

,



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

# Human Factors Associated with Use of

Community Services by Mexican Americans in Michigan presented by

Elda Nair Pelayo

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

M.S. \_\_\_\_\_degree in \_\_\_\_\_ Family and Child Ecology

Nelson

Major professor

Date\_\_\_\_\_Spring 1982

**O**-7639

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution



• .

# HUMAN FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH

# USE OF

# COMMUNITY SERVICES BY MEXICAN AMERICANS IN MICHIGAN

By

Elda Nair Pelayo

A THESIS

Submitted to

Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCES

Department of Family and Child Ecology

### ABSTRACT

#### HUMAN FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH

#### USE OF

### COMMUNITY SERVICES BY MEXICAN AMERICANS IN MICHIGAN

By

Elda Nair Pelayo

64.103

Human factors of gender, age and area of residence were related to human perceptions of effectiveness, importance and satisfaction with community services by Mexican Americans in Michigan.

The present study used secondary analysis of the data collected for the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project NC-128 "Quality of Life According to Area of Residence".

Hypotheses were analyzed based on percentages of frequencies, rank ordering, Chi-square and Pearson's coefficient of correlation.

Data analysis yielded few significant results, however, suggestions for future research were presented with special emphasis on further studies of Mexican Americans.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My recognition to Dr. Linda Nelson, my Major Professor, for her encouragement and assistance. I am also indebted to Professor Peter Gladhart and Professor Ann Field, members of my committee, for their insights, comments and the dedication of their time. I also appreciate the assistance of Dr. Dennis Keefe, for permitting the use of data from the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project NC-128.

The simple recognition of these professors is insufficient. Their support went beyond what is normally expected. I am grateful for their moral support in helping me overcome problems of language and culture. For their genuine friendship, I will be forever grateful.

I also wish to express my gratitude to INTA Agentina for financial support and for their confidence in my ability to use this opportunity in furthering the goals of my nation.

I sincerely appreciate the friendship of many people from all of the Americas at Michigan State, for whom borders and languages were not limitations to understanding.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION Statement of the Problem Objectives of Study Significance of the Study Limitations of the Study Operational Definitions Conceptual Framework Hypotheses	1 3 4 5 7 7 9 12
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
III.	METHODOLOGY Sample Design and Selection Research Subsample Variables Selected Development of Secondary Instrument Statistical Tests Used Computer Programs	22 25 27 29 31 32 33
IV.	FINDINGS Relationship Between Perception of Importance and Reported Community Services.	34 35
	Relationship Between Importance Placed Upon Community Services and Satisfaction with Them.	37
	Relationship Between Age and Use. Effect- iveness, Importance and Satisfaction.	45
	Relationship Between Age of Residence and Use, Effectiveness, Importance and Satisfaction with Community Services.	54
ν.	TESTS OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	67
IV.	SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	76

# APPENDICES

Α.	Elements and Domains of Life Quality	84
В.	Research Instruments	88
c.	Summary of Discussion about Hypotheses	91
REF	ERENCES	94

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Importance Placed Upon Community Service by Gender.***	36
2	Use of Community Services by Gender.	38
3	Ranking of Community Services According to Use and Importance, all Services.	39
4	Relationship of Importance and Use of Community Services According to Gender.	40
5	Satisfaction with Community Services by Gender.***	41
6	Ranking of Community Services According to Importance and Satisfaction all Respondents.	43
7	Relationship of Importance and Satisfaction with Community Services by Gender.	44
8	Use of Community Services Reported by Female Adults and Adolescents.	46
9	Effectiveness of Community Services Perceived by Female Adults and Adolescents.	47
10	Importance of Community Services Reported by Female Adults and Adolescents.	48
11	Satisfaction with Community Services Reported by Female Adults and Adolescents,	50
12	Use of Community Services Reported by Male Adults and Adolescents.	51
13	Effectiveness of Community Services Perceived by Male Adults and Adolescents.	52

TABLE		PAGE
14	Importance of Community Services Reported by Male Adults and Adolescents.	53
15	Satisfaction with Community Services Reported by Male Adults and Adolescents.	55
16	Use of Community Services Reported by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Females.	56
17	Effectiveness of Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Females.	58
18	Importance of Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Females.**:	* 59
19	Satisfaction with Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Females.***	60
20	Use of Community Services Reported by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Males.	63
21	Effective Use of Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Males.	64
22	Importance of Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonemtropolitan Males.***	65
23	Satisfaction with Community Services Perceived by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Males.***	66

# LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Human Ecology Model Source: The Human Ecosystem: A Model Bubolz et al (1979).	9
2	Human Ecology Model Adapted for the Analysis of Data from Study of Community Services Used by Michigan Mexican Americans.	11

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

For a long time, it has been a concern of social workers to understand the lack of use that people make of community services. These resources that are available in different amounts in different communities tend to satisfy people's needs at different levels.

Although it seems apparent that community services affect quality of life through their manifest roles, which are the surface actions of the services in interacting with people, for example, health services-health schools-education, it is also assumed that community services improve the quality of life of the population they serve through their latent roles. Although the auto-exclusion of possible beneficiaries from the services does not refer only to minority groups, like Mexican Americans, the availability of data related to this population provides an opportunity to look for some possible reason that could help to understand this phenomenon.

Researchers and social planners have recently placed emphasis on the study of the factors that lead to acheiving quality of life and different perspectives from a variety of disciplines have been used for this purpose. Among these

perspectives is the human ecological approach which derives from a general ecological model, it considers organisms interacting with their environment as an ecosystem. This ecosystem has three central organizing concepts: human environed unit, environments, and interactions and transaction between and among the components (Sprout and Sprout, 1965). The human environed unit can be either a single individual (with biophysical, psychological and social dimensions) or a group of people who share common resources, goals, values and interests and have a sense of identity. Social and cultural constructions belong to what is defined as human constructed environment. An example of these social constructions are the community services upon which this study is based. The relationship of reciprocal influence among components of the system is defined as interaction (Bubolz, Eicher, Evers and Sontag. 1980).

Abraham Maslow (1954) proposed a hierarchy of human needs, where the physiological needs of hunger and thirst are the most primitive and prepotent, and the higher ones cannot emerge until these are satisfied. The need for safety is the following and it means to be protected from physical dangers. When this physiological need is gratified, the need for love, affection and belongingness emerges. The next level is the need for self-respect, self esteem and the esteem of others. The last need is the one for self actualization - the desire of self-fulfillment - to become everything that one is capable of becoming. Ackerman (1977), considers that the satisfaction

people feel goes beyond the mere possesion of material goods, but satisfaction and/or frustrations depend on objective reality on one side and on aspirations and expectations on the other (Campbell, 1972).

The findings of Bubolz and Eicher (1976) and Campbell et al. (1976) indicate that satisfaction with the quality of life is closely linked to feelings about the family. Satisfaction with community services is low and is considered of least importance according to Helmick (1980). Little is known however, about the factors associated with the use of community services in terms of fulfillment of families' needs and about the characteristics of the relationship between Mexican Americans and the human constructed environment for external social units as defined by Miller (1975). Salcedo (1979) stated that social planners of minority programs need to have information of the needs and concerns of their target groups.

The purpose of this study is to focus upon Mexican Americans, the United States' second largest minority group (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971), their use of community services and some of the factors associated with this use.

# Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to analyze some human factors associated with the use of community services among Mexican

Americans:

Specifically this study explores the following questions:

- Which are the three services ranked as the most important by Mexican Americans?
- 2. How often do Mexican Americans report the use of these services?
- 3. Is gender associated with differences in services selected and use reported?
- 4. Is there any relationship between importance and satisfaction with the services?
- 5. How are perceived effectiveness, importance and satisfaction associated with reported use of services?
- 6. Are age and residential areas associated with use of services?

# Objectives of Study

The objectives of this study are the following:

- 1. To determine human factors that are associated with the use of community services among Mexican Americans.
- 2. To determine the relationship of: a) female and male Mexican Americans, b) male adults and male adolescents, c) female adults and female adolescents, d) male adults and male adolescents from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of residence and e) female adults and femal adolescents from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of residence for:

- 2.1 reported use of community services
- 2.2 perceived effectiveness of community services
- 2.3 reported importance of community services
- 2.4 reported satisfaction with community services

# Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be considered in terms of both methodology and findings. With respect to metodology, this study uses secondary analysis, defined by Herbert H. Hayman (1972, p. 1) as the "extraction of knowledge topics other than those which were the focus of the original surveys".

The analysis of existing survey data, rather than collecting data in a new survey, makes it possible to economize money, time and personnel. Hayman (1972), estimates that the phases of a survey essential to producing data consume about 40% of the total budget. In terms of time, he considers that the three or four months or more needed for field work and coding, ignoring the time of preparation for these activities, can be compressed into less than three or four weeks, not using large staff of interviewers, which is another economy not worthy of disdain.

Besides these practical benefits, secondary analysis allows researchers to obtain information without any intrusion and exacerbation of social conflict, and at the same time, protects people's good will toward survey, that according

to Hayman, must not have been worn out any faster than necessary. This methodology also benefits science because it increases the types and number of data sources and measurement procedures studied by primary surveys which can be compared to cover a wide array of social conditions. This wider perspective also expands the intellectual horizon, since it stimulates thinking about otherwise forgotten problems and forces higher levels of abstraction.

Other benefits that can be mentioned are: 1) understanding of the past, 2) understanding of change, 3) examing problems comparatively, 4) improving general knowledge through replication and enlargement and 5) enlarging theory.

With respect to findings, this study will help to better understand some factors that are associated with the use of community services among Mexican Americans. This information can assist social planners in their program efforts to obtain more participation from this minority group.

Since participation has been considered valuable by the researcher, some considerations about it are necessary at this point. The concept of participation has gained wide popularity during the last decade. Now it is accepted that the beneficiaries of social programs must be involved in efforts to change and improve their lives. In spite of this, the practical applications and implications of participation are interpreted in many different ways.

It is an assumption of this researcher that community services which provide for basic needs of people can also be

organized to facilitate the acquisition by users of knowledge and skills for effective participation in their society. This perspective can bring more people-centered programs rather than only those programs focussed on the final outcomes or products of the different activities.

### Limitations of the Study

Since the data were collected during 1977 and 1978, the conclusions reported many not necessarily reflect the way Mexican Americans feel in 1982. The data only reflects the view of Mexican Americans in two communities in Michigan.

Since the researcher did not participate in the original data collection, no experiential interpretation of the data can be made.

# Operational Definitions

#### Human Factors

- Age: It was classified as adults and adolescents. For purposes of this study adults were considered those who responded to forms for husband and wife. Adolescents were those oldest sons and daughters, between 12 and 18 years, who completed forms for adolescents.
- Gender: Males included both adults (209) and adolescents (39); females included both adults (208) and adolescents (43).

3. Perception: Four classifications of perception were asked of the respondents without providing any definition of the concepts of use, importance, effectiveness and satisfaction. Each respondent used a seven point scale to classify each perception of each community service as will be explained in methodology.

#### Community Services

For the purpose of the original study a list of thirteen services was given to the respondents without any definition of each of them. These services were: business, church, day care services, employment, general services, health, housing, places to buy things, police and fire services, recreation for adults and recreation for children, schools, and transportation. All respondents were asked about perceptions of use and effectiveness related to the above thirteen services In terms of importance and satisfaction, adults were asked about all thirteen services while adolescents were asked only about the following six: church, employment, police and fire, recreation for children, school, and transportation.

# Mexican Americans

At least one of the adult respondents in each family had to self-identify as Mexican American.

### Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan

For the purpose of the original study, communities with populations between 50,000 and 250,000 were considered as metropolitan and those with a population of 5,000 or less were considered nonmetropolitan.

# Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is the human ecological model. (Fig. 1). Its central concepts have already been described.

This perspective allows the researcher to study interaction between an individual (human environed unit HEU) and the human behavioral, human constructed and natural environments. These three environments that furnish the resources necessary for life are embedded within each other.



Fig. 1. Human Ecological Model. Source: The Human Ecosystem: A Model. Bubolz et al. (1979)

The natural environment (NE) is formed by nature with space-time, physical and biological components. All these components are interrelated.

The human constructed environment (HCE) has been defined as an environment altered or created by human beings. It includes modifications made by humans of the natural environment's physical and biological components and other social and cultural constructions. Social institutions that perform essential societal functions are part of HCE's sociocultural component.

The human behavioral environment (HBE) has been defined as the environment of human beings and their biophysical, psychological and social behaviors. This environment is essential for meetings biological and physical needs and the social and psychological needs for love, relationships, communication, knowledge and self-fulfillment.

All components exist objectively, whether or not individuals or groups are aware of them, and exist also subjectively according to the extent and maner that individuals and groups perceive them.

For the purpose of this study selected relationships among the environments were studied. The adaptation of this model made to show the relationships studied and the assumptions upon which the analysis is presented. (Fig. 2). The HEU was Mexican Americans; perception of effectiveness, importance and satisfaction constituted the HBE studied; comunity services as creations of human beings, belonged to



Fig. 2. Human Ecological Model Adapted for the Analysis of Data from Study of Community Services Used by Michigan Mexican Americans. the HCE and the NE was represented by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of residence.

Some assumptions were made related to each of the elements studied in each environment, they were the following:

- HEU: Mexican American family in role structured
- HBE: Based on the role structure of the family there are different attitudes between females and males towards community services
- HCE: Females and males have equal accessibility to community services
- NE: There is more sexual role differentiation between females and males in metropolitan areas than in nonmetropolitan ones.

# Hypotheses

For the purpose of this research on Mexican Americans, six hypotheses were developed for testing.

- H<sub>1</sub>: There will be significant difference between females and males in the community services they perceive important.
- H<sub>2</sub>: There will be significant relationship between perception of importance and the reported use of community services.
  H<sub>2.1.</sub>: There will be a positive relationship between perception of importance and the reported use of community services.

- H<sub>2.2</sub>: There will be difference between females and males and their perception of importance and reported use of community services.
- H<sub>3</sub>: There will be a significant relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.
  - H<sub>3.1</sub>: There will be an inverse relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.
- H<sub>4</sub>: Among females, there will be no significant age differences in the level of:
  - a. use of community services reported
  - b. perceived effectiveness of community services
  - c. importance of community services ranked
  - d. satisfaction with community services reported
- H<sub>5</sub>: Among males, there will be no significant age differences in the level of:
  - a. use of community services reported
  - b. perceived effectiveness of community services
  - c. importance of community services ranked
  - d. satisfaction with community services reported

- H<sub>6</sub>: Among metropolitan and nonmetropolitan females and males, there will be significant differences in the level of:
  - a. use of community services reported
  - b. perceived effectiveness of community services
  - c. importance of community services ranked
  - d. satisfaction with community services reported

# CHAPTER II

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Little research has been done relating to the problem proposed in this study. However, related aspects have been considered.

The study of factors that lead to achieving quality of life has been a concern for a variety of diciplines and, because of that, different approches have been utilized. The complexity and diversity of the phenomenon under study makes necessary that the framework to be utilized for its conceptualization and analysis would allow the integration of criteria from several disciplines. The Human Ecological Approach fulfills this requirement according to Auerswald (1968). This perspective derives from a general ecological model, in which organisms are regarded in interaction with their environment as an ecosystem. According to this approach humans as individuals and in groups, are affected by their spatial and temporal distribution. Human capacities to contrive and adapt the environment to one's needs mean that both environmental influences on humans and human perception and creation of that environment must be taken into account (Melson, 1980).

A human ecosystem according to Evans (1956) involves production, circulation, transformation and storage of energy, matter and information through biological, physical and social processes. The relationship of reciprocal influence among components of the system is defined as interaction (Bubolz, Eicher, Evers and Sontag, 1980). According to Morrison (1974) from the human constructed environment comes the processed information and the decision-making which to some degree reflect the measurement of satisfaction with the built environment, that is the ability of the built environment to meet human needs.

Maslow (1954) postulated five levels of human needs to fulfill these needs:

- Physiological needs: To survive, people need food, clothing and shelter. These represent the most elemental needs.
- Safety and security needs: When physiological needs are satisfied, people want to keep and protect what they have.
- 3. Social needs: As the environment becomes more stable, people seek to be part of something larger than self. They have social needs for belonging, for sharing, and association, for giving and receiving friendship and love.
- Ego needs: These are the needs for self-confidence, independence, achievement competence and knowledge.
- 5. Self-fulfillment needs: As the capstone of all other needs, people want to realize the full range of their individual potential as human beings.

Of thirteen community services considered in this study, one could assume that housing, general services and places to buy things are included in the first level of Maslow's hierarchy; day care services, health and police and fire services are included in the second level; church, recreation for adults and recreation for children are included in the third level; business and school are included in the fourth level. Employment could be included in the first level because it facilitates survival. If the employment provides other needs, it might be included in many or all of the other levels. The clasification of transportation is not clear. Transportation pertains to the human constructed environment and its functions in relation to Maslow's hierarchy problem, vary by size of community. This rough classification is based on the interpretation of the researcher. If some definitions had been given in the original study, this classification could be completely different.

Although Helmick (1980) stated that satisfaction with community services has a low correlation with quality of life as a whole, little is known about the factors associated with actual use of services.

Parsons (1960) stated that the nuclear family is rolestructured, based on generation and sex differentiation. He also considered that the last one is a qualitive mode of differentiation that tends to appear in all systems regardless of their composition. According to Parsons' opinion, society in many respects reinforces this differentiation in the family

through the articulation between family and occupational system that is placed upon the one adult male and the responsibility of mother role on the one adult female. This role system is only possible as a unit of an integrated system of social interaction, where common values are shared, and there is acceptance of the goals ascribed to one's own sexrole and corresponding renunciation of those ascribed to the others.

The following definitions could be helpful to understand Parsons' theory.

Expressive, concerned primarily with integration or solidarity of the group. While husband-father is away at work, the mother may stay at home, responsible for the emotional satisfaction of the family (Parsons and Bales, 1960). <u>Instrumental</u>, primarily concerned with relation of the group to the external situations. In the nuclear family the husbandfather tends to specialize in these activities (Parsons and

Bales, 1960).

<u>Role</u>, that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines participation in an interactive process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning personal actions and those of others with whom interaction occurs (Parsons and Shils, 1951 in Nye and Berardo, 1981).

Parsons' theory has been the base for the establishment of the hypotheses of this study. Based on the sexual differentiation of roles, different perception about community

services between females and males was assumed and also different frequency of use. It was also assumed that the degree of exposure that Mexican Americans have to the majority American culture by their area of residence either metropolitan or nonmentroitan would be associated with differences of the degree of sexual role differentiation.

In terms of the concern of this study some characteristics of Mexican Americans could be helpful to take into account. Mexican Americans constitute the second largest minority group in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971). Despite this fact, little research has focused upon this group. Findings from studies done, mostly in New Mexico and Texas, help to understand family life in the rural environment, but there is a lack of information about the 80% of Mexican Americans who live in urban areas. Alfredo Mirande (1977) stated that even though a proliferation of research on the Mexican American family has occurred, almost all of the studies tended to focus on a dominant family type making comparison to a middle-class, white, Protestant ideal. On the other side, some researchers tried to compensate and presented an idealized and romanticized image of the Chicano family.

Two contradictory views of the family have emerged. The stereotypical view of the family has been rejected by other findings like the prevailing pattern of shared decision-making and action taking among Mexican American husbands and wives (Hawkes and Taylor, 1975). The more traditional view still indicates strong role division along the Parsonian lines of

gender differences.

Even when their family patterns have been involved in a change process through generations, as a result of their struggle to survive as a minority, they may be considered as familistic, since they place more value on family relationships and obligations than most Anglo Americans. Their clanishness is a defense for a poor and unskilled population in a demanding, indifferent or hostile world (Moore, 1976). Murillo (1971) stated that the family is so important that in case of a conflict between it and school or work the Mexican Americans will be more sensitive to femilial demands. In times of stress or when problems arise, a Chicano will turn to the family rather than to outside agencies, for help. Sharing and cooperation are encouraged and valued. There is no distinction between relatives and friends, and the last mentioned are symbolically incorporated into the family by means of the institution of "compadrazgo" that is the relationship between parents and godparents of a child.

Ramos (1973) pointed out the difficulties of social agencies to understand the auto-exclusion of Mexican Americans from their programs. According to this author, social agencies do not know the true conditions of the families. They learn about the isolated instances or problems which are specifically related to the agency's specialty. Thus, for example, the school is concerned with school absenteeism, while welfare is concerned with money, and as a result the family is between the action of different agencies without being connected to any

one of them because the family copes with the practical circumstances in its every day life not as separate events, but as events that are very much related to each other.

Based on the literature review already done, it could be briefly stated that the use of community services is associated with some human factors related to the background knowledge of the people who obtain benefits from them. As a result of oversimplified models of family types, there is no systematic knowledge about the way Mexican Americans interact with external social units.

The hypotheses of this study are based on the traditional perspective of Mexican Americans, since it is the most used in the studies done about this ethnic minority. It is assumed by the researcher that although the findings may not provide proof of the traditional perspective, they could facilitate identification of Mexican Americans in Michigan with respect to a potential tendency in relation to this perspective.

### CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on secondary analysis of data collected for the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project NC-128. "Quality of Life According to Area of Residence".

This study was developed to find some systematic knowledge about quality of life, its components, the way those components vary among different kinds of population, and the extent to which they can be realized in metropolitan communities as compared with nonmetropolitan ones. This systematic knowledge could enhance policy formulation directed toward improving the well-being of families, including the economically disadvantaged and ethnic minorities.

Since one characteristic of the American society is its plurality, it can be assumed that there are differences in people's values, aspirations and life styles. Project NC-128 was designed to determine some of the variance in achievement of self-determined aspects related to quality of life.

The objectives of the study were:

- To describe areas of residence in terms of the factors that influence quality of life, and to assess the impact of these factors upon households with differing social and economic characteristics.
- To establish a descriptive base in order to document and analyze change in attributes of quality of life and their achievements.

The following fourteen states took part in the regional project: Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Texas. Since Michigan is the state with the second largest concentration of Mexican Americans outside the southwest, and this ethnic minority family has not been systematically studied, this state was one of the four where data were collected on totally Mexican American samples.

Each of the states in the Project collected the data using a common primary and secondary instrument. The questionnaires used in the interviews were pre-tested for validity and reliability. Each state also drew the samples, using identical or compatible methods, from at least one nonmetropolitan and one metropolitan community.

The primary instrument was used to obtain sociodemographic information about the family, such as age, education, relationship of all household members, number of years of marriage, number of children not living at home, current labor force status and health status of husband and wife,

family income, housing tenure, and number of years lived in present dwelling, neighborhood, community, and state. Respondents also provided information about their employment, kind of work, religion, and ethnic origin.

The respondents also ranked nine domains in order of importance to their quality of life, housing, leisure and recreation, education, financial security, work, religion, community, family and friends.

The importance of many elements of life quality were rated on a seven point scale ranging from (1) "extremely unimportant" to (7) "extremely important". Satisfaction with these elements was assessed on a seven point scale ranging from (1) "extremely disatisfied" to (7) "extremely satisfied".

The different elements of community life evaluated by respondents were factor analyzed into two domains, which were identified as community services and community environment (Appendix A).

The community services specified in the original study were: school, health services, day care services, police and fire services, transportation, places to buy things, general services, business services, adult recreation, kids recreation, church, employment opportunities and quality of housing.

Respondents were asked to assess the adequacy of their family income and also to report the amount of control they felt they had over their lives.

According to the interest of the NC-128 Project, the impact of area of residence upon life satisfaction was taken into account. Husbands and wives, were asked to compare several aspects of their current situation with circumstances five years earlier on a scale ranging from "much worse" to "much better".

Adolescent respondents were asked about expectations and aspirations concerning marriage and children and education, importance of their current employment, and impact of employment on life quality. They also rendered an assessment of the impact of different aspects of their father's and mother's employment upon their own quality of life. Secondary questions were developed as packages and were used to collect more in-depth data with respect to particular domains.

# Sample Design and Selection

### Metropolitan

Michigan had ten standard metropolitan statistical areas which met the sampling criteria of the NC-128 Project which was to have population between 50,000 and 250,000. Only four of those ten had more than 1,000 Spanish speaking families with children under 18, to provide the 100 sample families needed. These communities were Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing - East Lansing, and Saginaw. The last one was randomly selected.
To assure the probability of proportionate representation of city blocks where the highest concentration of Mexican Americans was found, the original sample design was to be a systematic random one. According to its requirements, this procedure would have been too expensive in terms of money and time, since the sample families had to have both parents present, at least one of whom was Mexican American, and at least one child 18 years of age or younger. As an alternative, sample families were selected from a list of Spanish surnames taken from the Polk City Directory for Saginaw. This list was composed by the Latin American Affairs Department of the Catholic Diose of Saginaw.

One parent was interviewed in each of the 106 selected families, the other parent and the oldest child between 12 and 18 years old (54 available), completed a self administered questionnaire. The data collection took place during the months of November and December 1977 and January and February 1978.

### Nonmetropolitan

According to the Regional Project, to meet the sampling criteria, a County should have a population of 5,000 or less and a sizeable concentration of Spanish speaking population, to provide the 100 sample families needed. Census records of 1970 revealed that Gratiot County fulfilled these requirements. The Local Latin American Department Office in Alma, the largest city of the county, listed the Mexican American household heads by names, with addresses and telephone numbers.

These names were grouped by communities, the four largest being Alma, St. Louis, Ithaca and Brekenridge.

To be eligible, a family had to fulfill the same requirements as the families in the metropolitan area, i.e. have two parents, at least one of whom was Mexican American, and at least one child 18 years of age or younger.

Members of 126 households were interviewed. Of these, 51 were from Alma, 29 from St. Louis, 21 from Ithaca, 8 from Brekenridge and 17 from smaller communities in Gratiot County. The data were collected between January and May 1978.

## Research Subsample

The selection of the sample for the present study was based on the criteria of rejecting those respondents whose answers were coded as missing data in relation of an entire block of questions for either use, effectiveness importance or satisfaction. The number of cases dropped was 62.

Secondly, since examination of the questionnaires revealed that some respondents checked the same answer for an entire category of perception of services and on the assumption that this indicated a lack of seriousness on the part of the respondents, it was decided to eliminate all of those who reported identical level of use and effectiveness (N cases dropped 32) or identical level of importance and satisfaction for all the 13 services (N cases dropped 27). Total eliminated was 60, because nine cases were classified with both errors.

The total number of cases available when these criteria were applied was 499. These can be split as follows: 417 adults (209 males and 208 females) and 82 adolescents (39 males and 43 females).

The collection of data on identical or comparable items from husband, wife and adolescent in the same family would seem to allow the analysis of intra-family concordance or discordance. The level of analysis that would be required went beyond the current ability of this researcher and would have been possible only with a great deal of outside help. Since the criteria for selecting the sample, as was expressed above, were based primarily on the quality of the answer given by the respondents and after checking that there were too few families with complete data for the husband, and wife and the adolescent in the same family, the idea of learning new methods of analysis was discarded as unreasonable at this time.

Since adolescents were not asked about all the thirteen community services considered in the study, with relation to importance and satisfaction, the analysis, where the variable age was considered, was made upon the six services where data for the three (husbands, wives and adolescent) were available. These services were: church, employment, police and fire services, recreation for children, school, and transportation.

### Independent variable:

The independent variable in this study is gender. According to Parsons and Bales (1960), sex determines a differentiation of functions in terms of external and internal relations of the family as a system. Thus, the relationship of the system to outside systems is an instrumental function developed by males while the expressive function related to the internal affairs of the system is developed by females.

The primary instrument collected the data related to this variable as follows:

### Sex

Wife

Husband 1

2

# Adolescent

What is your sex? Circle 1 for male

2 for female

Dependent variables: The dependent variables considered are:

- 1. Use of community services: as reported by respondents.
- Perceived effectiveness: the perception that respondents have about the degree of effectiveness of community services.
- Importance of services: perception respondents have about the importance community services have.

 Satisfaction with services: perception of how satisfied the respondents feel about the community services.

The primary instrument collected the data related to each of these variables for each of the 13 community services: school, health services, day care services, police and fire services, transportation, places to buy things, general services, business services, adult recreation, kids recreation, church, employment opportunities, quality of housing, as follows:

Now, please think about the.....available in your community.

I use this seldom 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I use these often

b. Now, please think about the....available in you community

Ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Effective

c. Some of these items may be important to you. Some may not. Using the importance scale please circle the number which indicates how important each of these is to the quality of your life.

Kind of servicesImportance.....1234567

d. Using the satisfaction scale, please circle the number which indicates how satisfied or disatisfied you are with the availability and quality of each of the following in your community. Kind of services

..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Third variables: This study also considered two third or intervening variables. They are:

Age: that was operationalized in terms of adults and adolescents and Area of residence that was operationalized according to metropolitan and nonmetropolitan as determined by sample selection. These third variables were used to control the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

Development of Secondary Instrument

A secondary instrument was developed to be used in this study (Appendix B). This secondary instrument utilized the code of the following orginal variables: sex of respondents and area of residence, and recoded the use of community services, perceived effectiveness, importance of community services, satisfaction with community services and age of respondents.

Since the researcher was not concerned with the slight differentiation given by the 1 to 7 scale used in the primary instrument related to the variables use of community services, perceived effectiveness, importance of and satisfaction with community services, the secondary one recoded the scores as follows:

Primary Code	Secondary Code
1 - 2	1 (low)

3	-	4	-	5	2	(medium)
	6	-	7		3	(high)

Statistical Tests Used

In order to determine the relationship between the reported use of community services and their perceived effectiveness, importance and satisfaction by gender, the nonparametric statistical method selected was chi-square. Nonparametric statistics or distribution-free methods do not assure that the underlying distribution of the population approximates a normal curve. They depend on the use of the median rather than the mean (Siegel, 1956, p. 3). Most nonparametric tests apply to data in an ordinal scale (Siegel, 1956, p. 31).

Chi-square  $(X^2)$  is suitable for analysing data when the interest is placed on the number of subjects which fall in various categories. It tests whether a significant difference exists between an observed number of subjects falling in each category and an expected number based on the null hypothesis (Siegel, 1956, p. 43).

Gamma was obtained to tell the direction of the ordering in the contingency tables; it does not take ties or table sizes into account, so it generally has higher numerical values than tau (Nie, et al., 1975, p. 228). In the present study this measure was used in the tables 4 and 7.

Spearman's  $r_s$ , was used to determine correlation between the ranks of two variables. This measure can be interpreted as a product-moment correlation applied to ranks rather than raw scores (Blalock, 1972, p. 416). This measure was used in tables 3, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

## Computer Programs

Analysis was done on the Control Data Corporation CYBER 750 model computer using the 8.0 version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, et al., 1975). All of the computations were implemented at the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory.

#### CHAPTER IV

#### FINDINGS

This chapter contains the results of the analysis of the data. The findings for the present study are presented under the following section headings:

- 1. Relationship between gender and importance of services.
- 2. Relationship between perception of importance and reported use of community services.
- 3. Relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.
- Relationship between age and use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction by gender.
- Relationship between area of residence and use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction with community services.

All tabulated data in this chapter are presented in alphabetical order by community services in order to facilitate location of data for any specific service.

Relationship Between Gender and Importance

The first topic of analysis was the relationship between gender and the importance placed on the 13 community services

considered in the study. The percentages of males and females rating each service as "high" in importance are presented (Table 1).

A ranking was made based on these frequencies. More males gave housing a high ranking than they did any other service while housing ranked only sixth in frequency of high rating for females. This major difference aside, the three most important for females coincided with the second, third and fourth for males although not in the same rank order. They are: health, police and fire services and school.

Based on the chi-square statistic, the data show that males and females gave a significantly different evaluation of the importance of six services ( $p \le .05$ ): general services, housing, police and fire services, transportation, recreation for adults, and recreation for children. One other service, the church, just missed the criterion of significance at .06.

Relationship Between Perception of Importance and Reported Use of Community Services

The second topic of analysis was the relationship between gender and use of community services. The three services reported as the most used by both males and females in identical rank order were: places to buy things, church

	Males	(N:248)	Females	(N:251)		
Services	r %	**	. %	**		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ರ
Business	76.6	10	68.1	6	4.84717	.0886
Church	77.0	6	71.3	7	5.60071	.0608
Day care services	61.4	13	56.5	12	1.19690	.5497
Employment	82.1	S	78.8	Ŋ	3.34606	.1877
General services	79.9	7	70.7	8	6.12867	.0467*
Health	88.5	2	83.7	ę	2.25774	.3234
Housing	91.4	1	77.4	Q	15.53564	*7000.
Places to buy things	81.5	9	80.1	4	10661.	.9053
Police and fire	87.5	3.5	84.6	2	6.14552	.0463*
Recreation for adults	s 64.4	12	42.9	13	19.12524	.0001*
Recreation for children	7.77	ω	63.7	10	12.88308	.0016*
Schools	87.5	3.5	86.9	1	.05569	.9725
Transportation	67.9	11	57.2	11	6.38480	.0411*
*Significant at p <	< .05					

Importance Placed Upon Community Services by Gender.\*\*\* Table 1.

\*\* Recoded from 6+7 of the original scale

\*\*\*Because adolescents were not asked to rank importance for all services, but were all included for calculating this table if 100% of adult males (209) ranked those services high, 84% would be the highest percent of high rank. If 100% of females (208) ranked those services higher, 83% would be the highest percent of high rank.

and school (Table 2). The only differences between males and females in reported use of services to have statistical significance were employment and school (p= .02).

The relationship between importance and use is significant at the .01 level with a  $r_s = .78$ . Ranking of the importance of services and their frequency of use was computed based on the percentage of "high" responses from the entire sample (Table 3).

The results indicate that services considered less important have, in accordance, less use reported, i.e. recreation for adults, transportation and day care services. Some services such as church or places to buy things, in spite of being considered not so important (8 and 5 in ranking) ranked high in use (2 and 1).

The importance and use of individual services were tabulated also according to gender. The strongest relationship between importance and use is related to church, with a gamma of .63 for males and .56 for females (Table 4). Gamma can be interpreted as the proportionate reduction in error in predicting variable two as a consequence of knowing the value of variable one (Blalock, 1972).

Relationship Between Importance Placed Upon Community Services and Satisfaction with Them

There are no significant relationships between satisfaction with community services and gender (Table 5). In

y Gender.
Services b
Community
Use of
Table 2.

	Males	(N:248)	Females	(N:251)		
Services		%	0	~ 0		
	'high'	Rank	'high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Business	28.8	6	27.4	6	3.96605	.1377
Church	64.9	2	68.2	2	.61243	.7362
Day care services	21.1	13	21.7	11	4.97379	.0832
Employment	44.9	Ŋ	33.2	œ	7.82599	.0200*
General services	50.6	4	49.8	4	.24769	.8835
Health	42.5	9	42.0	Ŋ	.51688	.7723
Housing	33.6	7	35.7	9	.56361	.7544
Places to buy things	69.6	1	71.3	1	.28562	.8669
Police and fire	27.4	11	27.1	10	.29713	.8619
Recreation for adults	27.7	10	21.6	12	3.47056	.1764
Recreation for children	33.3	œ	33.5	7	2.09385	.3510
School	54.3	Υ	58.0	n	3.19623	.0251*
Transportation	25.1	12	21.6	13	1.12200	.5706
*Significant at p <	.05					

Services	Imp.*	Use*	
Business	9	9	
Church	8	2	
Day care services	12	13	r <sub>s</sub> = .78
Employment	6	6	p= .01
General services	7	4	
Health	2.5	5	
Housing	4	7	
Places to buy things	5	1	
Police and fire	2.5	10	
Recreation for adults	13	11	
Recreation for children	10	8	
School	1	3	
Transportation	11	12	

Table 3. Ranking of Community Services According to use and Importance, all Services.

\*Rank based on % "high".

Services	Ma	ales	Fema	les
	N	Gamma	N	Gamma
Business	154	. 33	186	.18
Church	242	.63	242	. 56
Day care services	240	. 48	228	. 39
Employment	235	09	223	.00
General services	161	.01	193	.11
Health	197	.28	199	.27
Housing	199	.06	192	.28
Places to buy things	240	.10	244	.26
Police and fire	237	.03	233	. 34
Recreation for adults	121	.06	172	.07
Recreation for children	233	.24	233	.16
School	243	.19	243	07
Transportation	203	01	198	.00

Table 4. Relationship of Importance and use of Community Services According to Gender.

	Males (	N:248)	Females	(N:251)		
Services	%	. 0		%		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	$\mathbf{x}^2$	ಶ
Business	51.4	5.5	46.6	7	1.26127	.5323
Church	72.4	1	69.2	1	1.76322	.4141
Jay care services	38.1	11	33.7	11	3.81658	.1483
3mployment	31.4	12	35.9	10	2.01952	.3643
General services	50.7	7	51.0	5	3.01952	.2210
Health	56.9	4	55.6	ę	.08654	.9577
Housing	50.5	œ	46.1	80	3.53802	.1705
Places to buy things	63.3	2	66.0	2	1.28424	.5262
Police and fire	59.2	ç	52.8	4	2.01576	.3650
Recreation for adults	31.2	13	30.0	13	.06733	.9669
Recreation for children	41.8	6	42.6	6	.49084	.7824
School	51.4	5.5	49.0	9	.31754	.8532
<b>Transportation</b>	41.0	10	32.5	12	5.64566	.0594
***Because adolescents included for calcul high, 84% would be those services high	were not ating thi the highe ter, 83% w	: asked to s table if st percent ould be th	rank satisf E 100% of add C of high ran ne highest p	action for alt males ( nk. If 100 ercent of h	all services, (209) ranked th % of females ( igh rank.	but were all ose services 208) ranked

Satisfaction With Community Services by Gender.\*\*\* Table 5.

terms of ranking, males and females have rated almost the same three services in order of satisfaction: church is first, places to buy things is second and third are police and fire, for males, and health for females. The chi-square statistics satisfaction by gender, for transportation, just missed the criterion of significance at p=.06. All other tabulations for chi-square showed calculated value of  $p \leq .14$ .

As with importance and use, ranking for importance of services and satisfaction with them was computed and also the degree of association measured using the Spearman's rank order correlation (Table 6). Spearman's  $r_s = .53$  with p= .03. Based on the computed ranking, the services considered more important were reported with less satisfaction while some of them, like church that is considered in ninth of importance, was reported the highest in satisfaction. Those considered the less important such as transportation, day care services and recreation for adults (rated 11, 12 and 13 in importance) were reported almost in similar order in terms of satisfaction (10, 11 and 13).

The relationship between importance and satisfaction according to gender shows that there is moderate to strong association among males for the following services: church, day care services, health, places to buy things, police and fire services and school among females for church, health, housing and places to buy things (Table 7).

Services	Imp.*	Satisf.*	
Business	8	7	
Church	9	1	
Day care services	12	11	r <sub>s</sub> = .53
Employment	6	12	p= .03
General services	7	5	
Health	2.5	3	
Housing	4.5	8	
Places to buy things	4.5	2	
Police and fire	2.5	4	
Recreation for adults	13	13	
Recreation for children	10	9	
School	1	6	
Transportation	11	10	

Table 6. Ranking of Community Services According to Importance and Satisfaction all Respondents.

\*Rank based on % "high".

Services	Ma	les	Fema	le
	N	Gamma	N	Gamma
Business	208	. 40	206	. 28
Church	246	.66	250	.61
Day care services	168	.50	193	. 40
Employment	245	02	248	.19
General services	209	. 27	208	.24
Health	209	.73	207	. 50
Housing	204	. 40	206	. 54
Places to buy things	248	.53	250	.60
Police and fire	245	.62	242	.41
Recreation for adults	205	. 22	203	. 25
Recreation for children	244	. 31	249	. 32
School	247	.60	251	.28
Transportation	233	.43	237	.06

Table 7. Relationship of Importance and Satisfaction with Community Services by Gender.

Relationship Between Age and Use, Effectiveness, Importance and Satisfaction

Results of the application of the third variable age divided into adults and adolescents by gender, will be presented next.

# Females

There are no significant differences between female adults and adolescents and the reported use of community services (Table 8). For this analysis where the variable age is considered only six services have been taken into account, since adolescents were not asked about all the services during the original collection of data. In the chi-square analysis no statistically significant differences were found, except for transportation (p= .0006). Females rated church and school as the services most used and in the third place by adult females was employment and recreation for children by adolescents.

In terms of perceived effectiveness, there is no difference between female adults and adolescents based on ranking, based on statistics transportation was reported with p= .0138 (Table 9). The services perceived as more effective by females are: church, police and fire services and school.

Similarly, adult and adolescent females did not differ in their assessment of importance of community services. The three ranked as more important are: school, police and fire services and employment (Table 10).

Adolescents.
and
Adults
Female
bу
Reported
Services
Community
of
Use
Table 8.

	[nbA	lts	Adoles	scents		
Services	6	~ 0	0~	~ 0		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Church	69.7	1	61.0	2	2.04684	.3595
Employment	33.7	ς	30.6	2	2.44807	.2940
Police and fire	26.0	4	32.5	4	.73246	.6933
Recreation for children	17.4	9	41.7	£	5.23971	.0728
School	57.1	2	62.5	1	.95416	.6206
Transportation	22.5	S	17.1	9	14.89794	.0006*

\*Significant at p .05

Effectiveness of Community Services Perceived by Female Adults and Adolescents. Table 9.

	Adu	lts	Adole	scents		
Services	0 ~	~		~°		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ø
Church	82.3	1	83.3	1	.12622	.9388
Employment	32.6	9	42.1	9	5.31877	.0700
Police and fire	65.2	2	70.0	ç	.55335	.7583
Recreation for children	40.0	4	58.5	4	5.03005	.080
School	64.3	ς	76.7	2	5.27709	.0715
Transportation	34.1	5	47.1	5	8.56352	.0138*

\*Significant at p .05

Importance of Community Services Reported by Female Adults and Adolescents. Table 10.

	Adu	lts	Adole	scents		
Services		%	0 ~	ĥ		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	σ
Church	70.2	4	76.7	4	3.32228	.1899
Employment	78.8	ς	78.6	n	.61983	.7335
Police and fire	85.4	2	81.0	2	.86967	.6474
Recreation for children	62.5	S	69.8	S	.97363	.6146
School	86.5	1	88.4	1	.41590	.8122
Transportation	58.0	9	53.5	9	2.76093	.2515

With regard to satisfaction, while there is no difference in terms of ranking (church, police and fire services, and school), statistically satisfaction reported with transportation just missed the .05 at the .0517 (Table 11).

## Males

Based on the same procedure of analysis, percentages, ranking and chi-square, for males, the data in Tables 12, 13, 14 and 15 show the following results: no differences related to community services most used: church, school and employment. Statistical differences is reported for school p= .0223. Statistical differences is reported for transportation p= .0091; related to effectiveness, in terms of ranking, adolescents reported transportation as more effective while adults reported school.

Related to importance, there is coincidence in the two services considered as most important: school and police and fire services. The service ranked third in importance by adult males is employment and by adolescent males is transportation. Two significant statistical differences are shown related to police and fire services and recreation for children; adult males rated both services as more important than did adolescents (Table 14).

The results of the analysis of satisfaction are essentially similar to those for importance, in terms of ranking; however, in this case no statistically significant differences

Adolescents
and
Adults
Female
bу
Reported
Services
Community
with
Satisfaction
11.
Table

	Adu	lts	Adole	scents		
Services	0 -	~0	0 -	%		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Church	69.1		69.8		4.70958	.0949
Employment	36.2	2	34.1	9	4.68969	.0959
Police and fire	50.2	2	64.9	2	3.51512	.1725
Recreation for children	43.2	4	39.5	4	.82769	.6611
School	47.1	n	58.1	Υ	1.90512	.3858
Transportation	31.4	9	38.5	Ŝ	5.92531	.0517

	Adu	lts	Adoles	scents		
Services		%	~	. 0		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ð
Church	64.5	1	66.7	2	3.12852	.2092
Employment	44.8	ς	45.7	ę	1.19592	.5499
Police and fire	26.1	S	34.2	9	2.39255	.3023
Recreation for children	31.8	4	41.0	4	1.38252	.5009
School	51.5	2	70.3	1	7.60239	.0223*
Transportation	22.5	9	38.2	Ŋ	3.73072	.1548

Use of Commuty Services Reported by Males Adults and Adolescents Table 12.

\* significant at  $p \leq .05$ 

	[npW	lts	Adole	scents		
Services	} "high"	x Rank	"high"	ر Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Church	74.3	1	82.1	1	2.80443	.2461
Employment	42.2	Ŋ	51.4	ŝ	2.07264	.3548
Police and fire	67.7	2	69.2	2	.80373	.6691
Recreation for children	44.7	4	41.0	9	1.02591	.5987
School	59.1	ę	56.8	4	.57897	.7486
Transportation	33.9	9	57.1	ო	9.39421	.0091*

Effectiveness of Community Services Perceived by Male Adults and Adolescents Table 13.

\* significant at p < .05

	Adu	lts	Adole	scents		
Services		%	<b>V</b> : <b>-</b>	%		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	Ø
Church	79.4	5	64.1	5.5	4.44575	.1083
Employment	86.0	ε	65.1	4	13.63209	.0011*
Police and fire	89.0	1	79.5	2	6.00256	*0497*
Recreation for children	80.3	4	64.1	5.5	5.72338	.0572
School	87.6	2	87.2	1	.27705	.8706
Transportation	65.9	9	78.9	m	2.99640	.2235

Importance of Community Services Reported by Male Adults and Adolescents. Table 14.

\* significant at p ≤ .05

can be pointed out between adults' and adolescents' satisfaction.

Relationship Between Area of Residence and Use, Effectiveness, Importance and Satisfaction with Community Services

Taking into account the third variable for this study, area of residence, which was divided into metropolitan and nonmetropolitan, the results are presented by gender. Females

There is no difference between females from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas in terms of the services they reported as most used. Based on ranking these services were: places to buy things, church and school.

The differences in reported level of usage were statistically significant with higher use reported by metropolitan residents for 7 of the 13 services: business, day care services, employment, health, housing, recreation for adults and recreation for children (Table 16). In addition school, which had higher use by nonmetropolitan residents also showed statistically significant difference.

Spearman's coefficient tabulated was .81 and p= .005.

In terms of effectiveness, there are differences based on ranking by (metropolitan church, places to buy things and health and nonmetropolitan church, police and fire

and Adolescents.
e Adults
by Mal€
Reported
Services
Community
with
Satisfaction
Table 15.

	[npW	lts	Adole	scents		
Services	0~	~		%		
	"high"	Rank	"high"	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ರ
Church	72.9	1	69.2		.94672	. 6229
Employment	30.6	9	39.9	9	1.49843	.4727
Police and fire	60.7	2	51.3	ς	1.54196	.4626
Recreation for children	41.0	4	46.2	4	1.26233	.5320
School	52.9	ſ	43.6	Ŋ	1.48244	.4765
Transportation	38.6	Ŋ	54.1	2	5.13350	.0768

\* significant at  $p \leq .05$ 

and Nonmetropolitan	
Metropolitan	
bу	
Reported	
Services	
Community.	
of iles	
Use Fema	
16.	
Table	

	Metropoli (No. 109	tan )	Nonmetı (No	copolitan 140)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high"	% Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ø
Business	29.5	6	25.8	œ	8.79861	.0123*
Church	69.2	2	67.4	2	. 34986	.8395
Day care services	26.7	11	18.0	12	7.87740	.0195*
Employment	46.2	7	23.8	10	13.88021	.0010*
General services	49.5	4.5	50.0	4	3.98764	.1362
Health	47.7	9	37.4	Ś	8.74800	.0126*
Housing	49.5	4.5	25.9	6	15.15153	.0005*
Places to buy						
things	75.0		68.4		5.85604	.0535
Police and fire	23.5	12	29.9	7	1.23594	.5390
Recreation for						
adults	27.3	10	17.5	13	13.11202	.0014*
Recreation for						
children	34.3	ø	32.8	9	13.15869	.0014*
School	57.4	ო	58.5	ო	12.27535	.0022*
Transportation	21.8	13	21.4	11	.86456	.6490
* significant at <sub>I</sub>	p <u>≤</u> .05					

r<sub>s</sub>= .81 p= .005

services and school respondents (Table 17). In addition, based on the chi-square statistics, ten out of 13 services showed difference from zero with  $p \leq .05$ . They were: church, employment, general services, health, housing, places to buy things, police and fire services, school, recreation for adults and recreation for children. Spearman's coefficient computed .64; level of significance .03.

No differences related to importance placed on community services by area of residence were found (Table 18). The three considered as more important were: school, police and fire services and health. Statistical differences of  $p \leq$ .05 were reported for 7 out of 13 services. These services were: business, day care services, general services, health, school, recreation for adults and recreation for children. Separman's coefficient computed .89; level of significance .002,

In terms of satisfaction, there is a slight difference based on ranking (Table 19). Females from metropolitan areas reported health in third place, while females from nonmetropolitan areas reported police and fire services in third place. Church and places to buy things, were ranked either first or second (Table 19). Ten statistical differences on satisfaction by area of residence can be pointed out. Metropolitan residents reported higher satisfaction with day care services, employment, health, housing, police and fire services, places to buy things, recreation for adults and recreation for children.

by Metropolitan and	
Perceived	
Services	
Community	Females.
Effectiveness of	Nonmetropolitan 1
Table 17.	

.

	Metropolit (No109)	can	Nonmetro (No.1	oolitan 40)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Business	44.2	10	56.9	9-	5.59238	.0610
Unuton Dav care services	48.0	<b>-</b> ۵	39.4		5.67860	0585
Employment	48.5	000	23.7	13	19.15790	.0001*
General services	60.6	4	60.7	Ś	12.73616	.0017*
Health	70.1	ო	52.3	7	8.44087	.0147*
Housing	60.0	ъ	40.0	6	10.36680	.0056*
Places to buy						
things	73.1	2	62.0	4	6.26595	.0436*
Police and fire	52.4	7	76.3	2	29.44855	*0000.
Recreation for						
adults	37.5	12	25.2	12	13.80002	.0010*
Recreation for						
children	41.0	11	45.0	œ	22.91717	*0000.
School	56.8	9	74.1	ო	12.43633	.0020*
Transportation	31.4	13	39.8	10	2.56660	.2771
* significant at [	o <u>≤</u> .05					

r<sub>s</sub>= .63 p= .03

Table 18.	Importance of Community	y Services	<b>Perceived</b>	bу	Metropolitan	anc
	Nonmetropolitan Female	s. ***		•		

	Metropoli (No. 109	tan )	Nonmetr (No.	opolitan 140)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Business	61.5	11	73.5	œ	11.76997	.0028*
Church	69.4	7	72.9	6	1.62233	.4443
Day care services	67.5	8	48.7	12	8.12953	.0172*
Employment	80.0	Ŋ	77.9	5	.31849	.8528
General services	64.8	6	75.2	7	12.35647	.0021*
Health	86.8	ſ	81.2	2.5	6.77880	.0337*
Housing	79.1	9	76.1	9	1.30816	.5199
Places to buy						
things	81.1	4	79.3	4	3.37741	.1848
Police and fire	89.0	2	81.2	2.5	4.49557	.1056
Recreation for						
adults	37.5	13	47.0	13	19.87050	<b>*</b> 0000.
Recreation for						
children	62.2	10	65.0	10	12.79035	.0017*
School	92.8	-1	82.1	1	7.37390	.0250*
Transportation	59.0	12	55.8	11	4.29022	.1171
*significant at p	< .05			r = .89		
	1			S		

p= .002

\*\*\*Because adolescents were not asked to rank importance for all services but were all included for calculating this table, if 100% of the metropolitan adult females (91) ranked those services high 83% would be the highest percent of high rank. If 100% of nonmetropolitan adult females (117) ranked those services higher, 83% would be the highest percent of high rank.

Table 1	و	Satisfaction with Con	mmunity	Services	Perceived	bу	Metropolitan	and
		Nonmetropolitan Femal	les.***			•	·	

	Metropol: (No. 10	itan 9)	Nonmetro (No.	opolitan [40)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Rusiness	6 77	σ	47 9	9	9 74414	007*
Church	70.0	2	68.6	)	5.46369	.0651
Day care services	42.5	11	27.4	11	12.01388	.0025*
Employment	48.1	2	26.4	12	12.72530	.0017*
General services	57.1	4	46.2	2	5.31468	.0701
Health	61.1	Ś	51.3	4	10.98199	.0041*
Housing	56.7	ъ	37.9	6	7.31330	.0258*
Places to buy						
things	78.4	-1	56.1	2	14.70309	*9000.
Police and fire	53.3	9	52.5	Υ	16.65235	.0002*
Recreation for						
adults	37.2	13	24.8	13	6.09559	.0475*
Recreation for						
children	43.1	10	42.1	∞	10.60688	.0050*
Schoo1	46.8	∞	50.7	S	17.69035	.0001*
Transportation	38.1	12	28.3	10	3.16860	.2051
* significant at p	05			r = .75		
)	ł			S		
				p= .01		

\*\*\*Because adolescents were not asked to rank satisfaction for all services but were all included for calculating this table, if 100% of the metropolitan adult females (91) ranked those services high 83% would be the highest percent of high rank. If 100% of nometropolitan adult females (117) ranked those services higher, 83% would be the highest percent of high rank.

Nonmetropolitan residents reported higher satisfaction with business and school.

## Males

Based on the same analysis, the Tables 20, 21, 22 and 23, show the results of male responses by residence.

There is no difference in the two services males reported as more used: places to buy things and church, but while males from metropolitan areas considered employment as the third one, nonmetropolitan males chose school. Statistical differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) are reported for recreation for adults, business, employment, health, and housing. Spearman's coefficient computed .79; level of significant .01.

More differences based on ranking and statistics are reported related to effectiveness perceived. Males from metropolitan areas considered places to buy things, church and health as the most effective while nonmetropolitan males reported church, police and fire services and school as most effective (Table 21). Significant statistical differences  $(p \le .05)$  were reported for 8 out of 13 services. Males from metropolitan areas reported higher effective uses for: day care services, employment, housing, places to buy things, recreation for adults and recreation for children. Police and fire services and school were reported as higher effective by nonmetropolitan males.

Related to importance placed on services, the differences in terms of ranking is that males from metropolitan areas consider housing as one of the three more important, while
males from nonmetropolitan areas considered police and fire services. Statistical significant differences correspond to day care services and health (Table 22). Spearman's coefficient computed .84 and level of significance .003.

Some differences are reported in terms of satisfaction by ranking (Table 23). Males from metropolitan areas were most satisfied with places to buy things, church and health, while nonmetropolitan males were satisfied with church, police and fire services, and school.

Statistical differentiation of  $p \le .05$  were reported for 11 out of 13 services (Table 23). Males from metropolitan areas reported higher satisfaction with: business, church, day care services, employment, general services, health, places to buy things, police and fire services, recreation for adults, and recreation for children. School was reported as higher in satisfaction by nonmetropolitan males. Spearman's coefficient computed .75; level of significance .01.

and
Metropolitan
Ъу
Reported
Services
Community
of es.
Use Mal
ľable 20.

	Metropoli (No124	tan	Nonmetr (No.,	opolitan 144)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Business	35.6	ω	23.5	12	8.18143	.0167*
Church	65.1	2	64.7	1 ;	.57276	.7510
Day care services	26.5	11	17.1	13	5.28844	.0711
Employment	64.6	Ś	30.7	7	30.15587	*0000.
General services	50.9	4	50.4	4	.42474	.8087
Health	45.7	9	39.8	Ś	9.90421	.0071*
Housing	44.9	7	25.4	6	10.94728	.0042
Places to buy						
things	75.9	Ч	64.4	2	5.85604	.0535
Police and fire	25.0	12	29.3	ω	5.30186	.0706
Recreation for						
adults	31.6	10	24.6	11	9.03680	*0100.
Recreation for						
children	34.6	6	32.3	9	4.64453	.0595
School	47.7	ъ	59.6	m	9.54104	.0085*
Transportation	25.0	13	25.2	10	.06710	.9670

r<sub>s</sub>= .79 p= .01

\* significant at  $p \leq .05$ 

ı and	
Metropolitan	
bу	
Perceived	
Services	
Community Males.	
of n	
Effectiveness Nonmetropolita	
21.	
Table	

	Metropolit (No. 124)	lan	Nonmetropc (No. 142	olitan +)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Business	48.1 70 E	ıç	45.9 70.7	~ r	5.76078	.0561
unurcn Dav care services	53.0	7 00	30.0	11	4.44//2	.0018*
Employment	63.7	4	28.5	12	31.92994	*0000.
General services	61.7	2	61.1	4	1.72256	.4226
Health	64.8	ო	53.8	9	4.28807	.1172
Housing	55.0	7	38.1	6	8.38691	.0151*
Places to buy						
things	73.4	Ч	55.3	Ŝ	14.67945	.0006*
Police and fire	57.5	9	76.1	2	26.34356	*0000.
Kecreation for adults	41.2	13	26.2	13	10.87101	*7700
Recreation for	1	)		)		-
children	49.0	6	40.2	8	7.80059	.0202*
School	47.2	11	67.9	ო	16.60175	.0002*
Transportation	45.2	12	31.9	10	4.64157	.0982

r<sub>s</sub>= .46

\* significant at p  $\leq .05$ 

Nonmetropolitan	
and	
Metropolitan	
Ъу	
Perceived	
Services	
Community	
of	
Importance Males.***	
Table 22.	

	Metropolit (No. 124)	can	Nonmetrop (No. 14	olitan 4)		
Services	"high" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
Rijeinace	78° N	σ	75 4	01	4 74661	0932
Church	28.9	~ œ	5.57	90	1 24852	5357
Dav care services	76.3	10	51.3	13	14.18296	.0008*
Employment	83.2	9	81.3	Ϋ́	.29386	.8634
General services	80.2	7	79.7	7	.12920	.9374
Health	93.4		84.7	m	6.21282	.0448*
Housing	92.3	2	90.7	1	1.30335	.5212
Places to buy						
things	88.1	S	76.3	တ	5.66317	.0589
Police and fire	89.0	4	86.3	2	2.75575	.2521
Recreation for						
adults	62.6	13	65.8	11	1.86816	.3929
Recreation for						
children	73.4	11	81.2	9	5.66128	.0590
School	91.7	ო	84.2	4	4.02086	.1339
Transportation	71.7	12	65.0	12	2.05387	.3581
* significant at p	o <u>≤</u> .05			r <sub>s</sub> = .84		
				p= .003		
		•	•		•	1

\*\*\*Because adolescents were not asked to rank importance for all services, but were all included for calculating this table if 100% of metropolitan adult males (91) ranked those services high 73% would be the highest percent of high ranked. If 100% of nonmetropolitan adult males (118) ranked those services higher, 81% would be the highest percent of high rank.

and	
Metropolitan	
Ъу	
Perceived	
Services	
Satisfaction with Community Nonmetronolitan Males ***	NOIMICLEOPOTELCUI ILLEO
Table 23.	

Services "hig Business 57	Metropolité	an	Nonmetrop	olitan		
Services "hi£ Business 57	(No. 124)		(NO. 14	(†)		
Business 57	gh" %	Rank	"high" %	Rank	x <sup>2</sup>	ಶ
		4	46.6	∞	24.71868	*0000.
Church /J.		2	69.8		7.41057	.0246*
Day care services 47.	0.	6	32.4	11	23.19971	*0000.
Employment 44.	٣.	11	21.6	13	14.46881	.0007*
General services 51.	.6	7	50.0	9	8.62734	.0134*
Health 62.	.6	ო	52.5	2	8.44640	.0147*
Housing 54.	. 7	ى ا	47.5	7	1.27766	.5279
Places to buy						
things 76.	.1	-1	53.2	4	15.17387	.0005*
Police and fire 53.	8.	9	63.3	2	10.56141	.0051
Recreation for						
adults 38.	.6	13	25.6	12	17.83914	.0001*
Recreation for						
children 42.	.5	12	41.3	6	10.07865	.0065*
School 47.	.7	œ	54.3	რ	10.17134	.0062*
Transportation 45.	.1	10	37.9	10	3.05956	.2166
* significant at p <	. 05			r = .75		
)				s =c		
				тоц		

\*\*\*Because adolescents were not asked to rank satisfaction for all services, but were all included for calculating this table if 100% of metropolitan adult males (91) ranked those services high 73% would be the highest percent of high ranked. If 100% of nonmetropolitan adult males (118) ranked those services higher, 81% would be the highest percent of high rank.

## CHAPTER V

### TESTS OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Tests of each of the six hypotheses formulated for this study of human factors associated with use of community services by Michigan Mexican Americans were made using data presented in the findings chapter. The results and some possible reasons for them will be presented and discussed in this chapter. A summary table has been prepared to indicate for each hypothesis, the tests, the results and the discussion used to support or not the hypothesis (Appendix C).

H<sub>1</sub>: There will be significant difference between females and males in the community services they consider important.

Rank orderings and chi-square analysis of male and female ratings of the importance of each service were made based upon the frequencies of high importance ratings (Table 1). With the exception of the ranking given to housing, the rank orderings for men and women were highly similar and gave little support for the hypothesis. While statistically significant differences were found in the degree of importance that men and women attributed to six services, this is not

evidence of any fundamental differences between women and men in their evaluations. All but one service, recreation for adults with 42.9% "high" for women, were rates as high in importance by at least 50 percent of both men and women. In view of the similarity of the rankings, the hypothesis is not confirmed on the basis of these data.

- H<sub>2</sub>: There will be significant relationship between perception of importance and the reported use of community services.
  - H<sub>2.1</sub>. There will be a positive relationship between perception of importance and the reported use of community services.
  - H<sub>2.2</sub>. There will be difference between females and males and their perception of importance and reported use of community services.

This hypothesis is partially supported on the basis of the data (Tables 3 and 4). The findings do not allow the establishment of a direct or inverse relationship between importance and use, since some of the services considered as more important were reported to be used less. This finding is easily understood if it is taken into account, for example, that health is considered the most important, but it does not mean people will use the service if they are not ill.

Some services considered of medium importance such as church, or places to buy things (7 and 4 in ranking) reported the highest use (2 and 1). These findings could be understood in terms of needs fulfillment. Related to the places to buy things, it is true that the family consumption determines the need to buying goods at least once a week, or more often if their purchasing power does not allow them to store purchases in quantity.

In terms of church, it could be said that the religious organizations not only lay down ethical norms, but provide services designed to benefit family life. For example, they provide charity for families in financial distress. Even when the state takes over the financial support, churches provide psychological support to families in trouble. Besides this, religious institutions provide education for marriage and family life, that begins before the couple gets married and follows during all the steps of their lives. Blood, (1972) states that churches in many countries devote more energy than any other social institution to the support of family life.

The services that were reported lowest in importance were also reported lowest in use. They were: day care services, transportation, and recreation for adults.

It was not possible to support  $H_{2.2.}$  based on the result of gamma since none of the gmmas except that for church were  $\leq$  .50 and church was above this for both males and females.  $H_3$ : There will be a significant relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.

- H<sub>3.1</sub>. There will be an inverse relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.
- H<sub>3.2</sub>. There will be difference between females and males in importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the data (Tables 5, 6 and 7). While services considered as most important were reported as achieving moderate satisfaction, those considered moderate in importance were reported as providing high satisfaction, and those rated as least important were reported as reaching least satisfaction.

These findings could be related to the relative deprivation theory. According to this, since some services are considered as the most important by respondents, they have different expectations about them than about those they do not consider so important. The higher the expectations, the higher the demand they will have and therefore, the lower the satisfaction they will feel. On the other hand, lower expectations are felt related to those services they consider lower in importance: the demand or expectations are lower, so the satisfaction is higher.

In terms of gender, there is a moderate to strong association of importance and satisfaction for the following services: school, health, day care services, police and fire services, places to buy things and church for males and health, places to buy things, church and housing for females (gamma .50).

H<sub>4</sub>: Among females, there will be no significant age differences in the level of:

1. Use of community services reported.

- 2. Perceived effectiveness of community services.
- 3. Importance of community services ranked.
- 4. Satisfaction with community services reported.

This hypothesis has been supported by the results of the analysis of the data (Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11).

Rank ordering of importance, use, satisfaction and effectiveness of services were made based upon frequencies. Chi-square analysis of ratings of each service by female adults and adolescents was also performed.

With the exception of the ranking given to satisfaction with transportation that presents a significant statistical difference of .05, no other difference was found.

- H<sub>5</sub>: Among males, there will be no significant age differences in the level of:
  - 1. Use of community services reported.
  - 2. Perceived effectiveness of community services.
  - 3. Importance of community services ranked.

4. Satisfaction with community services reported.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the data analyzed (Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15).

Based on chi-square and rank ordering analysis of use, importance, effectiveness and satisfaction by male adults and adolescents, the adolescents ranked transportation as more effective while adults ranked school as more effective. In terms of importance adolescents reported transportation high, while adults reported employment high. Statistical differences are related to police and fire services and recreation for children.

There are more differences between male adults and adolescents than were observed between female adults and adolescents.

The findings related to  $H_4$  and  $H_5$  can be understood based on the literature reviewed. Mexican American malefemale relations are based on strongly held beliefs in the superiority (biological, intellectual and social) of males. The nature of this relationship is learned very early in childhood. The father-son relationship is generally a distant and respectful one. At a very early age the boys begin to identify with the father and his role. During adolescence, even though the father's power remains, there is a shift toward peer group relations.

The mother-daughter relationship is considered the closest of the parent-child relationships. This is because the identification of roles. In his analysis, Penalosa (1968) pointed out that because of this close relationship prevailing between mother and daughter on emotional and household chore levels, there is a full identification.

H<sub>6</sub>: Among metropolitan and nonmetropolitan Mexican American families and males, there will be significant differences in the level of:

1. Use of community services reported.

2. Perceived effectiveness of community services.

3. Importance of community services ranked.

4. Satisfaction with community services reported.

This hypothesis is partially confirmed on the basis of the data.

Females (Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19)

Related to use of services, there is no difference based on ranking. Statistical differences were reported for 8 of 13 services. They were: business, day care services, employment, health, housing, school, recreation for adults and recreation for children.

The perception of effectiveness is the variable where the analysis confirms the hypothesis for a greater number of services. Based on statistics, the differences are significant at  $p \leq .05$  for 10 of 13 services. Metropolitan females reported as higher effective: employment, health, housing, places to buy things and recreation for adults. Nonmetropolitan females reported as higher effective: church, general services, police and fire services, recreation for children and school.

In terms of importance, the services that were reported with statistical differences were: business, day care services, general services, health, school. recreation for adults and recreation for children.

In relation to satisfaction, both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan females coincided on church and places to buy things, as first and second. While females from metropolitan areas rated health as third. Statistical differences were reported for 10 of the 13 services. Metropolitan residents reported higher satisfaction with: day care services, employment, health, housing, places to buy things, police and fire services, recreation for adults and recreation for children. Nonmetropolitan residents reported higher satisfaction with: business and school. Males (Tables 20, 21, 22 and 23)

Based on the same analysis, males from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas reported some differences, employment is rated as the third most used for males from metropolitan areas, while males from nonmetropolitan rated school. Both coincided on places to buy things and church, Statistical differences  $p \leq .05$  are reported for business, employment, health, housing, school and recreation for adults.

Similar to females, metropolitan and nonmetropolitan males, reported more differences related to effectiveness; while metropolitans ranked places to buy things, church and health as most effective, nonmetropolitans ranked church, police and fire services and school. Significant statistical differences were related to eight services: day care services, employment, housing, places to buy things, police

and fire services, school, recreation for adults, and recreation for children.

In terms of importance there were the following differences based on ranking, metropolitan females reported: health, housing and school. While nonmetropolitan reported: housing, police and fire and health. Based on statistics, the differences at  $p \leq .05$  were reported for day care services and health, as higher in importance by metropolitan males.

Males showed more differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan than females did in relation to their satisfaction with community services. From metropolitan males, places to buy things, church and health were rated while church, police and fire services and school were reported by nonmetropolitan males. Significant differences based on statistics were reported for 10 of the 13 services. Metropolitan males reported higher satisfaction with: business, church, day care services, employment, general services, health, places to buy things, recreation for adults and recreation for children. Nonmetropolitan males reported school in the higher satisfaction.

## CHAPTER VI

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study examined some of the human factors that are associated with the use of community services by Mexican Americans in Michigan.

The objectives of the study were:

- 1. To determine human factors that are associated with the use of community services among Mexican Americans.
- 2. To determine the relationship of: a) female and male Mexican Americans, b) male adults and male adolescents, c) female adults and female adolescents, d) male adults and male adolescents from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of residence and e) female adults and female adolescents from metropolitan areas of residence for:
  - 2.1. Perceived use of community services.
  - 2.2. Perceived effectiveness of community services.
  - 2.3. Perceived importance of community services.
  - 2.4. Perceived satisfaction with community services.

The present study used secondary analysis of the data collected for the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project NC-128 "Quality of Life According to Area of Residence".

This Regional Study was developed to find systematic knowledge about quality of life, its components, the way these components vary among different kinds of population and the extent they can be realized in nonmetropolitan communities as compared with metropolitan ones.

Fourteen states took part in the study; of those, Michigan was one of the four where data were collected on totally Mexican American samples. The Michigan data collection took place during November and December 1977 and January and February 1978 in metropolitan areas and from January to May 1978 in nonmetropolitan areas. The data collection was done using a primary instrument and a secondary one which was developed to obtain more in-depth data with respect to particular domains.

The present study is based on responses to the questions indicated below for each of the following 13 services: business, church, day care services, general services, health, housing, employment, places to buy things, police and fire services, school, transportation, recreation for adults and recreation for children.

- Now, please think about.....available in your community.
   I use these seldom 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I use these often
- 2. Now, please think about.....available in your community. Ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Effective
- 3. Some of these items may be important to you. Some may not. Using the Important Scale please circle the number

which indicates how important each of these is to the quality of your life.

Kinds	of	ser	vi	.ce	es			]	Lmj	201	cta	ind	ce	
	•	•	•		•			1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A secondary instrument was developed to recode, when it was necessary the original variables for consideration in this study (See Appendix B).

Percentages, rank ordering, chi-square, and Pearson's  $r_s$  were used to establish the association of gender, importance, satisfaction and perceived effectiveness with the use of community services.

The number of cases analyzed for this report was 499, split as follows: 417 adults, (208 females and 209 males) and 82 adolescents (43 females and 39 males).

Conclusions have been drawn about the proposed hypotheses based on findings. The first hypothesis related to significant difference between females and males in the community services they considered important was not confirmed on the basis of the data. Rank orderings of importance of services were made upon the frequencies of high importance ratings. Chi-square was also performed. The statistically significant differences found cannot be considered as evidence of any fundamental difference between women and men in their evaluation of importance.

The second hypothesis proposed a significant relationship between perception of importance and the reported use of community services. Although, a positive relationship between importance and use was assumed, the findings did not allow the establishment of a direct or inverse relationship since some services considered as more important were reported to have less use and at the same time services considered as less important were reported with high use and some considered as least important were reported with the lowest use.

The third hypothesis, related to an inverse relationship between importance placed upon community services and satisfaction with them was partially supported by the data. Those services considered as more important were reported with moderate satisfaction, those considered moderate in importance were reported high in satisfaction, and those rated as less important were reported with less satisfaction. Another part of the third hypothesis proposed differences in importance and satisfaction related to gender.

In terms of gender, there was a moderate to strong association of importance and satisfaction with the following services: school, health, day care services, police and fire services, places to buy things, and church for males and health, places to buy things, church and housing for females.

The fourth hypothesis related to the lack of age differentiation between females in the level of reported use of community services, perceived effectiveness, importance and satisfaction with community services, has been supported by the data. Frequencies, rank orderings, chi-square analysis performed did not report any significant difference.

On the other hand, the fifth hypothesis that was related to the same relationships as the fourth but between males was partially supported by the data analyzed. Adolescents ranked transportation as more effective while adults ranked school. In terms of importance, adolescents reported transportation high while adults reported employment. The statistical differences were related to police and fire services and recreation for children.

The sixth hypothesis related to the association of area of residence to the relationship between gender and level of reported use of community services, perceived effectiveness, importance and satisfaction with community services was partially supported by the data. Even when area of residence is not associated with high use of community services, the overall pattern of reported use for separated services shows statistical significant differences in 8 of the 13 services. There are significant differences pointed out related to importance, satisfaction and perceived effectiveness.

### Implications

Although statistically significant differences were not found frequently enough to support all the hypotheses, inspection of the content of specific services cited may provide insights for future research as well as for program planning with Mexican Americans. Based on the data, church seems to be a service worth studying in greater detail. It may be associated with other factors not analyzed in this research.

Since the original study required at least one of the adults to be Mexican American, an aspect to take into account is the real number of selfidentification Mexican Americans that took part. Analysis by gender and identification of ethnicity might modify the results. It would be also interesting to make comparative studies between the Michigan sample and those samples of the other states that focused on this minority group and between Mexican Americans and other groups that took part in the Regional Study.

Another area worth looking into is the selection and classification of the community services. It is the researcher's opinion that a comparative analysis of the use of services classified as essential (those like health or places to buy things that must be used in terms of survival) and those classified as optative (such as recreation, which can be avoided without incidences for

peoples survival) would be worthwhile.

The provision of a prior definition about each community service, would help the respondents to answer and the researcher to interpret the findings. Similarly, definitions of use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction might be useful to respondents and researchers.

To understand the results of the analysis, it would be necessary to know how the members of the family satisfy their needs in addition to use of community services. This may be within the kinship group as Murillo (1971) suggested.

Although the analysis by family was impossible, the researcher considers it very important to look for a methodology that allows the use of this unit of analysis in order to understand the human environed unit of interest in family ecology.

The present secondary analysis was related to some human factors associated with the use of community services. Some other factors also available such as socio-economic status, educational level, language spoken, length of time living in the community should be worth considering.

In terms of social planners, the researcher considers more important the perspective about the integration of reality for respondents. People in their

real life have no split compartments, but only one reality; health or educational or economic problems are not produced in vacuum, independent one each other. As long as social planners continue considering isolated aspects of life, people's auto-exclusion from the community service programs will be a common result. In the special case of Mexican Americans, both researchers and social planners still need to discover the reality of perception of community services.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Elements and Domains of Life Quality

# ELEMENTS AND DOMAINS OF LIFE QUALITY

Elements	Domains
* Amount of education	
* Usefulness of education	Education
Your health	II. a 1 th
* Your family's health	health
Number of children in the family	
Schools	
* Health Services	
* Day Care	
Police and Fire Services	
Transportation	
Places to buy things	
* Servicesgeneral	Community
* Business Services	Services
* Adult Recreation	
Kids Recreation	
Church	
Employment Opportunities	
* Quality of Housing	

\* Asked of husbands and wives only, not adolescents.

Elements	Domains
Climate	
Air	
Appearance of Building	
Scenery	
Noise	
Traffic	
Safety	
Friendliness	Community
Moral Standards	Environment
Efforts to improve things	
Efforts to conserve energy	
Privacy	
Ethnic Mix in the Community	
Ethnic Mix in the Schools	
* Local Government effectiveness	
* Return for taxes	
Family Life	
* Relationship with spouse	
* Relationship with children	Family
* Relationship of children with each other	ramily
<b>**</b> Relationship between parents	
* Relationship with parents	
<b>**</b> Relationship with siblings	
* Asked of husbands and wives only, not ** Asked of adolescents only, not parents	adolescents.

E	lements	Domains
	Money management	
	Time available	Management
	Amount of work family performs at home	8
	Quality of work family performs at home	
	Way leisure and recreation time is used	Leisure
	Friendship	Friendship
	Current employment situation	Employment
*	Family income	Financial
	Standard of living	Security
*	Savings	
	Aesthetic quality of exterior of dwelling Aesthetic quality of interior of dwelling	
	Housing	Housing
	Neighborhood	
	Community	
	State	

\* Asked of husbands and wives only, not adolescents.

## Elements

Domains

\*\*\* Radical or ethnic origin

\*\*\* Religion

\*\*\* Age

\*\*\* Sex

\*\*\* Respondents were asked to rate importance only, not satisfaction.

Source: Quality of Life as Affected by Area of Residence. University of Missouri-Columbia. Research Bulletin 1036 (December) 1980.

APPENDIX B

Research Instrument

## Research Instrument

Seconda	ry Instrument	Primary Instrument
1. <u>Sex</u> <u>Adu</u> 1.	<u>of respondent</u> <u>lts</u> Male	Utilizes the code of original variable.
2.	Female	<u>Sex</u> Husband 1 Wife 2
<u>Ado</u> 1. 2.	<u>lescent</u> Male Female	<u>Adolescent</u> What is your sex, Circle 1 for male 2 for female
2. <u>Use</u> 1. 2. 3.	of community service Low Medium High I	Utilizes code of the original variable. Now, please think about the available in your community. use these 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I use these seldom often
<ol> <li>3. Per</li> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> </ol>	<u>ceived effectiveness</u> Ineffective Moderate Effective	Utilize recode of original variable. Now, please think about theavailable in your community.

Ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Effective

- 4. Importance of community services
  - 1. Unimportant
  - 2. More or less important
  - 3. Important

Utilizes recode of original variable.

Primary Instrument

Some of these items may be important to you. Some may not. Using the Importance Scale please circle the number which indicates how important each of these is to the quality of your life.

Kinds of services

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Importance

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

# 5. Satisfaction with community services

1.	dissatisfaction	Utilizes recode of original variable.
2.	Moderate	Using the Satisfaction
3.	Satisfaction	Scale, please circle the number which indicates how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the avail- ability and quality of each of the following in your community.
		Kinds of Services
		Satisfaction
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7

# Secondary Instrument

Primary Instrument

- 6. Age of respondent
  - 1. Adult
  - 2. Adolescent

Utilizes recode of original variable.

Age

How old were you on your last birthday.

- 7. Area of residence
  - 1. Metropolitan
  - 2. Nonmetropolitan

# Utilizes code of original variable.

# Residence

- 1. Metro
- 2. Nonmetro

APPENDIX C

Summary of Decisions About Hypotheses

Hypotheses
about
Decisions
of
Summary

	Hypothesis	Test	Results*	Decision
н <sub>1</sub>	Males and females differ in services considered important	Rank order Chi-square	é 3	Not Supported
H2.1	Positive relationship between importance and use	Rank order Spearman's for rank order	$r_{s}=.78$ $p_{p}=.01$	
<sup>H</sup> 2.2	Males and females differ in their perception of importance and reported use of services	Gamma	1	Partially Supported
<sup>Н</sup> 3.1	Inverse relationship between 'importance and satisfaction	Rank order Spearman's for rank order	1 rs= .53 p= .03	
<sup>Н</sup> 3.2	Males and females differ in their perception of importance and satisfaction	Garma	6 (males) 4 (females)	Partially Supported
H <sub>4</sub>	Among females no age difference in the level of use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction	Rank order	use: 2 effect: 3 imp.: 3 satis: 3	Partially Supported

\* The key for reporting the test results appears at the end of the table.

	Hypotheses	Test	Results*	Decision
		Chi-square	use: 1 effect: 1 imp.: 0 satis: 0	
Н5	Among males no age differences in the level of use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction	Rank order	use: 3 effect: 2 imp.: 2	
		Chi-square	effect: 1 imp.: 2 satis: 0	Supported
H <sub>6</sub>	Metropolitan and nonmetropolitan females and males differ in the level of use, effectiveness, importance and satisfaction	Rank order	F. M. use: 3 2 effect: 1 1 imp.: 3 2	
		Spearman's for rank order	satus: 2 I F M use: r <sub>s</sub> = .81 .79 p= .005 .01 p= .03 p= .03	Partially Supported

\* The key for reporting the test results appears at the end of the table

Summary of Decisions about Hypotheses

Decision	
	M. .84 .75 .01 .01
	F. 89 . 89 . 75 . 80 . 86 . 10 . 86 . 10 . 86 . 10
Results*	imp.: rs satis: rs satis: rs b use: rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs rs r
Test	Chi-square
Hypotheses	

Summary of Decisions about Hypothese

Key for reporting results of tests.

. . Chi-square test for cross tabulated frequencies on separate services: Number of tests where p  $\leq$  .05; 0 to 13. Number of positions that coincide: 0, 1, 2, Spearman's  $(r_s)$  for rank over order correlation:  $r_s$ ; p First three ranks within rank ordering:

<u>-</u>.50 in Gamma test of association on separate services: Number of tests where gamma absolute value; 0 to 13.
## SELECTED REFERENCES

## Selected References

- Ackerman, Norleen M. "The Relationship of Objective and Subjective Family Income Adequacy to Select Measures of Perceived Life Quality". Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Michigan State University. 1977.
- Alvarez, D. and F. Bean. "The Mexican American Family" In Ethinc Families in America. Patterns and Variation. Mindel and Habenstein. New York. 1976.
- Auerswald, E. H. "Interdisciplinary versus Ecological Approach". Family Process 7, pp. 202-215. 1968.
- Blalock, Jr. Social Statistics. McGraw-Hill Inc. New York. 1972.
- Blood, Robert O. "The Family" In the Family and Its Social Environment. The Free Press. New York. 1972.
- Bubolz, Margaret et at. "A Human Ecological Approach to Quality of Life: Conceptual Framework and Results of Preliminary Study". Reidel Publishing Co. Dordrecht, Holland and Boston. U.S.A. 1980.

"The Human Ecosystem: A Model". Journal of Home Economics (Spring) pp. 28-31. 1979.

"Quality of Life Indicators: A Human Ecological Systems Approach". Unpublished manuscript. Michigan State University. 1976.

Campbell, et al. The Human Meaning of Social Change. Russell Sage Foundation. New York. 1972.

The Quality of American Life. Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfactions. Russell Sage Foundation. New York. 1976.

Danes, Sharon M. Relationship of Non-Market Resource Transfers and Quality of Life for Non-Migrant Michigan Mexican Americans. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Michigan State University. 1978.

4

- De Hoyos, A. "Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspirations of the Mexican American Youth". Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Michigan State University. 1961.
- Evans, F. "Ecosystem as the Basic Unit in Ecology". Science 123. pp. 1127-1128. 1956.
- Gesmar, Ludwing. Family and Community Funtioning. A Manual of Measurement for Social Work Practices and Policy. The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Metuchen. New York. 1971.
- Grebler et al. The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. The Free Press. New York. 1970.
- Hawkes, Glenn and Minna Taylor. "Power structure in Mexican and Mexican American Farm Labor Families". Journal of Marriage and the Family 37 (Nov). pp. 807-811. 1975.
- Hayman, Herbert H. Secondary Analysis of Sample Surveys: Principles, Procedures and Potencialities. John Miley and Sons Inc. New York. 1972.
- Helmick, Sandra. "Perceptions of Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Family Members" In Quality of Life as Affected by Area of Residence. North Central Regional Research Publication 270, Columbia. Missouri. 1980.
- Hook, Nancy and Beatrice Paolucci. "The Family as an Ecosystem". Journal of Home Economic Vol. 62, N5, (May) pp. 313-315. 1970.
- Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. Harper and Row. New York. 1954.
- Melson, Gail F. Family and Environment. Burgess Publishing Co. 1980.
- Miller, M. Variations in Mexican American Family Life. A Review Synthesis. Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meeting in San Francisco. California. 1975.
- Mirande, Alfredo. "The Chicano Family" A Reanalysis of Conflicting Views. Journal of Marriage and The Family. 1977.
- Moore, J. Mexican American. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1976.
- Morrison, Bonnie. "The Importance of a Balanced Perspective: The Environment of Man". Man Environment System Vol. 4, N3, Michigan State University. 1974.

- Murillo, Nathan. "The Mexican American Family" In Chicanos, Social and Psychological Perspectives. Saint Louis. Mosby. 1971.
- Nuffield Foundation. Family Needs and the Social Services. PEP George Allen and Unwin Ltd. London. 1961.
- Nie, Norman et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd. ed. McGraw-Hill Co. New York. 1975.
- Parsons and Bales. Family Socialization and Interaction Process. The Free Press Glencoe. Illinois. 1960.

in Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis. Nye and Berardo. Praeger Publishers. New York. 1981.

- Penalosa, Fernando. "Mexican Family Roles" Journal of Marriage and the Family. 30 (Nov). pp. 680-688. 1968.
- Ramos, Reyes. "A Case in Point: An Ethnomethodological Study of a Poor Mexican American Family". Social Science Quarterly 55 (March) pp. 905-919. 1973.
- Salcedo, Ermelinda. Patterns of Resource Exchange in Mexican American Parent-Child Interaction. Unpublished dissertation. Michigan State University. 1979.
- Shanon, L. and M. Shanon. Minority Migrants in the Urban Community: Mexican and Negro Adjustment to Industrial Society. Sage Publications. California. 1973.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavorial Sciences. McGraw-Hill Inc. New York. 1956.
- Spielberg, J. B. "Dimensions for the Study of Work-related Values in the Mexican American Cultures: An Exploratory Essay" in American Minorities and Economic Opportunities. Kaplan. Itasca. Illinois. 1977.
- Sprout, H. and M. Sprout. The Ecological Perspectives on Human Affair. Priceton. N. J. PUP. 1965.
- Unites States Bureau of the Census. "Fertility Variations by Ethnic Origins". <u>Current Population Reports</u> Series P-20 N226. Nov. 1971.

