self esteem, ethnic identity, and other related variables. There is a study in process here at UCR that hopes to develop a Q-Sort instrument for Mexican Americans. As part of the of the interest generated by investigating the socialization practices of Mexican Americans and Latinos in general other studies will be created in the process. The literature in this area is lacking and therefore opportunities to do interesting and productive cross cultural research will be available. The future should also produce new instruments that will hopefully be better barometers in quantifying social variables for underrepresented groups in particular African-Americans and Latinos.

APPENDIX A: Informed Consent

Because there is an increasing urgency to understand this rapidly shifting society, researchers are once again focusing their attention toward understanding American populations. One of the goals is to provide legislators and educators with insightful information. This information will allow programs to be designed and implemented that benefit society as a whole. It is with the hope of a better future for American society that we are undertaking this study.

We are asking you to take 2 hours of your time to complete the a number of questionnaires. The questionnaires solicit information about demographic characteristics of yourself and your family, and about your experiences and opinions. You may refuse to answer any question at any time. In addition, you may withdraw from the study at any time.

All information collected in this study will be treated as confidential, and totally anonymous, with no details released to anyone. Any findings published as a result of this study will address only group outcomes. If you agree to participate, please sign the bottom of this informed consent form and return it to the researcher.

Signature _____

Date ____/____/____

APPENDIX B: College Demo

Please be aware that all your responses are strictly confidential.

Thank you for participating.

Age: _____ **Birthdate** _____ **Check one:** Male ___
 Female ___
Marital Status: Single ___ Married ___ Separated ___
 Divorced ___ Widowed ___

Do you have any children? Yes ___ No ___

If yes what are their ages ? _____

Education: Highest grade completed:

12th ___ Freshmen ___ Sophomore ___ Senior ___

List your current GPA _____

Are you employed: Full time ___ Part time ___ No ___

Your Income:

		0		15000	-	19999	_____
Under	-	999	_____	20000	-	24999	_____
1000	-	4999	_____	25000	-	29999	_____
5000	-	9999	_____	30000	-	34999	_____
10000	-	14999	_____	35000	-	39999	_____
				Over	-	40000	_____

Your Parents' Income:

		0		50000	-	54999	_____
Under		999	_____	55000	-	59999	_____
1000	-	4999	_____	60000	-	64999	_____
5000	-	9999	_____	65000	-	69999	_____
10000	-	14999	_____	70000	-	74999	_____
15000	-	19999	_____	75000	-	79999	_____
20000	-	24999	_____	80000	-	84999	_____
25000	-	29999	_____	85000	-	89999	_____
30000	-	34999	_____	90000	-	94999	_____
35000	-	39999	_____	95000	-	99999	_____
40000	-	49999	_____	Over	-	100000	_____

How do you identify yourself? Please circle one answer.

Latino ___ Asian ___ African American ___ White ___
 American Indian ___ If Other, please state: _____

APPENDIX C: TMEIM

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asia-American, American Indian, Anglo-America, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in:

In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be _____

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

4: Strongly Agree 3: Somewhat Agree 2: Somewhat disagree 1: Strongly disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. _____
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. _____
3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. _____
4. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____
5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. _____
6. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. _____
7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn't try to mix together. _____
8. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life. _____
9. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____

10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group. _____
11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. _____
12. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups. _____
13. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. _____
14. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and it's accomplishments. _____
15. I don't try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups. _____
16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. _____
17. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups. _____
18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. _____
19. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____
20. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. _____

Write in the number that gives the best answer to each question.

21. My ethnicity is _____
 - (1) Black
 - (2) African
 - (3) African American
 - (4) American
 - (5) Other (write in): _____
22. My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above) _____
23. My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above) _____

APPENDIX D: Social Affiliation Scale

This questionnaire is designed to measure people's social affiliation tendencies. There are no wrong or right answers. Read each of the following questions and respond accordingly in the spaces provided.

1. Circle one of the following racial/ethnic classification to which you most closely identify with:

American-Indian Asian Black/African-American White
 Latino

2. Indicate your gender: Male _____ Female _____

3. During high school did you: (Mark all that apply)

- _____ Participated in a study abroad program
- _____ Enrolled in an ethnic studies course
- _____ Attended a racial/cultural awareness workshop
- _____ Participated in an ethnic/racial organization (NAACP, etc.) _____
- _____ Participated in campus protests/demonstrations
- _____ Participated in intercollegiate sports
- _____ Joined a fraternity or sorority
- _____ Been elected to a student office
- _____ Was actively involved in a student organization

4. Since entering college have you: (Mark all that apply)

- _____ Participated in a study abroad program
- _____ Enrolled in an ethnic studies course
- _____ Attended a racial/cultural awareness workshop
- _____ Participated in an racial/ethnic organization
- _____ Participated in campus protests/demonstrations
- _____ Participated in intercollegiate sports
- _____ Joined a fraternity, or sorority
- _____ Been elected to a student office
- _____ Was actively involved in a student organization

5. Indicate the option that describes where you lived most often each year in college.

1 2 3 4

- With parents - - - -
- Other private home, apartment, room - - - -
- College dormitory - - - -

Fraternity, or sorority house - - - -
 Other campus student housing - - - -
 Other - - - -

6. In high school indicate how often (Frequently, Occasionally, or Not at all) you: (Circle one in each row)

F O N Studied with someone from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Dined with someone from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Heard faculty make inappropriate remarks about minorities

F O N Had a roommate from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Felt excluded from school activities because of your racial/ethnic group

F O N Dated someone from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Were insulted, or threatened by someone of another racial/ethnic group

F O N Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group

F O N Felt pressure not to socialize with students from other racial/ethnic groups

7. At U.C.R. indicate how often (Frequently, Occasionally, or Not at all) you: (Circle one in each row)

F O N Studied with someone from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Dined with someone from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Heard faculty make inappropriate remarks about minorities

F O N Had a roommate from a different racial/ethnic group

F O N Felt excluded from school activities because of your racial/ethnic background

F O N Dated someone from a different racial or ethnic group

F O N Were insulted, or threatened by individuals of a different ethnic/racial group. If yes by which ethnic group _____

F O N Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group

F O N Felt pressure not to socialize with individuals from other racial/ethnic groups

8. Please write one paragraph about your preferences to interact, or not interact with individuals of other racial/ethnic groups.

9. Please write one paragraph about your parents preferences to interact or not interact with individuals of different racial/ethnic groups.

26. Thinks it is not okay for people to get welfare.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

27. Expects children to talk to adults in the family about their problems.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

28. Expects children not to associate with certain kinds of people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

29. Believes that children should have chores.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

30. Believes that police hassle people in their racial group.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

31. Tells children what to do if they get stopped by the police.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

32. Wants the family to eat at least one meal together.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

33. Makes the children go to church.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

34. Says race is not important.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Least Most

REFERENCES

- Astin, A.W., Panos, R.J., Craeger, J.A. (1966). A program of longitudinal research on the higher educational system, ACE Research Reports. 1 (1): American Council on Education, 1966, 42 pp.
- Baldwin, J.A. (1981). Notes on an Africentric theory of black personality. The Western Journal of Black Studies. 5 (2), 172-179.
- Baldwin, J.A. (1984). African self-consciousness and the mental health of African-Americans. Journal of Black Studies. 15 (2), 177-194.
- Baldwin, J. A., & Bell, Y.R. (1985). The African self-consciousness scale: An Africentric personality questionnaire. The Western Journal of Black Studies. 9 (2), 61-68.
- Baldwin, J. A., Duncan, J.A., Bell, Y.R. (1987). Assessment of African self-consciousness among black students from two college environments. The Journal of Black Psychology. 13 (2), 27-41.
- Baldwin, J.A., & Rackley, R. (1990). Some socio-behavioral correlates of African self-consciousness in African-American college students. The Journal of Black Psychology. 17 (1),
- Banks, C.W. (1992). The theoretical and methodological crisis of the Africentric conception. Journal of Negro Education. 61 (3), 262-272.
- Baumeister, R.F., (1986-A). Identity: cultural change and the struggle for the self. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R.F., (1986-B). Public self and private self. (Ed. Roy F, Baumeister). New York: Springer-Verlag, Springer Series in Social Psychology.
- Blasi, A., & Milton, K. (1991). The development of the sense of self in adolescence. Journal of Personality. 59 (2), 217-241.
- Cheatham, H.E., Tomlinson, S.A., Ward, T.J. (1990). The African self-consciousness construct and African-American students. Journal of College Student Development. 31,

- Crocker, J., & Schwartz, I. (1985). Prejudice and ingroup favoritism in minimal intergroup situation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 11 (4), 379-386.
- Erikson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and Society. (2d ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Jackson, J.S., McCullough, & Gurin, G. (1988). Family, socialization environment, and identity development in Black Americans. In H.P. McAdoo (Eds). Black Families (pp. 242-245) Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Judd, C., & Park, B. (1988). Out-group homogeneity. Journal Of Personality and Social Psychology. 54 (5), 778-788.
- Madsen, W. (1964). Mexican-Americans of South Texas. New York. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 13 419-438.
- Martinez, M.A. (1986). Family socialization among Mexican-Americans. Human Development. 29, 264-279.
- Nelson, M. (1994). The underlying motives of interpersonal affiliation. Paper presented at UCLA undergraduate research conference.
- Peacock, (1994). Q-Sort Scale. Dissertation. University of California Riverside.
- Perdue, C., Gurtman, Dovidio, Tyler (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 39, 475-486.
- Phinney, J.S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. Journal of Adolescent Research. 7 (2).
- Quattrone, G.A., & Jones, E.E. (1980). The perception of variability within in-groups and out-groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 38 (1), 141-152.
- Ramirez, M. (1967). Identification with Mexican family values and authoritarianism in Mexican-Americans. The Journal of Social Psychology. 73, 3-11.

- Rueschenberg, E., & Buriel, R. (1989). Mexican-American family functioning and acculturation: A family systems perspective. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences. 11 (3) 233-244.
- Schumm, W.R., McCollum, E.E., Bugaighis, M.A., Jurich, A.P., Bollman, S.R., Reitz, J., (1988). Differences between Anglo and Mexican-American family members on satisfaction with family life. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences. 10 (1), 39-53.
- Sotomayor, M. (1970). Mexican-American interaction with social systems. Family Journal of Social Casework. 52, 316-322.
- Spencer, M.B., & Markstrom-Adams, C. (1990). Identity processes among racial and ethnic minority children in America. Child Development. 61, 290-310.
- Stevenson, H. (1994). Validation of the scale of racial socialization for African-American adolescents. Journal of Black Psychology. 20 (4), 445-468.
- Stevenson, H. (1995). Relationship of adolescent perceptions of racial socialization to racial identity. Journal of Black Psychology. 21 (1), 49-70.
- Stokes, J. (1994). The influence of race socialization on the group identity and self-esteem of African-American youth. Dissertation.
- Thornton, M.C., Chatters, L.M., Taylor, J.R., Allen, W.R. (1990). Sociodemographic and environmental correlates of racial socialization by Black parents. Child Development. 61, 401-409.
- White, C.L., & Burke, P.J. (1987). Ethnic role identity among Black and White college students. Sociological Perspectives. 30 (3), 310-331.