

# ASSIMILATION AND ADAPTATION: FILIPINO MIGRANTS IN SAN FRANCISCO

JOSEFINA JAYME CARD  
*Sociometrics Corporation*

*This study analyzes patterns of assimilation and adaptation among the Filipinos migrant community living in the San Francisco Bay Area. Data came from a sample of 200 Filipino migrants and 100 Caucasian controls from the Filipinos' neighborhoods. The study yielded four findings. First, extensive cultural differences exist between Filipino migrants and their Caucasian neighbors. Second, these differences are smaller for Filipinos who have been in the U.S. for some time than for newly arrived migrants; though the data are cross-sectional, they are consistent with the hypothesis that cultural assimilation of Filipino migrants occurs over time. Third, structural (association with Caucasians) assimilation shows an even stronger relationship with time spent in the U.S. than this cultural assimilation. However, socioeconomic assimilation appears to be the slowest in coming. Fourth, while both socioeconomic and structural assimilation are moderately related to migrant adaptation (satisfaction with life in the U.S.), cultural assimilation is not related to adaptation. Thus a Filipino migrant can live happily in the U.S. with a good job and with moderate comingling with Americans, even if he or she retains the old country's values and attitudes.*

Over the last decade, the Philippines has sent more migrants to the United States than to any other country in the world except for Mexico (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Report, 1970-1979).<sup>1</sup> Very little is known about the assimilation and adaptation of this large group of migrants. This paper analyzes data collected in the course of a cross-cultural study of the motivation for fertility control (Card 1978a; Card 1978b, Card 1979) to provide empirical descriptions of these phenomena. Specifically, the paper describes patterns of assimilation and adaptation among Filipino migrants living in the San Francisco Bay Area; documents the empirical interrelationships among various kinds of assimilation (socioeconomic, cultural, and structural) discussed in the theoretical literature; and assesses the extent to which the various types of assimilation are related to successful adaptation by the migrant to American or U.S. life. While the data base analyzed was not designed with present objectives in mind, it contains sufficient information to provide insight on these important issues.

## *Assimilation and Adaptation*

The term "assimilation" is used here to refer to the process by which a person or group becomes integrated into a new culture, "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 (Park and Burgess 1921)."

Several kinds of assimilation have been suggested by the theoretical literature. Of these the most important are: (1) socioeconomic assimilation, or the extent to which a person or group attains occupational "success;" (2) cultural assimilation, or the extent to which a person or group adopts the cultural patterns — including values, attitudes, roles, and behaviors — of the dominant or majority group in a society; and (3) structural or associational assimilation, or the extent to which a person or group co-mingles with and encounters in primary relationships members of the dominant group (Gordon 1964, Portes 1975). It is important

that these various types of assimilation be kept distinct, both conceptually and operationally, since "no a priori reason exists for assuming perfect correlation among them. . . . Immigrant families may maintain original identities and values and yet prove occupationally successful. Success in the socioeconomic structure and cultural transformation does not, on the other hand, automatically guarantee acceptance into native circles (Portes 1975)."

An additional postulate in the theoretical literature is that assimilation comes in stages or phases. Typical of this thinking is the notion that structural assimilation is a prize 'attainable only after cultural assimilation (Gordon 1964) and/or socioeconomic assimilation (Grebler, Moore and Guzman 1970) have been achieved. Empirical studies (cf. Greely 1974) have generally failed to find support for these theoretical presumptions. The present paper will present empirical data relevant to this issue.

The adjustment process by which a migrant establishes and maintains a relatively stable reciprocal relationship with his or her new environment is referred to as "adaptation." In the present paper, adaptation will be measured by respondents' self-reports of general satisfaction with their lives in the U.S. The following variables have been found to be related to satisfactory adjustment, or adaptation: the psychological make-up of the migrant, his/her occupation and socioeconomic status in the country of origin, the motivation behind the migration, the consonance between the norms of the countries of origin and destination, and the presence of resistance or receptor (especially family) networks in the new community (Bar-Yosef 1968, Myers and Masnick 1968, Price 1968, Brody 1969, Sandis 1970, Rogg 1971; Chen 1973, Choldin 1973). The relationship between the various types of assimilation and adaptation has not been systematically investigated.

Filipino migrants make an interesting case study because their culture of origin is somewhere between Western and Eastern in terms of proximity to the U.S. way of life. The U.S.

colonial period (1898-1946) in the Philippines exposed most Filipinos to American ways; in addition, as a result of the educational system established in this period, most Filipinos speak some English and do not have to adjust to a completely unfamiliar language upon arrival in the U.S. On the other hand, like most Asian countries the Philippines is a developing country with traditional values, attitudes, and mores. This paper will provide data on the extent to which the new<sup>2</sup> group of post-1965 Filipino immigrants have been assimilated into and themselves adjusted to the U.S. way of life. It will then address another gap in the literature on the role of assimilation in the migrant adaptation process. Can adaptation occur without assimilation? Proponents of the melting pot concept have long discouraged this notion. This paper will look into whether empirical support for their concerns exists.

### *The Samples*

Data for the study were gathered via 300 in-depth interviews of 1-1/2 hours each, conducted as part of a larger project on cross-cultural determinants of the motivation for fertility control (Card 1978a, Card 1978b, Card 1979).

One hundred Filipino and 50 Caucasian married couples between the ages of 20 and 40, and residing in the San Francisco Bay Area, were interviewed. All couples were racially homogeneous, i.e., husband and wife were either both Filipino or both Caucasian. The Filipino samples was stratified by number of years lived in the U.S. (<4 years; ≥4 years). Both the Filipino and Caucasian samples were then further stratified by age of wife (20-30; 31-40) and by socioeconomic status (low; high<sup>3</sup>) in an effort to assure that a wide variety of age and socioeconomic groups were represented in the study.

Filipino respondents were chosen by random selection from immigrant entry listings at the Philippine Consulate for the years 1965-1976. Caucasian respondents were chosen by random

selection from telephone street directories of the Filipinos' neighborhoods. The Filipino stratified random sample was augmented by personal referral methods for about one-fourth of the cases, for cells in the sampling design difficult to fill.

Husbands and wives were interviewed separately but simultaneously by a pair of interviewers matched for race and sex with respondents. All interviews were conducted in the language of the respondents' choice; for the vast majority of cases (95 percent of Filipinos and 100 percent of Caucasians) this was English; a small number of interviews was conducted in Tagalog, the Philippine national language.

#### *Variables*

It was hypothesized that migrant adaptation (satisfaction with life in the U.S.) would be a function of (1) *background factors* such as socioeconomic status in the country of origin; (2) the degree to which the migrant was *assimilated* – socioeconomically, culturally, and structurally – into the new environment; and (3) the extent to which the migrant was able to maintain satisfactory *family and kin relationships* in the new environment. A brief description of the variables included and how each was operationalized follows.

*Background demographic factors.* There were six background factors hypothesized to be related to assimilation and adaptation: (young) age, (many) number of years lived in the U.S., (high) origin socioeconomic status, (large) size of community of socialization, (high) educational attainment, and the extent to which migration was motivated by professional and other opportunities in the U.S. Origin socioeconomic status was computed as a linear combination of father's education, father's occupation, and mother's education (Hollingshead and Redlich 1958<sup>4</sup>). Coefficient alpha reliability on the index was .77.

*Socioeconomic assimilation.* This variable was measured by combining male respondents' education and occupation into a single socio-

economic status score, again using the Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) categories. This score was then imputed to both the male respondent and his wife. Coefficient alpha reliability on the index was .53.

*Cultural assimilation.* Cultural assimilation was conceptualized as the degree to which a given migrant had taken on the knowledge, attitudes, values, roles and behaviors of the host culture. Operationally it was measured by computing the discrepancy between migrants' standard scores on 17 of these characteristics and the Caucasian mean score on the characteristic (see row headings, Table 1), weighting such discrepancy by the difference between the Filipino group mean and the Caucasian group mean (last column, Table 1), and then summing up the 17 weighted scores. Because data analyzed were gathered as part of a fertility-related study, the indices of cultural assimilation used referred either to fertility-related attitudes and behavior, or to hypothesized determinants of this behavior. However, the fertility decision model which guided design of the interview questionnaire (Card, Wood, and Jayme 1979) encompassed a wide gamut of individual characteristics, including knowledge, values, attitudes, roles, and behavior (see Table 1). For this reason, it is believed that the available data form a comprehensive enough basis for inferring amount of individual cultural assimilation.

*Structural assimilation.* Structural assimilation was conceptualized as the amount of actual or potential interaction between the migrant and the surrounding (non-Filipino) community. Seven interview items were used to measure structural assimilation: (1) Are you at present a member of any American social, political, or other similar organization? (2) What percentage of your leisure or social time do you presently spend with Americans? (3) Given a choice how would you rather spend the majority of your working hours? The possible answer codes are: with a mixture of people composed mainly of Filipinos; with a mixture of people composed mainly of Americans; no preference.

Table 1. *Components of Index of Cultural Assimilation*

Name of variable	Interpretation of high score on variable	Scale statistics		Cross-cultural differences on variable		Differences between group means (weight for cultural assimilation index)
		No. of items measuring variable	Coefficient alpha reliability	Mean z Filipinos	Mean z Caucasians	
<b>Knowledge-Related Variable</b>						
1. Knowledge about reproduction and birth control <sup>a</sup>	Accurate	6	.49	-.32	.64	.96***
<b>Variables Related to Values</b>						
2. Modernity <sup>b</sup>	High	6	.55	-.32	.64	.96***
3. People orientation	High	4	.47	.22	-.44	-.66***
4. Planfulness <sup>c</sup>	High	8	.61	-.08	.17	.25
5. Career salience	High	1	—	-.29	.57	.86***
6. Family size concept	Large	2	.54	.26	-.52	-.78***
7. Influence of religion	High	1	—	.27	-.14	-.41*
<b>Attitudinal Variables</b>						
8. Attitudes toward children <sup>d</sup>	Favorable	14	.82	.42	-.84	-1.26***
9. Number preferences for children <sup>e</sup>	High	1	—	.25	-.49	-.74***
10. Sex preferences for children <sup>e</sup>	Male	1	—	.14	-.30	-.44*
11. Attitudes toward abortion	Favorable	6	.84	-.25	.51	.76***
12. Attitudes toward population control <sup>f</sup>	Favorable	7	.69	-.18	.35	.53**
13. Motivation for fertility control	High	8	.91	-.20	.40	.60***
<b>Role-Related Variables</b>						
14. Husband vs. wife roles	Egalitarian	8	.70	.17	-.34	-.51**
15. Role of children	Active	7	.51	-.08	.16	.24
<b>Behavioral Variables</b>						
16. Frequency of church attendance	Frequent	1	—	.74	-.37	-1.11***
17. Strength of contraceptive behavior	High	3	.64	-.19	.38	.57***

<sup>a</sup>Miller and Fisk 1969<sup>b</sup>Smith and Inkeles 1966<sup>c</sup>Miller 1975<sup>d</sup>Arnold, et al. 1975<sup>e</sup>Coombs 1975<sup>f</sup>Gough 1975\**p* < .05\*\**p* < .01\*\*\**p* < .001

(4) Given a choice how would you rather spend the majority of your social hours? Same choices here as in 3 above. (5) To what extent do you feel actively involved in American culture, in its people, and in its way of life? Five response options ranging from very much to very little and given. (6) What percent of your present close friends are Filipino? Five response options ranging from almost all of them to almost none of them and given. (7) To which culture do you feel closer, Filipino or American? Five response options ranging from Filipino, definitely to American, definitely are listed here. These items were looked at separately and in combination as a single scale score. Coefficient alpha reliability of the scale score was .59.

*Family relationships in the new country.* Seven variables were examined as being relevant to family relationships in the U.S. Six of these were single items: number of relatives living in house, in neighborhood, in U.S.; number of relatives seen monthly; presence of emotional or physical problems with children; and perceived ease of finding childcare. The seventh variable was the total score on a 10-item scale measuring the extent of communication between the individual and his/her spouse on various topics ranging from politics to number of children desired. Coefficient alpha reliability of the spouse communication scale was .69.

*Adaptation.* Adaptation was conceptualized as the degree to which the migrant was happy in and satisfied with his/her life in the U.S. It was measured by combining respondents' answers (previously transformed into standard scores) to the following three questions: (1) Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days – would you say you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy these days? (2) In general, how satisfying do you find the way you're spending your life these days? Would you call it completely satisfying, pretty satisfying, or not very satisfying? (3) Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder [10] represents the best possible life for you and the bottom [1] represents the worst possible life for you.

Where would you put yourself on the ladder at the present stage of your life in terms of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your own personal life? All three questions have been used widely in national and multinational surveys of life satisfaction (e.g. Question 1: Gurin, Veroff, and Field 1960; Bradburn and Caplovitz 1965; Question 2: Converse and Robinson 1965; Question 3: Cantril 1965).

### *Results*

Answers to the following research questions will be discussed in turn: (1) are there indeed significant differences between Filipino migrants and Caucasian controls on the study's indices of assimilation and adaptation? (2) Do these differences decrease with increasing exposure to U.S. culture? That is, is there reason to believe that, within the 12-year time frame of the study (1965-1977), individual assimilation and adaptation occur? (3) Do the data support Gordon's theory that cultural and socioeconomic assimilation are necessary for structural assimilation to occur? (4) Which of the three types of assimilation – socioeconomic, cultural, or structural – is most important to adaptation? How does the magnitude of the relationship between assimilation and adaptation compare with the magnitude of the relationship between adaptation and its other antecedents such as background demographic factors and family relationships in the new country?

#### *Are There Cross-Cultural Differences in Cultural Assimilation and Adaptation?*

Table 1 listed the 17 knowledge, value, attitudinal, role, and behavior-related variables that made up the cultural assimilation index for Filipino migrants, and showed rather extensive cross-cultural differences on the variables between the Filipino migrant and Caucasian control samples. Fifteen of the 17 inter-group differences were statistically significant; of these, 13 were of a magnitude greater than half a standard deviation. Thus, Filipino migrants (1) had less accurate knowledge about re-

production and birth control, (2) were less modern, (3) enjoyed associating with people more, (4) valued their careers less, (5) had larger concepts of the term "family", (6) were more influenced by religion, (7) had more favorable attitudes toward children, (8) preferred larger-sized families, (9) had stronger preferences for male children, (10) had less favorable attitudes toward abortion, (11) had less favorable attitudes toward population

control, (12) had less motivation to practice contraception, (13) believed more strongly in spouses' sharing household tasks,<sup>5</sup> (14) attended church more frequently, and (15) used less effective contraception in a less regular way than their Caucasian neighbors.

Table 2 presents the mean scores of Filipino migrants and Caucasian controls on the three indices of adaptation studied. Caucasians gave

Table 2. *Mean Self-Rating of Happiness and Satisfaction, Filipino Migrants Vs. Caucasian Controls*

<i>Adaptation index</i>	<i>Filipino migrants</i>			<i>Caucasians</i>			<i>t, Filipinos vs. Caucasians</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>n</i>	
Happiness rating (3-point scale)	2.16	.58	200	2.41	.54	100	3.59***
Satisfaction rating (3-point scale)	2.04	.51	199	2.17	.50	100	2.09*
Ladder satisfaction rating (10-point scale)	7.16	1.37	198	7.49	1.29	100	2.00*

\* $p < .05$   
\*\*\* $p < .001$

slightly higher self-happiness ratings than Filipinos on all three indices studied. In short, Filipino migrants appear to be less satisfied with their lives in the U.S. than Caucasian controls, but the magnitude of these differences is small compared to the magnitude of cultural differences between the groups.

#### *Do Migrant Assimilation and Adaptation Increase with Time?*

The assimilation and adaptation processes are necessarily longitudinal — occurring over time and involving continuous feedback between the individual and his/her environment. Data in the present study were gathered at a single point in time, albeit from cross-sectional

groups with varying amounts of exposure to U.S. culture. Most of the analyses to be reported in this and the following section represent attempts to obtain longitudinal, process-related insights from available cross-sectional data. The terms "change" and "increase/decrease" will be used loosely throughout to stand for differences among respondent subgroups differing in amount of time ever lived in the U.S. It should be kept in mind that actual intrapersonal change is never directly measured because the study was not a longitudinal one.

Table 3 presents the average deviation from the socioeconomic status, cultural assimilation, structural assimilation, and adaptation grand

Table 3. *Assimilation and Adaptation of Filipino Migrants, by Number of Years Lived in the U.S.*

<i>Variable name</i>	<i>Deviation from grand mean of various migrant groups</i>				<i>Eta</i>	<i>F-test of difference amount four means (1/194 df)</i>	<i>F-test of linear trend amount four means (1/3 df)</i>
	<i>&lt;2 Hrs. in U.S. (n=64)</i>	<i>2-5 Yrs in U.S. (n=52)</i>	<i>6-10 Yrs. in U.S. (n=65)</i>	<i>&gt;10 Yrs. in U.S. (n=19)</i>			
Socioeconomic status <sup>a</sup>	-0.42	-0.09	0.61	-0.42	.27	5.20**	0.05
Cultural assimilation <sup>b</sup>	-1.02	-0.49	1.26	0.49	.28	5.20**	2.99
Structural assimilation <sup>b</sup>	-1.59	-0.49	1.37	2.00	.35	8.47***	52.33**
Adaptation <sup>b</sup>	-0.81	-0.20	0.77	0.62	.28	4.98**	7.74

<sup>a</sup>With age partialled out

<sup>b</sup>With age and socioeconomic status partialled out

\*\* $p < .01$

\*\*\* $p < .001$

means for subgroups of Filipino migrants who lived in the U.S. for varying lengths of time (less than 2 years; 2-5 years; 6-10 years; and more than 10 years). Age and socioeconomic status were partialled out before the computation of subgroup means to ensure that obtained subgroup differences were indeed attributable to length of time lived in the U.S. and not to factors correlated with this independent variable of interest. On all four measures, statistically significant subgroup differences were found. In general, both assimilation and adaptation grew with number of years lived in the U.S. The trend was strongly significant and linear for structural assimilation. For socioeconomic status, cultural assimilation, and adaptation there was a slight downturn for migrants who had lived in the U.S. more than ten years. The small number of respondents in this subgroup (19), however, makes it hard to evaluate how much significance to attach to this last finding.

*Are the Various Types of Assimilation Postulated Distinct? If so, How are They Interrelated?*

As previously mentioned, two of the primary theoretical issues in the assimilation literature center around the multidimensionality of the assimilation construct and the time ordering of assimilation phases. Table 4 presents the intercorrelations among the three types of assimilation studied and number of years lived in the U.S. Significant but moderately low correlations (.16 to .19) were found among the three assimilation constructs. Even allowing for truncation of true correlations brought about by measurement error in the variables, it seems reasonable to conclude that the three types of assimilation are related but distinct. It is thus important, when talking about assimilation, to specify which type of assimilation is meant.

Table 4. *Intercorrelations Among Assimilation-Related Variables*

	<i>Socioeconomic status</i>	<i>Cultural assimilation</i>	<i>Structural assimilation</i>
No. of years in U.S.	.05	.14*	.28***
Socioeconomic status		.19**	.18**
Cultural assimilation			.16**

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

\*\*\* $p < .001$

The relative magnitude of the correlations between types of assimilation and number of years lived in the U.S., in conjunction with Table 3 data on differences in assimilation means among subgroups of migrants who have lived in the U.S. for varying lengths of time, can be used to shed light on the Gordon and Grebler hypotheses of time ordering of assimilation

phases. If socioeconomic and/or cultural assimilation were necessary for structural assimilation to occur, as the Gordon and Grebler theories postulate, the first two assimilation types should change more rapidly than the third. Data in Table 3 and in the first row of Table 4 imply that this is not the case. Socioeconomic status and cultural assimilation do not increase



Table 5. *Correlations Between Migrant Adaptation and Hypothesized Predictors*

<i>Name of factor</i>	<i>Correlation with adaptation</i>	<i>Name of factor</i>	<i>Correlation with adaptation</i>
<b>Background Demographic Factors</b>		<b>Cultural Assimilation (con't.)</b>	
Age	-.03	Husband vs. wife roles	.00
Origin (parents') socioeconomic status	-.04	Role of children	.00
Size of community of socialization	.00	Frequency of church attendance	.04
Educational attainment	.09	Strength of contraceptive behavior	-.06
Extent to which migration was motivated by professional and other opportunities in the U.S.	.00	Composite sociopsychological assimilation score	.04
Number of years lived in U.S.	.22***	<b>Structural Assimilation</b>	
<b>Socioeconomic Assimilation</b>		Membership in Amercian organizations	.14*
Socioeconomic status	.23***	Percent of social time spent with Americans	.13*
Type (prestige) of job	.11*	Preference for spending working hours with Americans	.22***
<b>Cultural Assimilation</b>		Preference for spending social hours with Americans	.10
Knowledge about reproduction and birth control	.09	Extent of perceived involvement in American culture and people	.13*
Modernity	.17**	Percent of close friends that are not Filipino	.16**
People orientation	.10	Feeling of closeness to American culture	.03
Planfulness	.16**	Composite structural assimilation score	.23***
Career salience	-.06	<b>Family Relationships in New Country</b>	
Family size concept	-.04	Presence of relatives in house	-.06
Influence of religion	.00	Presence of relatives in neighborhood	.16*
Attitudes toward children	-.03	Presence of relatives in U.S.	.02
Number preferences for children	.05	Relatives seen monthly	.16*
Sex preferences for children	-.05	Problems (physical or emotional) with children	-.22**
Attitudes toward abortion	.09	Ease of childcare	.15**
Attitudes toward population control	-.04	Extent of communication with spouse	.32***
Motivation for fertility control	-.09		

\* $p < .05$   
 \*\* $p < .01$   
 \*\*\* $p < .001$

as significantly or in as linear a fashion as structural assimilation. The caveat should be made again that the data analyzed were cross-sectional and not longitudinal in nature. Keeping this limitation in mind, it appears that the following conclusions are consistent with the data: (1) Filipino migrants comingle with Caucasians at a more rapid rate than their rise in socioeconomic status or their adoption of Caucasian values, attitudes, and the like, and (2) such co-mingling can occur independently of socioeconomic status or of adoption of the Caucasian way of life.

#### *How are the Various Types of Assimilation Related to Adaptation?*

Are socioeconomic, cultural, and/or structural assimilation necessary for a migrant's satisfaction with life in the new country? How does the relationship between assimilation and adaptation compare to the relationship between adaptation and other postulated antecedents such as socioeconomic status in the country of origin, the motivation behind the migration, and the extent of kinship networks in the new country? Table 5 presents relevant data. The correlation between adaptation and present socioeconomic status was .23 ( $p < .001$ ); the correlation between adaptation and the composite index of cultural assimilation was .04 (not significant); the correlation between adaptation and the composite index of structural assimilation was .23 ( $p < .001$ ). It appears that a good job and the opportunity to associate with Americans are moderately associated with migrant adaptation, but adoption of American values, attitudes, and the like is not. In further support of this conclusion is the finding that the structural assimilation index least related to adaptation (feeling of closeness to American culture) is the index most conceptually allied to cultural assimilation.

Contrary to expectations, background factors relating to the migrant's characteristics in the country of origin (date of birth, parents' socioeconomic status, size of community in which the migrant grew up, educational attain-

ment) or to the (professional nature of the) motivation behind the migration were not related to adaptation. The availability of relatives outside the nuclear family for intermittent interaction had a small positive association with satisfaction ( $r = .16, p < .05$ , for relatives living in one's neighborhood and for number of relatives seen monthly), but intimate contact (relatives living in house) was not necessary for adaptation ( $r = -.06$ ; not significant). Not surprisingly, relations with spouse and children also had significant correlations with migrant adaptation.

These data may be summarized as saying that good jobs and interpersonal relationships are the most important correlates of migrant adaptation. Note, too, that co-mingling with *both* Caucasians and relatives from "back home" was positively related to adaptation.

#### *Summary*

Data from a sample of 200 Filipino migrants and 100 Caucasian controls from the Filipinos' neighborhoods (stratified by age and socioeconomic status) were analyzed to study patterns of assimilation and adaptation among the Filipino migrant community living in the San Francisco Bay Area. It was found that:

1. Extensive cultural differences exist between Filipino migrants and Caucasian controls living in the same neighborhoods.
2. The evidence from cross-sectional data implies that these differences "decrease" with time, i.e., that assimilation of Filipinos in the direction of the surrounding Caucasian culture occur. The changes are rapid enough to be detected over a brief 12-year period.
3. This cultural assimilation of Filipino migrants is more rapid than their socioeconomic assimilation, but less rapid than their structural (association with Caucasians) assimilation. Thus, it appears that structural assimilation can occur without cultural assimilation.
4. While socioeconomic and structural assimilation are moderately related to migrant

adaptation (migrant satisfaction with life in the new country), cultural assimilation is not related to adaptation. Thus a Filipino migrant can live happily in the U.S. with a good job and with moderate comingling with Americans, even if he/she retains the old country's values, attitudes, and the like.

5. The presence of extended family members in the migrant's neighborhood makes a small, positive contribution to his/her adaptation; however, the presence of extended family in the house makes no additional contribution.

The robustness of these conclusions should be verified on other samples because of the following limitations of the present study: (1) Cross-sectional and not longitudinal data were analyzed. (2) The index of cultural assimilation used, while constructed in a methodo-

logically rigorous manner, was conceptually limited in scope, because it was based on data gathered in the context of a fertility study. Other investigators in possession of more general cultural data are encouraged to use the present study's approach in quantifying cultural assimilation and then to test whether relationships obtained between this variable and structural assimilation and between this variable and adaptation are replicated. (3) These conclusions may not apply to non-Filipino migrants. For example findings that significant "trends" toward assimilation and adaptation occur within a single generation may not be true of other Asian migrants who do not possess the facility with English and an *a priori* familiarity with American culture that Filipino migrants do because of that country's historical colonial ties with the United States.

### Notes

This study was supported with funds provided by the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (Contract HD-52808 and Grand HD-10684).

<sup>1</sup>In 1965 the U.S. Immigration Act was amended. The amendment abolished the old national origins quota system (of 100 per year for many Third World countries) and substituted a proviso limiting the number of immigrants to 170,000 from the Eastern Hemisphere and 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere. There was a per country limit of 20,000 for countries in the former, but no individual country limitations in the latter. Through the 1970s the Philippines has sent the full number allowed by law. Thousands more cases are backlogged waiting for new yearly quotas to be released.

<sup>2</sup>During the American colonial period in the Philippines, many Filipinos migrated to the U.S. as farm laborers. These Filipinos, now called "oldtimers", were generally of lower socioeconomic background than Filipinos who have been admitted under the 1965 Act. This paper deals exclusively with the new wave of migrants and not with the oldtimers.

<sup>3</sup>Socioeconomic status was computed as a linear combination of husband's education and occupation (cf. Hollingshead and Redlich 1958). For purposes of stratification, a couple was considered to be of high

socioeconomic status if the husband either (1) had some postcollege education, or (2) worked as an executive, proprietor, manager, administrator, or professional. All other couples were considered to be of low socioeconomic status. In the data analysis to be discussed later, however, socioeconomic status was treated as a continuous variable ranging from 1 (Low) to 10 (High).

<sup>4</sup>Education categories. 1=less than 7 years of school; 2=junior high school; 3=partial senior high school; 4=high school graduate; 5=partial college or vocational education training; 6=standard (4-year) college or university graduation; 7=graduate professional training (at least one course leading to a graduate degree). Occupation categories 1=unemployed; 2=unskilled employees; farm share croppers; 3=machine operators and semi-skilled employees 4=skilled manual employees, small farm owners; farm tenants who own farm equipment; 5=clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses; farm owners; 6=adminstrative personnel, small independent businesses and minor professionals; farm owners; 7=business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals; 8=higher executives, proprietors of large concerns and major professionals.

<sup>5</sup>Possibly because more Filipino wives were working in keeping with migrants' beliefs that one major reason for migrating is to make more money, and because domestic help was readily available to most

Filipino migrants when they lived in the Philippines, causing household tasks to be perceived as allocatable more by class than by sex.

### References

- Arnold, Fred and others.  
1975 The value of children: A cross-national study. Honolulu: East-West Population Institute.
- Bar-Yosef, R. W.  
1968 Desocialization-resocialization: The adjustment process of immigrants. *International Migration Review* 2:27-42.
- Boyd, M.  
1971 Oriental immigration. *International Migration Review* 4:48-61.
- Bradburn, N., and D. Caplovitz.  
1965 Reports on happiness. Chicago: Aldine.
- Brody, E. B.  
1969 Migration and adaptation: The nature of the problem. *American Behavioral Scientist* 13:5-13.
- Cantril, H.  
1965 The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Card, J. J., W. J. Wood, and E. B. Jayme  
1979 Determinants of individual fertility and contraceptive use: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Philippine Sociological Review* 27:211-234.
- 1978a The malleability of fertility-related attitudes and behavior in a Filipino migrant sample. *Demography* 15:459-476.
- 1978b The correspondence of data gathered from husband and wife: Implications for family planning studies. *Social Biology* 25:196-204.
- 1979 Differences in the antecedents and consequences of the motivation for fertility control among Filipino migrants and Caucasian controls. *Journal of Population* 2:140-161.
- Chen, Pei-Ngor  
1973 Samoans in California. *Social Work* 18:41-48.
- Choldin, H.  
1973 Kinship networks in the migration process. *International Migration Review* 7:163-175.
- Converse, P., and J. Robinson  
1965 The use of time in American society In J. P. Robinson and P. R. Shaver (eds.), *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Coombs, L. C.  
1975 A brief memorandum on the background, uses, and procedures for the Coombs preference scale. Unpublished paper.
- Gordon, M. M.  
1964 Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origin. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gough, H. G.  
1974 Population policy and social attitude questionnaire. Paper presented at symposium on cross-cultural psychology, Western Psychological Association meetings, San Francisco.
- Grabler, L., J. W. Moore, and R. C. Guzman  
1970 The Mexican-American people: The nation's second largest minority. New York: The Free Press.
- Greely, A. M.  
1974 Ethnicity in the United States: A preliminary reconnaissance. New York: Wiley.
- Gurin, G., J. Veroff, and S. Feld  
1960 Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books.
- Hollingshead, A. B., and F. C. Redlich  
1958 Social class and mental illness. New York: Wiley.
- Hong, L. K.  
1976 Recent immigrants in the Chinese-American community: Issues of adaptations and impacts. *International Migration Review* 10:509-514.
- Lyman, S.  
1974 Chinese-Americans. New York: Random House.
- Miller, W. B.  
1975 Description of instruments used in a research project on the psychological aspects of fertility behavior in women. Unpublished paper.
- Miller, W. B. and N. M. Fisk  
1969 Sexual knowledge questionnaire. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Myers, G. C., and G. Masnick  
1968 The migration experience of New York Puerto Ricans: A perspective in return. *International Migration Review* 2:80-90.
- Park, R. E., and E. W. Burgess  
1921 Introduction to the science of sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Portes, A.

- 1975 Assimilation of Latin American minorities in the U.S. Duke University, unpublished research proposal.

Price, C.

- 1968 Southern Europeans in Australia: Problems of assimilation. *International Migration Review*, 2:3-23.

Rogg, E.

1971. The influence of a strong refugee community on the economic adjustment of its members. *International Migration Review*, 5:474-481.

Sandis, E. E.

- 1970 Characteristics of Puerto Rican migrants to and from the U.S. *International Migration Review*, 4:22-43.

Smith, D. H., and A. Inkeles

- 1966 The O. M. scale: A comparative socio-psychological measure of individual modernity. *Sociometry* 29:353-377.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

- 1970-1979. Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

## Information for Contributors

**Categories.** For purposes of its placement within an issue of the PSR, a manuscript approved for publication will be classified as an article, a research note, a news item, or a book report.

An article will be distinguished from a brief communication or a research note principally on grounds of its completeness (or degree of finish) and/or its complexity. Length is not a primary consideration in this distinction.

The PSR distinguishes four kinds of book report, namely, the book listing, the book notice, the book review, and the review article. An elaboration of these classifications can be found in Volume 19 (1-2), January-April 1971.

**Style.** In general, we follow the norms of the *Chicago Manual of Style* (12th edition, revised; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969) and of Kate Turabian's *Manual for Writers* (4th edition, revised; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1973). However, it should be noted that source references without substantive content are made in *running text*, not in notes by inserting within parentheses the author's name, year of publication, and page(s) referred to. The bibliographic data to accompany this brief reference will be placed under References at the end of the article.

**Format and copies.** Using 9 1/2-x-11 inch paper, the author should prepare a *double-spaced* typescript original and at least two carbon copies of manuscript. The original and one carbon, both on bond paper (not onionskin), should be submitted to PSR, with one or more other copies retained by the author to guard against loss. The editor may return a carbon copy marked to indicate suggested changes, but *submitted manuscripts will otherwise not be returned to the author.*

Authors should leave at least one inch on all sides to make it possible for the editor to insert instructions to the printer. Content notes, numbered consecutively, bibliographic references, tables, and figures should be placed on separate sheets and not included within the text or at the bottom of text page. Where the manuscript is intended as an article, the author should also add an abstract of 50 to 75 words summarizing its contents.

The list of bibliographic references should be double-spaced. No vertical lines are to be included in the table; however, a horizontal line should separate the table title from the column headings, and the column headings from the body of the table. A single line is used to mark the end of the body of the table. Acknowledgements are to be included at the end of the text.

Examples of PSR's norms for categories, style and format will be found in any recent issue of the Review.

The editor will generally acknowledge receipt of manuscripts by surface mail. If the author feels that a quicker reply is desirable, he/she should enclose sufficient postage to cover the added cost.