

MEXICAN AMERICANS TOWARD ACTION:  
A STUDY IN BARRIO LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Sociology  
University of Houston

---

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

---

by  
George F. Rivera, Jr.  
August, 1968

---

454469

## PREFACE

The study of Mexican American leadership trends has received little attention in social research. In specific, the characteristics of the barrio as they relate to leadership recognition have existed in the literature as assumptions only. This study is an effort to test these assumptions.

The purpose of this study is to examine two hypotheses: (1) there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio; and (2) leadership recognition is directly related to educational status, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media. This study represents an effort to comprehend post-Civil Rights leadership trends among Mexican Americans.

No claim can be made that this work constitutes a definitive analysis. Limitations of the data and shortcomings in the ability of the writer made a definitive analysis impossible. It is believed, however, that this study contributes to present knowledge of leadership recognition in urban Mexican American barrios.

Special acknowledgements are due to Mr. Enrique Campos of the Magnolia residential area. Mr. Campos' splendid co-operation in making available to the writer the schedules of his 1967 summer program in Magnolia made the study possible.

Acknowledgements are due also to Professor Jack E. Dodson, of the Department of Sociology, The University of Houston. Professor Dodson's competence as a sociologist, his comprehensive knowledge of minority groups and his patience were of inestimable assistance to the writer.

G. F. R.

August 10, 1968

MEXICAN AMERICANS TOWARD ACTION:  
A STUDY IN BARRIO LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION

---

An Abstract of a Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Sociology  
University of Houston

---

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

---

by  
George F. Rivera, Jr.  
August, 1968

## ABSTRACT

This thesis reports an investigation of two hypotheses: (1) there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio; and leadership recognition is directly related to educational status, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

The locale for the study was the Magnolia community in Houston, Texas. This barrio is a residential area with a tradition of being the oldest Mexican American enclave in the city.

All interviews were conducted by barrio residents. It is believed that this use of marginal informants is essential to meaningful survey research in the barrio.

With reference to Mexican Americans, the professional literature is minimal and suggests that, for all practical purposes, the barrio is without leaders. In specific, what literature does exist on Mexican American leadership has mainly focused either upon leadership "types" or upon the characteristics of "influentials."

Although a number of assumptions have been made in the literature regarding the relationship between leadership and the characteristics of the barrio, none of these assumptions have been tested empirically. The writer thus undertook to investigate the relationship between leadership recognition and educational status, occupational rank, degree of

assimilation, and access to communication media.

The writer's two hypotheses were tested and verified. It is held that low leadership recognition is characteristically low in the barrio because low education, low occupational rank, low rate of assimilation, and low rate of access to communication media perpetuate a lower status simulating that of Gunnar Myrdal's "vicious circle." This "vicious circle" is kept intact by discrimination and prejudice on part of the dominant Anglo group. It is evident from the findings of this thesis that low leadership recognition trends among Mexican Americans are not apt to disappear until the "vicious circle" has become a part of the barrio past.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: PROBLEM AND APPROACH . . .	1
The Movement and Mexican Americans	
Leadership	
Statement of the Problem	
Relationship to Sociological Theory	
II. PORTRAIT OF MEXICAN AMERICANS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	17
Leadership	
Education	
Occupation	
Assimilation	
Communication	
Summary	
An Evaluation of the Literature on Mexican Americans	
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	37
The Marginal Informant	
Description of the Sample Area	
Procedure and Method	
The Schedule	
Limitations of the Data	
IV. ANALYSIS . . . . .	49
Statistical Profile of Magnolia	
Leadership: A Preliminary Analysis	
Socioeconomic Rank as Related to Leadership Recognition	
Education	
Occupation	
Assimilation	
Communication	
Findings	
Major Findings	
Minor Findings	
Discussion	

CHAPTER	Page
V. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? . . . . .	78
Education	
Occupation	
Assimilation	
Communication	
REFERENCES. . . . .	85
APPENDIX. . . . .	97
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	111



# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Medium Education Attainment of Ethnic Group and Anglo Males by State, 1960 . . . .	6
II. Years of School Completed by Persons 25 Years Old and Over for Texas, 1960 . . . . .	9
III. Leadership Recognition by Percentages and Rank Order Classification. . . . .	54
IV. Leaders Classified by Types of Influentials . . . . .	56
V. Leadership Recognition Rates by Education. . . . .	59
VI. Leadership Recognition Rates by Occupation . . . . .	62
VII. Leadership Recognition Rates by Assimilation . . . . .	66
VIII. Leadership Recognition Rates by Communication. . . . .	70

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION: PROBLEM AND APPROACH

The Civil Rights Movement has made substantial gains for the Negro in America. A catalyst for social change has been the well publicized Negro problem in American society. Unfortunately, these gains have obscured the plight of Mexican Americans--the forgotten people of the Southwest.

#### The Movement And Mexican Americans

The Civil Rights Movement came to the fore during World War I. The American campaign to "make the world safe for democracy" was challenged by American Negroes who lived in a racist society. The conflicting value system became the reason for the involvement of many in the movement.

Events contributed to the challenge of the democratic credo. The "Great Migration" contributed to the rise of the protest movement. The relocation of rural, Southern Negroes to the urban North during the war industry's recruitment effort created a state of social disorganization which became manifest in a series of race riots.

After W.E.B. Du Bois challenged the abolitionist leadership of Booker T. Washington, a new climate of Negro protest gained momentum. The movement was clearly a Negro movement; it voiced to American society the injustices ex-

istent in a racist society.

White America was slowly being awakened, but the sudden jolting of America did not occur until three decades after World War I. In 1954 the Supreme Court handed down the Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas decision overruling the "separate but equal" doctrine set forth in the 1896 Plessy V. Ferguson case.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, 1955 saw the Montgomery Bus Boycott. The injustices that existed in American society were televised to the nation and to the world. The boycott physically lasted one year, but spiritually there began a new era of Negro unity and protest.

From Montgomery emerged Dr. Martin Luther King as the protest leader; Dr. King was to be a "Moses" to lead his people toward the promised land. The charismatic King importantly adopted the Ghandian teachings of non-violence; non-violence gave the movement an efficacious protest tactic.

King quickly became a national leader. He gave leadership to the establishment of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957. Thereafter, in 1960 the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) evolved as the student branch of SCLC. The protest was more clearly voiced by these two organizations than by any of the other Civil Rights groups.

In 1960 the student sit-in movement emerged; rapidly

the movement became epidemic and spread across the South as a non-violent protest against discrimination. A commitment for more change, such as occurred at Montgomery, was clearly evident in the 1961 Albany Movement. During the same year the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) members again organized "Freedom Rides", to test anti-discrimination laws in "a dramatic attempt to expose and challenge segregation in interstate travel in the Deep South."<sup>2</sup>

Crisis proved to be the breath of the movement; Birmingham and Selma proved to be great moments in Negro history. In 1963 the Birmingham encounter pricked the conscience of White America. President Lyndon B. Johnson led Congress to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Again in 1965 the Selma crisis was followed by the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In 1968 Resurrection City has been built (and torn down) and though King is dead, people are waiting for more meaningful governmental action and legislation. The last wait is history and militants await the Second Coming.

Although the movement has had a leader, a history, and a voice, it has primarily been a Negro movement and the gains that it has achieved have been gains for Black people. It was not until recent times that the movement made an effort to include other minorities. Apparently Dr. Martin Luther King only late in his life became aware of Mexican Americans;

Stokley Carmichael only recently visited Cuba and became aware of the grievances of Latin Americans.

Cesar Chavez and Reyes Lopez Tijerina, two Mexican American national leaders, have been incorporated minimally into the Civil Rights Movement. Whenever the movement included these Mexican Americans, their voices have been drowned out by the Negro issue. Furthermore, Negro leaders who make an effort to include Mexican Americans in the movement are often ignorant of the discrimination and prejudice suffered by Mexican Americans. Unfortunately, Negro leaders do not perceive or understand the problems of Mexican Americans.

Any American who lives unaware of the Negro problem lives in ignorance, for the Negro has had Dr. King and Professor Myrdal to voice his problems. The Mexican American has had neither a leader nor a concerned intelligentsia to voice the cost and pain of the vicious discrimination experienced by Mexican Americans. There are no Mexican American counterparts to Ralph Ellison or James Baldwin. "White" America has not yet had a sympathetic voice to convey the life situation of Mexican Americans.

It is fundamental to recognize that discrimination in education has victimized the Mexican American. Historically, limited educational opportunities have deprived Mexican Americans of personages such as George Washington Carver,

W.E.B. Du Bois, Dr. Martin Luther King, Ralph Ellison, James Baldwin, Whitney Young, E. Franklin Frazier, and Stokely Carmichael. These Negroes are well educated men; they are challenging "White" racism and are concerned with the distortions in the Establishment's history of the United States.

While the eyes of White America have been on the Negro, the plight of the forgotten people has been heightened. Throughout the Southwest, with the sole exception of New Mexico, Mexican Americans have a lower educational status than that of Anglos or Negroes. (See Table I.)

TABLE I  
MEDIAN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF ETHNIC GROUP  
AND ANGLO MALES<sup>a</sup> BY STATE, 1960<sup>b</sup>

Ethnic Group	Arizona Schooling	California Schooling	Colorado Schooling	New Mexico Schooling	Texas Schooling
Spanish Surname	6.7 yrs.	8.5 yrs.	8.1 yrs.	7.7 yrs.	4.8 yrs.
Nonwhite	6.8 yrs.	10.2 yrs.	11.1 yrs.	7.0 yrs.	7.5 yrs.
Anglo	12.1 yrs.	12.1 yrs.	12.1 yrs.	11.4 yrs.	10.8 yrs.

<sup>a</sup>Age 25 and over.

<sup>b</sup>Source: Data condensed from Walter Fogel, Education And Income of Mexican Americans In The Southwest, Table 5, p. 8.

The median educational statistics clearly show that American society has deprived Mexican Americans of comparable educational opportunities given to the Negro.

Negroes have experienced school desegregation, and this change is not unknown to Mexican Americans. Only after 1947 were Texas Mexican Americans superficially freed from the injustices of the segregated "Mexican schools". The famous Delgado Case legally ended school segregation for Mexican Americans but did not end the educationally deprived cycle experienced by Mexican Americans in most newly desegregated school systems.<sup>3</sup>

After the Brown decision the federal government began minimally to facilitate desegregation in the public schools. This federal effort continues to the present; yet no such efforts have been undertaken to cope with the consequences of inferior and largely de facto segregated schools for Mexican American children. The realization of bilingual education has been postponed by officials. In the usual curricula the achievements of the Mexican people are ignored or distorted: children have been robbed of their cultural heritage.

For those Mexican Americans who had the opportunity to learn minimal English, school desegregation opened the door to the American dream. Therefore, in the late fifties, and more so in the early sixties, Mexican Americans, for the first time in Texas history, began to capitalize upon more



nearly equal educational opportunities. Expanded educational opportunities have created new Mexican American leaders.

This process is reminiscent of the rise of the Negro leadership. Although only a small percentage of Mexican Americans go to college, it has been these "first few" who have begun to awaken from the long dormancy of the "sleeping giant".<sup>4</sup>

Table II provides a comparative analysis of educational attainment through college for Anglos, Spanish-surnames, and Non-whites.

TABLE II  
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY PERSONS  
25 YEARS OLD AND OVER FOR TEXAS,  
1960<sup>a</sup>

Years of Schooling	Ethnic Group		
	Anglo	Spanish-Surname	Nonwhite
No Schooling	1.1%	22.9%	5.4%
Elementary (Grades 1 - 8)	31.2%	56.8%	54.8%
High School (Grades 9 - 12)	46.5%	16.1%	31.4%
College (1 - 44)	21.2%	4.2%	8.4%

<sup>a</sup>Source: Adapted from Clifton McClosky, The Government and Politics of Texas, p. 9.

From Table II the educational deprivation of Mexican Americans comes to the forefront. Mexican Americans are disproportionately in the illiterate and/or elementary school levels and are again disproportionately underrepresented at the high school and college levels. Notwithstanding, the very small percentage in the college class represents the present and future Mexican American intelligentsia.

It was on the college campuses that the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) began, and it is on the same sites that Mexican American militants are appearing. Although the barrio Mexican Americans have been reluctant to accept the militant Reyes Lopez Tijerina, like the "Uncle Toms" of yore, it has been on the college campuses that Tijerina has spoken with widest appeal to Mexican Americans.

Although Chavez and Tijerina are prominent names in Mexican American leadership, these two men are older and have limited education. The new and significant leaders of la raza are young and are most often found on the college campuses. Students lead in demands for community change. These vanguards of the Mexican American movement are awakening to "la noche del grito," and the college campuses are motivating Mexican Americans into articulating the incongruities of American society.

The Civil Rights Movement and its relation to the status of Mexican Americans has been discussed. Ultimately,

the status of Mexican Americans must be related to the specific problems which create a leadership vacuum. A review of the small amount of literature which concerns leadership is required.

### Leadership

The sociological literature on leadership is confusing. There is, in fact, a lack of agreement on the definition of the term itself. Bell, Hill, and Wright state that "each concept, methodology, and resultant identification of leaders may be correct for the problems posed by the particular researcher."<sup>5</sup> In fact, they conclude that "an arbitrary, single definition of public leadership seems premature . . . in view of the diversity of usages in the various studies . . . ."<sup>6</sup>

They suggest that leadership studies can be classified as emphasizing one, or a combination of the following five approaches:<sup>7</sup>

- (1) positional or formal leadership;
- (2) reputational or nominal leadership;
- (3) social participation;
- (4) personal influence or opinion leadership;
- (5) event analysis or decision-making.

One of the most direct ways of locating leaders is to select those persons who occupy important organizational positions . . . . Such identifications have been used in analyses of local community, regional, and national leadership.<sup>8</sup>

The "positional approach" or the "formal leadership approach" is one of the major approaches to the study of leadership.<sup>9</sup> By definition, this approach is heavily dependent upon the researcher's judgment as to who will be defined as leaders.

Studies utilizing the positional approach have dealt with elected political leaders,<sup>10</sup> higher civil servants and political appointees,<sup>11</sup> business leaders,<sup>12</sup> military leaders,<sup>13</sup> and office holders in voluntary associations.<sup>14</sup>

The other major approaches will only be noted briefly because they are not as satisfactory in locating leaders as is the positional approach, which is the approach utilized in the study undertaken for this thesis.

The second major approach to locating leaders, the reputational, differs from the positional in that it identifies leaders through the opinions or judgments of other members of society, who tell the researcher who they think the leaders are. The researcher then uses some criterion of consensus to decide which persons appear to be operating as leaders in the community.<sup>15</sup>

The reputational approach to leadership studies has given much attention to the use of "key informants" or "a panel of experts" who know the community and are qualified to identify its leaders. It is evident that this particular methodology can be erroneous since it is dependent upon the identification of a few citizens to convey the leadership of the entire community.

Researchers like Floyd Hunter have recognized the

limitations of the reputational approach and have consequently combined this approach with the positional approach.<sup>16</sup>

Another approach of lesser acclaim is that of social participation. It is empirically an approximation to an operational definition of public leadership.<sup>17</sup> An individual's activities are used as an index of a leadership position and those most active are identified as leaders.

The Personal Influence or Opinion-Leadership Approach differs from the other approaches. It focuses on "people who are usually turned to by others for information or advice about some topic or who have influenced some specific decision or opinion of the respondent."<sup>18</sup>

Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet's The People's Choice, which examines voting behavior, is a representative classic of the Personal Influence Approach.<sup>19</sup> Robert K. Merton has also contributed to this approach but has focused his research on the local-cosmopolitan typology of influentials.<sup>20</sup>

The final major approach is the Decision Making or the Event-Analysis Approach. This approach involves tracing the history of a particular public decision about some community issue or policy. Although this approach to the study of community power often yields some insight into the structure of community decisions, it does not always provide data on leadership that can be compared to the other leadership approaches.<sup>21</sup>

The approach to the study of leadership in this thesis is the positional approach. The ethnic identity of the researcher, as well as his marginal status, lends itself well to the study of Mexican American leadership trends.

### Statement of the Problem

This is a survey study of leadership recognition in a Mexican American community as it relates to education, occupation, assimilation, and communication. The two major hypotheses to be investigated are these: (1) in the Mexican American barrio (community) leadership recognition will characteristically be low, and (2) Mexican American leadership recognition is directly related to educational attainment, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

The initial purpose of the survey design was to do research in an urban Mexican American barrio in order to further understand its sociological relationship to the larger community. Although data were collected on several aspects of barrio life, leadership recognition appeared to be one of the more fruitful areas of analysis. Thus, for the purposes of this thesis prime consideration will be given to leadership recognition only.

### Relationship to Sociological Theory

Traditionally, an ethos of political inactivity has

prevailed in the Mexican American community. It is theorized that this social milieu has characterized barrio life because there have been few leaders recognized by the Mexican rank and file. Unfortunately, most of those who potentially could become leaders move out of the community as they assimilate and identify with the dominant caste.

Therefore, social change in the Mexican American community has been slow and minimal. Whatever change has occurred has been a consequence of (1) the efforts of a few aggressive Mexican American leaders, (2) the Negro protest, and (3) the effects of the "War on Poverty."

The experience of Mexican Americans in the Southwest has been one of discrimination, which has demoralized and isolated the Mexicano. Furthermore, a poverty status has been perpetuated through the Mexican American's low exposure to educational opportunities, occupational opportunities, assimilation, and communication media.

With the exception of D'Antonio, et. al., Woods, Watson and Samora, survey studies of leadership in Mexican American communities do not exist.<sup>22</sup> In the main, these studies have dealt with the characteristics of leaders or of influentials rather than with the characteristics of those who recognize leaders. In this thesis an attempt is made to study the post-Civil Rights leadership trends in the Mexican American community and to test the relationship between



leadership recognition and four major characteristics of the barrio residents. A number of assumptions have been made in the literature regarding this relationship, but none of these assumptions have been tested empirically. This thesis endeavors to analyze such a test, which the writer conducted.

Chapter II will constitute a survey and critical evaluation of the literature on Mexican Americans; Chapter III will present the methodology of the survey design; and Chapter IV will be an analysis of the data collected as it relates to the hypotheses; the conclusion will be summed up in Chapter V and conjectures on the findings of this research effort will be discussed.

## CHAPTER II

### PORTRAIT OF MEXICAN AMERICANS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This section reviews the existing literature on the Mexican American as it relates to that minority's present status in leadership, education, occupational status, assimilation, and communication.

In a decade where race relations are becoming increasingly critical, it is surprising to find "A Minority Nobody Knows".<sup>1</sup> Even the Amish of Pennsylvania have received more attention than the Mexican American. Twenty-seven years ago, George I. Sanchez wrote a book which characterized Spanish-speaking people as "the forgotten people".<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, Mexican Americans have not lost this identity.

If one were to investigate the plight of the "forgotten people", one would find that the Spanish-speaking constitute "the least known, the least sponsored, and the least vocal large minority group in the nation."<sup>3</sup>

Without reservation the central focus of minority group studies in the United States has been upon the Negro problem. In fact, many Americans are still under the illusion that Mexican Americans have been successfully assimilated into every aspect of American life. Even in the social sciences this deception is understandable since social science publications, graduate seminars, and undergraduate

minority groups courses have consistently failed to mention the Mexican American. "In terms of research, sociologists, like others, have virtually forgotten about the Mexican Americans in our midst."<sup>4</sup> If sociology, a discipline which is directly concerned with minority groups, has forgotten the Mexican American, it is not surprising that the civil rights movement and the federal government also have.<sup>5</sup>

### Leadership

"Perhaps the most important single factor requisite to the speedy and permanent solution [for Mexican Americans] in Texas is that of leadership--intelligent, informed, positive leadership. . . ."<sup>6</sup> Leaders, no doubt, are important because they are the voice of the subordinate group. ". . . The ability of a subordinate group to generate effective leadership in its relation with a dominant alien people is a critical aspect of dominant-subordinate group relations."<sup>7</sup> Mexican Americans are no exception.

"Mexican leadership has been practically unexplored;"<sup>8</sup> the information that has been gathered creates a collective portrait that is overwhelmingly negative:

. . . There is singularly little controversy concerning whether Spanish leadership is weak, regardless of the point of view of the different commentators. Agreement is all but unanimous among scientific investigators, among social workers, and public and private agencies interested in the Spanish-speaking people, among Anglo politicians, and among the people themselves."<sup>9</sup>

Leonard Broom and E. Shevsky upheld the traditional view when they stated that in the United States as a whole the Mexican American has been without leadership.<sup>10</sup> E.S. Bogardas wrote three decades ago:

. . . they have not had leaders to show the way. They have not had skilled leadership in organization work. . . . Neither have they had popular speakers to challenge and arouse them, as the Negroes have had.<sup>11</sup>

Among Mexican Americans themselves, "the Community has not been vocal in bringing its problems to the fore."<sup>12</sup> In the past, whatever Mexican American leadership did exist rested on the frailest of rank and file participation.<sup>13</sup> The corollary of leader is followers; without followers leaders are paralyzed. Americo Paredes states that ". . . support from the rank and file of their own people has always been inadequate . . . ."<sup>14</sup> At every level of political participation Mexican Americans have been leaderless. "Even in municipal affairs it is uncommon to find spokesmen for the Mexican."<sup>15</sup>

James B. Watson and Julian Samora speak of leadership as being submerged within its own inactivity. They feel that leaders do exist but describe them as "leaders by default; although uniquely qualified in some respects to lead, they do not."<sup>16</sup>

Although individual leaders can frequently make a great deal of difference in opposing or encouraging assimilation . . . in a fragmented community, . . .

one is tempted to conclude that it remains unassimilated by default--no one does or can lead effectively.<sup>17</sup>

Whatever leadership has existed in the past has been either unrepresentative, unheard, or unaware of the needs of the people. Sanchez wrote concerning the "Default of Leadership":

Political leadership . . . in Texas gives every evidence of being either completely unaware of, or completely indifferent to, the need to discover ways and means of accelerating the acculturation of the status Spanish-speaking population . . . . At best this leadership (of the Spanish-speaking) does an unimaginative, pedestrian job; . . . at worst . . . that leadership sees in political position simply an opportunity for selfish gain, for personal enrichment, and for a freedom of behavior that will not stand the light of moral judgement.<sup>18</sup>

Mexican American leaders--potential or actual--have undoubtedly failed in their role, whether this failure be willing or not. Dr. Sanchez expounds on this point:

Where are our leaders--like Llorazolo, like Seguin, like Navarro, like Chavez, like Fernandez, like a host of others who sought to get justice for my people? What did they accomplish? Frustration.<sup>19</sup>

Frustration may have been the pivotal factor influencing potential leaders to assimilate rather than to lead.

The literature overwhelmingly presents the fact that marginal Mexican Americans have assimilated and have, in turn, deprived the Mexican American community of potential leadership. Broom and Shevsky found that "those individuals who have advanced substantially, either economically or in educational status, have tended to lose their identity with

the group and have moved away from the ethnic enclaves which are entirely lower class."<sup>20</sup> Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna agree: "Individuals who learn to think and act like Anglos are more likely than not to drift off, . . . to see greater opportunity, thus depriving the remaining residents of . . . assimilating leadership."<sup>21</sup> Severing relations with the Mexican American community has continued to perpetuate its lower class homogeneity.<sup>22</sup> Fernando Ponalosa and Edward C. McDonagh's Pomona study confirms the notion that the younger and more educated Mexican Americans are moving out of the barrio and are settling in the "better" Anglo residential areas.<sup>23</sup>

The loss of indigenous leadership can best be explained by the fact that upwardly mobile Mexican Americans do not hit a ceiling on the way up as do Negroes.<sup>24</sup> This statement, although not wholly true, accounts for the major loss of leadership.

Although caste-like enough to give sharp definition to the two groups, Anglo structure is relatively open to the competent Spanish and thus permits the siphoning off of potential Spanish leadership, individuals relatively well adapted to the Anglo system.<sup>25</sup>

Thus, the barrio remains in its original dilemma: a forgotten people without a voice.

This bleak portrayal may not be altogether true. There is an emerging climate of opinion pointing to a closing of the leadership gap by the relatively small membership in

the Mexican American middle class. Carey McWilliams, in his effort to illuminate the Mexican American problem, wrote:

"One reason . . . for their equivocal leadership has been the absence of a Spanish-speaking middle class."<sup>26</sup> Frances Jerome Woods, in her study, hypothesized and found evidence to support the contention that "Mexican ethnic leadership is inextricably linked to class structure and supplied by the middle classes."<sup>27</sup> Leadership in fragmented forms appears to be emerging within the middle class.

There exists some evidence that though the middle-class leaders are young, they have not forgotten the urban and rural slums where they were born.<sup>28</sup> The educational level of the masses trapped in the barrio is improving because a growing number of educated persons are returning to lead the masses into shades of the American dream.<sup>29</sup>

This return may mark the beginning of a new era for the Mexican Americans because the leadership gap at last shows signs of closing. Perhaps now the patron or jefe politico will pass into history as leadership changes from exploitative to concerned, responsible leadership.<sup>30</sup>

### Education

In general, the school systems have pitifully failed the Mexican American. The median educational attainment for Texas as reported from the 1960 Census was: 4.8 years for the Spanish-surname population; 7.5 years for Nonwhites;

10.8 years for Anglos.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, the median school years completed by Mexican American males for Texas in 1960 was 6.2 years; Texas statistics rated lowest in comparison to statistics from all other Southwestern states where Mexican Americans reside.<sup>32</sup>

"The educational status of adult Mexican Americans is still very low and, in terms of functional illiteracy, even lower than that of Negroes in the area."<sup>33</sup> Houston, Texas, statistics are no exception. Comparison of Spanish-surname, Anglo, and Nonwhites with four years of school or less with those with four years of high school or more yield the following percentages for the Houston Metropolitan Statistical Area (1960):<sup>34</sup>

SPANISH SURNAME	<u>4 yrs. or less</u>	<u>4 yrs. H.S. +</u>
	38.2%	16.9%
ANGLO	4.5%	51.8%
NONWHITE	18.2%	25.3%

Such statistics only magnify the educational deprivation experienced by Mexican Americans in a highly urbanized area.

Mexican Americans rank low educationally because they have a language barrier, are a discriminated minority instilled with an inferior self image, and attend de facto segregated schools. "Today the schools attended by Mexicans are located in the poorest areas and are largely segregated on a de facto basis."<sup>35</sup> Like the Negro ghetto, the Mexican



American barrio atmosphere of deprivation is further perpetuated by the dominant community's successful segregation attempts.

Mexican Americans are deprived of the American dream of maximum public school education. The low rate of college attendance reflects this institutionally-imposed status. In Texas only 4.2 per cent of the Spanish-surname population have one to four years of college or college-plus compared to 8.4 per cent of the Nonwhite population and 21.2 per cent of the Anglo population.<sup>36</sup>

If education is the index of comparison, the existing statistics lead one to conclude that Mexican Americans rank lowest at every level of educational attainment.

### Occupation

Occupational classification is perhaps the most revealing characteristic that distinguishes the Mexican population in the United States.<sup>37</sup>

If one were to define white collar workers in the labor force as professionals, technicals, managers, proprietors, and sales workers, one would find that in Texas only 14.8 per cent of Mexican Americans fall into this category compared with 41.8 per cent of Anglo Americans.<sup>38</sup> Conversely, if blue collar workers in the labor force are defined as all workers below the white collar class, 85.9 per cent of the Mexican American population are in the blue collar cate-

gory compared with 58.2 per cent of Anglo Americans in this category.<sup>39</sup>

Broom and Shevky explain that there exists a caste-like occupational status for Mexican Americans in the labor force which accounts for the clustering of Mexican Americans in the blue collar category.<sup>40</sup> M.F. Murray, in her socio-cultural study, also found a majority of Mexican Americans employed in unskilled and semiskilled occupations.<sup>41</sup>

William V. D'Antonio and Julian Samora view the low occupational status of the Mexican American as an index of low assimilation on the part of this majority.<sup>42</sup>

Although N.D. Humphrey concludes that the Anglo population is generally on a higher economic level than the Mexican,<sup>43</sup> Celia S. Heller states the fact more bluntly when she writes that Mexican Americans in Texas "rank lowest in occupation, education, and income."<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, Heller points to the fact that "concentration in unskilled occupations means of course that Mexican Americans characteristically earn much less than most other groups in the United States."<sup>45</sup> Income statistics more than support the inferior status that society confers upon Mexican Americans. Median income of ethnic group and Anglo males age 25 and over for Texas in 1960 was Anglo: \$4,768; Nonwhite: \$2,161; Spanish surname: \$2,400.<sup>46</sup>

Thus, not only is the Mexican American's minimal ac-

culturation and assimilation reflected in his low socioeconomic status,<sup>47</sup> but his low occupational and income status is closely related to his low educational status.<sup>48</sup>

### Assimilation

"When the person has come predominantly to accord his conduct to the meaning of the second culture, he may be said to have achieved a state or condition of assimilation."<sup>49</sup> John Burma defines assimilation as "the degree to which and the rate at which a minority takes on the material and non-material culture of the majority. . . ."<sup>50</sup> Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess more traditionally define assimilation as ". . . a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life."<sup>51</sup> William C. Smith describes it as a process whereby "the immigrant slowly gives up the traditional ideas, standards and practices and adopts those of the new country."<sup>52</sup> To sum up the various definitions: "assimilation for the most part means conforming to Anglo-Americans models."<sup>53</sup> Mexican Americans, for the most part, have not yet conformed.

"Both in the rate and the degree of acculturation and assimilation Mexican Americans are among the least 'Americanized' of all ethnic groups in the United States."<sup>54</sup>

Samora and Lamanna's study reveals that ". . . in the case of the Mexican Americans there is no doubt that their extremely low educational, income, and occupational levels presented especially severe obstacles to their assimilation."<sup>55</sup> Murray's sociocultural study found that

these people have been freed to a considerable extent from the controls of the customs and traditions of their parents, and have not yet been completely assimilated into the new life and culture.<sup>56</sup>

Mexican Americans appear to be transitional marginals who have not yet acquired the dominant culture. Partial explanation for this status is offered by Humphrey when he asserts that ". . . a fierce pride in 'race' . . . acts to deter assimilation of American culture."<sup>57</sup> In fact, barrio life has been so highly valued that McWilliams wrote years ago: ". . . Mexican immigrants have seldom ventured beyond the fan of Spanish influence in the borderlands."<sup>58</sup> Although Mexican Americans have ventured beyond the immediate borderlands, they have not ventured beyond the borders of barrios located in urban areas in the Southwest.

As pointed out earlier most Mexican Americans are permanent class-keepers of the lower class. Anthony Gary Dworkin concludes from his studies that "low type" Mexican Americans (poverty class) do not meet Ozzie G. Simmons' three criteria for assimilation:<sup>59</sup> "occupational achievement . . . wealth . . . and command of Anglo ways."<sup>60</sup> Further-

more, Simmons holds fast to the following assumption: "If the full acceptance of Mexicans by Anglo-Americans is contingent upon the disappearance of the cultural differences, it will not be accorded in the foreseeable future."<sup>61</sup>

Other writers, although not disagreeing with this idea of unassimilated status, feel that Mexican Americans are more adequately classified as being at every stage of acculturation.<sup>62</sup> Since the rural areas are least likely to participate in the social change felt in a secular society, Patrick H. McNamara perceives that "if assimilation is taking place, the big city, of course, is the place to look for it."<sup>63</sup>

Clark S. Knowlton concludes from his El Paso, Texas, Studies that Mexican Americans, as a group, are still undecided about acculturation and assimilation.<sup>64</sup> Although Arthur J. Rubel found that some Mexicans had forsaken Spanish for English on the basis of their understanding that assimilation would be conducive to higher status, this in fact, has added up to only "a very few".<sup>65</sup>

In terms of value orientations, Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck conclude that Mexican Americans are minimally assimilated.<sup>66</sup> Adherence to the values of the old culture has been studied by Samora and Lamanna as they relate the length of time in the United States and proximity of Mexico to assimilation.<sup>67</sup>

Unlike other immigrant groups, Mexican Americans have not been quick to assimilate. In fact, the prevailing literature points to a tightly-knit subculture with few signs of other-culture directed interaction. Barrio life has conformed to little else than itself. Consequently, assimilation has not been a part of the "race relations cycle"<sup>68</sup> of this ethnic group.

### Communication

Communication with the dominant culture controls and is controlled by the degree of isolation experienced by the subculture. If the subculture is highly isolated, then minimal communication with the dominant culture will prevail. Although this characteristic of Mexican American barrio life has long been commented upon, it has not received much close attention in past studies.

Burma estimates that about three fourths of all Mexican Americans in the United States live in barrios.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, a large percentage of these barrio dwellers are urbanites. Lyle Saunders views Mexican Americans as "particularly concentrating in the larger cities . . . ." <sup>70</sup> The U.S. Bureau of the Census reports that "in five southwestern states in 1960, 79.1 per cent of the Spanish-surname population was urban and only 5.3 per cent was rural-farm."<sup>71</sup> It appears that larger cities are increasingly becoming the homes of modern Mexican Americans.<sup>72</sup>

Barrios are characteristically located in the heart of the Metropolitan areas.<sup>73</sup> Segregation has long been a pattern of existence of Mexican Americans in both rural and urban areas. Joan W. Moore and Frank G. Mittelbach found that the larger the city, the greater the degree of segregation of Mexican Americans versus Anglos.<sup>74</sup> Needless to say, segregation of the Mexican American in predominantly Spanish-speaking neighborhoods tends to further retard the Americanization process.<sup>75</sup> Thus, Broom and Shevky's prediction has not been altered: "the continued isolation of the atomistic enclaves."<sup>76</sup>

"New studies of Mexican society indicate a social and cultural heterogeneity within localities . . . ."<sup>77</sup> Although the Mexican American barrios are predominantly lower class, there appear signs of cultural differences that are perhaps manifestations of the differential degrees of assimilation. "For whatever the culture of the barrios may be, it is certainly a hybrid one, neither classical Mexican nor traditional Anglo urban."<sup>78</sup> Broom and Shevky have alluded to this characteristic when they termed the barrios "marginal neighborhoods".<sup>79</sup>

Thus, it appears that if the exodus from isolation is to become a reality, channels of communication with the outside, dominant culture have to be expanded. This has prompted Burma to write: "It seems. . . that another fruit-

ful technique for improving Mexican-American relations is . . . the media of mass communication: radio, newspapers, magazines, television."<sup>80</sup> Sanchez also perceives that isolation ". . . increases the value of library service, of radio and visual education, of community recreation, and of newspaper service."<sup>81</sup>

This study will investigate the effects of communication with the Anglo community upon leadership recognition. Although included as part of another variable, assimilation, the converse will be investigated: the effects of communication within and exclusive with the Mexican American community as it effects leadership recognition.

### Summary

In summary, the literature referred to in this section indicates that leadership has always been lacking within the Mexican American community. This lack has often been related to the low educational status, low occupational status, low assimilation, and low degree of communication with the dominant culture.

The relevant literature on education, occupation, assimilation, and communication was examined because leadership, ultimately leadership recognition, is a function of each of these variables. Many opinions regarding this relationship between these variables and leadership recognition have been expressed, but no data appear to explain specif-



ically this relationship. The validity of the assumptions in this area has not been empirically tested. Such testing is the purpose of this thesis.

Education for the Mexican American has always been lacking, if not totally inadequate. In the Southwest, Mexican Americans have consistently ranked lower than Anglos and Negroes. A low educational status has been a prevailing characteristic of the barrio.

Occupational status varies directly with the level of education obtained. Since education has been overwhelmingly low, it is not surprising that most barrio dwellers are in the blue collar class.

Assimilation has often been commented upon in the literature. There exists considerable agreement pointing to the fact that Mexican Americans have not yet assimilated. Their lack of assimilation has often been associated with a fierce pride in "La Raza".

Although Mexican Americans are predominantly urban, the barrios have continued to be isolated from the greater society. Nevertheless, the barrios are not characteristically homogeneous. In fact, recent studies point to a heterogeneous, hybrid culture which is more marginal than classically Mexican or traditionally Anglo. Isolation undoubtedly is a result of the lack of communication between the subordinate group and the superordinate group. If this contin-

ues, the subculture will only perpetuate itself. Therefore, communication with the outside community surrounding the barrio becomes a most important area of study.

Mexican Americans have not been able to generate effective leadership because potential emerging leaders have not had the support of the rank and file. The dilemma is perpetuated by a trend toward assimilation evident in potential leaders, who tend to assimilate rather than to lead.

Positive trends may be emerging, however. Some evidence suggests that the Mexican American leadership gap is being closed by the rising middle class. This may mark a new era for the "forgotten people" whose destiny may turn from exploitative leadership to concerned, responsible leadership.

#### An Evaluation of the Literature On Mexican Americans

If Mexican Americans have been ignored in scholarly writing, fault lies partially within the social sciences. Often government action on social problems follows the foci of professional research. If this is true, social research has failed Mexican Americans.

The literature that exists is outdated and what has been written is scant. In the limited research which concerns Mexican Americans, the major texts were written before 1956. The following list includes the leading social scientists who have had concern with Mexican Americans:

Bogardus (1934), Burma (1954), Gamio (1930), Griffith (1948), Kibbe (1946), McWilliams (1944, 1949), Murray (1954), Sanchez (1940), Saunders (1949), Talbert (1955), Tuck (1956), and Woods (1949).

Little has been written since 1956. The above mentioned scholars have become the authorities on Mexican Americans. All of the superannuated studies portray a rural Mexican American; this is highly deceiving since Mexican Americans are now more urban than rural. Even as late as 1964 William Madsen's study, The Mexican Americans of South Texas, described Mexican Americans as a highly rural minority. Such images of Mexican Americans are anachronistic and are continually perpetuating an erroneous view of Mexican Americans.

The barrios which were once rural are now urban, and a host of new problems have arisen in Mexican American culture. For example, the urban setting is more conducive to the marginality of Mexican Americans. These "new Mexicans" are neither wholly American nor wholly Mexican. Furthermore, they represent a transitional culture which is not wholly urban or wholly rural. The social science literature has failed to conceptualize the urban barrio culture as distinct and different from the rural barrios where farmworkers reside.

The most recent and significant studies on leadership

were done between 1949 and 1954 by Woods, Watson and Samora. Only one of these studies dealt with leadership in the urban setting; that study was a dissertation written in 1949. These studies are made even more outdated by the changing character of the urban Mexican American culture.

The most recent material that pertains to Mexican American leadership has been tangential, reported in D'Antonio's community power studies.<sup>82</sup> These reputational studies have focused upon community influentials. They do not enable generalizations because D'Antonio's research, like Madsen's, was conducted in South Texas which contains a rural Mexican American society highly different from Mexican Americans in the highly populated urban centers.

If the extent of literature is representative of the concern for the problems, then clearly social scientists do not recognize leadership as a Mexican American problem.

The studies on leadership that do exist, including D'Antonio's reputational studies, focus on the types of influentials or the characteristics of leaders. Although leadership has minimally been the focus of attention, leadership recognition has been totally ignored; as if those who follow have no relationship to the recognition of leaders.

When movements depend on leaders and leaders on followers, the careful research of the characteristics of followers is of critical importance. Only through such re-

search can the roots of the leadership problem be uncovered.

To state in one's findings that Mexican Americans have "x" characteristics, or that Mexican Americans have little or no leaders evades the issue that gave rise to the question. The issue that has systematically been evaded by social scientists doing research on the Mexican American problem is that discrimination and prejudice have made it difficult for Mexican American leadership to arise.

In conclusion, the literature on Mexican Americans is minimal and what exists is distinctly outdated. The social conditions wherein Mexican Americans have searched for the sun have only been a reflection of a racist society that has traditionally discriminated against peoples of color.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

In contemporary American sociology the survey method is both popular and widely employed. Survey data are "objective" and are amenable to analysis by use of inductive statistics. Objectivity and rigorous analysis, of course, are highly desirable in sociological research. The elaboration of the techniques of survey research and the subsequent widespread use of the survey method have contributed much to sociological research.<sup>1</sup>

Yet there are critics of the survey method and of survey research.<sup>2</sup> Among criticisms is the charge that interviewers cannot always elicit candid and accurate responses from informants. This contention has serious implications; no refinement in analysis can overcome serious imperfections in basic research data. There undoubtedly is a greater or lesser problem of interviewer-respondent communication in many survey projects. In the study reported here, most certainly there were potential problems of this kind.

Qualifications for interviewing jobs usually include at least some college "props" of manner and dress which indicate "middle class" identity,<sup>3</sup> and some sort of link between interviewers and the scholarly community. In the barrio of Magnolia the interviewer with the usual quali-

fications would have been impossibly handicapped. The writer decided to use as interviewers selected young residents of the neighborhood.

### The Marginal Informant

Although the use of the poor and uneducated as indigenous interviewers is viewed with skepticism by many specialists in social research, Arthur Pearl argues that such procedure can yield valuable and unique data in survey research.<sup>4</sup> Pearl reports not only that the poor can do the job of interviewing, but also that the poor can interview the poor more effectively. Of critical importance for Pearl is that "poor" interviewers establish greater rapport with poor informants than do traditionally trained interviewers.

The use of indigenous interviewers becomes of critical importance when one does research in the Mexican American barrio. Such research has partially been deterred by the language barrier and by the Mexicano's suspicion of non-barrio members. One must not only understand this subculture but must also be a member in order to win fully the confidence of informants, which is so critical for survey research. Interviewers who do not speak Spanish, or who only speak formal Spanish, are not likely to break the barrio-barrier.

Having considered the above problems, this researcher chose to recruit indigenous interviewers for his proposed project. A research training seminar for barrio locals was

organized. The interviewers-in-training were Mexican American juveniles from the sample area. Those juveniles were all bilingual and were all known throughout the neighborhood. In fact, the interviewers were more versed in Spanish than in English.

Most of the interviews were conducted totally in Spanish or in a Spanish-English variant. The schedule, which was originally written in English, was translated into Spanish in order to facilitate interviewing.

#### Description of the Sample Area

The neighborhood where the research project was conducted is known as Magnolia. It has a tradition of being the oldest Mexican American enclave in Houston, Texas.

Magnolia is primarily a residential area located in East Houston near the Houston ship channel. Here the "little Mexico" of Houston has persisted, having had in its history much crime--elaborate narcotic operations, the traditional nachuco gangs, and much vice.

The area is relatively isolated from the greater community. Its boundaries are very well defined by a ship channel, a bayou, and three major thoroughfares. The barrio residents move easily within this "turf", but strangers are most certainly not welcome.

Magnolia contains one recreational park, appropriately named De Zavala Park. This park is the center of youth



activity because the use of its facilities is the chief means of entertainment available to the barrio youth. The area also contains an elementary school (De Zavala Elementary) which is adjacent to De Zavala Park. The junior high school (Edison Junior High) and the high school (Milby High School) are both located on the periphery.

Although Magnolia is predominantly a residential area, there exists a small business area which is Mexican-owned and/or designed to cater to Mexican American needs. The major Mexican food distributors for Houston are also located in this traditional Mexican American enclave--e.g. a tortilla factory.

Magnolia was selected as a research site for the following reasons: (1) the area is a community that is exclusively Mexican American; (2) the area has well defined boundaries; (3) several generations of Mexican Americans live there; (4) the area is highly residential and noncommercial; (5) the majority of residents work in or near the community; (6) and the community has much solidarity. All things considered, it is held that Magnolia is typical of urban Mexican American barrio life.

For these reasons, it was here that the writer chose to test these hypotheses: (1) there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio; and (2) leadership recognition is directly related to educational status, occupational rank,

degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

### Procedure And Method

The community selected for study overlaps into three census tracts. Over two thousand families live in the area. A twenty per cent area sample of households was selected from the Houston City Directory (1966).

A list of block addresses was collected from the Directory. Every fifth address from this list was selected for interview purposes. A total of four hundred and fifteen schedules were administered.

Time for the structured interviews ranged from one hour to one and a half hours per schedule. One hundred questions were asked, most being of the yes-no type. Very few questions were the categorical type. The schedule was designed to facilitate the administering and recording of each schedule. The interviews were conducted over a six-week period.

Two adult supervisors, one consultant, and fifteen indigeneous interviewers worked on the project. Interviews were conducted by teams of two; one interviewer asked questions and the other recorded responses. The majority of the interviews were conducted in Spanish or in Spanish and English; many of the interviews would not have been obtained had it not been for the bilingualism of each of the interviewers.

The schedule was pretested in a neighboring Mexican

American neighborhood on the fringe of the Magnolia area. Consequently, each of the interviewers had one or more practice runs prior to actual interviewing in the Magnolia area.

### The Schedule

The schedule was constructed by this writer. A model, so to speak, was supplied by a schedule used in a Negro community in a previous study.<sup>5</sup> Although many questions were revised to gain simplicity or, more importantly, to make the items more applicable to the Mexican American community, the schedule was not fundamentally changed for use in this project. The schedule contained one hundred questions. Some of the data were not used because they were not applicable to this thesis.

A list of Negro, Anglo,<sup>6</sup> and Mexican American leaders was gathered from local city newspapers, from local Spanish newspapers, from the recommendations of prominent local Poverty Program officials, and from the comments of Mexican Americans in the Magnolia area and in the greater Houston area. The criterion for selection was a claim to represent Mexican Americans. The following question was asked with the following names to checked if recognized:

72. Do you recognize any of these names?

- a. Cesar Chavez \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Henry B. Gonzalez \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Reyes Lopez Tijerina \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Lauro Cruz \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Barbara Jordan \_\_\_\_\_

- f. Bob Eckhardt \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Roy Elizondo \_\_\_\_\_
- h. Rev. Antonio Gonzalez \_\_\_\_\_
- i. Rev. James LaVois Novarro \_\_\_\_\_
- j. Frank Partida \_\_\_\_\_
- k. Louis Welch \_\_\_\_\_

A summated rating scale was used to classify leadership recognition on a low-medium-high continuum. Wherever one of the names was recognized, the response was weighted by one point; where a name was not recognized, the response was weighted zero. Low leadership recognition was defined as 0-3 points; medium leadership recognition was defined as 4-7 points; and high leadership recognition was defined as 8-11 points.

The following question was used to obtain information on educational attainment:

80. What is the highest grade the man of the house completed?
- a) 0 - 4 yrs.
  - b) 5 - 8 yrs.
  - c) 9 - 11 yrs.
  - d) 12.
  - e) College.<sup>7</sup>

Low educational attainment was defined as 0 - 4 years; medium educational attainment defined as 5 - 8 years; and high educational attainment as 9 years through college.

An assimilation index was obtained from the summated ratings of five questions. The questions used to measure assimilation were:

6. How long have you lived in this house or apartment?

- a) 0 - 3 yrs.
- b) 4 - 6 yrs.
- c) 7 - 10 yrs.
- d) 10 - 20 yrs.
- e) All your life.

7. Where were you born?

- a) Texas
- b) Mexico
- c) In the United States but not in Texas

29. Do you read any Spanish newspapers?

- a) Yes
- b) No

33. Do you listen to any Spanish radio stations?

- a) Yes
- b) No

93. Do you feel more attached to Mexico or the United States?

- a) Mexico
- b) United States

Question six measures the stability of the population.

If a respondent had lived in the same house only 1 - 3 years or less, this was weighted zero points; if a respondent had lived in the same house 4 - 10 years, this was weighted one point; and if a respondent had lived in the same house 10 years and above, this was weighted two points.

Question seven measures nativity as an index of assimilation. If the respondent were born in Mexico, this was weighted zero points, but if the respondent were born in Texas or in the United States, this was weighted one point.

Question twenty-nine and question thirty-three measure

the degree of attachment to Spanish-language communication media. If a respondent answered yes to either question number 29 or 33, this was weighted zero points, but if the respondent answered no to each of the two questions, then this was weighted one point per each such response.

Question ninety-three measures attachment to country as a measure of assimilation. If a respondent felt more attached to Mexico, this response was weighted zero points, and if a respondent felt more attached to the United States, this was weighted two points.

The total possible points that could be accumulated as a measure of assimilation was seven points. Low assimilation was defined as 0 - 2 points; medium assimilation was defined as 3 - 5 points; and high assimilation as 6 - 7 points.

Access to channels of communication<sup>8</sup> was measured by four questions. The following questions were used to construct this index:

23. Do you watch 6 o'clock news or any other news program?
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
24. Do you watch any of the election programs, for example politicians who campaign on T.V. or radio?
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
27. Do you read any newspapers?

- a) Yes
- b) No

31. Do you read any magazines?

- a) Yes
- b) No

Each "yes" response was weighted one point and each "no" response was weighted zero points. Low score on access to channels of communication media was defined as 0 - 1 points; medium was rated as 2 points; and high was rated as 3 - 4 points.

Occupational classification was compiled from answers to one question:

84. What is the occupation of the man of the house?

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

The data were grouped into three categories: white collar, blue collar, and unemployed or not in the labor force. Occupational classifications were aided by the Classified Index of Occupations and Industries<sup>9</sup> and by C. Wright Mills's definition of white collar.<sup>10</sup> Those defined as unemployed or not in the labor force included retired people in the area.

#### Limitations of the Data

It is admitted that the data upon which the research reported here was based are not ideal in every respect. Although the sample was randomly selected, a question arises as to the representativeness of Magnolia.

It is admitted that Magnolia may not wholly be typical

of Mexican American communities throughout the Southwest, but it is believed that it approximates the typical urban barrio. Whatever differences do exist between Magnolia and other urban barrios appear minimal when the low status of all Mexican Americans is used as a base. It is these low status conditions that typify barrios throughout the Southwest.

Another limitation of the data is the degree of generalization that may be made on the basis of leadership trends in Magnolia. Barrios in other southwestern locales possibly may be more closely attuned to leadership than was the Magnolia barrio.

A more accurate account of leadership trends would ideally have been a sample which would have included Mexican Americans from each of the major barrios located in the Southwest. Undoubtedly, this would have allowed more accurate generalizations, especially of leadership trends on a national level. However, for the purposes of this thesis research, this was impractical.

Although local and regional leaders vary from barrio to barrio, general leadership trends should be consistent. Leadership trends may fluctuate, but it is believed that the relationship between the barrio and their leaders will not differ markedly from place to place.

Insofar as the author is concerned with leadership in



general rather than solely with leadership in Magnolia, the trends are sufficient to gain perspective into the Mexican American leadership problem. Therefore, for the chief purposes of this research, the generalizations that can be made from the data are believed to characterize barrio life in the contemporary United States.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS

Mexican Americans have continually been a "forgotten people." Historically, Mexicans in America have suffered since the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. The treaty which was signed after the United States-Mexican war provided that all conquered citizens of Mexico could become U.S. citizens or retain Mexican nationality. All Mexican nationals who remained in the area and made no public choice automatically became American citizens subject to United States law after a period of time. Furthermore, the United States guaranteed that it would honor all extant Spanish land grants which had been recognized as valid by the Mexican republican government.

Unfortunately, Mexican citizens were treated like Montezuma's conquered Aztecs. Not only was the treaty broken and land grants not honored, but Mexicans in America have never experienced full citizenship rights. The breach of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo by the U.S. government was indicative of the maltreatment inflicted upon Mexican Americans of the Southwest.

With this heritage Mexican Americans struggled to build their barrios which, to this day, have a distinct language and culture. First, the barrios appeared in the

rural areas where Mexican Americans lived as farmworkers. There they have remained until automation has gradually displaced them. Thereafter, they flocked to the cities where 80 per cent of Mexican Americans now live.<sup>1</sup>

Although Mexican Americans have migrated to the urban centers with the onset of automation, their conditions have remained the same regardless of locale. Urbanization has not brought prosperity to Mexican Americans. The barrio has not disappeared. In fact, it has endured and has fostered strong solidarity within la raza.

Mexican American culture has traditionally been plagued by a low educational attainment, a low occupational status, a low rate of assimilation, and a slight communication with the greater community. These disabilities have been as characteristic of the barrio culture as has the Spanish language.

The variables characteristic of the barrio culture are all interrelated and exemplify Myrdal's "principle of cumulation."<sup>2</sup> Low education creates a cumulative trend which perpetuates a low degree of communication with the greater community. In turn, this perpetuates low occupational achievement. Finally, all these variables combined perpetuate a low rate of assimilation. Undoubtedly, this "vicious circle" has guaranteed a low status for Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Needless to say, all these var-

ables reflect opportunities which are not made available to Mexican Americans. The dilemma suggests the problem, and more optimistically, "the malady suggests the cure".<sup>3</sup>

These "social conditions" which have plagued the barrio suggest the underlying causes of the Mexican American leadership problem. If one understands the milieu of the barrio, then the assertion that Mexican Americans have no effective leaders is no surprise.

The Mexican American community, unlike the Negro community, has not had the intellectual elites to synthesize an ideology of protest. For the Mexican American there have been no Martin Luther Kings or Stokley Carmichaels. Without leadership Mexican Americans have had no voice to ring the sound of the "forgotten people".

It is with this understanding of the conditions of Mexican American life that the problem of Mexican American leadership is approached. It is the task of this thesis to test two hypotheses: (1) there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio, and (2) leadership recognition is directly related to educational attainment, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

#### Statistical Profile of Magnolia

Goodman and Jarlais estimated the percentage of Mexican Americans of the total Houston population to be 7.1 per

cent.<sup>4</sup> The percentage of the Spanish-surname<sup>5</sup> population in each of the three census tracts included in the present study according to the 1960 Census was: Census Tract 19, 58 per cent; Census Tract 20, 48 per cent; and Census Tract 21, 15 per cent.<sup>6</sup> Although no one census tract was completely within the Magnolia boundaries, the bulk of the Spanish-surname population in each of the census tracts resides within Magnolia. Ethnically, Magnolia is predominantly Mexican American. Thus, within Magnolia proper, Mexican Americans constitute a much greater percentage than any one census tract might indicate.

The median school years completed by Spanish-surname persons 25 years and over, according to the 1960 Census, are as follows: Census Tract 19, 5.5 years; Census Tract 20, 5.2 yrs.; Census Tract 21, 6.7 yrs.<sup>7</sup> Within the area, one elementary school is centrally located, one junior high school is located on the western boundary, and one high school is located on the southern boundary.<sup>8</sup> As the statistics suggest, de facto segregation and discrimination have taken their toll in Magnolia.

In Magnolia income is correlated positively with education in the usual manner. The median income of Spanish-surname families for 1960 was as follows: Census Tract 19, \$3,995; Census Tract 20, \$3,850; Census Tract 21, \$3,929.<sup>9</sup> Each of these census tracts is considered to be at the pover-

---

ty level according to the Houston Harris County Community Action Association, which uses \$4,000 as the poverty criterion so as to adjust for higher earning in urban areas.<sup>10</sup>

The median school years completed by the total Houston Spanish-surname population in 1960 was 6.4 years compared to 8.8 years for the total Houston Anglo population.<sup>11</sup> For 1965 Goodman and Jarlais estimated that median school years for each of the groups mentioned above as 7.2 years for the Spanish-surname population, 9.5 years for the Negro population, and 12.5 years for the Anglo population.<sup>12</sup>

The median annual income for 1959 and 1964 was as follows:<sup>13</sup>

	TOTAL HOUSTON	SPANISH-SURNAME	NEGRO
1959	\$6,040	\$4,339	\$3,426
1964 estimate	\$6,700	\$5,350	\$4,400

It is to be noted that the Mexican American population of Magnolia had in 1959 less education than the total Houston Spanish-surname population and less income than the total Houston Spanish-surname population. Although "the Mexican-American percentage of the total Houston population has been steadily increasing,"<sup>14</sup> Mexican American barrio life has not changed significantly in character and structure. Although there have been relative gains toward equality, the gap remains, as do the forgotten people.

#### Leadership: A Preliminary Analysis

The percentage of recognition per leader is presented in Table III; this table also includes a rank ordering of the leaders.

TABLE III  
LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION BY PERCENTAGES  
AND RANK ORDER CLASSIFICATION

Leader	% Recognized	Rank
Cesar Chavez	17.3%	11
Henry B. Gonzalez	54.1%	4
Reyes Lopez Tijerina	27.6%	9
Lauro Cruz	66.1%	2
Barbara Jordan	33.9%	7
Bob Eckhardt	29.6%	8
Roy Elizondo	20.2%	10
Rev. Antonio Gonzalez	64.9%	3
Rev. James LaVoie Novarro	44.0%	6
Frank Partida	50.5%	5
Louis Welch	70.0%	1

Before description of the above table is given, perhaps, a brief description of each leader is appropriate at this point.

- (1) Cesar Chavez: Non violent Mexican American leader who organized the Farm Workers' Union in Delano, Calif.
- (2) Henry B. Gonzalez: Representative to the U.S. House of Representatives from San Antonio.
- (3) Reyes Lopez Tijerina: Militant Mexican American from New Mexico who is attempting to recover land grants to Spanish citizens as specified in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.
- (4) Lauro Cruz: Area Representative to the State House of Representatives who campaigned and established his headquarters in Magnolia.

- (5) Barbara Jordan: A Negro woman who is an area Senator to the State Senate.
- (6) Bob Eckhardt: Representative to the U.S. House of Representatives whose constituents reside in Magnolia.
- (7) Roy Elizondo: A local Houstonian who is the state chairman of the Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations (P.A.S.O.).
- (8) Rev. Antonio Gonzalez: A local priest whose church was located in central Magnolia and who also was very active in the state's Valley March on Austin by South Texas farmworkers.
- (9) Rev. James LaVois Novarro: A local Baptist minister who was active in the state's Valley March on Austin by South Texas farmworkers.
- (10) Frank Partida: A local resident who is a board member on the local Poverty Program board and who is President of the United Organizations Information Center, an organization of organizations created to represent city Mexican Americans.
- (11) Louie Welch: Mayor of the City of Houston.

Mayor Louie Welch received the maximum amount of recognition (70.0 per cent) and Cesar Chavez the minimum recognition (17.3 per cent), constituting a range of 52.7 percentage points. With the exception of Louie Welch, the first six leaders in rank order were all Mexican Americans  $\angle$ (2) L. Cruz: 66.1 per cent; (3) A. Gonzalez: 64.9 per cent; (4) H.B. Gonzalez: 54.1 per cent; (5) F. Partida: 50.5 per cent; (6) J.L. Novarro: 44.0 per cent $\angle$ 7. Thereafter, recognition declined steadily  $\angle$ (7) B. Jordan: 33.9 per cent to (11) C. Chavez: 17.3 per cent $\angle$ 7.

Leadership recognition can further be analyzed on a



cosmopolitan-local<sup>15</sup> classification. Table IV presents leaders classified in this respect:

TABLE IV  
LEADERS CLASSIFIED BY TYPES OF INFLUENTIALS

Leader	Classification*
Cesar Chavez	(C)
Henry B. Gonzalez	(C)
Reyes Lopez Tijerina	(C)
Louro Cruz	(L)
Barbara Jordan	(C)
Bob Eckhardt	(C)
Roy Elizondo	(C)
Rev. Antonio Gonzalez	(L)
Rev. James LaVois Novarro	(L)
Frank Partida	(L)
Louie Welch	(C)

\*Robert K. Merton's classification of "local" (L) and "cosmopolitan" (C) is used, and the chief criterion for distinguishing the two is found in their orientation toward the local community or the greater society outside of the community.

Although only four leaders were locals (Cruz, Novarro, A. Gonzalez, and Partida), all ranked in the top six. Each of the leaders was classified as a "local" because local Mexican American Community leadership, although sometimes obscured by state involvement, was their prime role requirement. The remaining seven leaders were classified as "cosmopolitans" because their major loyalty was not to the Mexican Americans of Magnolia, but rather to a multiplicity of communities.

Socioeconomic Rank Is Related To Leadership Recognition

The two indicies of socioeconomic rank used in this study are education and occupation. "While there are many exceptions, the evidence is conclusive that educational level is closely related to occupation . . . ."16 Both variables are related to the status of Mexican Americans in Texas as well as throughout the Southwest. The Mexican American's ". . . economic status is probably in the lower quartile of ethnic groups in terms of pay rates and percentage of Mexicans in skilled jobs and the professions."17 Samora also adds that ". . . in the case of the Mexican Americans there is no doubt that their extremely low educational, income, and occupational levels presented especially severe obstacles to their assimilation."18 Thus, there exists considerable agreement that education and occupation are valid indicies of socioeconomic rank.

After a review of the literature and a brief introduction to the variables to be discussed, the reader should be aware that each variable has been treated in isolation without due pertinence to leadership recognition. This has, in part, been both intentional and unavoidable. To the knowledge of the author, there has been no study relating the variables in question to leadership recognition. In the main, the literature has dealt either with types of Mexican American leaders and/or influentials, but not with the nature

of the followers who classify the leaders.<sup>19</sup> Specifically, the educational and occupational status, the degree of assimilation, and access to channels of communication as characteristics of the followers have not been studied in relationship to leadership classification or recognition. Throughout the remainder of the thesis, the author will attempt to test the hypotheses: leadership recognition is directly related to (1) education (2) occupation, (3) assimilation, and (4) communication.

TABLE V  
LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION RATES BY EDUCATION  
Percent Leadership Recognition<sup>a</sup>

EDUCATION <sup>b</sup>	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LOW	68	46.8	60	41.3	17	11.7	145	99.8
MEDIUM	47	41.2	50	43.8	17	14.9	114	99.9
HIGH	36	35.2	44	43.1	22	21.5	102	99.8
NO RESPONSE	38	70.3	12	22.2	4	7.4	54	99.9
TOTAL	189	45.5	166	40.0	60	14.4	415	99.9

<sup>a</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

<sup>b</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

## Education

The relation between educational attainment and leadership recognition will be analyzed first. Education will herein be defined as the education of the male head of the household. Four major categories were constructed to classify the educational attainment of the male head of the household. Thirty-three per cent of the sample were categorized as having low education (0 - 4 years); twenty-eight per cent of the sample were classified as having medium education (5 - 8 years); twenty-six per cent were categorized as having high education (9 - college); and thirteen per cent were classified in the "no response" category.

Table V shows that, generally speaking, the higher the Mexican American's educational attainment, the greater is his recognition of leaders. However, for those characterized by low leadership the relationship seems not to be consistent. It is easy to explain this illusion of inconsistency.

The leadership recognition data show that low leadership recognition decreases with education. The conclusion is clear that if leadership recognition increases with education, then the rates of low leadership recognition will decrease with a higher educational attainment.

For those with low leadership recognition a steady decrease is noted from 46.8 per cent for those with low edu-

cation to 35.2 per cent for those with high education. Conversely, high leadership recognition rates increase from 11.7 per cent in low education to 21.5 per cent in high education.

This analysis of leadership recognition by education provides evidence for accepting the hypothesis that states that leadership recognition is directly related to educational attainment. Thus, the better educated Mexican American is more likely to recognize more leaders.

### Occupation

Since the place that an individual attains in the social stratification system is often dependent upon his occupation,<sup>20</sup> occupational classification is one of the most significant characteristics which distinguish the Mexican population of the United States.<sup>21</sup> Occupation is another index of socioeconomic rank, which, like education, indicates the lower status of Mexican Americans in our society.

Occupation, as this writer previously explained, was classified into three categories: white collar, blue collar, and unemployed or not in the labor force. Classification was aided by the Census adentum, 1960 Classified Index of Occupations and Industries, and by C. Wright Mills' classic book, White Collar. The classification "unemployed or not in the labor force" included retired people in the area.

TABLE VI  
LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION RATES BY OCCUPATION

OCCUPATION <sup>b</sup>	Percent Leadership Recognition <sup>a</sup>							
	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
UNEMPLOYED OR NOT IN LABOR FORCE	23	50.0	18	39.1	5	10.8	46	99.9
BLUE COLLAR	124	41.8	126	42.5	46	15.5	296	99.9
WHITE COLLAR	5	25.0	9	45.0	6	30.0	20	100.0
NO RESPONSE	37	69.8	13	24.5	3	5.6	53	99.9
TOTAL	189	45.5	166	40.0	60	14.4	415	99.9

<sup>a</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

<sup>b</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

Table VI shows that the higher the occupational rank of the barrio Mexican American, the greater is his recognition of leaders. Here again, those with low leadership recognition do not manifest the trend evident in medium and high leadership recognition. This apparent incongruency is explained by further examination of the data.

The data show that low leadership recognition rates decrease from 50.0 per cent among those of unemployed or not in the labor force status to 25.0 per cent for those of white collar status. Contrastingly, high leadership recognition rates increase from 10.8 per cent in the unemployed status to 30.0 per cent in the white collar status.

Since occupational rank influences leadership recognition at all levels, an explanation can be easily ascertained. A higher occupational rank increases the degree of leadership recognition. Presumably, the greater one's occupational rank, the greater is his awareness of community leaders. Therefore, a greater occupational rank would tend to decrease low leadership recognition and tend to increase high leadership recognition.

The analysis of leadership recognition by occupation leads to an acceptance of the hypothesis which states that leadership recognition is directly related to occupational status. Therefore, it is true that white collar Mexican Americans recognize a greater number of leaders.



### Assimilation

Mexican Americans have not yet been totally assimilated into American society. This fact prompts Marcos De Leon to write:

One promise is certain, we can no longer accept the usual procedures . . . without considering:

- (1) the bicultural community in which he lives;
- (2) the lack of his complete and total acceptability by "American society";
- (3) the consequent isolation and segregation, thereby producing unassimilated social units;
- (4) the inherent culture lag brought on by barriers which prohibits normal participation in community living . . . .<sup>22</sup>

Assimilation among Mexican Americans is definitely something that has not been achieved. Although different degrees of assimilation are evident among Mexican Americans, the final goal of total and complete assimilation is as unreal as the Spanish conquerors' Christian god was to the Aztecs, who looked to Tezcatlipoca for strength and guidance.<sup>23</sup>

The index to measure assimilation was constructed from the summated ratings of five questions. The assimilation index was constructed from questions that were measures of (1) length of residence in the barrio; (2) nativity; (3) degree of attachment to intracultural communication channels; and (4) the degree of national identity.

An analysis of the responses will be commented upon briefly in order to give a perspective of the summated ratings. The question on length of residence reveals the following totals in the response categories: (a) 0 - 3 years, 30 per

cent; (b) 4 - 6 years, 14 per cent; (c) 7 - 10 years, 14 per cent; (d) 10 - 20 years, 29 per cent; (e) all life, 9 per cent. Nativity responses reveal that 69 per cent were born in Texas or the United States and only 29 per cent of the sample were born in Mexico. The two questions on the degree of attachment reveal that 39 per cent of the sample read Spanish newspapers; 57 per cent do not. Regarding intra-cultural communication, responses on those who listen to a Spanish radio station ranged as high as 82 per cent, whereas only 13 per cent of the sample did not listen to a Spanish radio station. [Eighty-five per cent of the sample felt more attached to the United States and only 7 per cent felt any attachment to Mexico.]

TABLE VII  
LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION RATES BY ASSIMILATION  
Percent Leadership Recognition<sup>a</sup>

ASSIMILATION <sup>b</sup>	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LOW	65	69.1	25	26.5	4	4.2	94	99.8
MEDIUM	114	38.9	128	43.6	51	17.4	293	99.9
HIGH	10	35.7	13	46.4	5	17.8	28	99.9
TOTAL	189	45.5	166	40.0	60	14.4	415	99.9

<sup>a</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

<sup>b</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

Assimilation. Table VII shows that the higher the degree of assimilation, the greater is the recognition of leaders. The same apparent inconsistency appears between low leadership recognition and medium and high leadership recognition.

To restate, the rates of low leadership recognition decrease with the degree of assimilation, and the rates of high leadership recognition increase with the degree of assimilation. This, however, is a reflection of the effects of assimilation upon all classes of leadership recognition.

The data show that low leadership recognition rates decrease from 69.1 per cent in low assimilation to 35.7 per cent in high assimilation, whereas high leadership recognition rates increase from 4.2 per cent in low assimilation to 17.8 per cent in high assimilation. The change for low leadership recognition from low assimilation (69.1 per cent) to medium (38.9 per cent) and high assimilation (35.7 per cent), grouping the latter two is a strong direct relationship. However, the change from medium to high is weakly direct. A similar trend is evident for high leadership recognition which changes from 17.8 per cent in medium assimilation to 17.4 per cent in high assimilation.

The analysis of leadership recognition by the degree of assimilation supports the hypothesis which states that leadership recognition is directly related to the rate of

assimilation. As a result, Mexican Americans who assimilate are more likely to rank high in leadership recognition.

### Communication

The presence of Mexican movies and newspapers helps perpetuate his (the Mexican American's) original language. The fact that he mainly follows certain unskilled occupations and pursues these in company with other Mexicans keeps his original culture alive.<sup>24</sup>

Communication at both the intracultural<sup>25</sup> level and the intercultural<sup>26</sup> level are factors which will determine the fluidity of the delicate fusion of "Mexican" with "American". Intracultural communication will undoubtedly deter "Americanism", but, on the other hand, intercultural communication will be the critical breakthrough to meaningful "Americanization" of the Mexican American barrio resident.

The intercultural communication index was constructed from four questions which were measures of contact with television news media, radio and television election programs, and the news media via newspapers or magazines. The responses revealed that 79 per cent of the respondents watch six o'clock news or some other news program while only 16 per cent do not. Sixty per cent of the sample watch some of the election programs whereas only 33 per cent do not. Sixty-nine per cent read newspapers and only 27 per cent do not. When asked if they read magazines, 54 per cent responded positively and 41 per cent responded negatively.

The following table reveals the relationship between  
intercultural communication and leadership recognition.

TABLE VIII :  
LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION RATES BY COMMUNICATION  
Percent Leadership Recognition<sup>a</sup>

COMMUNICATION <sup>b</sup>	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LOW	50	65.7	25	32.8	1	1.3	76	99.8
MEDIUM	49	52.6	36	38.7	8	8.6	93	99.9
HIGH	90	36.5	105	42.6	51	20.7	246	99.8
TOTAL	189	45.5	166	40.0	60	14.4	415	99.9

<sup>a</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

<sup>b</sup>For construction of index see Chapter III, Schedule.

Communication. Table VIII shows that the greater the access to communication media, the greater is the recognition of leaders. Here again, the trends of low leadership recognition appear to differ from the trends manifested in medium and high leadership recognition.

The data show that low leadership recognition rates decrease with the access to communication media. On the other hand, high leadership recognition rates increase with the access to communication media. From a comparative analysis it becomes clear that if high leadership recognition rates increase with a greater access to communication media, then low leadership recognition rates will decrease with greater access to communication media.

Low leadership recognition rates manifest a decline from 65.7 per cent in low communication classes to 36.5 per cent in high communication classes. However, high leadership recognition rates increase from 1.3 per cent for those in low communication to 20.7 per cent for those in high communication.

Access to communication media has a direct relation with leadership recognition. Greater access to communication media not only makes the individual more aware of the community around him but it also makes him more aware of the leaders. Therefore, low leadership recognition is inversely affected by access to communication media, and high leader-



ship recognition is directly affected by access to communication media.

These findings allow acceptance of the hypothesis which states that leadership recognition is directly related to the access to communication media. Thus, it holds true that Mexican Americans who have more access to the news media are more aware of community leaders.

In retrospect, a close surveyance of the marginal cells in Tables V - VIII reveals that a major part of the sample either clustered in the low leadership recognition column (45.5 per cent) or in the medium leadership recognition column (40.0 per cent). Contrastingly, only 14.4 per cent of the sample is characterized by high leadership recognition.

Almost one half of the sample lies within the classification of low leadership recognition. This supports the hypothesis which states that there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio.

### Findings

The writer's two hypotheses stated (1) that there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio, and (2) that leadership recognition is directly related to educational attainment, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

### Major Findings

(1) Low Recognition of Leaders: The hypothesis was accepted because the data reveal that an overwhelming number of Mexican Americans in the barrio are in the low leadership recognition classification.

(2) Leadership Recognition by Education: The hypothesis was accepted because the data reveal that leadership recognition is directly related to educational attainment.

(3) Leadership Recognition by Occupation: The hypothesis was accepted because the data reveal that leadership recognition is directly related to occupational rank.

(4) Leadership Recognition by Assimilation: The hypothesis was accepted because the data reveal that leadership recognition is directly related to the degree of assimilation.

(5) Leadership Recognition by Communication: the hypothesis was accepted because the data reveal that leadership recognition is directly related to the access to communication media.

### Minor Findings

(1) Mexican American leaders who ranked highest on leadership recognition were Mexican American locals.

(2) An Anglo leader ranked highest on leadership recognition.

(3) The state chairman of the Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations (P.A.S.O.), a statewide Mexican American political group, and a nationally known non-violent Mexican American leader ranked lowest on leadership recognition.

### Discussion

The author's findings reveal that the barrio is plagued by a low recognition of leaders. A distressingly high percentage of Mexican Americans interviewed could not identify more than three leaders. Moreover, only a very

small percentage could identify as many as eight leaders.

For all intents and purposes the barrio is without the right kind of leadership. Whatever leadership does exist is either too localistic in character or middleclass in orientation.. Both characteristics are detrimental to the barrio's identity with any leadership beyond the barrio locale.

Because the barrio residents are mainly in the lower class, middleclass goals do not meet the needs of the majority of Mexican Americans. The data lend evidence to this fact. The Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations (P.A.S.O.) has become a predominantly middleclass Mexican American organization.<sup>27</sup> Thus, organizational activity at the state level bypasses the barrio and is lost leadership. The fact that the state chairman of P.A.S.O. ranked extremely low in leadership recognition indicates that P.A.S.O. does not relate to the barrio in any meaningful way.

Mexican Americans are more prone to recognize Mexican American locals than they are to recognize Mexican American cosmopolitans. This Gemeinschaft orientation deters all efforts at la raza's identity beyond the barrio area. Without a "brown consciousness" throughout the Southwest, Mexican Americans will continue to remain unheard and will continue to be the "forgotten people".

The fact that a nationally known leader of a farm

worker's strike ranked lowest in leadership recognition demands some explanation. The United Farmworkers Association has been a predominantly rural-focused organization. It was created to alleviate the conditions of rural farmworkers in California. Since the Magnolia residents are predominantly urban Mexican Americans, the rural character of the UFA has perhaps been a determinant of the low rate of recognition. The California identity of the organization is also a significant deterrent. Leaders beyond the barrio domain are not leaders to the barrio people.

Interestingly enough, an Anglo ranked highest on leadership recognition. The writer contends that this occurred, in part, because the Anglo was the mayor of the city. One would therefore expect his name, like that of the Pope, to be prominently in the news, whether the news be through intercultural or intracultural media.

Other of the author's hypotheses state that leadership recognition varies directly with educational attainment, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media. This invariable proved to be the case.

Because Mexican American barrio life is highly isolated because of residential de facto segregation, the Mexican American subculture through time becomes a self-perpetuating lower class. Identity with la raza is kept intact by (1) institutionalized segregation and discrimination, which

creates withdrawal tendencies, and (2) Mexican American regression into the more familiar world, el barrio.

It has been stated in earlier chapters that the barrio has been plagued by low education, low occupational rank, low rate of assimilation, and low rate of access to communication media. The writer holds, furthermore, that education is the most important variable. Low education causes a cumulative trend in the other variables, perpetuating a "vicious circle". Using Myrdal's theory, low opportunities are the cause of low achievement which, in turn, fosters the prejudice and discrimination which are the core of the belief system of the white supremacist. However, as Myrdal states, all variables are interrelated.

If prejudice and discrimination were the only cause for the low status of a minority group, then there would have been no Civil Rights Movement. It is at this point of argument that Negroes move ahead of Mexican Americans in the struggle for Civil Rights.

If the "vicious circle" has not been broken by the actions of the dominant group, the responsibility to change the negativity of the cumulative trend rests with the minority group. However, if the minority group has no leaders, the "vicious circle" continues. This is the plight of Mexican Americans.

Because Negroes, however segregated, still were pro-

vided with college, their reservoir of educated leaders was constantly building. This advantage was never afforded to Mexican Americans. The fact that the Negro colleges and universities were comparatively inferior is a moot point. Even before the Delgado Case of 1948, Mexican Americans were never provided with even segregated colleges.

The "vicious circle", which surrounds the barrio, thus perpetuates the low status of Mexican Americans. "Nay" (to use Dr. George Sanchez's often-quoted expression), it guarantees that Mexican Americans will stay in their place.

Discrimination and prejudice have perpetuated the "vicious circle"; and, if it is to be broken, Mexican Americans must create the needed leadership, committed and educated elites, in order to challenge American society.

## CHAPTER V

### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

In the previous chapter an analysis of the data demonstrated that the Mexican American barrio is without leaders. The data supported the two hypotheses which stated that (1) there exists a low recognition of leaders in the barrio, and that (2) leadership recognition is directly related to educational status, occupational rank, degree of assimilation, and access to communication media.

Where do we go from here? One direction is that of additional research. Although the Mexican American has persisted as an identifiable minority in American society, the Mexican American has been viewed as a minority meriting little sociological inquiry. The studies that do exist are not definitive either quantitatively or qualitatively.

In the realm of research on the Mexican American, the social sciences once more have displayed the "conservative mood".<sup>1</sup> This writer proposes that Mexican Americans have been a forgotten people because research in this domain could have been more embarrassing to American society than research on the social conditions of the American Negro.<sup>2</sup>

In particular, Mexican American leadership has received little research attention. Although Mexican American leadership has frequently been commented upon, little re-

search has been conducted to substantiate the various assertions. Furthermore, the research on Mexican American leadership that does exist has focused upon leadership types or influentials rather than upon the characteristics of the population who recognizes leaders. This thesis has been an effort to study this totally neglected area.

Sociology texts on minority groups rarely include Mexican Americans, and those that do devote only a few paragraphs or pages to this minority. Mexican Americans are a minority nobody knows, but this need not continue.

Leading sociologists who specialize in minority group and race relations must fill the "credibility gap". In an era of "publish or perish", the study of the Mexican American provides an array of unexplored research material. Sociologists and anthropologists need not go to Latin America to study another culture because a forgotten one exists across the tracks in the Southwest.

With the fact of extremely low leadership recognition, where do we go from here? The direction is implied in the findings. Mexican American barrio culture has not yet: (1) achieved sufficient education to participate fully in American society; (2) achieved a sufficiently high occupational status; (3) assimilated into American society; or (4) achieved meaningful contact with the dominant culture. If low leadership recognition is a function of these variables, the social



conditions of the Mexican American must be improved.

Education. The high drop-out rates of Mexican Americans in the public school system must be lessened. Positive steps to curb these high rates of drop-out can be taken by: (1) an active appreciation of Mexican culture and Mexican American contributions in school text books in order to instill a positive self image in Mexican American youth, and (2) an adoption of bi-lingual education, especially at the elementary levels.

Educational reforms should not end at the public school level. The low rate of Mexican Americans who attend college is a problem which merits much attention. More Mexican Americans should be counseled to go to college rather than to vocational training school, e.g. to become mechanics. Moreover, colleges and universities must take a new look at their entrance requirements.

College entrance exams, which all applicants for college admission must take, are highly discriminatory toward Mexican Americans. Because Mexican American youth suffer from a language problem and are products of a different culture, they do not score as high as their Anglo counterpart who has neither handicap. Thus, many Mexican Americans are turned away from colleges because they cannot score the entrance level of the college boards.

College entrance exams as a basis for admission to

college have been modified as admission criteria for minority group members by many progressive eastern colleges such as Harvard and Yale. Yet they continue to be a major entrance requirement in the colleges and universities located in the Southwest where five and a half million Mexican Americans reside.

Occupation. Traditionally, Mexican Americans have been laborers. With little education they have been forced into low status jobs. However, education is not the only deterrent. All too often, Mexican Americans have suffered from job discrimination. Thus, although the urban area is an escape from farmworker status, it offers Mexican Americans jobs which are likewise low-paying, e.g. janitorial jobs.

The directions needed here are clear. More education is essential in order that Mexican Americans might qualify for higher status jobs. Furthermore, discrimination in business and industry must cease if Mexican Americans are to profit fully from the opportunities opened by higher education.

Assimilation. Mexican Americans have tacitly retained their native culture. The barrio is permeated with Mexican culture. Unfortunately, the dominant culture views the barrio culture quite negatively. This is, in part, why Mexican Americans who achieve reject la raza. Those who assimilate take on the values of the dominant culture and thus re-

ject la raza because such identity has un-American connotations.

Mexican Americans must be taught to feel proud of their cultural heritage. It is only through such identity that the Mexican American middle class will re-identify and "come home" to provide the needed leadership. Although those who assimilate escape the barrio, they cannot escape their own surname.

Communication. The Mexican American barrio has been highly isolated. Such isolation must be penetrated. The federal government should create meaningful media of communication that does not threaten Mexican American culture. Only if the two cultures are highly valued can an integration of the two cultures be possible. In order to foster better race relations the news media must offer meaningful communication between the barrio and the dominant culture.

The future of Mexican Americans leadership is dependent upon the condition of the barrio rank and file. Today, the barrio is plagued by a low status and a low recognition of leaders. The barrio will endure. The basic question is: "Where do we go from here?"

If the problems inherent in low leadership recognition are not dealt with, the forgotten people will be further frustrated until the barrio, like cancer, will erupt leaderless into an amorphous mass. As the Negro Civil Rights Move-

ment passes from non-violence to violence, Mexican Americans watch and learn. Let us hope that the problems of the forgotten people will be solved without the resort to violence born out of frustration. Although Mexican Americans are starving in San Antonio, it is not too late to find the long awaited leadership to reach for the sun.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

## CHAPTER I

<sup>1</sup>Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, 347 U.S. 454 (1954).

<sup>2</sup>Howard Zinn, SKCC. The New Abolitionists (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), 40.

<sup>3</sup>James W. Vander Zanden, American Minority Relations (New York: Ronald Press, 1963), 231.

<sup>4</sup>Clark S. Knowlton, "Changing Patterns of Segregation And Discrimination Affecting the Mexican Americans of El Paso, Texas," (El Paso: Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, 1967), 2; Ralph Guzman, "Mexican-Americans on the Move," Agenda, II (July, 1966), 4; Fernando Penalosa Edward C. McDonagh, "Social Mobility in a Mexican-American Community," Social Forces, XLIV (June, 1966), 505.

<sup>5</sup>Wendell Bell, Richard J. Hill, and Charles R. Wright, Public Leadership (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1961), 5.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Robert D. Schulze and Leonard U. Blumberg, "The Determination of Local Power Elites," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (Nov., 1957), 290 - 296.

<sup>10</sup>Donald R. Matthews, The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1954).

<sup>11</sup>James L. McCamy and Alessandro Corradini, "The People of the State Department and Foreign Service," American Political Science Review, XLVIII (Dec., 1954), 1067 - 1082; Paul T. David and Ross Pollock, Executives for Government: Central Issues of Federal Personnel Administration (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1957).

<sup>12</sup>W. Lloyd Warner and James C. Abegglen, Occupational Mobility in American Business and Industry (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955); "The Nine Hundred," Fortune, XLVI (Nov., 1952), 132 - 135, 232 - 237.

<sup>13</sup>Arthur K. Davis, "Bureaucratic Patterns in the Navy Officer Corps," Social Forces, XXVII (Dec., 1948), 143 - 153; Morris Janowitz, Sociology and the Military Establishment (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959).

<sup>14</sup>Christopher Smith, "Social Selection in Community Leadership," Social Forces, XV (May, 1937), 530 - 535; Samuel A. Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties (New York: Doubleday, 1955).

<sup>15</sup>Bell, Hill, and Wright, on. cit., 21.

<sup>16</sup>Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

<sup>17</sup>Bell, Hill, and Wright, on. cit., 21.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., 23.

<sup>19</sup>Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice (New York: Dvelli, Sloan and Pearce, 1944).

<sup>20</sup>Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (revised and enlarged edition) (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), 387 - 420.

<sup>21</sup>Bell, Hill, and Wright, 29.

<sup>22</sup>Sister Francis Jerome Woods, Mexican Ethnic Leadership in San Antonio, Texas (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949); James B. Watson and Julian Samora, "Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-cultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), 413 - 421; Julian Samora, "Minority Leadership in a Bi-racial Cultural Community" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University of St. Louis, 1953); William V. D'Antonio and William H. Form, Influentials in Two Border Cities: A Study in Community Decision Making (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965); William V. D'Antonio and Eugene C. Erickson, "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 362 - 375; William V. D'Antonio, William H. Form, Charles Loomis and Eugene C. Erickson, "Institutional and Occupational Representations in Eleven Community Influence Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), 440 - 446; William V. D'Antonio and Julian Samora, "Occupational Stratification in Four

<sup>22</sup>con't--Southwestern Communities: A Study of Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," Social Forces, XLI (October, 1962), 17 - 25.

## CHAPTER II

<sup>1</sup>Helen Rowan, "A Minority Nobody Knows," The Atlantic Monthly, CCXIX (June, 1967), 47 - 52.

<sup>2</sup>George I. Sanchez, Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940), 98.

<sup>3</sup>George I. Sanchez, "The Default of Leadership," Summarized Proceedings IV, Southwest Council on the Education of the Spanish-speaking People, Fourth Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, (January 23 - 25, 1950); (see also Carey McWilliams, Brothers Under the Skin (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944), 113.)

<sup>4</sup>A. Pinkney, "Prejudice Toward Mexican and Negro Americans: A Comparison," Phylon, XXIV (Winter, 1963), 353.

<sup>5</sup>Clark S. Knowlton, "Changing Patterns of Segregation And Discrimination Affecting the Mexican Americans of El Paso, Texas," (El Paso: Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, 1967), 1.

<sup>6</sup>Pauline R. Kibbe, Latin Americans in Texas (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1946), 263.

<sup>7</sup>James B. Watson and Julian Samora, "Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-cultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), 413.

<sup>8</sup>Sister Frances Jerome Woods, Mexican Ethnic Leadership In San Antonio, Texas (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949), 123.

<sup>9</sup>Watson and Samora, op. cit., 414 - 415.

<sup>10</sup>Leonard Broom and E. Shevsky, "Mexicans in the United States," Sociology and Social Research, XXXVI (Jan., 1952), 154.

<sup>11</sup>E.S. Bogardus, "Second Generation Mexicans," Sociology and Social Research, XIII (1929), 277; see also Carey McWilliams, North From Mexico, The Spanish-speaking People of the United States (New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1949), 206.



<sup>12</sup>John Bryan, "Mexican Ghetto is Slow to Revolt", Los Angeles Free Press, IV, #8 (February 24, 1967), - 3, 6.

<sup>13</sup>Joan Moore and Ralph Guzman, "The Mexican Americans; New Wind from the Southwest." Nation, CCII (May, 1966), 647.

<sup>14</sup>Americo Paredes, "Texas' Third Man: The Texas-Mexicans," Race, III-IV (May, 1963), 55.

<sup>15</sup>Ernesto Galazar, "Program For Action," Common Ground, IX (Summer, 1949), 33.

<sup>16</sup>Watson and Samora, on. cit., 421.

<sup>17</sup>Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna, Mexican-Americans In A Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago, Advance Report 8, (Los Angeles: Mexican-American Study of Project, 1966), 134.

<sup>18</sup>Sanchez, "The Default of Leadership," on. cit.

<sup>19</sup>George I. Sanchez, "'Do I Sound Bitter? I Am Bitter'," The Texas Observer, December 9, 1966, 15.

<sup>20</sup>Broom and Shevky, on. cit., 154; Bryan, on. cit., 3.

<sup>21</sup>Samora and Lamanna, on. cit., 131; Mary Ellen Goodman and Don des Jarlais, "Demography," unpublished article, (Rice University, Houston, Texas, August, 1967), 20.

<sup>22</sup>Celia Stopnika Heller, Mexican-American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads (New York: Random House, 1966), 93; W. Kennedy Upham and David E. Wright, Poverty Among Spanish Americans In Texas: Low-Income Families in a Minority Group (College Station: Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, 1966), 5.

<sup>23</sup>Fernando Penalosa and Edward C. McDonagh, "Social Mobility in a Mexican American Community," Social Forces, XLIV (June, 1966), 500.

<sup>24</sup>Beatrice Griffith, America Me (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1948), 229.

<sup>25</sup>Watson and Samora, on. cit., 417.

<sup>26</sup>McWilliams, Brothers Under the Skin, on. cit., 135. See also John Burma, Spanish-speaking Groups in the United States (Durham: Duke University Press, 1954), 54; and Ozzie G. Simmons, "The Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo-Americans." Daedalus, XC (Spring, 1961), 292.

<sup>27</sup>Woods, on. cit., 41; also see Mary Ellen Goodman and Joe De La Isla, "Houstonians of Mexican Ancestry: Report On a Study In Progress," unpublished article, Rice University, (Houston, Texas, August, 1967), 7.

<sup>28</sup>Ralph Guzman, "Mexican-Americans On the Move," Agenda, II (July, 1966), 4.

<sup>29</sup>Samora and Lamanna, on. cit., 98.

<sup>30</sup>Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodbeck, Variation In Value Orientation (Evanston: Row Peterson, 1961), 177. Note: The patrón or jefe político, which is the existing leadership in the barrio, has, to date, catered to the needs of the Anglo politicians rather than to the barrio residents. This type of leadership is not recognized by this writer as legitimate leadership for the barrio poor.

<sup>31</sup>Walter Fogel, Education and Income of Mexican-Americans In the Southwest, Advance Report I, (Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, 1965), 15.

<sup>32</sup>Heller, on. cit., 68.

<sup>33</sup>Samora and Lamanna, on. cit., 68.

<sup>34</sup>Julian Samora, The General Status of the Spanish-Speaking People in the U.S. Unpublished typewritten copy (Lake Arrowhead, California: Lake Arrowhead Conference, August, 1963).

<sup>35</sup>Heller, on. cit., 47.

<sup>36</sup>Clifton McCleskey, The Government and Politics of Texas (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), 9.

<sup>37</sup>Manuel Gamio, Mexican Immigration to the United States (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 51.

<sup>38</sup>Heller, on. cit., 12.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., 13.

<sup>40</sup>Broom and Shevsky, on. cit., 153.

<sup>41</sup>Sister M.J. Murray, A Socio-Cultural Study of 118 Mexican Families Living in a Low Rent Housing Project in San Antonio, Texas (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1954), 117.

<sup>42</sup>William V. D'Antonio and Julian Samora, "Occupational Stratification in Four Southwestern Communities: A Study of Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," Social Forces. XLI (Oct., 1962), 18.

<sup>43</sup>N.D. Humphrey, "On Assimilation and Acculturation," Psychiatry, VI (Nov., 1943), 344.

<sup>44</sup>Heller, on. cit., 16.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 14.

<sup>46</sup>Fogel, on. cit., 8.

<sup>47</sup>Heller, on. cit., 17.

<sup>48</sup>Talbert, on. cit., 42.

<sup>49</sup>Humphrey, on. cit., 343.

<sup>50</sup>Burma, on. cit., 122.

<sup>51</sup>Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), 735.

<sup>52</sup>William C. Smith, Americans in the Making: The Natural History of the Assimilation of Immigrants (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1939), 114.

<sup>53</sup>Samora and Lamanna, on. cit., 131.

<sup>54</sup>Heller, on. cit., 4.

<sup>55</sup>Samora and Lamanna, on. cit., 133.

<sup>56</sup>Murray, on. cit., 2.

<sup>57</sup>N.D. Humphrey, "The Detroit Mexican and Naturalization," Social Forces, XXII (1943 - 44), 333.

<sup>58</sup>McWilliams, on. cit., 207.

<sup>59</sup>Anthony Gary Dworkin, "Stereotypes and Self-Images Held by Native-Born and Foreign Born Mexican-Americans," Sociology and Social Research, XLIX (Jan., 1965), 214.

<sup>60</sup>Simmons, on. cit., 288.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 298.

<sup>62</sup>William R. Holland, "Language Barrier as an Educational Problem of Spanish-Speaking Children," Excentional Children, XXVII, #1 (September, 1960), 44; Knowlton, op. cit., 1; Humphrey, "On Assimilation . . .," op. cit., 343.

<sup>63</sup>Patrick H. McNamara, "Mexican-American in the Southwest: Mexican American Study Project," America, CXIV (March 12, 1966), 353.

<sup>64</sup>Knowlton, op. cit., 12.

<sup>65</sup>Arthur J. Rubel, Across the Tracks: Mexican Americans in a Texas City (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966), 44.

<sup>66</sup>Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, op. cit., 26.

<sup>67</sup>Samora and Lamanna, op. cit., 134.

<sup>68</sup>Robert E. Parks, Race and Culture (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950), 150.

<sup>69</sup>Burma, op. cit., 88.

<sup>70</sup>Lyle Saunders, The Spanish-Speaking Population of Texas (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1949), 15.

<sup>71</sup>United States Census of Population 1960 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), 2.

<sup>72</sup>McNamara, op. cit., 353.

<sup>73</sup>Ernesto Galazar, op. cit., 33.

<sup>74</sup>Joan W. Moore and Frank G. Mittelbach, Residential Segregation of Minorities in the Urban Southwest, Advance Report 4, (Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, 1966), 39.

<sup>75</sup>Edward McDonagh, "Status Levels of Mexicans," Sociology and Social Research, XXXIII (July, 1949), 456.

<sup>76</sup>Broom and Shevky, op. cit., 155.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 152.

<sup>78</sup>Rowan, op. cit., 49.

<sup>79</sup>Broom and Shevky, op. cit., 153.

<sup>80</sup>Burma, op. cit., 136.

<sup>81</sup>Sanchez, Forgotten People, on. cit., 95.

<sup>82</sup>William V. D'Antonio and William H. Form, Influentials in two Border Cities: A Study in Community Decision Making (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965); William V. D'Antonio and Eugene C. Erickson, "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 362 - 375; William V. D'Antonio, William H. Form, Charles Loomis and Eugene C. Erickson, "Institutional and Occupational Representations in Eleven Community Influence Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), 440 - 446; William V. D'Antonio and Julian Samora, "Occupational Stratification in Four Southwestern Communities: A Study of Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," Social Forces, XLI (October, 1962), 17 - 25.

### CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>M.H. Hansen, W.N. Hurwitz, and W.G. Madow, Sample Survey Methods and Theory (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1953), I & II; also see Mildred B. Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures (New York: Harper and Row, 1950).

<sup>2</sup>C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 50 - 75.

<sup>3</sup>Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1959).

<sup>4</sup>Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, New Careers for the Poor, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1965); Arthur Pearl, "Youth in Lower Class Settings," in Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, eds., Problems of Youth: Transition To Adulthood In A Changing World, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965) 89 - 109.

<sup>5</sup>"A Study of Family and Community Life." Unpublished schedule, (Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama, January, 1966).

<sup>6</sup>"Anglo" is here defined as any leader who is not Negro or who is not of Mexican decent.

<sup>7</sup>Less than one per cent of barrio households interviewed did not have a male head.

<sup>8</sup>"Channels of communication" is here defined as channels of communication with the Anglo world by radio, T.V. or newspapers; each media is defined as a non-Spanish channel of communication.

<sup>9</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), 5; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Classified Index of Occupations and Industries (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962).

<sup>10</sup>C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Classes (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951).

#### CHAPTER IV

<sup>1</sup>United States Census of Population 1960 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), 2.

<sup>2</sup>Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma, II (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1944), 1035 - 1064.

<sup>3</sup>Carey McWilliams, Brothers Under the Skin (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944), 138.

<sup>4</sup>Mary Ellen Goodman and Don des Jarlais, "Demography." Unpublished article (Rice University, Houston, Texas, August, 1967), 3.

<sup>5</sup>Spanish-surname is the census term which includes Americans of Mexican descent.

<sup>6</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), 16 - 17. Percentages were computed by the author.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 81.

<sup>8</sup>These schools are located on the boundary of Magnolia but not on the boundary of the Mexican American community, which extends beyond Magnolia.

<sup>9</sup>Census, op. cit., 16 - 17.

<sup>10</sup>Goodman and Jarlais, op. cit., 7.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 10.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 3.

<sup>15</sup>Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), 393. Merton defines the local as one who " . . . largely confines his interests to this community . . . is preoccupied with local problems, to the virtual exclusion of the national and international scene . . . is, strictly speaking, parochial." In contrast the cosmopolitan is " . . . oriented significantly to the world outside. . . is ecumenical."

<sup>16</sup>Robert A. Talbert, Spanish-Name People in the Southwest and West (Fort Worth: Potishman Foundation, 1955), 42.

<sup>17</sup>Edward McDonagh, "Status Levels of Mexicans," Sociology and Social Research, XXXIII (July, 1949), 459.

<sup>18</sup>Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna, Mexican Americans In A Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago, Advance Report 8, (Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, 1966), 133.

<sup>19</sup>Sister Francis Jerome Woods, Mexican Ethnic Leadership In San Antonio, Texas (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949); James B. Watson and Julian Samora, "Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-cultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), 413 - 421; Julian Samora, "Minority Leadership in a Bi-racial Cultural Community" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, 1953); William V. D'Antonio and William H. Form, Influentials in Two Border Cities: A Study in Community Decision Making (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965); William V. D'Antonio and Eugene C. Erickson, "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 362 - 375; William V. D'Antonio, William H. Form, Charles Loomis and Eugene C. Erickson, "Institutional and Occupational Representations in Eleven Community Influence Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), 440 - 446; William V. D'Antonio and Julian Samora, "Occupational Stratification in Four Southwestern Communities: A Study of Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," Social Forces, XLI (October, 1962), 17 - 25.

<sup>20</sup>Pitirim Sorokin, Social And Cultural Mobility, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959), 99.

<sup>21</sup>Manuel Gamio, Mexican Immigration to the United States, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930), 51.

<sup>22</sup>Marcos De Leon, "Wanted: A New Educational Philosophy for the Mexican American," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXIV (November, 1959), 3.

<sup>23</sup>Tezcatlinoca is the Aztec word for Eagle God, representing the Sun. In the Aztec period, the diety carried a mirror through which he observed deeds of men on earth and punished them accordingly. Ignacio Bernal, Mexico Before Cortez: Art, History, Legend (New York: Doubleday And Company, Inc., 1963), 111.

<sup>24</sup>William D. Althus, "The Mexican-American: The Survival of a Culture," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIX (1930), 220.

<sup>25</sup>"Intracultural" is herein defined as communication within and exclusively with the barrio culture.

<sup>26</sup>"Intercultural" is herein defines as communication between Mexican American barrio subculture and the dominant Anglo culture.

<sup>27</sup>"Middleclass" is here defined as becoming like the Anglo and rejecting Mexican barrio identity.

## CHAPTER V

<sup>1</sup>C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 96 - 97; Mills, The Marxists (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1962), 28 - 29; Mills, Power, Politics and People (New York: Ballantine Books, 1939), 292 - 304; Irving Louis Horowitz, The New Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 147 - 160.

<sup>2</sup>An outstanding exception to this has been the work done by the U.C.L.A Study Project.



## APPENDIX

## APPENDIX. SCHEDULE

1. Do you have any close kinfolks such as your parents and brothers and sisters who do not live in Houston?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
2. Do you have any close kinfolks such as your parents and brothers and sisters who do not live in the Magnolia Area?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Do any of your close kinfolks such as your parents and brothers and sisters live within walking distance?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
4. (If yes to question 3) Which relatives live within walking distance?  
a) Parents (either father or mother or both)  
b) Brother or brothers  
c) Sister or Sisters  
d) More than one of the above  
e) None of the above
5. (If yes to question 3) How often do you talk to them?  
a) Every day  
b) Once or twice a week  
c) Once or twice a month  
d) Very little
6. How long have you lived in this house or apartment?  
a) 1 to 3 yrs.  
b) 4 - 6 yrs.  
c) 7 - 10 yrs.  
d) 10 - 20 yrs.  
e) All your life
7. Where were you born?  
a) Texas  
b) Mexico  
c) In the United States but not in Texas
8. Where did you live last?

- a) In Houston
  - b) Out of Houston
9. How long did you live there?
- a) A few months
  - b) 1 - 3 yrs.
  - c) 4 - 6 yrs.
  - d) 7 - 9 yrs.
  - e) More than 10 yrs.
10. Why did you move here?
- a) Came with parents
  - b) Came with husband or wife
  - c) Came alone to find work
  - d) Came with friends
11. Why did you decide to move to this part of Houston?
- a) Had kinfolk here
  - b) Had friends here
  - c) Other \_\_\_\_\_
12. Do you think there is any chance of your moving in the next 12 months?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
13. Do you plan to stay in the Houston area if you move?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
14. Do you plan to stay in Texas if you move?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
15. Was the last place you lived in a town or a city to your way of thinking?
- a) Town \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) City \_\_\_\_\_
16. If you move will you move to a town or a city?
- a) Town \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) City \_\_\_\_\_
17. Are there any celebrations such as birthdays, holidays, reunions, anniversaries which bring the family together during the year?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

18. How many times would you say you go to these big get-togethers?

- a) Once a month or more
- b) Several times a year
- c) Once a year
- d) Never

19. Name 3 people with whom you feel closest to and know best besides your husband, wife or children: (Give last name only)

	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Relative or Friend</u>	<u>Age</u>
1) _____	M F	R F	
2) _____	M F	R F	
3) _____	M F	R F	

20. How often do you see the above 3 people?

- a) Everyday (0, 1, 2, 3) \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Once or twice a week \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Once or twice a month \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Seldom \_\_\_\_\_
- e) Never \_\_\_\_\_

21. If you never see one or more of the 3 people mentioned in question 19, do you phone or write to them?

- a) Phone (0, 1, 2, 3) \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Write \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Both \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Neither phone or write \_\_\_\_\_

22. Do you watch television?

- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- b) No \_\_\_\_\_

23. Do you watch 6 o'clock news or any other news program?

- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ How often? \_\_\_\_\_
- b) No \_\_\_\_\_

24. Do you watch any of the election programs, for example politicians who campaign on TV and radio?

- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- b) No \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you listen to radio?

- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- b) No \_\_\_\_\_

26. Which do you turn on more often?  
a) Radio \_\_\_\_\_ b) TV \_\_\_\_\_
27. Do you read any newspapers?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
28. Which newspapers? List:  
1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_
29. Do you read any Spanish newspapers?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
30. Which newspapers? List:  
1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_
31. Do you read any magazines?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
32. Do you read any Spanish magazines?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
33. Do you listen to any Spanish radio stations?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
34. Do you belong to any clubs or groups like these?  
1. Labor Union \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Political club or group \_\_\_\_\_  
3. PTA \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Church or church connected groups \_\_\_\_\_
35. What are 3 most important problems facing the Magnolia area? List:  
1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_
36. What are 3 most important problems facing the Mexican?
1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
37. Do you think the Poverty Program has done any good in the Magnolia area?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
38. Who do you think has helped the poor Mexican the most, Catholics, Protestants, or Jews?
- a) Catholic \_\_\_\_\_ b) Protestants \_\_\_\_\_ c) Jews \_\_\_\_\_
39. Who do you think has helped the poor Mexican the least?
- a) Catholic \_\_\_\_\_ b) Protestants \_\_\_\_\_ c) Jews \_\_\_\_\_
40. Do any of your children go to play at the Neighborhood Centers such as Ripley House?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
41. Do you think that the Poverty Program really cares about the poor Mexican?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
42. What do you hate most about the Poverty Program? Name:
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
43. Do you think that other ethnic groups are getting more help than the Mexican?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
44. Do you think that other ethnic groups should get more help than the Mexican?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

45. If you think that other ethnic groups are getting more, does this make you feel that you are being treated unfairly?
- a) Makes me mad \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Makes me feel that I am being treated unfairly \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Both \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) None of the above reasons \_\_\_\_\_
46. Do you think that something can be done if some unfairness exists?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
47. Are you willing to do something?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
48. Are there any Anglos or Mexicanos who have tried to help Magnolia with its problems?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) No \_\_\_\_\_
49. Would you please name these people?
- 1. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4. \_\_\_\_\_
50. What Mexicanos do you think are the most important people in Magnolia? List:
- 1. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4. \_\_\_\_\_
51. What Anglos are the most important people in Magnolia?
- a) There aren't any \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Yes, these
    - 1. \_\_\_\_\_
    - 2. \_\_\_\_\_
    - 3. \_\_\_\_\_
52. Who do you think are the most important Mexicanos in Houston?
- a) There aren't any \_\_\_\_\_

- b) Yes, these 1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_
53. Who do you think are the most important Anglos in Houston who have helped the Mexicano?  
a) There aren't any \_\_\_\_\_  
b) Yes, these 1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_
54. Do you think there are any important Negroes in Houston?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
55. If yes, who are these Negroes?  
1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_
56. Over the past 10 years would you say that the Mexican leadership in Houston has changed or remained the same?  
a) Changed for the better \_\_\_\_\_ b) Changed for the worse \_\_\_\_\_  
c) Remained the same \_\_\_\_\_
57. How much would you say that white citizens respect our Mexican leaders?  
a) A lot \_\_\_\_\_ b) Some \_\_\_\_\_ c) Very little \_\_\_\_\_  
d) Not at all \_\_\_\_\_
58. Now, considering the United States as a whole, who do you think is the most important Mexican leader?  
a) There isn't any \_\_\_\_\_ b) Yes, this one \_\_\_\_\_
59. Have you ever heard of Cesar Chavez or Eugene Nelson?



- a) Yes, who \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
60. Suppose you thought your child's teacher was not doing a good job of educating your child, would you do anything about it?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
61. Do you think the school is doing a good job of educating your children?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
62. Do you think that any political party is interested in helping the Mexican American?
- a) Yes, which one \_\_\_\_\_ (Democratic or Republican)
- b) No \_\_\_\_\_
63. In the Houston Mexican Community which organization or group has helped the Mexican the most?
- a) IULAC \_\_\_\_\_ b) PASO \_\_\_\_\_ c) G. I. FORUM \_\_\_\_\_
- d) PORT HOUSTON LIONS CLUB \_\_\_\_\_ e) None \_\_\_\_\_
64. Have you ever attended a meeting of any of these groups?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_ c) Which ones \_\_\_\_\_
65. If someone wanted to help the Mexican in the Magnolia area, would you help him in any way?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
66. Have you heard of the Civil Rights Bill?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
67. Are you a registered voter?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
68. If someone was willing to show you how to register to vote and how to vote, would you let them help you?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

69. Does voting really get anything done for the Mexicanos?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

70. Do you try to get other people to vote?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

71. Do you trust college groups which try to help the Mexicanos?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

72. Do you recognize any of these names and what do you associate with them?

a) Porfirio Diaz \_\_\_\_\_

b) Francisco Madero \_\_\_\_\_

c) Venustiano Carranza \_\_\_\_\_

d) Cesar Chavez \_\_\_\_\_

e) Henry B. Gonzalez \_\_\_\_\_

f) Reyes Lopez Tijerina \_\_\_\_\_

g) Curtis Graves \_\_\_\_\_

h) Lauro Cruz \_\_\_\_\_

i) Barbara Jordan \_\_\_\_\_

j) Bob Eckhardt \_\_\_\_\_

k) Roy Elizondo \_\_\_\_\_

l) Al Hernandez \_\_\_\_\_

m) Rev. Antonio Gonzalez \_\_\_\_\_

n) Jorge Rivera \_\_\_\_\_

o) Eugene Nelson \_\_\_\_\_

p) Rev. James LaVois Novarro \_\_\_\_\_

q) A. B. Olmos \_\_\_\_\_

- r) Frank Partida \_\_\_\_\_
- s) Franklin Harbach \_\_\_\_\_
- t) Ernest Nieto \_\_\_\_\_
- u) John Ontiveros \_\_\_\_\_
- v) Dan Trevino \_\_\_\_\_
- w) Ben Canales \_\_\_\_\_
- x) Peter Navarro \_\_\_\_\_
- y) Marcelite Womack \_\_\_\_\_
- z) Louie Welch \_\_\_\_\_
- aa) Rev. Lawrence Peguero \_\_\_\_\_
73. Do you keep any type of firearms in your home?
- a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
74. Can you name any Mexican American organizations.
- a) Yes, these 1. \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
75. Do you recognize any of these and (check) if they have ever done anything for you.
- a) IULAC
- b) PASO
- c) G.I. FORUM
- d) PORT HOUSTON LIONS CLUB
76. What is your religion?
- a) Protestant \_\_\_\_\_ b) Catholic \_\_\_\_\_ c) None \_\_\_\_\_
77. If Protestant, to what do you belong?
- a) Methodist \_\_\_\_\_ b) Baptist \_\_\_\_\_ c) Episcopalian \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Church of Christ \_\_\_\_\_ e) Other, what \_\_\_\_\_

78. How much education do you think your children will get?  
a) 8th grade \_\_\_\_ b) Some high school \_\_\_\_ c) Trade school \_\_\_\_  
d) High school diploma \_\_\_\_ e) College \_\_\_\_
79. Have any of your children graduated from high school?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_
80. What is the highest grade the man of the house completed?  
a) 0 - 4 yrs. b) 5 - 8 yrs. c) 9 - 11 yrs. d) 12  
e) College
81. What is the highest grade his father completed?  
a) 0 - 4 yrs. b) 5 - 8 yrs. c) 9 - 11 yrs. d) 12  
e) College
82. Do you think there are more jobs for Mexicanos now than there was 10 yrs. ago?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_
83. Do both the mother and father of this house work?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_
84. What is the occupation of the man of the house?  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_
85. How many people live in the house?  
a) 2 \_\_\_\_ b) 3 \_\_\_\_ c) 4 \_\_\_\_ d) 5 \_\_\_\_ e) 6 \_\_\_\_  
f) 7 \_\_\_\_ g) 8 \_\_\_\_ h) 9 \_\_\_\_ i) 10 \_\_\_\_ or more?
86. Do you own your house?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_
87. Has your landlord ever improved your house?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_

88. If renting, have you ever asked him to improve (fix) your house?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
89. How old is the man of the house? Age \_\_\_\_\_
90. Are there others in the family who are not living here?  
a) Yes, how many \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
91. How many people in this family have jobs?  
a) 1 \_\_\_\_ b) 2 \_\_\_\_ c) 3 \_\_\_\_ d) 4 \_\_\_\_ e) 5 or more \_\_\_\_
92. If you ever needed welfare would you accept this help?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
93. Do you feel more attached to Mexico or the United States?  
a) Mexico \_\_\_\_\_ b) United States \_\_\_\_\_
94. Do you think that the Mexicans should demonstrate or march to get his full rights?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
95. Would you or any members of your family march or demonstrate to help the Mexicano in the Magnolia area?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
96. Are social workers doing any good in this area?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
97. Are the cops hated in this area?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
98. Do you think that Mexicans in general are proud of being Mexican?  
a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_
99. Do you think that other ethnic groups make Mexicans feel proud of being Mexican?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

100. Does the Mexican have anything good to offer American society?

a) Yes, what \_\_\_\_\_ b) No \_\_\_\_\_

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. Books

- Bell, Wendell, Richard J. Hill, and Charles R. Wright. Public Leadership. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1961.
- Bernal, Ignacio. Mexico Before Cortez: Art, History, Legend. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963.
- Bogardus, Emory S. The Mexican in the United States. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1934.
- Browning, Harloy L. and S. Dale McLemore. A Statistical Profile of the Spanish-Surname Population of Texas. Austin: Population Research Center, University of Texas, June 9, 1964.
- Burma, John. Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1954.
- D'Antonio, William V. and William H. Form. Influentials in Two Border Cities: A Study in Community Decision-Making. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.
- David, Paul T., and Ross Pollock. Executives for Government: Central Issues of Federal Personnel Administration. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1957.
- Fogel, Walter. Education And Income of Mexican-Americans In The Southwest. Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, 1965.
- Gamio, Manuel. Mexican Immigration to the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959.
- Griffith, Beatrice. America Me. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948.
- Hansen, Morris Howard, William N. Hurwitz, and William G. Madow. Sample Survey Methods and Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1953.



- Heller, Celia Stopnicka. Mexican-American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Hill, Gladwin. "The Political Role of Mexican-Americans" in Arnold M. Rose and Caroline B. Rose, eds., Minority Problems. New York: Harper and Row, 1965, 202 - 204.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. The New Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Janowitz, Morris. Sociology and the Military Establishment. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959.
- Kibbe, Pauline R. Latin Americans in Texas. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1946.
- Kluckhohn, Florence and Fred Strodbeck. Variation in Value Orientation. Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1961.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. The People's Choice. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944.
- McCleskey, Clifton. The Government And Politics of Texas. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- McWilliams, Carey. "The Forgotten Mexican," in Brothers Under the Skin, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944, 113 - 139.
- \_\_\_\_\_. North From Mexico, the Spanish-Speaking People of the United States. New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1949.
- Madsen, William. The Mexican-Americans of South Texas. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Matthews, Donald R. The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1954.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. (revised and enlarged edition). New York: The Free Press, 1957.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Marxists. New York: Dell Publ. Co., 1962.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Power, Politics and People. New York: Ballantine Books, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. White Collar: The American Middle Classes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Clarence Senior, and Rose Kohn Goldsen. The Puerto Rican Journey. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.
- Moore, Joan W. and Frank G. Mittelback. Residential Segregation In The Urban Southwest: A Comparative Study. Los Angeles: Mexican-American Study Project, 1966.
- Murray, Sister M.J. A Socio-Cultural Study of 118 Mexican Families Living in a Low Rent Housing Project in San Antonio, Texas. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1954.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. Vol. 2. New York: Harper and Row Inc.
- Park, Robert Ezra. Race And Culture. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Ernest Burgess. Introduction to the Science of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.
- Parten, Mildred B. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Pearl, Arthur. "Youth in Lower Class Settings," in Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, eds., Problems of Youth: Transition to Adulthood In A Changing World. Chicago: Aldine Publ. Co., 1965, 89 - 109.
- Pearl, Arthur, and Frank Riessman. How Careers for the Poor. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1965.
- Rubel, Arthur J. Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
- Samora, Julian, ed. La Raza: Forgotten Americans. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Richard A. Lamanna. Mexican-Americans In A Mid-west Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago. Los Angeles: Mexican-American Study Project, 1967.

- Sanchez, George I. Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940.
- Saunders, Lyle. The Spanish-Speaking Population of Texas. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1949.
- Schermerhorn, R.A. These Our People. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1949.
- Smith, William Carlson. Americans in the Making: The Natural History of the Assimilation of Immigrants. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1939.
- Sorokin, Pitirim. Social And Cultural Mobility. New York: The Free Press, 1959.
- Stouffer, Samuel A. Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955.
- Talbert, Robert H. Spanish-Name People in the Southwest and West. Fort Worth: Potishman Foundation, Texas Christian University, 1955.
- Tuck, Ruth D. Not with the Fist, Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956.
- United States Census of Population 1960. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. (Report of U.S. Bureau of the Census.)
- Upham, W. Kennedy and David E. Wright. Poverty Among Spanish Americans In Texas: Low-Income Families in a Minority Group. College Station, Texas: Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, 1966.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, and James C. Abegglen. Occupational Mobility in American Business and Industry. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Woods, Sister Frances J. Mexican Ethnic Leadership in San Antonio, Texas. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949.
- Zanden, James W. Vander. American Minority Relations. New York: Ronald Press, 1963.
- Zinn, Howard. SNCC. The New Abolitionists. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

## II. Journal Articles

- Alinsky, Marvin. "The Mexican-Americans Make Themselves Heard," The Reporter, XXVI (Feb. 9, 1967), 45 - 48.
- Althus, William D. "The American-Mexican: The survival of a Culture," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIX (1949), 211 - 220.
- Aragon, Manuel. "Their Heritage--Poverty," Agenda, II (July, 1966), 9 - 13.
- Arias, Ronald. "The Barrio," Agenda, II (July, 1966), 15 - 20.
- Bogardus, Emory S. "Second Generation Mexicans," Sociology and Social Research, XIII (1929), 276 - 283.
- Broom, Leonard and Eshref Shevky. "Mexicans in the United States," Sociology and Social Research, XXXVI (Jan., 1952), 150 - 8.
- Bryan, John. "Mexican Ghetto is Slow to Revolt," Los Angeles Free Press, IV, #8 (Feb. 24, 1967), 3, 6.
- Carlson, Olan E. "Community Organization Turns a Corner," Sociology and Social Research, XXXII (March - April, 1948), 782 - 786.
- D'Antonio, William V., and Eugene C. Erickson. "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 362 - 375.
- \_\_\_\_\_, William Form, Charles Loomis and Eugene C. Erickson. "Institutional and Occupational Representatives in Eleven Community Influence Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), 440 - 446.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Julian Samora. "Occupational Stratification in Four Southwestern Communities: A Study of Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," Social Forces, XLI (Oct., 1962), 17 - 25.
- Davis, Arthur K. "Bureaucratic Patterns in the Navy Officer Corps," Social Forces, XXVII (Dec., 1948), 143 - 153.

- De Leon, Marcos. "Wanted: A New Educational Philosophy for the Mexican-American," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXIV (Nov., 1959), 1 - 12.
- Demos, George D. "Attitudes of Mexican-Americans and Anglo Groups Toward Education," Journal of Social Psychology, LVII (Aug., 1962), 249 - 256.
- Dworkin, Anthony Gary. "Stereotypes and Self-Images Held by Native Born and Foreign Born Mexican-Americans," Sociology and Social Research, XLIX (Jan., 1965), 214 - 224.
- Form, William and William D'Antonio. "Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials in Two Border Cities," American Sociological Review, XXIV (Dec., 1959), 804 - 814.
- Galazar, Ernesto. "Program for Action," Common Ground, IX (Summer, 1949), 27 - 38.
- Guzman, Ralph. "Mexican-Americans on the Move," Agenda, II (July, 1966), 2 - 8.
- Holland, William R. "Language Barrier as an educational problem of Spanish-Speaking Children," Exceptional Children, XXVII, No. 1 (Sept., 1960), 42 - 44, 46 - 50.
- Humphrey, W.D. "The Detroit Mexican and Naturalization," Social Forces, XXII (1943 - 1944), 332 - 335.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Assimilation and Acculturation," Psychiatry, VI (Nov., 1943), 343 - 345.
- Klapp, Orrin E., and L. Vincent Padgett. "Power Structure and Decision-Making in a Mexican Border City," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (Jan., 1960), 400 - 406.
- Leonard, Olen, and C.P. Loomis. "Culture of a Contemporary Rural Community: El Cerrito, New Mexico," Rural Life Studies, United States Department of Agriculture, I (Nov., 1941).
- Lucey, Robert E. "Justice for the Mexicans," Commonweal, XLIX (Nov. 12, 1948), 117.
- McCamy, James L., and Alessandro Corradini. "The People of the State Department and Foreign Service," American Political Science Review, XLVIII (Dec., 1954), 1067 - 1082.

- McDonagh, Edward. "Status Levels of Mexicans," Sociology and Social Research, XXXIII (July, 1949), 449 - 459.
- McNamara, Patrick H. "Mexican-American in the Southwest: Mexican-American Study Project," America, CLIV (March 12, 1966), 352 - 354.
- McWilliams, Carey. "The Forgotten Mexican," Common Ground, Spring, 1943, 65 - 78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'The Mexican Problem,'" Common Ground, VIII (Spring, 1948), 3 - 17.
- "The Mexican American," The Economist, CLVI (June 18, 1949), 1139 - 1140.
- Moore, Joan and Ralph Guzman. "The Mexican-Americans: New Wind from the Southwest," Nation, XXII (May 30, 1966), 645 - 648.
- "The Nine Hundred," Fortune, XLVI (Nov., 1952), 132 - 135, 232 - 237.
- Paredes, Americo. "Texas' Third Man: The Texas-Mexican," Race, III - IV (May, 1963), 49 - 58.
- Penalosa, Fernando and Edward C. McDonagh. "Social Mobility in a Mexican-American Community," Social Forces, XLIV (June, 1966), 498 - 505.
- Pinkney A. "Prejudice Toward Mexican and Negro Americans: A Comparison," Phylon, XXIV (Winter, 1963), 353 - 9.
- Rowan, Helen. "A Minority Nobody Knows," The Atlantic Monthly, CCXIX (June, 1967), 47 - 52.
- Sanchez, George I. "The Default of Leadership," in Summarized Proceedings IV, Southwest Council on the Education of the Spanish-Speaking People, Fourth Regional Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Jan. 23 - 25, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Do I Sound Bitter? I Am Bitter,'" The Texas Observer, Dec. 9, 1966, 15.
- Schulze, Robert O., and Leonard U. Blumberg. "The Determination of Local Power Elites," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (Nov., 1957), 290 - 296.

Simmons, Ozzie G. "The Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans," Daedalus, XC (Spring, 1961), 286 - 99.

Smith, Christopher. "Social Selection in Community Leadership," Social Forces, XV (May, 1937), 530 - 535.

"Twenty-Eight Important Mexicans," Commonweal, XLVII (Feb. 13, 1948), 436 - 437.

"U.S. Latins on the March," Newsweek, LXVII (May 23, 1967), 32 - 36.

Watson, James B. and Julian Samora. "Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-cultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), 413 - 421.

### III. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertations

Penalosa, Fernando. "Class Consciousness and Social Mobility in a Mexican-American Community." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963.

Samora, Julian. "Minority Leadership in a Bi-racial Cultural Community." Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University, 1953.

### IV. Other Unpublished Materials

Goodman, Mary Ellen and Jose de la Isla III. "Houstonians of Mexican Ancestry: Report On a Study In Progress," Houston, Texas: Rice University, August, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Don des Jarlais. "Demography," Houston, Texas: Rice University, August, 1967.

Knowlton, Clark S. "Changing Patterns of Segregation and Discrimination Affecting The Mexican Americans of El Paso, Texas." Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, March 31, 1967.

Samora, Julian. The General Status of the Spanish-Speaking People in the U.S. Lake Arrowhead, California: Lake Arrowhead Conference, August, 1963.

"A Study of Family and Community Life." Unpublished schedule, Tuskegee, Alabama: Tuskegee Institute, January, 1966.

V. Laws

Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas. 347 U.S. 454 (1954).