



Social Science Literature and the Naturalization Process

Louis DeSipio

International Migration Review, Vol. 21, No. 2. (Summer, 1987), pp. 390-405.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28198722%2921%3A2%3C390%3ASSLATN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>

International Migration Review is currently published by The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc..

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/cmigrations.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Social Science Literature and the Naturalization Process

Louis DeSipio¹

The NALEO Education Fund

This article examines social science research into the socioeconomic and cultural factors associated with immigrants who naturalize. Few of the studies in this review use statistical methodologies and many of the findings are highly impressionistic. Yet, several of the studies find common factors to explain the decision to naturalize. These include: length of residence in the United States, varied potentials for acculturation among different national origin groups, motivation for immigration and formal education and language skills. However, no single study is found that examines all of the variables influencing the naturalization decision.

While much academic study has been devoted to immigration and the social, economic and political assimilation of the immigrants in the United States, relatively little study has addressed the legal side of this process — naturalization. For the immigrant, naturalization represents acquisition of permanent legal status in the United States equal to that of native born Americans — regardless of personal actions (with the exception of those few individuals found to have lied on their immigration or naturalization applications). Yet, naturalization studies, particularly quantitative studies utilizing advanced statistical methodologies, are few. As a result, we know little about why individuals decide to naturalize and what differentiating socioeconomic and cultural factors are associated with immigrants who do naturalize.

Recent studies focusing on naturalization among recent Latino immigrants have begun to examine just these questions (Alvarez, 1985; Garcia, 1986; Pachon and DeSipio, 1986; Portes and Curtis, 1986). The review of the available naturalization literature presented here serves as a background study to each of these analyses.

The literature that does exist on naturalization can be divided into three broad categories. The first category includes studies performed before 1945 that address the relative “Americanization” potential of the “new” immigrants (from Southern and Eastern Europe who began to arrive after 1880) in

¹ The author would like to express his appreciation to Nelle Sandridge who provided much of the early research and direction for this article.

contrast to the Americanization potential of the "old" immigrant groups (from Northern and Western Europe who provided the bulk of immigration prior to 1880). The second category of naturalization studies uses Census, Immigration and Naturalization Service (I.N.S.) or social science survey data sets to examine length of residence of immigrants from different countries or regions prior to naturalization and, in some studies, to contrast the socioeconomic characteristics of the newly naturalized with the non-naturalized. Although naturalization status is just one variable of many included in these studies, it is used to create bi-polar distinctions between immigrants positively inclined toward naturalization and those negatively inclined. The third category of naturalization here rely on interviews with the recently naturalized (and, in some studies, the non-naturalized) to assess the attitudes of immigrants toward naturalization.

Several of the studies included here specifically address the naturalization patterns of Hispanic immigrants and are particularly relevant to the new studies of Latino naturalization contained elsewhere in this volume. Each of these studies addressing Latino naturalization patterns are examined later in this review. These are: Carter and Doster, 1950a and 1950b; Cornelius, 1981; Fernandez, 1984; Garcia, 1981; Grebler, 1966; Portes and Bach, 1985; Portes and Mozo, 1985; Ramirez, 1979; Reisler, 1976; Rogg, 1974; Walker, 1929.

The categories outlined here not only provide an index to the disparate naturalization studies, but also highlight the weaknesses of this body of literature. Logically, the most appropriate means of assessing the statistical findings of these studies would be to perform a meta-analysis of the literature. Meta-analysis, as defined by Hunter, Schmidt and Jackson, allows a researcher to develop an integrated set of findings across different studies (1982:12-27). However, such an analysis cannot be undertaken with the available data on the causes of naturalization. Analyses that have more study characteristics than studies have a multiple correlation of 1.00 by fiat. Sampling error also becomes magnified (32-33). Instead, this review will examine in greater depth the few studies that do undertake advanced statistical examinations of the socioeconomic and cultural factors associated with naturalization.

THE OLD VERSUS NEW DEBATE: NATIVISM AND NATURALIZATION RATES

Academic study of relative naturalization rates among different national origin groups began with the reform of naturalization law in the first decade of this century. Prior to this reform, naturalization was left largely to the individual states with little direct federal control (Bernard, 1922; Franklin, 1969). The reforms, proposed by a blue ribbon panel of experts, established national naturalization standards and concentrated the power to naturalize in the federal courts (Immigration Commission, 1911). The panel that made

these recommendations based their findings on an evaluation that more recent immigrants were less likely to "Americanize" because of lower levels of political or civic interest. One of the manifestations of this decreased interest in American values was a low level of interest in naturalization. To prevent these disinterested Americans from being naturalized without being properly Americanized, new naturalization standards were proposed.

The Immigration Commission's findings that the Southern and Eastern Europeans were less likely to naturalize established the core of the first academic debate in naturalization. Subsequent studies by Gavit (1922) and Carpenter (1927), based on an analysis of 26,284 naturalization petitions filed with the courts in 1913-1914, demonstrated that the length of residence of immigrants is just one of the many factors that affect naturalization rates. Gavit (1922) found that while the old immigrant groups did have higher naturalization rates, there were many factors other than higher "political or civil interest" explaining these differences. These other factors, such as socioeconomic variables, education and age at immigration, were studied by many later scholars of immigration.

Gavit found that, on average, the "old" immigrants had resided in the U.S. longer than the "new" immigrants. However, within the old and new categories, there was a wide variation in naturalization rates for immigrants with five years or more of residence in the United States. The "new" group with the highest naturalized or holding "first papers" rate (a now defunct requirement which indicated an intent to naturalize) was "Hebrew (other than Russian)" at 61.6 percent; the lowest was Portuguese at 5.5 percent. Among the "old" groups, the Swedish had the highest rate at 92.3 percent and the Mexicans had the lowest at 10.0 percent (211). Other differentiating factors included: higher weekly earnings in all sectors of the economy among older immigrants (216), and higher rates of first paper holders among both "old" and "new" immigrants in states allowing the vote on first papers (217-218).

While these data suggested that naturalization rates were not the only measure to judge Americanization potential, Gavit was careful to offer evidence to disprove the Immigration Commission's hypothesis concerning "political and civil interest". Gavit compared causes of naturalization denial and found that on the average "old" and "new" groups had roughly the same denial rates. When he examined intervals between filing naturalization petitions, he found that the "old" groups had a longer elapsed time between immigration and the filing of the application for citizenship (237-239).

Carpenter (1927) relies on Gavit's data set to further elaborate on variables associated with naturalization rates among different nationality groups. He finds that immigrants in the Central states have the highest naturalization rates while the foreign born in New England and in the West South Central states have the lowest rates, that the foreign born in rural areas are more

likely to be naturalized than are the urban foreign born, and that the 1920 Census showed a smaller gap between naturalization and rates of old and new immigrants (255-257).

The emergence of cultural factors as the focus of study of factors influencing naturalization is confirmed with Bernard (1936). In his examination of 1,285 foreign born residents of New Haven, he finds that the variance in naturalization rates are the result of specific cultural factors that have influenced each nationality group differently. Old and new status alone does not explain naturalization. The Irish (old) and Italians (new) are the slowest to naturalize (946). Internal differences also exist within nationalities. New Haven's Polish immigrants, for example, start out very slowly (few naturalize during the first years of eligibility), but catch up in later years. By establishing a dichotomy between naturalized and non-naturalized within each nationality group, Bernard suggests that the naturalized have more formal education, more specialized and prestigious jobs and higher family income (950).

The Bernard study did not lay to rest the old versus new distinction as the primary factor influencing naturalization. Schibsky (1937) contends that many of the other factors identified by analysis such as Bernard's do not necessarily represent an "identification with American life". Her study, however, highlights a more important consideration. By the mid-1930s, the flow of immigration to the U.S. from both "old" and "new" countries had declined greatly (663). Academic debate of the differences in naturalization rates continued, but the distinction in the naturalization pool disappeared (Guest; 1980).

CENSUS AND I.N.S. COHORT STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE DATABASES: NATURALIZATION AND SOCIOECONOMIC VARIABLES

With the decline of the "old" versus "new" debate, academic study of naturalization came to focus on the socioeconomic variables, such as those identified by Bernard, associated with the foreign born population who had naturalized. These studies take three forms. The first form examines a single variable *e.g.* length of U.S. residence prior to naturalization, and compares naturalization rates for different national origin groups. The second relies on more complex statistical methodologies to assess the interrelationship of multiple social and economic variables on naturalization patterns of different immigrant groups. The third and final type of naturalization study relies on comprehensive social science data bases to assess the attitudes of a specific immigrant community (including attitudes toward naturalization).

Single Variable Studies

Of the nationality groups examined in the naturalization literature, Mexican

immigrants receive the most attention. The richness of study results, in large part, from the consistently low naturalization rates among Mexican immigrants. Concluding that the Mexican "is not part of the real America", Walker finds that Mexicans account for just 0.5 percent of applicants for citizenship in three Southern California counties in the 1926-1928 period (1929:467). She hypothesizes that this low percentage is a result of laziness or an unwillingness to perform the work necessary to become a citizen. The Mexican immigrants in her study are reported not to have the feeling of being part of the body politic in the U.S. Although no basis is provided for these generalizations, they set the tone for the academic debate that follows.

The length of residence between immigration and naturalization among Mexicans is documented in several studies as being longer than for other immigrant groups (I.N.S., 1945; Eckerson, 1946; Krichesky, 1957 and 1963; Grebler, 1966). The longer wait for naturalization is partially explained through several factors. Immigration from Mexico has followed unique patterns that differentiate it from European immigration. Most notably, immigration from Mexico continued in the 1930s and early 1940s. In contrast, immigration from outside the Americas largely stopped in this period (I.N.S., 1986: Table IMM 1.2). Consequently, Mexican citizenship applicants in 1945 were about ten years younger on average than other applicants (I.N.S., 1945). This pattern of youth among Mexican origin citizenship applicants reversed itself after the war (Grebler, 1966). Carter and Doster highlight other unique factors of the Mexican naturalized. The length between immigration and naturalization is partially explained by the relative youth of the Mexican immigrants at the time of immigration. In their sample of 446 Mexicans naturalized in 1949, the average age at immigration was 13.4 years for females and 15.7 years for males. Over 20 percent were under 5 when they entered (1950a).

Residential patterns are also found to influence naturalization rates among Mexican immigrants. Although 33 percent of the Mexican foreign born resided in California, over 50 percent of the naturalized resided there. Texas, on the other hand, had 43.4 percent of the registrants, but only 25 percent of the naturalized citizens (1950b). A later study found that this pattern had reversed itself with Mexican immigrants in Texas naturalizing in greater numbers than their counterparts in California (Grebler, 1966:25-27). Interestingly, Moore finds that Los Angeles has a higher naturalization rate for Mexican immigrants than San Antonio. She suggests that Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles are naturalizing more rapidly, after fifteen years instead of the twenty year average in San Antonio (1985:25). While these findings vary widely they suggest the possible importance of area of residence to the decision to naturalize.

Carter and Doster also take age and marital status into account. Immigrants who entered before the age of 16, naturalized more quickly. Different elapsed

naturalization times were documented between immigrants married to U.S. citizens (12.7 years), to naturalized citizens (14.5 years) and to non-citizens (19.3 years) (50-51). In his examination of Mexican immigrants in the industrial midwest in the first four decades of this century, Reisler finds that only two to three percent of the Mexican immigrants are naturalized. He views this as a conscious choice by immigrants who felt that greater protection was offered by the Mexican counsel to Mexican nationals than by the U.S. government to naturalized citizens (1976:113). These different findings on citizenship among Mexican immigrants suggest the range of socioeconomic factors influencing naturalization rates not accounted for in Walker's generalizations.

The unique naturalization patterns of other nationality groups have also been examined. I.N.S. (1945) and Eckerson (1946) examine length of residence and age at naturalization for a wide range of nationality groups and regions. Beijbom (1971) examines differences between the naturalized and non-naturalized Swedes in Chicago counted in the 1870 Census. He finds that the higher the occupational status of the immigrant, the more likely he is to be naturalized. The naturalized Swedes had also resided in the U.S. longer than the non-naturalized and were, for the most part, married (135-136).

The impact of the 1965 changes in the immigration law on Asian immigrants is examined in Barkan (1983). With the removal of racial quotas after 1965, the pool of Asian immigrants eligible for naturalization changed. After 1965, Asians applying for naturalization tended to be younger and more male than their pre-1965 counterparts. The post-1965 Asian immigrants naturalize at a rapid rate. In the 1969-1977 period, 76 percent of Asians and 46 percent of all immigrants naturalized within 5 1/2 years of entry (58-68).

Military service is shown to be a factor in the decision to naturalize. Special provisions in the naturalization law have allowed rapid naturalization for servicemen in wartime. Jacobs and Hayes (1981), in addition to documenting this phenomenon, suggest that the quick provision of citizenship to aliens in the armed forces has prevented the development of a caste system in the military with non-citizens being treated differently (1981:197). The urge to naturalize among civilians during World War II is discussed by Polenbergl (1980).

Some of the studies of socio-demographic factors influencing the decision to naturalize examine all immigrant groups in a given period. Schibsky (1937) and I.N.S. (1945) examine age and residential patterns of the newly naturalized. Age is a particularly important factor in this period. Immigration was severely reduced in the early 1920s and did not resume until after World War II, so the pool available for naturalization steadily aged (Schibsky, 1937:663). The median age for naturalizing citizens in 1945 reached 45.9; the national median age was only 29.5. The median age of naturalization

applicants had increased from 37.9 in the mid 1930s (I.N.S., 1945). The virtual elimination of new immigration in the 1930s and early 1940s and continuing naturalization increased the percentage naturalized among the foreign born. This percentage reached an all-time high after World War II (North, 1985:59; Polenberg, 1980). Smith finds that among immigrants in the 1961-1965 period who had naturalized by 1970, thirteen of the sixteen countries with the lowest naturalization rates (less than 10%) were from the Americas (1973:31).

Multi-Variable Studies

Several recent large scale analyses have addressed factors influencing naturalization. Although the findings of these studies are often contradictory and the levels of confidence of the majority of their findings are low, they provide the most complete analysis available on the socio-demographic factors influencing the decision to naturalize (See, Table 1).

In a study of 1950 and 1970 Census data on the socioeconomic achievement of the foreign born, Barkan and Khokolov (1980) test a null hypothesis that levels of educational achievement, occupation, income and urbanization will not significantly influence the rates of naturalization among the foreign born. Agricultural and blue collar occupations and percentage within a national origin group with income below \$1,500 in 1950 are shown to be statistically valid negative predictors of naturalization for all the groups studied. However, blue collar occupations among Mexican and Latin American immigrants is a positive predictor. High median income and white collar employment among immigrant groups characterized by blue collar employment are statistically valid positive predictors. They conclude that, since there are few statistically significant correlations between the Census economic, labor sector and education data and naturalization, future studies should concentrate on cultural and political variables. They suggest motives for coming to the U.S., pressures to remain in the U.S., status upon arrival, age and sex, proximity to homeland, return migration patterns, political conditions in the U.S., length of residence in the U.S., area of residence, mobility and rate of acculturation. It should be noted that the factor analysis techniques used in this study have been called into question (Portes, 1986:28).

In a series of studies on immigrant behavior and earnings, Jasso and Rosensweig assess the influence of personal characteristics, immigrant visa characteristics, length of residence (both legal and undocumented), age, region and country of origin and earnings on the propensity to naturalize (1984:3-6). In a linear probability model with personal characteristics and date of entry as regressors, Asian and African origin are shown to add 39 percent and 38 percent to the likelihood of naturalization. Mexican origin

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF STATISTICALLY VALID PREDICTORS OF NATURALIZATION

Barkan and Khokhlov (1980) n = unclear	Garcia (1981) n = 369
<u>Correlations</u>	<u>Bivariate Associations</u>
p<.01	p<.02
Agricultural occupations (Caveat: Swedes alter findings)	Family ties with Mexico r = .25 r ² = .06
1950 - all groups r = -.885 r ² = .78	Identification with being Mexican r = .24 r ² = .06
1950 & 1970 - all groups r = .559 r ² = .31	English language proficiency r = -.26 r ² = .07
p<.05	
Blue collar occupations	Preference for primary interactions with other Mexicans r = -.20 r ² = .04
1950 and 1970 Mexican and Latin American r = .999 r ² = .99	Length of residence in the U.S. r = -.20 r ² = .04
1950 and 1970 10 top groups r = -.662 r ² = .48	
1950 Median income r = .760 r ² = .58	<u>Regression</u> Aggregate explained variance = 33.8% F Ratio <.05
1950 % below \$1,500 income r = -.752 r ² = .57	Two significant factors: Social identity: American b = -.33 Length of residence in U.S. b = .20
<u>Factor Analysis</u>	
Variance less than .20	
Blue collar occupations - For Americas sample 98% For all groups 6%	
White collar employment For top 13 blue collar groups 40%	

TABLE I (Continued)
SUMMARY OF STATISTICALLY VALID PREDICTORS OF NATURALIZATION

Jasso and Rosenzweig (1985) n = 2,044	Portes and Mozo n = INS data sample, 1969-1979
<u>Linear Probability Model</u>	<u>Correlations</u>
Specification model 1 - personal characteristics and date of entry	p < .05
	Percent with college education
	r = .54
Strong indicators-	r ² = .29
Asian origin +39%	regression b = +1.5%
African origin +38%	
Mexican origin -9%	p < .10
Cuban origin +28%	Immigration from a country contiguous to the U.S.
Chinese origin +35%	r = -.34
Specification model 2 - immigrant	r ² = .12
Visa and model 1 characteristics	regression b = -.21%
3rd preference visa holders +15%	Political immigration
7th preference visa holders +19%	regression b = +13%
Chinese origin +16%	
Cuban origin +24%	
Specification model 3 - socio-economic data about country of origin added to the existing regressors	
Origin in centrally planned economy	
	+24%
Age ²	+80%
Date of entry	+67%

decreases the likelihood by 9 percent. When immigrant visa characteristics are added as regressors, the third and seventh preferences add 15 percent and 19 percent to the likelihood of naturalization.² The third preference immigrants are professionals. The seventh preference includes political refugees. The final specification adds socioeconomic data about the country

² Each year approximately 270,000 immigrants are admitted legally to the United States through the preference system. The seven preferences are: (1) unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, (2) spouses and unmarried children of resident aliens, (3) professional and highly skilled immigrants, (4) married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, (5) brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, (6) skilled workers in jobs that cannot be filled with U.S. citizens and (7) political refugees. Outside of the preference system, U.S. citizens can immigrate their immediate families including spouses, parents and minor children. In 1985, there were 305,801 non-preference immigrants and 264,208 preference immigrants (I.N.S., 1986: Table 2.4).

of origin to the regressors in the first two specification models. The only statistically significant predictors in this model are origin in a centrally planned economy, which adds 24 percent to the likelihood of naturalization, age squared (+.8) and date of entry, measuring length of residence as measured by date of entry (+.67).

A subsequent study by these authors examines country of origin data for immigrants and finds two additional factors negatively associated with naturalization, but not statistically significant. Immigrants from countries with high GNPs and those with English as the official language are less likely to naturalize. Immigrants from countries that receive Voice of America broadcasts, housed U.S. military bases, or had high inflation rates prior to 1971 are more likely to naturalize. Although not statistically significant, "Hispanic country" as a region of birth is the largest negative predictor of the likelihood to naturalize (Jasso and Rosensweig, 1985a:17-18).

In their study of immigrant assimilation in the Cuban community, Portes and Mozo examine naturalization patterns. The Cuban experience is contrasted to that of other immigrants from the Americas. The authors hypothesize that the differences in naturalization rates are due to a combination of three factors: geographical distance from the place of emigration, reasons for departure and the education and occupational backgrounds of each immigrant group. Both professional status and educational level for the national origin groups under study prove to be positive and statistically significant predictors of naturalization. At the $p < .05$ level, the most influential predictor is percent with college education. At the $p < .10$ level of confidence, college education adds approximately 1.5 percent to the likelihood of naturalization. While emigration for "political" reasons increases the likelihood by 13 percent, emigration from a country contiguous to the U.S. reduces likelihood of naturalization by 21 percent (9-11). Again, as with other studies based on large social science databases highlighted here, there are few statistically significant factors positively or negatively associated with naturalization.

The focus of these studies relying on large scale databases are, for the most part, national origin groups. In contrast, in his study of patterns of racial discrimination and ethnic segregation in American cities, Lieberman focuses on cities. He finds that in the period under study, 1910-1950, much of the variance between national origin groups naturalization rates can be explained by the city of residence (1963). While this overlooks the ethnic compositions of the cities under study (*e.g.* the slow to naturalize groups such as the Mexican immigrants who are geographically concentrated), it provides yet another variable for consideration.

Large Scale Databases on the Mexican and Cuban Immigration

Two recent surveys of the Cuban and Mexican American communities allow

for a more precise assessment of the attitudes toward naturalization of the immigrants in these two populations and of the proximate causes of naturalization in these communities.

Among the 590 Cuban immigrants and 821 Mexican immigrants interviewed in 1973 by Portes and Bach (1985) and then reinterviewed after 3 and 6 years, between 85 percent and 95 percent plan to remain in the United States permanently. However, 10 percent to 15 percent fewer plan to obtain U.S. citizenship (Table 87). The percentage of Mexican immigrants unsure about U.S. citizenship is much higher than the comparable rate for Cuban immigrants. These data are explored further by the Portes and Curtis in this volume.

The Chicano Survey questioned both naturalization status and attitudes toward naturalization among the foreign born respondents. Although these findings are updated in this volume, the overall conclusion that naturalization is linked more to cultural traits than to socio-demographic or socio-political traits bears repeating (Garcia, 1981). The statistically valid (at the $p < .02$ level) influences identified are family ties with Mexico (.25), identification with being American (.24) and length of residence in the U.S. English language proficiency (-.26), preference for primary interactions with other Mexicans (-.20), length of residence in the U.S. (-.20) and social identity as an American (-.33) are found to be negative predictors.

The two studies contained in this volume that rely on these databases of immigrant group characteristics focus on naturalization as a dichotomous variable (due to the small number of questions addressing naturalization asked in the original questionnaire). They benefit from the fact that they have concentrated their research efforts on the naturalization variable. While this has allowed for a more comprehensive interpretation of the impact on the social-economic and cultural variables on the decision to naturalize, the studies were not designed to investigate the naturalization process. As a result, the findings, while advancing our knowledge of naturalization, remain tentative.³

ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES: IMMIGRANT ASSIMILATION AND NATURALIZATION

As mentioned, each of these large scale studies of multiple factors influencing the decision to naturalize are hampered by the fact that naturalization is viewed as a dichotomous variable. While the Chicano survey instrument allowed questions for the desire to naturalize, the government data sources

³ The author of this study and the author of the introduction to this special section of *IMR* are presently conducting a survey specifically assessing the naturalization experiences of the Latino foreign born.

see only naturalized or not naturalized. The smaller ethnographic studies of naturalization, while limited in the degree to which they may be generalized, allow for a broader understanding of the process of acquiring citizenship. As with the studies of the large-scale databases, some of the findings are contradictory.

Again, many of these studies focus on the naturalization experiences of the Mexican immigrant and address the larger question of why the naturalization rate for this group is low. Ramirez (1979) interviews Mexican Americans who are eligible to naturalize. Of 194 subjects, 60 had naturalized. While he finds that these legal residents feel it is important to naturalize, they do not see many tangible benefits in naturalization. He also sees widespread fear of public institutions among this population. Among the naturalized, he finds more education and higher level occupations (9-12). Cornelius, in a study of the undocumented and legal residents, contradicts Ramirez' finding that U.S. citizenship is important. Among the 87 legal immigrants interviewed, only 4 had naturalized. Of the remaining 83, 21 percent wanted to naturalize. The unwillingness to naturalize was based on several factors: perceived lack of English language proficiency, fear of the loss of property-holding rights in Mexico, an expectation of permanent return to Mexico and a perception that one's economic condition would not improve with citizenship (1981).

Fernandez (1984) does not address the question of desire to naturalize in his study of 60 naturalized resident Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles and Tucson. Instead, he assesses perceptions of the naturalization process and individual behavior toward the process. He finds that interest in naturalization crosses education and skill level boundaries. However, higher levels of education and technical skills reduce the barriers to naturalization (27). Schooling primarily in the U.S. also increases the likelihood of citizenship (28). He finds that people in the 20-50 age groups are most likely to naturalize, with few obtaining citizenship through derivative citizenship when their parents are naturalized (29). Interestingly, he also finds that family and friends provide a support network against naturalization and in defense of an undefined Mexican "heritage" (43-50). Unfortunately, the author does not quantify any of his findings.

Other factors that need to be examined in any comprehensive study of the naturalization process are highlighted in studies of other immigrant populations. In a study of cultural assimilation and desire for naturalization among Cuban exiles in New York and Northern New Jersey in the early 1970s, Rogg finds that only 40 percent of the former political refugees want to become citizens. However, even with this group, knowledge of English is shown to be positively related to the decision to naturalize (1974:96-98).

The bond to the country of origin and lack of social integration are mentioned by European immigrants to Canada interviewed by Legendre and Shaffir (1984:258). Richmond (1967) also examines European immigrants

to Canada. His interviews, however, suggest that there are differences between British immigrants and non-British immigrants. Finding that "the greater the similarity between the immigrant's way of life in the new country and that in his former country, the less likely will he be to change his nationality", naturalization is more likely among immigrants who made a radical break from their former way of life (225-228).

CONCLUSION

While the social science literature on the naturalization process is weak and few statistically valid generalizations can be made about the effect of specific cultural, economic, political or familial variables on naturalization, the studies outlined in this review do provide a history of naturalization studies and substantiate the variety of factors influencing the decision to naturalize.

The studies discussed here, and the varied approaches to the study of naturalization they offer, provide a groundwork for a comprehensive study of the reasons why immigrants naturalize. The newly performed analyses contained elsewhere in this volume take this groundwork and build upon it. The variables that need to be examined in greater depth, at least with reference to Latino immigrants, are outlined. A review of the literature, however, amply demonstrates that naturalization, as a focus of social science research, has not received the attention it merits in a polity which prides itself on the political integration of its immigrants.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, R.
1985 "A Profile of the Citizenship Process Among Hispanics in the United States: An Anthropological Perspective", The NALEO Education Fund, Washington.
- Barkan, E.R.
1983 "Whom Shall We Integrate? A Comparative Analysis of the Immigration and Naturalization Trends of Asians Before and After the 1965 Immigration Act (1951-1978)". In *The Journal of American Ethnic History*. Vol.3 #1, Fall:29-57.
- Barkan, E.R. and N. Khokhlov
1980 "Socioeconomic Data as Indices of Naturalization Patterns in the United States: A Theory Revisited", *Ethnicity*, Vol. 7.
- Beijbom, U.
1971 *Svedes in Chicago: A Demographic and Social Study of the 1846-1880 Immigration*, The Chicago Historical Society.
- Bernard, W.S.
1936 "Cultural Determinants of Naturalization". In *American Sociological Review*. Vol.1 #6, December: 943-953.
- 1937 "Naturalization Adjusts to the Changing Status of Women". In *Studies in the Science of Society*. Edited by G.P. Murdock. Yale University Press, New Haven: 43-65.

- Carpenter, N.
1927 *Immigrants and Their Children 1920*, Arno Press, New York (Originally published 1927).
- Carter H. and B. Doster
1950a "Social Characteristics of Naturalized Americans from Mexico: Age and Marital Status". In *I.N.S. Monthly Review*. Vol. 8 # 3, September: 35-39.
-
- 1950b "Residence and Occupation of Naturalized Americans from Mexico". In *I.N.S. Monthly Review*. Vol. 8 #4, October: 47-53.
- Cornelius, W.A.
1981 "The Future of Mexican Immigrants in California: A New Perspective for Public Policy", *Working Papers in U.S. Public Policy*. #6, University of California at San Diego.
- Eckerson, H.F.
1946 "Outstanding Facts About Citizens Naturalized in 1945". In *I.N.S. Monthly Review*. Vol. 3 #10, April: 293-297.
- Fernandez, C.
1984 "The Causes of Naturalization and Non-naturalization for Mexican Immigrants: An Empirical Study Based on Case Histories". Final Report to Project Participar, unpublished.
- Fernandez, C. and M.L. Frias
1984 "Factors Affecting the Rate of Naturalization Among Mexican Immigrants: Research Findings and Field Observations", Project Participar, Research Publication Series.
- Franklin, F.G.
1969 *The Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States*, Arno Press and *The New York Times*, New York.
- Garcia, J.A.
1986 "A Look at Political Integration of Mexican Immigrants: Factors Affecting Naturalization". The NALEO Education Fund, Washington, D.C.
-
- 1981 "Political Integration of Mexican Immigrants: Explorations into the Naturalization Process". In *International Migration Review*, 15(4):608-625.
- Gavit, J.P.
1922 *Americans by Choice*. Patterson Smith Reprint Series in Criminology, Law Enforcement and Social Problems. Patterson Smith Publishers, Montclair, NJ.
- Grebler, L.
1966 "The Naturalization of the Mexican Immigrant in the U.S.". In *The International Migration Review*, 1(3):17-32.
- Guest, A.M.
1980 "The Old-New Distinction and Naturalization: 1900". In *The International Migration Review*, 14(4).
- Hunter, J.E., F.L. Schmidt and G.B. Jackson
1982 *Meta-Analysis: Cumulating Research Findings Across Studies*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Immigration Commission
1911 *Report of the U.S. Immigration Commission*, Washington.
- Immigration and Naturalization Service
1986 *Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: 1985*, Washington.
- I.N.S. Monthly Review*
1945 "Median Age of Persons Naturalized in the Fiscal Year 1944". Vol.2 #7, January: 88-90.

Jacobs, J.B. and L.A. Hayes

1981 "Aliens in the U.S. Armed Forces: An Historico-Legal Analysis". In *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol.7 #2, Winter: 187-208.

Jasso, G. and M.R. Rosenzweig

1984 "U.S. Immigration Law and Immigrant Behavior: Preliminary Findings from a Longitudinal Analysis". Unpublished paper, The University of Minnesota.

1985a "What's in a Name? Country of Origin Influences on the Earnings of Immigrants in the United States". Economic Development Center, University of Minnesota. Bulletin Number 85-4, June.

1985b "Family Reunification and the Immigration Multiplier: U.S. Immigration Law, Origin-Country Conditions, and the Reproduction of Immigrants". Unpublished paper, The University of Minnesota, September.

Johnston, R.

1965 *Immigrant Assimilation: A Study of Polish People in Western Australia*. Paterson Brokensha Pty. Ltd., Perth.

Krichefsky, G.D.

1963 "Naturalization Rates of Immigrants". In *I & N Reporter*. Vol.11 #4, April: 43-50.

1957 "A Half Century of Naturalization". In *I & N Reporter*. Vol. 4 #3: 35-38.

Legendre, C. and W. Shaffir

1984 "Altering Citizenship Status: Some Preliminary Thoughts". In *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*. Vol.11 #2: 257-270.

Lieberson, S.

1963 *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*, The Free Press of Glencoe.

North, D.S.

1985 *The Long Grey Welcome: A Study of the American Naturalization Program*, The NALEO Education Fund, Washington.

Pachon, H. and L. DeSipio

1986 "The Attitudes of Citizenship Service Providers Toward the Naturalization Process". Paper prepared for Presentation at the meetings of the Western Political Science Association, Eugene, OR: March.

Polenberg, R.

1980 *One Nation Divisible: Class, Race and Ethnicity in the United States Since 1938*. The Viking Press, New York.

Portes, A. and R.L. Bach

1985 *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Portes, A. and R. Mozo

1985 "The Political Adaptation Process of Cubans and Other Ethnic Minorities in the United States: A Preliminary Analysis". In *The International Migration Review*, 16(1):35-63.

Portes, A. and J. Curtis

1986 "Changing Flags: Naturalization and its Determinants Among Mexican Immigrants", The NALEO Education Fund, Washington.

Portes, A. and C. Truelove

1986 "Making Sense of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States". Paper prepared for the *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol.13 (1987).

- Ramirez, D.M.
1979 "Legal Residents and Naturalization: A Pilot Study", Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, October.
- Reisler, M.
1976 *By the Sweat of their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900-1940*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Richmond, A.H.
1967 *Post-War Immigrants in Canada*, University of Toronto Press.
- Rogg, E.M.
1974 *The Assimilation of Cuban Exiles: The Role of Community and Class*, Aberdeen Press, New York.
- Schibsby, M.
1937 "Naturalization in the United States". In *Our Racial and National Minorities*. Edited by F.J. Brown. Prentice Hall, New York.
- Smith, L.
1973 "Naturalization Rates of Immigrants", The Immigration and Naturalization Service, Winter: 29-35.
- Walker, H.W.
1929 "Mexican Immigrants and American Citizenship". In *Sociology and Social Research*. Vol.13:5, May/June: 465-471.

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 2 -



You have printed the following article:

Social Science Literature and the Naturalization Process

Louis DeSipio

International Migration Review, Vol. 21, No. 2. (Summer, 1987), pp. 390-405.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28198722%2921%3A2%3C390%3ASSLATN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

References

Cultural Determinants of Naturalization

William S. Bernard

American Sociological Review, Vol. 1, No. 6. (Dec., 1936), pp. 943-953.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28193612%291%3A6%3C943%3ACDON%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

Political Integration of Mexican Immigrants: Explorations into the Naturalization Process

John A. Garcia

International Migration Review, Vol. 15, No. 4. (Winter, 1981), pp. 608-625.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28198124%2915%3A4%3C608%3APIOMIE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

The Naturalization of Mexican Immigrants in the United States

Leo Grebler

International Migration Review, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Autumn, 1966), pp. 17-32.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28196623%291%3A1%3C17%3ATNOMII%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5>

The Old-New Distinction and Naturalization: 1900

Avery M. Guest

International Migration Review, Vol. 14, No. 4. (Winter, 1980), pp. 492-510.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28198024%2914%3A4%3C492%3ATODAN1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 2 of 2 -



The Political Adaptation Process of Cubans and Other Ethnic Minorities in the United States: A Preliminary Analysis

Alejandro Portes; Rafael Mozo

International Migration Review, Vol. 19, No. 1. (Spring, 1985), pp. 35-63.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-9183%28198521%2919%3A1%3C35%3ATPAPOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

Making it Underground: Comparative Material on the Informal Sector in Western Market Economies

Alejandro Portes; Saskia Sassen-Koob

The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 93, No. 1. (Jul., 1987), pp. 30-61.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9602%28198707%2993%3A1%3C30%3AMIUCMO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>