Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences Among Mexican Americans

Item Type	text; Book
Authors	Telles, Edward E.; Murguia, Edward
Publisher	University of Arizona, Mexican American Studies and Research Center
Rights	The MASRC Working Paper Series © The Arizona Board of Regents
Download date	19/02/2021 06:31:29
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10150/218633

PHENOTYPIC DISCRIMINATION AND INCOME
DIFFERENCES AMONG MEXICAN AMERICANS

Edward E. Telles
The University of Texas at Austin

Edward Murguia
Trinity University

MASRC WORKING PAPER SERIES

The goal of the Mexican American Studies & Research Center's Working Paper Series is to disseminate recent research on the Mexican American experience. The Center welcomes papers from the social sciences, public policy fields, and the humanities. Areas of particular interest include economic and political participation of Mexican Americans, health, immigration, and education. The Mexican American Studies & Research Center assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions of contributors to its Working Paper Series.

Manuscripts and inquiries should be addressed to Dr. Antonio L. Estrada, MASRC Director, in care of the Center.

Working Papers are available directly from the Center for $3.00. Arizona residents add 5.6% sales tax.

Mexican American Studies & Research Center
César E. Chávez Building, Rm 208
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0023
(520) 621-7551 • FAX (520) 621-7966
MASRC website: http://masrc.arizona.edu/
E-mail: masrc@email.arizona.edu

PHENOTYPIC DISCRIMINATION AND INCOME DIFFERENCES
AMONG MEXICAN AMERICANS

ABSTRACT

    Usina a national probability sample of approximately 1.000
Mexican American heads of household. we analyze a subsample of
253 Mexican American male waae earners and present evidence of
the importance of phenotype. measured by skin color and physical
features. on earnings. controlling for other factors known to
affect earninas. Even after controlling these variables. indi-
viduals with a dark and Native American phenotype continue to
receive sianificantly lower earninas than individuals of a
liahter and more European phenotype. A decomposition of differ-
ences in earninas reveals that most of the differential in earn-
inas between the darkest one-third of the sample and the liahter
two-thirds is due not to differences in endowments but rather to
labor market discrimination. When taken as a whole. Mexican
Americans in all phenotypic aroups remain far from havina incomes
comparable to those of non-Hispanic whites.

PHENOTYPIC DISCRIMINATION AND INCOME DIFFERENCES
AMONG MEXICAN AMERICANS

INTRODUCTION

Although many analysts have studied the direct and indirect
effects of labor market discrimination on the earnings of Mexican
Americans and other minorities, little is known about within group
differences based on phenotype. In the United States and in many
other countries, intergroup phenotypic differences have been impor-
tant in determining the life chances of racial and ethnic groups.
No study to our knowledge, though, has examined whether and to what
extent phenotypic variation affects the income attainment of Mexican
Americans. In this study, we propose to (1) determine whether and
to what extent phenotype has an independent effect on earnings
within the Mexican American population, net of controls; (2) deter-
mine the amount of earnings differences due to labor market discri-
mination and (3) compare the earnings of Mexican American phenotypic
subgroups with other race/ethnic groups in the United States. We
believe that Mexican Americans with more Native American and darker
phenotypes will suffer greater labor market discrimination and thus
lower returns to education and other human capital characteristics
than their lighter and more European looking counterparts. However,
all of the Mexican American phenotypic subgroups remain in the lower
levels of the social and economic hierarchy of the United States.

The work of several researchers suggests that historically the
Mexican origin population in the U.S. has experienced discrimina-
tion, at least in part, because it is phenotypically distinguishable
from the majority society (McWilliams, 1968; Acuna, 1972; Barrera,
1979). This miscegenation of Native Americans and Europeans (mostly
Spanish), however, has led to an unusually wide variation of pheno-
type within the Mexican origin population, ranging from those are
virtually indistinguishable from the non-Hispanic white majority to
persons of a Native American physical appearance. This leads us to
the concern over whether there are intragroup differences based on
phenotype in the amount of discrimination that accrues to Mexican
Americans, as has been demonstrated for Blacks in various settings
(Ransford, 1970; Tidrick, 1973; Udry, Bauman and Chase, 1976; Mul-
lins and Sites, 1984; Da Silva, 1985). Under the assimilation per-
spective, ethnic groups are expected to move up the economic ladder
over time, but the bulk of evidence points to little economic inte-
gration for second and third generation Mexican Americans (Grebler,
Moore and Guzman, 1970; Hirschman, 1983; Roos and Hennessy, 1987;
Bean and Tienda, 1987). A variant of this perspective, but without
empirical referent, suggested that Mexican Americans of light skin
color and Spanish (or European) physical appearance would be most
upwardly mobile within the U.S. social hierarchy (Warner and Srole,
1945; Broom and Shevky, 1970; D'Antonio and Samora, 1970). We know
of only two studies that have made systematic attempts to assess the
effects of phenotypic variation on the life chances of Mexican Amer-

icans. A recent survey of a single city, San Antonio, Texas, found
that persons living in low income area of the city were darker than
those living in middle and high income areas and concluded that per-
sons of greater Native American admixture tended to be of a lower
social class (Relethford, et al., 1983). Another study, based on
data from the same national sample employed in this work, indicated
that life chances as measured by both objective socioeconomic indi-
cators (i.e. years of schooling and annual earnings), as well as the
subjective measure of perceived discrimination, are affected by a
respondent's phenotype where light and more European looking indi-
viduals do better than progressively darker and more Indian looking
individuals (Arce, Murquia and Frisbie, 1987). These studies,
although valuable, have been limited to the analysis of a single
locale or to bivariate analysis.

Earnings and Labor Market Discrimination

"Earnings" has been a particularly favored indicator of life
chances by social scientists seeking to assess the effects of dis-
crimination because it offers the possibility of measuring the
degree of labor market discrimination in a given social setting.
The analysis of earnings allows one to separate the amount of income
due to endowments desirable in the labor market from those due to
labor market discrimination. These methods derive from Becker's
economic theory of discrimination which assumes that differences in
earnings are related to individual human capital characteristics

which lead to greater productivity and thus higher earnings (Becker.

1971). Income differences between race/ethnic groups that cannot be

accounted for by means of these types of factors are then related to

discrimination by employers. We use such method to assess the

extent of additional discrimination that accrues to darker and more

Native American looking Chicanos.

Several researchers have analyzed Mexican American (as a group)

income as compared to non-Hispanic whites. Blacks. and other Hispan-

ics (Poston and Alvirez. 1973: Poston. Alvirez and Tienda. 1976:

Long. 1977: Carliner. 1981: Verdugo and Verdugo. 1984: Reimers.

1984. 1986: Cotton. 1985). Generally. these studies have shown that

although Mexican American and Black incomes are similarly low. the

proportion of the Mexican American income disadvantage estimated as

due to labor market discrimination is substantially lower than that

for Blacks. Low endowments. especially in education. have been

blamed as the primary reason for the relatively low earnings of Mex-

ican Americans. For Blacks. the estimate of labor market discrimi-

nation has played a greater role in explaining their low wages.

indicating that Mexican Americans have been relatively more success-

ful in translating their endowments. however limited. into income.

We feel that the examination of intragroup earnings differences

based on phenotype among male Mexican American workers is of partic-

ular importance for the study of discrimination in employment. Some

have suggested that earnings differences between males and females.

though significant. may not necessarily be due to discrimination.

Even when endowment differentials are taken into account, women may be choosing work situations which pay less than others and enable them to pursue other responsibilities, such as caring for home and children. Similar observations have been made concerning comparisons of ethnic and racial groups. Thus, an ethnic group could be thought of as penalizing itself in terms of earnings if members of the group choose not to be geographically mobile. Failing to move lessens their earnings potential by not relocating where occupations yield the highest earnings. This is not the case with income differences among phenotypic subgroups of Mexican American male workers. There is no basis on which to assume that any phenotypic subgroup would choose an occupation with less earnings by choice. In a very real sense, then, residual differences in earnings among Mexican American subgroups more confidently can be attributed to discrimination than can earnings differences comparisons across gender or cultural attributes. What this analysis adds, then, to the literature on income attainment and income discrimination are controls for gender and culture not present in inter-gender and intercultural comparisons.

DATA AND METHOD

The data employed are from the National Chicano Survey, the first national survey of exclusively Mexican origin individuals in the United States, conducted in 19791. The data represent between 85 and 90% of the total United States population of individuals of

Mexican ancestry as identified by the 1970 U.S. Census. The survey
is a probability sample of Mexican ancestry households in the South-
west (California, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado and Arizona) the Chi-
cago metropolitan area, and some households in Oklahoma City. The
data from this sample closely resemble data drawn from the 1980 Cen-
sus along various socioeconomic and demographic dimensions (Arce,
Murguia and Frisbie, 1987). Our sample consists of all working
civilian males with positive earnings, 18 to 65 years of age, who
were not retired, disabled nor students and for whom information was
available for all variables used in our analysis. Ultimately, our
sample consists of 253 individuals, 66 in the light category, 107 in
the medium category, and 80 in the dark category.2

The method used to ascertain the effects of phenotype on earn-
ings proceeds through two steps. The first step utilizes an ordi-
nary least squares analysis which assesses whether phenotype has a
singular effect on earnings net of all effects. We sought to design
three models of earnings which control for different sets of
effects. Thus, we are able to isolate phenotypic effects on earn-
ings from non-discriminatory effects which we believe should affect
income and for which information is available.

The second step, once phenotype is shown as an important vari-
able for studying income attainment differences, is to separate the
earnings of individuals into those related to (1) labor market dis-
crimination and (2) those that prevail because of personal endow-
ments desirable in the labor market such as age and work experience:

marital status which signifies having reached a transitional stage in the life cycle where the individual becomes more committed to work and hence increases his productivity; and characteristics which provide an individual greater access to better jobs and earnings. We also control for industry and region across which wage scales are known to vary. We refer to this second general group of character- istics as "endowments", i.e. non-discriminatory labor market charac- teristics. The decomposition formula we chose to use is:

$$Y_L - Y_D = \sum b^D(X^L - X^D) + \sum (b^L - b^D)(X^L - X^D) + [(a^L + b^L X^D) - (a^D + b^D X^D)]$$

where $Y_L - Y_D$ is the difference in means between light and dark phenotypic subgroups. X_i is the mean of the ith explanatory variable. a is the regression constant and b_i is the partial regres- sion coefficient for the ith explanatory variable. These components correspond to the difference in endowments, difference due to the interaction between differences in coefficients and endowments, and the unexplained differences, respectively. To measure the respec- tive components, we use the full model specified in the first stage (equation 1) for separate phenotypic groups except that the pheno- type dummy variables are dropped from the equation. Equation 1 serves us well since it is a fully specified model from which we assume that unexplained differences will approximate the cost of labor market discrimination. (This decomposition model has been extensively reviewed in the income attainment literature. For more

detailed explanations, see Althauser and Wigley, 1972; Jones and
Kelley, 1984).

Operationalization of Variables

Table 1 presents a summary of the dependent and independent
variables. Two variables are of special importance and require fur-
ther clarification.

Annual earnings, the dependent variable, was available for twen-
ty-eight categories. The first 26 categories were of $1000.00 each,
beginning with the first category of $0.00 to $999.00; the 27th
interval extended from $27,000 to $30,000. We used the midpoint of
each of these categories to calculate annual earnings. In the case
of this highest (28th) interval of $30,000 and above, we arbitrarily
assigned earnings of $32,000 to respondents in that category. This
potentially problematic interval comprised only 4 of the 253 cases.

Phenotype is a composite variable reflecting the respondent's
skin color (5 categories) and physical features (5 categories) as
reported by interviewers. Individuals scoring a 1 or a 2 on the
skin color variable and a 1 or a 2 on the physical features were
classified as light/European, those scoring a 4 or 5 on skin color
and a 4 or 5 on physical features were categorized as dark/Native
American. All others were classified as medium. (See Arce, Murguia
and Frisbie, 1987 for an appraisal of the reliability and validity
of this measure.)

FINDINGS

Earnings Differences among Mexican Americans

Table 2 reveals income differences for each of the three pheno-
typic groups in our sample. Although males of medium phenotype
report slightly lower incomes than light males, the gap between
medium and dark males is particularly striking. The mean income for
light individuals was $13,008, for medium individuals annual earn-
ings averaged $12,804, and for dark persons it was $11,287. There
is only a $204 difference between the light and medium groups, while
a sizable $1,721 difference exists between the light and dark
groups. In addition, the standard deviations indicate less varia-
tion in income around the lower mean for the dark group as compared
to the other two groups.

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for the indepen-
dent variables of the entire sample and the means for various pheno-
typic subgroups. Education, perhaps the most noteworthy variable in
the study of income attainment among Mexican Americans, varies by
phenotype so that the light group has more than one additional year
of completed schooling than the other groups. However, even this
figure is well below that for ethnic groups in the United States.
Table 4 demonstrates that the dark phenotype variable is significant
in our three models and indicates that dark Mexican Americans suffer
substantial earnings disadvantages even after controlling for other
variables. Medium phenotype in itself, however, does not appear
significantly to affect annual earnings in any of the models. The

earnings function for the full model (equation 1) shows that most variables are related to earnings in the expected direction. Education, work experience, unionization and residence in California are of greatest relevance in explaining differences in earnings among Chicanos, as has been demonstrated in other research. English language proficiency and nativity are highly correlated with each other and with schooling so that, although they do not register significance, they could be important.

The regression coefficients of equation 2 and 3 demonstrate the effects of variables upon removal of the access variables (equation 2) and upon removal of both access and industry variables (equation 3). These two models are intended to demonstrate the additional disadvantage that accrues to dark individuals when we do not control for the effects of variables that may also be linked to discrimination. For example, the amount of contact one has with members of the majority or the ability to enter a union shop or a certain industry may be affected by discriminatory practices. Equation 2 shows that, in fact, the cost of discrimination for dark phenotypic individuals is increased by the removal of these controls. Equation 3 provides evidence that concentration in certain industries appears to provide some slight advantages to dark individuals, but not to such an extent that they no longer suffer an earnings disadvantage. These equations support the view that Chicanos with a dark phenotype, and not necessarily those with a medium phenotype, suffer substantially greater earnings disadvantages than their lighter, more

European looking counterparts, net of different sets of effects.

Table 4 also presents regression coefficients for the full model (without the phenotype dummy variables) for both the dark group and a non-dark group comprised of the medium and light groups combined. The latter two groups are merged since we found no significant differences in earnings between them, and because of its larger size. However, the small sample size of the dark group precludes interpreting the means and coefficients as precise representations of the population. The mean values indicate that the non-dark phenotypic group generally possess slightly better labor market advantages, particularly in schooling, work experience, English language proficiency and unionization. The only significant advantage the dark group possesses is greater representation in California.

Table 5 demonstrates the results of our decomposition of annual income by phenotype using the results obtained in Table 4. Surprisingly, labor market characteristics account for only a small portion of the differences between dark and light/medium phenotypic Mexican Americans. Most of the total income difference between the darkest and most Indian-looking workers and the other two thirds is in the residual category. Thus, we believe that most of this difference is due to labor market discrimination since we controlled for those factors that have been shown most strongly to affect earnings. Specifically, 79% ($1,262) of the total income difference in 1979 between dark and all other Chicanos could not be explained with our full model and thus we believe that it is due mostly to discrimina-

tion. The difference attributable to composition comprises only 10% ($165) of the difference; while the interaction term made up 11% of the difference. This signifies that besides additional labor market discrimination, dark Chicanos had slightly lower endowments and receive lower returns per their level of endowments. Thus the labor market cost of being a dark Mexican American male worker is quite substantial when his earnings are compared to those of his lighter skinned and more European looking counterparts.

Comparisons with Non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks

The previous analysis has focused on within group differences of the Mexican origin population. This population, when analyzed in its entirety, has been shown to suffer labor market discrimination in the form of lower income (earnings) compared to those of non-Hispanic whites; however, the population's disaggregation into phenotypic groups shows that one subgroup has greater earnings disadvantages than the others. At this point it is appropriate to assess how differently Mexican origin phenotypic groups fare in terms of earnings attainment relative to other U.S. racial/ethnic groups in 1979.

When mean earnings for our sample are adjusted to approximate median annual income for male full time workers as determined in the 1980 Census, the adjusted earnings can be used to make approximate comparisons with other racial/ethnic groups.3 Table 6 shows that the average annual income figure for the total Mexican origin group

masks differences among phenotypic groups. This disaggregation inflates the light and medium subgroups' incomes above the earnings for the total Mexican origin population in the United States; while simultaneously deflating the income for dark Mexican American individuals to almost $1,000 below the mean for the entire Mexican origin group. Nonetheless, these differences are not nearly as great as those between non-Hispanic whites and the light phenotypic subgroup, the highest earning subgroup among the Mexican origin population. Compared to Blacks, median earnings of even the light Mexican Americans are lower. These differences, though, as some of the previously cited literature points out, may be due largely to the generally lower educational levels, younger age structure and the location of Mexican Americans in lower paying geographical labor markets. Since we cannot control for differences in endowments between groups, and because our adjustments are not precise, comparisons in Table 6 mainly serve heuristic purposes.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study has had several purposes. One has been the introduction of a previously understudied variable, namely, phenotype, for assessing earnings differences among Mexican Americans in the United States. We have discovered that there are differences in annual earnings, particularly between the darkest and most Indian looking Mexican Americans and the remainder of the Mexican American population.

One of the most surprising outcomes of this analysis was the
lack of difference in annual earnings between the medium and the
light phenotypic groups compared to the larger gap between the
medium and dark groups. One possible reason, admittedly specula-
tive, could be that affirmative action programs in unions and at the
work place have helped the medium group to a greater extent than the
dark group. Affirmative action efforts do little to prevent discri-
mination on the basis of phenotype. If we assume that the order of
preference of phenotype by the majority society is first, light,
then medium, and finally, dark, one would expect individuals with a
light phenotype who are almost indistinguishable from members of the
majority, to have the highest incomes. On the other hand, they are
not as "visible" and therefore valuable to organizations for public
relations purposes, whereas individuals with either medium or dark
phenotypes may be. Given the need for individuals that "look Mexi-
can," individuals of medium phenotype, everything else being equal
may be chosen for employment and promotion even over those with a
light phenotype. Persons in the medium category "look Mexican" but
are not "too dark and Indian looking" nor are they so light as to be
indistinguishable from members of the majority society. This phe-
nomenon we label the "symbolic" aspect of affirmative action.

It is important to note that while education has been shown to
be the most important factor in both this and previous research in
explaining the low earnings attainment of Mexican Americans, there
is little variation in education among Mexican American phenotypic

groups. All Mexican American phenotypic groups have quite low lev-
els of schooling. However, the ability to translate education into
earnings appears to be greater for the light and medium groups than
for the dark group. Public policy concerns for improving the quan-
tity and quality of education of Mexican Americans in order to raise
their income and status is important for all Mexican origin pheno-
typic groups, especially for individuals of dark phenotype. These
policies must be accompanied by others aimed at combatting employ-
ment discrimination. Further research, though, on possible pheno-
typic discrimination in education itself seems necessary.

Although we have discovered a significant difference by pheno-
type in earnings among the Mexican origin population, note that
these differences are intra-group differences and that a larger
difference remains between the Mexican origin group and the non-
Hispanic white population. Given the low values of some estimates
regarding the amount of labor market discrimination received by
Mexican Americans and given that some studies have shown that earn-
ings disadvantages of Chicanos are due to low endowments (which may
or may not be based on discrimination), one might even be inclined
to suggest that light and medium phenotypic Mexican Americans may
suffer little labor market discrimination. Such an assertion
remains an empirical question requiring further research where con-
trols representing personal and labor market characteristics must be
employed and where income decompositions can ascertain discrimina-
tion "costs" when comparing Mexican American phenotypic groups and

non-Hispanic whites.

We have demonstrated that phenotype is an important variable to be considered in future work regarding income attainment of Mexican-Americans. Dark and Native American looking individuals of Mexican descent suffer significantly greater earnings disadvantages than their lighter and more European looking counterparts primarily because of labor market discrimination. In the case of Mexican Americans, then, the enforcement of equal employment provisions which prohibit discrimination based both on national origin and color is important.

TABLE 1
Definitions of Variables

EARN | A continuous variable representing respondent's present annual earnings.

Phenotype:
DK, MED, | A set of three dummy variables where the omitted category is LT (light) phenotype.

SCH | Single years of completed schooling from 0 to 16.

WE | Work Experience (Age-schooling-6).

WES | Square of Work Experience.

FTE | Full Time Employment where 1=employed hours or more, 0=part time employment or unemployed.

ENGL | Summary measure of an individual's fluency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding English, ranging from 0 representing no English to 40 (very fluent).

VET | 1=veteran, 0=otherwise.

MARR | 1=currently married, 0=otherwise.

SEPDIV | 1=separated or divorced and not currently married, 0=otherwise.

NAT | 1=born in U.S., 0=born in Mexico.

CON | Self reporting of extent of contact individuals had with non-Hispanic whites, ranging from 0 to 4.

UNCOV | 1=respondent's job is covered by union, 0=otherwise.

Industry:
CONST, DRGDS, PUB,
MANU, TRANS, PERSV,
PROF, AGFOR | A series of nine dummy variables representing industry where the omitted category is WHRET (wholesale & retail).

Region:
CAL, TX, MW | A series of four dummy variables representing regions or states where the omitted variable is OSW (Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico).

TABLE 2

MEAN INCOME BY PHENOTYPE FOR SAMPLED POPULATION, 1979

Phenotype	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Light	66 (26%)	$13,008	$5,729
Medium	107 (42%)	$12,804	$5,896
Dark	80 (32%)	$11,287	$4,804
Total	253 (100%)	$12,377	$5,557

Source: National Chicano Survey data file

TABLE 3

MEAN VALUES FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE AND PHENOTYPIC SUBGROUPS

Variable	Mean All	Std. Dev. All	Light	Means Medium	Dark	Lt. & Med.
Dependent Variable						
EARN	$12,377	$5,557	$13,008	$12,804	$11,288	$12,882
Phenotype						
Medium	0.42	0.49	----	----	----	----
Dark	0.32	0.47	----	----	----	----
Endowments						
SCH	9.43	4.72	10.45	9.09	9.03	9.61
WE	19.68	11.92	19.06	20.81	18.69	20.14
WES	528.89	600.16	513.03	588.66	462.04	559.81
FTE	0.90	0.30	.86	.93	.90	.90
ENGL	338.24	141.85	365.53	339.25	314.38	349.28
VET	0.38	0.49	.42	.36	.35	.39
Marital Status						
MARR	0.87	0.33	.91	.84	.89	.87
SEPDIV	0.04	0.20	.03	.06	.04	.05
Access						
NAT	0.58	0.49	.62	.56	.56	.58
CON	2.03	1.02	2.06	2.12	1.88	2.10
UNCOV	0.34	0.47	.29	.40	.29	.36
Industry						
CONST	0.08	0.27	.06	.12	.04	.10
DRGDS	0.21	0.41	.20	.22	.23	.21
MANU	0.11	0.31	.09	.13	.10	.12
TRANS	0.09	0.29	.03	.07	.18	.06
PERSV	0.07	0.26	.06	.09	.05	.08
PROF	0.09	0.28	.11	.07	.10	.08
PUB	0.12	0.32	.18	.11	.08	.14
AGFOR	0.11	0.31	.08	.08	.18	.08
Region						
CAL	0.44	0.50	.44	.40	.48	.42
TX	0.34	0.47	.35	.32	.36	.33
MW	0.08	0.28	.11	.07	.08	.09
N	253		66	107	80	173

TABLE 4

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF MODEL VARIABLES

Equation	All (1)	All (2)	All (3)	Lt. and Med. (4)	Dark (4)
Variable					
Phenotype					
MED	-250	-120	238	----	----
DK	-1301*	-1541*	-1385*	----	----
Endowments					
SCH	450***	450**	497***	403**	551**
WE	260**	303**	345***	285**	156
WES	-4**	-4*	-5**	-4*	-2
FTE	2113*	3082**	3250**	674	4539**
ENGL	1	5	5	3	-3
VET	177	273	102	56	738
Marital Status					
MARR	1582	1322	1544	1250	2135
SEPDIV	1981	1803	2070	1863	2203
Access					
NAT	718	----	----	1103	-392
CON	735*	----	----	914*	306
UNCOV	2144***	----	----	2149**	2052*
Industry					
CONST	3921**	3994**	----	4211**	1995
DRGDS	2340*	2015*	----	1903	3226
MANU	2591*	2710	----	2633*	3008
TRANS	2450*	3646**	----	4534**	1323
PERSV	2006	2265	----	1847	3172
PROF	1972	1359	----	1918	2638
PUB	1582	1883	----	2136	-333
AGRFOR	606	633	----	553	471
Region					
CAL	2878**	2704**	2566**	3081**	2733
TX	758	353	524	552	1271
MW	889	555	1104	1576	-927
Constant	-4465	-3926	-3472	-4223	-5534
R2	.45	.35	.30	.46	.55
Adjusted R2	.40	.29	.26	.38	.38
Std. Error	4324	4817	4934	4564	3794
N	253	253	253	173	80

$* = p < .05$ $*** = p < .001$

$** = p < .01$ (One tailed test)

TABLE 5

<u>DECOMPOSITION OF EARNINGS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
DARK PHENOTYPIC CHICANOS AND ALL OTHERS1</u>

Total Difference	$1,594	(100%)
Composition	$165	(10%)
Interaction	$168	(11%)
Discrimination (Residual)	$1,262	(79%)

1Percents in parentheses.

TABLE 6

MEDIAN ANNUAL INCOMES FOR MALE FULL TIME WORKERS,
SELECTED RACE AND PHENOTYPE GROUPS, 1979

	Median Earnings[1]
Mexican Origin	9,615
Non-Hispanic White	18,005
Black	12,657

	Estimated Median Income[2]
Mexican Origin	
Light Phenotype	13,549
Medium Phenotype	13,337
Dark Phenotype	11,757

----

[1]Bean and Tienda (1988), Table 10-8.

[2]Mean earnings in Table 2 times .7768 to approximate actual annual median earnings as measured in the 1980 Census. The factor used was derived from the ration of Mexican Origin mean earnings in the NCS and 1980 Census median earnings of the U.S. Census as computed by Bean and Tienda (1988).

REFERENCES

Acuna, Rodolfo. 1972. Occupied America: The Chicano's
    Struggle toward Liberation. San Francisco: Canfield Press.

Althauser, R. and M. Wigley. 1972. "Standardization and
    Component Analysis," Sociological Method and Research. 1
    (August): 97-135.

Arce, Carlos H., Edward Murguia and W. Parker Frisbie. 1987.
    "Phenotype and Life Chances Among Chicanos," Hispanic Journal
    of Behavioral Sciences. 9: 19-32.

Barrera, Mario. 1979. Race and Class in the Southwest: A
    Theory of Racial Inequality. Notre Dame, Indiana: Univer-
    sity of Notre Dame Press.

Bean, Frank D. and Marta Tienda. 1988 (forthcoming) The Hispanic
    Population of the United States. New York: Russell Sage.

Becker, Gary. 1965. The Economics of Discrimination. (Second
    Edition.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Broom, Leonard and Eshref Shevky. 1970. "Mexicans in the United
    States: A Problem in Social Differentiation," in John H. Burma,
    ed., Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cam-
    bridge, Mass: Shenkman, 427-34.

Carliner, Geoffrey. 1981. "Returns to Education for Blacks,
    Anglos and Five Spanish Groups", Journal of Human Resources.
    11: 172-84.

Cotton, Jeremiah. 1985. "More on the Cost of Being a Black or
    Mexican-American Male Worker," Social Science Quarterly. 66:
    867-85.

D'Antonio, William V., and Julian Samora. 1970. "Occupational
    Stratifications in Four Southwestern Communities: A Study of
    Ethnic Differential Employment in Hospitals," in John H. Burma,
    ed., Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cam-
    bridge, Mass.: Shenkman, 363-75.

Grebler, Leo, Joan Moore and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. The Mexican
    American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New
    York: The Free Press.

Hirschman, Charles. 1983. "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," in
    Ralph H. Turner and James F. Short, eds., Annual Review of

Sociology, 9: 397-423.

Jones, F.L., and Jonathan Kelley. 1984. "Decomposing Differ-
    ences Between Groups: A Cautionary Note on Measuring Discri-
    mination," Sociological Methods and Research, 12: 323-43.

Long, James E. 1977. "Productivity, Employment Discrimination,
    and the Relative Economic Status of Spanish Origin Males,"
    Social Science Quarterly, 58: 357-73.

McWilliams, Carey. 1948/1968. North From Mexico. New York:
    Greenwood Press.

Mullins, Elizabeth I. and Paul Sites. 1984. "The Origins of
    Contemporary Eminent Black Americans: A Three Generation
    Analysis of Social Origin," American Sociological Review, 49:
    672-685.

Murguia, Edward. 1975. Assimilation, Colonialism and the Mexican
    American People. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies,
    The University of Texas at Austin.

Poston, Dudley, L., and David Alvirez. 1973. "On the Cost of
    Being a Mexican American Worker," Social Science Quarterly,
    54: 697-709.

_____, David Alvirez, and Marta Tienda. 1976. "Earning
    Differences between Anglo and Mexican American Male Workers in
    1960 and 1970: Changes in the `Cost' of Being a Mexican
    American," Social Science Quarterly, 57: 618-31.

Ransford, H.E. 1970. "Skin Color, Life Chances, and Anti-White
    Attitude," Social Problems, 18: 164-178.

Reimers, Cordelia W. 1984. "Labor Market Discrimination Against
    Hispanic and Black Men," The Review of Economics and Statis-
    tics, 570-579.

_____ 1985. "A Comparative Analysis of the Wages of
    Hispanics, Blacks, and Non-Hispanic Whites," in George J.
    Borjas and Marta Tienda (eds.) Hispanics in the U.S. Economy,
    Orlando, FL: Academic Press: pp.27-76.

Relethford, J.H., M.P. Stern, S.P. Gaskill, H.P. Hazuda. 1983.
    "Social Class, Admixture, and Skin Color Variation in Mexi-
    can-Americans and Anglo-Americans Living in San Antonio,
    Texas," American Journal of Physical Anthropology 61: 97-102.

Roos, Patricia A. and Joyce F. Hennessy. 1987. "Assimilation or

Exclusion? Japanese and Mexican Americans in California,"
    Sociological Forum, 2: 278-304.

Silva, Nelson De Valle. 1986. "On the Cost of Being Non-White
    in Brazil," in Fontaine, Michelle-Pierre (ed.) Race, Class
    and Power in Brazil, Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Afro Amer-
    ican Studies.

Tidrick, K. 1983. "Skin Shade and Need for Achievement in a
    Multi-Racial Society: Jamaica, West Indies," Journal of
    Social Psychology, 89: 25-33.

Udry, J. Richard, Karl E. Bauman and Charles Chase, 1976. "Skin
    Color, Status and Mate Selection," American Journal of
    Sociology, 722-733.

Verdugo, Naomi Turner and Richard R. Verdugo, 1984. "Earnings
    Differentials among the Mexican American, Black and White
    Male Workers," Social Science Quarterly, 65, (June), 417-25.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole. 1945. The Social Systems of Amer-
    ican Ethnic Groups. New Haven: Yale University Press.

NOTES

1. The data utilized in this study were made available by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data for MEXICAN ORIGIN PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES: THE 1979 CHICANO SURVEY were originally collected by Carlos H. Arce of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. Neither the collector of the original data not the Consortium bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

2. For simplicity's sake, we refer to individuals in the dark and Indian looking category as "dark" and those in the light and European looking category as "light". Note that these terms refer equally to both skin color and physical features.

3. Note that an adjustment is required to account for the fact that our sample had higher incomes due primarily to the inclusion of only household heads in the sample.

Mexican American Studies & Research Center

http://masrc.arizona.edu

WORKING PAPER SERIES

◆

The goal of the MASRC Working Paper Series is to disseminate research on the Mexican American experience.
Scholars from the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Public Policy fields, and the Humanities are encouraged to
submit manuscripts. Areas of particular interest include the Mexican immigrant experience in the United States,
History, Minority Economic Participation, and Public Health.

No. 17: El Orgullo De Ser: Mexican American/Latino Applied History Programs, Exhibitions and Museums. Antonio Ríos-Bustamante, 1990.

No. 18: Motivators for Colon Cancer Prevention Among Elderly Mexican Americans. Judith T. González, 1990.

No. 19: Predictors of Breast Self-Examination Among Mexican American Women: A Path Analytic Model. Judith T. González, 1990.

No. 20: U.S. Immigration Authorities and Victims of Human and Civil Rights Abuses: The Border Interaction Project Study of South Tucson, Arizona, and South Texas. Robert E. Koulish, Manuel Escobedo, Raquel Rubio-Goldsmith, and John Robert Warren, 1994.

No. 21: National Origin Based Variations of Latino Voter Turnout in 1988: Findings from the Latino National Political Survey. John R. Arvizu, 1994.

No. 22: Selections from A Frontier Documentary: Mexican Tucson, 1821-1846. Kieran McCarty, 1994.

No. 23: Utilizing the Informal Economy: The Case of Chicago's Maxwell Street Market. Steven Balkin, Alfonso Morales, and Joseph Persky, 1994.

No. 24: José Rangel Cantú: South Texas' Fiery Radio Warrior. Carlos Larralde, 1995.

No. 25: Beyond Access to Health Care:Institutional and Cultural Barriers Experienced by Mexican Americans in a Southwestern Community. Antonio L. Estrada, 1996.

No. 26: The Education of Immigrant Children: The Impact of Age at Arrival. Arturo González, 1998.

No. 27: Mexican American Women and Social Change: The Founding of the Community Service Organization in Los Angeles, An Oral History. Linda M. Apodaca, 1999.

No. 28: The Influence of Cultural Values On Self-Efficacy in Reducing HIV Risk Behaviors. Antonio L. Estrada, Barbara D. Estrada, and Gilbert Quintero, 1999

No. 29: LULAC and Veterans Organize for Civil Rights in Tempe and Phoenix, 1940-1947. Christine Marín, 2001.

No. 30: Of Information Highways and Toxic Byways: Women and Environmental Protest in a Northern Mexican City. Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2002.

No. 31: Social Exchange Practices among Mexican-Origin Women in Nogales, Arizona: Prospects for Education Acquisition. Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2004.

No. 32: Flexible Labor and Underinvestment in Women's Education on the U.S-Mexico Border. Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Gloria Ciria Valdez-Gardea, and Norma González, 2005.

No. 33: Viva Emiliano Zapata! Viva Benito Juarez! Helping Mexican and Chicano Middle School Students Develop a Chicano Conciousness via Critical Pedagogy and Latino/Latina Critical Race Theory. Martha Casas, 2006.

No. 34: Mujeres en el Cruce: Mapping Family Separation/Reunification at a Time of Border (In)Security. Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2007.