

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 847

CS 205 003

AUTHOR Subervi-Velez, Federico A.
TITLE Mass Media Exposure and Perceived Discrimination
Among Latinos in Chicago.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Association for Education in Journalism (62nd,
Houston, Texas, August 5-8, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cubans; Ethnic Groups; *Mass Media; Media Research;
Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; *Perception;
Predictor Variables; Puerto Ricans; *Social
Discrimination; *Social Integration; *Socialization;
*Spanish Americans; Television Viewing

ABSTRACT

Perceived ethnic discrimination was studied by surveying 388 members of the Latino community in Chicago (115 Puerto Ricans, 162 Mexicans, and 111 Cubans). A factor analysis of how these Latinos perceived the treatment they got from 19 private and public social organizations (such as churches, libraries, and landlords) produced four dimensions of discrimination: regulatory organizations, consumer organizations, socialization organizations, and employment opportunity organizations. Age, years of residency in the United States, education, family income, and four media exposure variables (television, radio, Spanish-language press, and English-language press) were tested with hierarchical regression analysis on each discrimination factor. After controlling for the background variables, exposure to television was found to be a negative predictor of the discrimination perceived from the consumer and socialization factors. Exposure to the other types of media was not a significant predictor of any factor with such controls; but exposure to English-language press was positively associated with discrimination perceived from the regulatory and socialization factors. Age was the strongest negative predictor of the regulatory, consumer, and employment opportunity factors, while education was the only positive predictor (for the regulatory factor). (Author/RL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Introduction

In the social sciences, race and ethnic inequality has been studied for decades, typically by measuring objective differences between groups and analyzing how they may be due, among other things, to the dominant society's prejudice and discrimination. The minority group members' attitudes, perceptions and experiences have also been investigated with the consistent finding that race discrimination has been felt by most blacks (Kasschau, 1971: 729).

Though to a lesser extent, studies have also been made about the socioeconomic inequalities of the Latinos. It is a fact that the majority of these people are worse off than their Anglo counterparts and that, overall, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans (also known as Chicanos) are at the bottom of the ladder, while most Cubans are well placed. (U.S. Census Bureau)

However, little is known about the Latino community members' perceptions on how or where they stand in society. The purpose of this paper is to provide some insights on this issue via an exploratory inquiry of how a sample of Latinos feel they are treated by a number of entities of the dominant society. In other words we explore the extent to which Latinos feel or do not feel discriminated against, and in regards to what area or areas of society they feel the discrimination. Thus, one of the questions we seek to answer concerns the level and category of the perceived discrimination; is it a uni-categorical or a multi-categorical problem?

The second focal point of the paper concerns the degree to which certain variables affect the perceived discrimination. In this vein, three sets of variables will be dealt with; a) age and years of residency in the

United States; b) socioeconomic status, and c) exposure to the mass media. Personality type variables that may be associated with the problem, nor the individual prejudices held by the Latinos are presently subject of scrutiny.

Discrimination and assimilation.

Recent census data shows that Latinos, also know as Hispanics, now compose about nine percent of the United States' population, making them the second largest minority group in the country. Because they cannot uniformly be distinguished by skin color, they are at times less excluded than the blacks from the social, political, and economic white world and have even been labeled "partial" minorities. (Howard, 1970) Nevertheless, as the blacks (who constitute twelve percent of the national population) and other racial and ethnic groups, the Latinos also suffer varying types and degrees of discrimination.

In accepting Gordon's (1964) proposition that in the process of ethnic assimilation one of the conditions is the absence of discrimination, it should be recognized that discrimination can be studied from either an objective or a subjective point of view. On the one hand, regarding a number of areas in which Puerto Ricans in New York have faced objective discrimination, Marden and Meyer (1973) point out restricted opportunities in employment, the granting of professional licenses, and political participation. In terms of discrimination against the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest United States, the same authors enumerate over a dozen practices in three major areas: economic, educational, and socio-civical opportunities. Though less is known about the discrimination against Cubans, they too, undoubtedly, have

felt the "pressures" of their new environment. Under such conditions, it is not difficult to understand why Latinos--in particular Puerto Ricans (Gordon, 1964: 76)--objectively may be the least assimilated of the nation's ethnic groups.

On the other hand, the subjective point of view has hardly been dealt with; it concerns the opinions held by the Latinos on how they feel they are treated by the core society. In other words, do the Latinos feel mistreated by society? If so, to what extent do they feel discriminated against: is it in their exchange with all the dominant entities or only with some?

In order to answer these and other questions, the dependent variable to be considered in this study is the Latino status as perceived by the Latinos themselves. The evaluation used for the study stems in a series of items in which the subjects pointed out ratings they gave a number of public and private organizations' treatment of Latinos. (See Appendix 1 for operationalization.)

Upon analyzing the response to the items, the underlying assumption is that if the Hispanics believe they are not well treated, it would be an indication that, at least subjectively, they have not been assimilated into the area or areas in which they feel unduly treated, i.e., discriminated against. Conversely, the area or areas in which the Latinos do not perceive mistreatment can serve as an indication of at least some degree of external assimilation to core society.

In predicting to different levels of perceived discrimination, it must be recognized that different theories of assimilation have pointed to a

multiplicity of independent variables associated with the problem. In the present study, three types of independent variables were tested in their association with perceived discrimination.

1. Time. Two time related variables were tested: age and years in the United States. Since time is an important contributor to ethnic assimilation, it was expected that these variables would also have their effects on the Latino's views of discrimination. Specifically, each one of these was hypothesized to be inversely related to the dependent variable, i.e., the older the person as well as the greater the years in the U.S. the less the perceived discrimination. The underlying assumption here is that greater age and years of residency could imply experiences the Latinos may have had and learned in order to adapt to the environment. This should lead to less problems in dealing with situations of rejection by the core elements of society, thus, eventual feeling less discrimination.

2. Socioeconomic status (SES). In dealing with socioeconomic status, for which the effects of education and family income were tested, two themes were possible. On the one hand, higher status Hispanics personally may be less subject to discriminatory actions by the dominant members of society and thus should evaluate positively the Latinos' situation, whereas the lower class Latinos face greater hardships and should evaluate negatively the treatment received by Hispanics. On the other hand, higher status Latinos might be more critical of the Anglo society as they may encounter greater discrimination in their upward mobility, an effort which implies a shift away from the majority Latino community and peers into a possibly more prejudiced Anglo work and residential environment. In addition, higher status Latinos may

be more aware of the problems faced by the Latino community and thus hold more critical opinions in spite of their own relatively better standing. Considering the objective reality of the studied ethnics, we expected the second propositions to hold true.

3. Exposure to the mass media: Although empirical evidence of its specific effects on assimilation is scarce, exposure to the dominant society's mass media has been long regarded as one of the major forces for promoting assimilation. (Gordon, 1964; Marden and Meyer, 1973; Kim, 1977) The obvious contention is that many of the mass media messages provide patterns or lessons that ought to be followed by emigrants and national minorities and that high exposure to such messages increases the probability of adaptation to the patterns.

In our search of the bases of perceived discrimination, the analysis of the role of the mass media is of central importance especially because we assume that the subjects may not have had personal experiences with each public and private organization they were asked to rate. Thus, it is possible that the mass mediated messages are central sources from which positive or negative discrimination feelings are established.

However, the current media environment of the Latino community in the United States does not allow for any unqualified assertion. In Chicago, (as well as in the Northeastern industrial states, in the Southwestern region, in California, and in Florida) there are many Hispanic based print and electronic media which convey the ethnic groups' own messages. Such media may very well help sensitize its audience on the social problems that affect them.

On the other hand, the same mass media may also be a means of reinforcing the messages of the establishment, particularly those messages pertaining to the basic ideology. Such dual role of the ethnic media has been explained clearly by Battistelli (1975) in his study of Italian Canadians. Regarding the evidence of the ethnic culture, he points out that "this diversity is maintained and reinforced by the mass media (radio, TV, journals, and the cinema); however, mass media are also the means of reinforcing the message of the establishment. Even the mass media as organized and maintained by Italian-Canadians over a period of time reveals the tendency to reflect much of the 'establishment' sociopolitical ideology while preserving Italian linguistic and cultural features."

If we assume that continuous messages of discrimination against the Latinos may be dysfunctional to the stability of the general society, we should expect that there be a restricted portrayal of critical messages in the Anglo as well as in the Hispanic mass media. Thus, in seeking an answer to the question of the effects of media exposure to the Latinos' perceived discrimination, we hypothesize that exposure to the electronic mass media--and its basically entertainment content--should be negatively related to discrimination perceptions.

However, in terms of the effect of print media and its generally news, commentary, and diverse opinion content, the effect may be in the opposite direction. This positive relation between print media and perceived discrimination should be even stronger for the Spanish-language press than for the English-language press--that is, if the former medium in Chicago plays the advocacy

role many of its counterparts are said to be playing in the Southwestern U.S.
Data analysis.

Research design: Data for the study were taken from Duran and Monroe's (1977) Latino Communication Project, a research project conducted in Chicago during early 1977, which studied the communication patterns and organizational activities of this city's Hispanic residents. A stratified cluster probability sample was used to make sure that the three major nationalities would be included.¹ This brought a total sample of 388 subjects-- of which there were 115 Puerto Ricans, 162 Mexican-Americans, and 111 Cubans.² Ethnicity of the interviewers were matched with that of the respondents and interviews were conducted in Spanish or English, depending on the respondents' preference.

Dependent variables: For the dependent variables, nineteen items related to the Latinos' treatment by private and public organizations in Chicago were selected for initial analysis. The items were among a series of questions concerning the respondents' status and the Latino community. Response to the selected items was scored on a scale ranging from 1 to 3: "1" meaning the subject was of the opinion that the Latinos are treated well by the organization, "2" that they are treated average, and "3" that they are treated badly. Missing data was replaced with the mean of the whole sample. The nineteen items are shown in Table 1 ranked by level of perceived discrimination.

Because the questions were asked in a consecutive sequence, a zero order correlation was performed between the items and the numbers one to nineteen to check if there was any overall indication of one type of response set.

Another reliability check was performed by splitting the sample in two equal halves, conducting zero order correlations of the nineteen items of each half, and then comparing the results. There were no observable differences among the halves, as well as there was no indication of any response set.

In order to gain some understanding of the clustering of the discrimination items, the next test performed on them was a principal component procedure factor analysis. Using varimax rotation the procedure produced a four factor solution for the items, as shown in Table 2. Only the items that were most strongly linked to each other in each factor were then summed to create four discrimination factors that were used as the final dependent variables in the subsequent analysis. The alpha coefficient of internal consistency of the four resulting factors were, respectively, .70, .76, .61, and .61.

Independent variables: Four personal background variables--age, years of residence in the United States, education, and family income--were selected as indicators of some important social structural factors. (See operationalization in Appendix 1.) For the whole group, the mean age was 39 years (s.d.=14) and the mean number of years in the U.S. was 15 (s.d.=14). The mean education measured as last school year finished for the group was 7.2 (s.d.=4) and the mean reported family annual income was about \$9,492 (s.d.=\$6,597). While this mean family income places the group as a whole slightly above the poverty level, the standard deviation indicates a great variation of income among the Latinos. On the other hand, the educational data indicates that more than half of our sample has completed less than

junior high school education.

The media exposure variables require a more complex presentation. First, of the over twenty media related variables in the Duran and Monroe data, only fifteen were used in the initial stage of the present analysis. Of the fifteen items, eight explicitly refer to Spanish-language media, but only one to an English-language medium (i.e., press). The other six items do not specify language; four of them deal with electronic media, the other two with print media. In order to determine if the unspecified language items were related to one another and/or to the Spanish and English items, all fifteen items were factor analyzed. (See Table 3.) Using the principal component procedure and varimax rotation, the factor analysis produced a solution in which three media exposure clusters could be clearly identified. The principal loaded variables in each factor were then summed in three indexes. The first, TV exposure, is composed by the following items: frequency of watching Spanish-language programs in a week, Spanish TV dependency to learn about the Latino community, having watched the Spanish news at 6:30 p.m. and having watched the Spanish news at 10:30 p.m. The alpha coefficient representing internal consistency was .77.

The second index, radio exposure, is composed of frequency of listening to the radio in a week, average number of hours spent listening in a week, frequency of listening to Spanish-language programs in a week, Spanish radio dependency to learn about the Latino community, and having listened to a radio news program. For this index, the alpha coefficient representing internal consistency was .66.

The intricate association of the Spanish-language electronic media with the electronic media items indicates that all these variables are basically different measures of the Latinos' exposure to Spanish TV and radio. The indexes will thus be referred to as Spanish TV exposure and Spanish radio exposure.

The third index, print media, composed of: a) reading of a newspaper within the last year; b) reading of a magazine within the last year; and c) number of Spanish-language newspapers read; was not used after the internal consistency alpha coefficient was found low, .56. Instead, the last item, number of Spanish-language newspapers read, was used as a single item independent variable. The respective means for these latter two variables were .45 (s.d.=.76), and .49 (s.d.=.71).

Four variables that did not group with the above items were discarded in the subsequent analyses, and missing data was replaced with group means.

Results.

Levels and categories of perceived discrimination.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations given by the whole sample of Latinos to the discrimination items. It shows that the evaluation is overall between good and average. Only for the non-specific entity of "Anglos" is there a majority opinion that the treatment of Latinos is worse than to the white counterparts. The two organizations from which the subjects feel least discriminated are the "Churches" and the "Public Libraries."

In terms of the clustering of the organizations, Table 2 shows that the items associate in four factors. The worst rated entity as well as the best rated organizations, along with another--the "Welfare Department"--are not

clearly part of any of the factors. For purposes of simplicity, the non-clustered items were left out of the subsequent analyses.

Using the primary loadings, the following organizations clustered together best in the first factor: the "Police Department," "Landlords," "Labor Unions," "Hospitals," and the "Immigration Department." The theoretical interpretation that can be given to this factor is that it holds together organizations which seem to regulate many aspects of the subjects lives. Most importantly, these organizations could be those which the Latinos are (or feel) most powerless in terms of having the fewest options, be it for required interactions or avoidance. The cluster is identified as a "Regulatory Organizations" factor.

The second factor holds together best four consumer related organizations: "Grocery Stores," "Department Stores," the "Telephone Company," and the "Gas Company." In the theoretical interpretation of this second factor, to be identified as the Consumer Organization factor, it can be argued that these organizations are possibly less ominous in the lives of the subjects. For the Latinos, as consumers, these organizations are the ones with which the normal interactions are of low complexity.

The third factor holds together very strongly two items: "Public Schools," and "Radio and TV Stations." The linkage of these organizations can be due to the explicit role they play of conveying culture and information or, more generally, socialization to the system. Thus, the factor will be identified as the "Socialization Organizations" factor.

The fourth and final factor pulls together most strongly four items: "Private Employers," and "Public Employers," as well as the "Republican Party,"

and the "Democratic Party." Though the emergence of this cluster may seem as an odd combination, these four organizations have the common denominator of representing the employment opportunity structure with which the subjects may have to deal with. It can be argued that this factor is a reflection of the view--and probably the experience--that jobs come through political contacts and that employment opportunities are concomitant to political conditions of the country or region. This fourth cluster will be identified as the "Employment Opportunity Organizations" factor.

The total variance accounted for by the four factors is 48.9 percent of which 14.3 percent comes from the "Regulatory" factor, 14.2 percent from the "Consumer," 10.3 from the "Socialization," and 10.1 from the "Employment." The respective eigenvalues are 5.6, 1.4, 1.2, and 1.

The linkages observed above are an indication that the images Latinos hold concerning discrimination against them in the United States are subject to categorization. The question that follows is which, if any, of the previously discussed independent variables are associated--and in which direction--with these factors of perceived discrimination?

General associations with the levels of discrimination in each factor.

Table 4 presents the zero order correlations for the dependent and independent variables. It provides the first indication of the intricate associations between the perceived discrimination indices and the selected background and media exposure variables.

Age, as expected, is negatively associated with perceived discrimination. Years in the United States is, on the contrary, positively associated with perceived discrimination, but to a significant degree with only one of the

factors.

The correlations of the socioeconomic measures are practically all in the expected directions--positively related to discrimination--but only two of the associations pertaining to education reach statistical significance, one with the "Regulatory" factor, the other with the "Socialization" factor.

The media indices provided the most unexpected results. On the one hand, exposure to Spanish-language television is, as expected, negatively associated with perceived discrimination, though only three of the four associations reach statistical significance. On the other hand, exposure to the second electronic medium is not significantly related to any of the discrimination factors.

In terms of the print media, Spanish-language press exposure only holds a non-significant positive association with the "Regulatory" factor. The rest of the associations are negative, though also statistically non-significant.

It is exposure to the English-language press that shows positive and statistically significant associations with at least two factors--the "Regulatory" and the "Socialization."

The crude measures used here concerning media exposure make it difficult to make any categorical assessment of the content differences these media may provide the Latino community in Chicago, but these associations are suggestive of particular effects of certain media on the different views of discriminatory treatments: exposure to Spanish TV promotes views of equality, while the exposure to English-language press enhances critical perspectives.

In the following analyses, the strength and independence of the associations, as well as the predictive power of the variables are tested with hierarchical regression analysis performed on standardized dependent and independent variables.

Predicting the perceived discrimination of each factor.

After introducing controls for each independent variable, the number of significant associations was reduced by more than half. Table 5 shows that the perceived discrimination from "Regulatory Organizations" is significantly predicted only by the respondents' age and education. One unit increase in age causes a $-.75$ shift in the perceived discrimination from the above factor; one unit increase in education causes a $.38$ shift in such perception of discrimination. This implies that older, less educated Latinos will be the ones to hold the least critical opinions of how the Latinos are treated by the regulatory organizations, while the younger, and the better educated sustain more critical evaluations. The R^2 of the total equation is 10.9 percent of which age accounts for more than half-- 5.8 percent--and education for less than 2 percent. The standard error of estimate (SEE) is 3.2, and the strength, i.e., the standard error of the regression coefficient (SERC), for the significant betas is $.19$ for both age and education.

For the "Consumer Organizations" factor, age as well as exposure to Spanish TV show negative associations with perceived discrimination. A unit increase in age produces a shift of $-.63$ in the evaluation of discrimination, while a unit increase in Spanish TV exposure produces a $-.16$ shift. This means that the older Latinos who watch more Spanish television have the most favorable views of the way Latinos are treated by the consumer

related organizations. The total variance explained by the full equation on this factor is only 8.3 percent but of which almost half, 4 percent, is accounted for by the media exposure variables. The SEE is 3 and SERC is .17 for age and .05 for the significant media variable.

The perceived discrimination from the "Socialization Organizations" factor is significantly predicted only by exposure to Spanish television. A unit increase in such exposure produces a -.10 shift in the discrimination opinion, meaning that the Latinos' positive view of the treatment given by the organizations alluded to is very much an effect of high exposure to the visual electronic media. For this factor, more than half of the variance is explained by the media items--4 percent out of the total 7.9 percent. In addition, the SEE is 1, and the SERC is .03.

For the final factor, age once again shows its effects; it is the only variable that can significantly predict perceived discrimination of the "Employment Opportunity Organizations." Latinos shift -.59 in opinion of discrimination given a unit change in age. The explained variance in this factor, however, is the lowest of the four; the total is 4.2 of which age accounts for 3.6 percent. The SEE is 2.7 and the SERC is .16.

Discussion and conclusions.

Regarding the first purpose of this study--to explore if the images held by Latinos about the discrimination in the U.S. are uni- or multi-categorical, it has been shown that the rated organizations cluster into four different factors: the "Regulatory," the "Consumer," the "Socialization," and the "Employment Opportunity" factors. The organizations in each factor are

divided into particular areas and types of exchange with which the Latinos interact. The variance accounted for by the produced factors themselves is low, but after summing the items that hold best loadings in each, the internal consistency coefficients justified further exploration regarding other factors with which they are associated.

The exploration of associations was the second purpose of the study. It was hypothesized that: a) the two time variables, age and years in the U.S. would be negatively related to perceived discrimination; b) the SES variables, education and family income, would be positively associated with perceived discrimination; and c) that exposure to electronic media would be negatively related, while exposure to press would be positive.

When controls were introduced for each independent variable, only parts of each of these hypotheses were supported and with only some of the discrimination factors. Nevertheless, the findings are revealing.

First of all, the effect of media exposure, i.e., to Spanish TV, is the only significant predictor with the "Socialization Organizations." Of the organizations of all four factors, the schools and the radio and TV stations are possibly those with which the Latinos have the least direct contact. In other words, except for subjects with school age children (a variable which was not controlled) the "Socialization Organizations" are the ones with which there is little or no opportunity to have first hand experiences with which to form opinions of the way the Latinos are treated as persons. Thus, the evaluations may be a product of the messages of the organizations own making. Regarding the particular organization of radio and TV stations, the subjects

are probably evaluating what they are exposed to, and our data seems to indicate that that is the Spanish-language programming.

In the other factor with which the media holds significant association, the "Consumer Organization," the effect of the personal experiences brought with age can be paralleled to effects brought by exposure to the media. What this means is that the positive evaluation (non-discrimination perception) produced by the electronic media is surely reflecting the effect of commercial advertising and promotion of both the retail stores and the home services organizations included in the factor.

These observations lead us to propose that the effect of television exposure will be significant on perceptions of discrimination when personal experiences or background elements for evaluation are weak. This fact may be well evidenced in the variances that the independent variables have accounted for in both factors; though it is low, the media block accounts for almost half of the total in each case.

A completely different picture emerges in the analysis of the effect of the independent variables on the other two factors. None of the media variables is significant, and together, they account for less than a quarter of the respective variances that can be accounted. Interestingly enough, most of the organizations of both the "Regulatory" and the "Employment" factors are those with which the subjects may have had more direct than indirect personal experiences during their life in Chicago or the United States. The effects of the mass mediated discrimination messages may thus be overshadowed by the effect of the other variables in spite of the fact that only age is significant in two cases and education in one.

In conclusion, the Latinos are not highly critical of the treatment Latinos receive by a number of public and private organizations in Chicago. Such perceptions, however, are not all part of a unique category. Based on the evaluations given to them, the organizations are categorized into four distinct groups.

The effects exposure to the media have on the opinion of the non-discrimination against Latinos from the organizations, vary with each type of organization factor. It is postulated that the media effect is greater with the organizations with which there is less direct personal experience.

Finally, our data does not allow a direct statement of the effect exposure to the media has on this sample of Latinos' assimilation. Nevertheless, our findings do indicate there is negative effect of exposure to Spanish TV programs on perceived discrimination. In as much as these perceptions can be at least theoretically related to the Latinos satisfaction with their adopted land's social environment, we should also expect the Latinos to transfer some of these evaluations into at least some form of external assimilation.

Needless to say the value of the assimilation feeling as well as that of the subjective perceptions of the treatment Latinos believe they are receiving from society should always be evaluated and judged with the facts of the objective reality at hand. Unfortunately, the data presently available limits the possibilities of such analysis. However, it is open to scrutiny about another interesting and important issue: do all Latino group members hold similar perceptions of discrimination or are there a number of differences among and between groups? These questions will be discussed in our next analysis of the data.

Notes.

1. A four stage sampling process was carried out, beginning with the selection of 155 census tracts, each of which had more than 400 Latinos. A selection of 45 of those tracts (15 tracts per Latino group) completed the first stage of the sampling process. Then, blocks within the census tracts, i.e., neighborhood, were selected. This was followed by the selection of housing units in each neighborhood. Finally, heads of households, or their spouse from the units, were selected as respondents. An N=400 with an acceptable confidence rate of 95 percent composed the total Latino sample.
2. Only the respondents who explicitly identified themselves as members of these groups were included. This resulted in a loss of twelve of the 127 cases of the Puerto Rican subset from the Duran and Monroe study.

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of the ratings given to the organizations perceived treatment of Latinos.

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Number of persons responding</u>
Anglos (1)*	2.47	.55	355
Private employers (2)	1.94	.71	328
Republican Party (15)	1.90	.72	234
Police Department (7)	1.85	.79	330
Public employers (3)	1.81	.72	284
Labor Unions (17)	1.70	.79	286
Immigration Department (19)	1.67	.80	270
Landlords (16)	1.62	.70	362
Welfare Department (6)	1.57	.72	290
Gas Company (13)	1.53	.72	345
Radio and TV stations (4)	1.44	.61	303
Democratic Party (14)	1.41	.57	265
Hospitals (18)	1.41	.63	362
Public Schools (5)	1.40	.57	324
Department stores (10)	1.35	.55	355
Grocery stores (9)	1.33	.57	373
Telephone Company (12)	1.32	.55	350
Public Libraries (11)	1.26	.44	261
Churches (8)	1.14	.37	361

*Numbers in parenthesis indicate the order of presentation in the questionnaire.

Table 2: Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation procedure of the nineteen perceived discrimination items.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor loadings</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Anglos	.424	.230	-.128	.200	
Private employers	.432	.085	-.178	.611	
Public employers	.339	.027	.170	.657	
Radio and TV stations	.124	.081	.700	.254	
Public Schools	.242	.196	.722	-.057	
Welfare Department	.416	.087	.302	.260	
Police Department	.614	.206	.183	.150	
Churches	.285	.104	.470	.107	
Grocery stores	.308	.647	.184	.023	
Department stores	.262	.686	.153	.061	
Public Libraries	-.031	.560	.406	.117	
Telephone Company	.202	.743	.086	.118	
Gas Company	.245	.662	-.067	.297	
Democratic Party	-.086	.385	.329	.463	
Republican Party	.078	.216	.199	.633	
Landlords	.568	.015	.166	.248	
Labor Unions	.555	.235	.120	.321	
Hospitals	.596	.248	.267	-.061	
Immigration Department	.520	.174	.153	.017	
Eigenvalues	5.648	1.499	1.230	1.008	
Percent of total variance	14.3	14.2	10.3	10.1	Total= 48.9
N= 388					

Table 3: Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation procedure of the fifteen media related items.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor loadings</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Freq. of TV/week	.554	.013	.071	.606	
Hours of TV/day	.085	.050	-.029	.824	
Spanish TV/week	.848	.067	-.056	.137	
6:30 p.m. news	.895	.021	-.073	.019	
10:30 p.m. news	.822	.080	.006	.030	
Spanish TV dependency	.664	.204	.066	-.147	
Freq. of radio/week	-.037	.848	.131	.177	
Freq. of radio/day	-.200	.594	-.053	.399	
Spanish radio/week	.130	.856	.113	-.060	
Radio news program	.222	.445	.005	.020	
Spanish radio dependency	.170	.754	.061	-.248	
Any newspaper/year	-.165	-.016	.855	.209	
Any magazine/year	.061	.091	.543	.010	
Spanish press exposure	.126	.116	.721	-.175	
English press exposure	-.335	-.065	.445	.477	
Eigenvalues	3.569	2.536	1.815	1.423	N= 388
Percent of total variance	21.6	17.7	12.0	11.0	Total= 62.3

Table 4: Zero order correlation coefficients between the independent variables and each perceived discrimination factor.

<u>Independent variable</u>	<u>Organization factor</u>			<u>Employment Opportunity</u>
	<u>Regulatory</u>	<u>Consumer</u>	<u>Socialization</u>	
Age	-.242 ^b	-.172 ^b	-.021	-.189 ^b
Years in the U.S.	.019	.033	.105 ^a	-.021
Education	.222 ^b	.035	.162 ^b	.029
Family income	.049	-.028	.057	-.024
Spanish press exposure	.049	-.098	-.014	-.002
English press exposure	.179 ^b	-.077	.148 ^b	-.036
Spanish TV exposure	-.176 ^b	-.178 ^b	-.246 ^b	-.054
Spanish radio exposure	-.029	.042	-.048	-.006

N= 388 a=p<.05 b=p<.01

Table 5: Standardized regression coefficients of the independent variables on each perceived discrimination factor.

<u>Independent variables</u>	<u>Organization factor</u>			<u>Employment Opportunity</u>
	<u>Regulatory</u>	<u>Consumer</u>	<u>Socialization</u>	
<u>Independent variables</u>	<u>a (R² Δ)</u>	<u>a (R² Δ)</u>	<u>a (R² Δ)</u>	<u>a (R² Δ)</u>
Age	-.75 ^b } .058	-.63 ^b } .030	.01 } .000	-.59 ^b } .036
Years in the U.S.	.27 } .014	.23 } .011	.13 } .014	.13 } .003
Education	.38 ^a } .023	-.19 } .002	.17 } .025	-.11 } .002
Family Income	-.08 } .023	-.13 } .002	.00 } .025	-.09 } .002
Spanish press exposure	.09 } .014	-.29 } .040	.01 } .040	.01 } .001
English press exposure	.23 } .014	.07 } .040	.06 } .040	.04 } .001
Spanish TV exposure	-.10 } .014	-.16 ^b } .040	-.10 ^b } .040	-.03 } .001
Spanish radio exposure	-.01 } .014	.08 } .040	-.00 } .040	.00 } .001

N= 388 Total R²= .109 R²= .083 R²= .079 R²= .042
a=p<.05 b=p<.01 Constant= -.971 -.433 .692 .730

Appendix 1: Operationalization of the dependent and independent variables.

The dependent variable. (See Table 1.)

The first item stems from the question "Do you believe that white Americans treat Latinos better, about the same, or worse than they treat other white Americans?"

The remaining eighteen items stem from the question: "I am going to read you a list of public and private organizations and ask you how you would rate them in the ways they treat Latinos. Do you feel that they are good, average, or bad in the way they treat Latinos?"

The independent variables.

	<u>Scale (Range)</u>
Age ("In what year were you born?") was later converted into age by the interviewer.	0 - n (16-82)
Years in the U.S. ("In what year did you first come to the United States?") was then changed to number of years.	0 - n (0-75)
Education ("What was the last grade of school you finished?")	0 - n (0-20)
From a scale as the one to the right, the midpoints of each interval were added for the respondent's answer about his/her own income, that of the spouse, and of any other member of the household, if applicable.	Under \$1,000 \$1,000 to 1,499 1,500 to 1,999 2,000 to 2,499 2,500 to 2,999 3,000 to 3,999 4,000 to 4,999 5,000 to 5,999 6,000 to 6,999 7,000 to 9,999 10,000 to 14,999 15,000 and over.
Family income thus became an index ranging from \$500 to \$35,000. The missing data was replaced with the mean of the personal income.	

Media exposure variables

-Television-

Frequency of TV per week ("We are interested in how often you watched TV during the last seven days -- would you say that you: watched every day, watched a few days a week, watched one day, did not watch at all.") 4 - 1

Frequency of TV per day ("Still thinking about the past seven days, on the average, how many hours did you spend watching television?") 0 - n (0-20)

Frequency of Spanish TV ("During the last seven days, how often did you watch Spanish-language television?" Coded same as frequency of TV per week). 4 - 1

Two specific news programs: a yes or no answer to having watched "Información 26 (6:30-7:00 p.m.)" and "Información 26 (10:00-10:30 p.m.)" during the last seven days. 1 - 0

Appendix 1: cont.

Spanish TV dependency ("We would like to know how much you depend upon TV to learn about the Latino community -- would you say that you depend on TV to learn about the Latino community a lot, somewhat, or hardly at all?") 3 - 1

-Radio-

Radio per week ("During the last seven days, how often did you listen to the radio?" Coded similar to TV per week). 4 - 1

Radio per day ("Still thinking about the last seven days, on the average day, how many hours did you spend listening to the radio?") 0 - n (0-16)

Spanish radio ("During the last seven days how often did you listen to Spanish-language radio programs?" Coded similar to Spanish TV per week.) 4 - 1

One specific radio news program: a yes or no answer to having listened to "El Periódico Del Aire" during the last seven days. 1 - 0

Spanish radio dependency: a similar question to that of the Spanish TV dependency for information about the Latino community. 3 - 1

-Print Media-

Non specific press and magazines ("Over the last year have you read any newspaper regularly?" "Over the last year have you read any magazines regularly?" Coded yes or no). 1 - 0

Spanish-language and English-language newspapers read: the name of the newspapers read were coded either Spanish or English and the numbers of each were added into a scale. 0 - 6 (0-5 for Spanish)
(0-3 for English)

References

- BATTISTELLI, Fabrizio (1975)** "L'Autonomia Culturale como Strumento di Assimilazione: I Mass Media Italiani nella Comunita Immigrata di Toronto (Cultural Autonomy as an Instrument of Assimilation: The Italian Mass Media in the Immigrant Community of Toronto." *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* 16: 449-465.
- DURAN, Daniel F. and Margaret E. Monroa (1977)** *The Latino Communications Project. An Investigation of Communication Patterns and Organizational Activities among Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Residents of Chicago.* Library School, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Project prepared under a grant of the U.S. department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, and Office of Libraries and Learning Resources.
- GORDON, Milton M (1964)** *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- HOWARD, John R (ed.) (1970)** *Awakening Minorities.* New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- KASSCHAU, Patricia L. (1970)** "Age and Race Discrimination Reported by Middle-aged and Older Persons." *Social Forces* 55: 728-742.
- KIM, Young Yun (1977)** "Communication Patterns of Foreign Immigrants in the Process of Acculturation." *Human Communication Research* 4: 66-77.
- MARDEN, Charles and Gladys Meyer (1973)** *Minorities in American Society.* Fourth edition. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co.
- UNITED STATES BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1977)** "Persons of Spanish Origin in the U.S.: March 1977." *Current Population Reports.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.