

enues for further study. The nature of the actual behavioral aspects of filial obligation could shed light into the practices of filial responsibility. The impact of increased longevity with its potential of chronic illnesses and the demands of the change and duration of assistance that would be needed is an area to be studied with regard to caregiving when prolongation of life brings about generational overlappings and a decrease in the pool of caregivers. How can the expressed climate of support of the groups of the study under consideration be negotiated for the benefit of a quality life for elderly Greek Americans and the satisfaction of their adult children who feel strongly about their filial responsibility, but they may not always be able to deliver the requisite assistance in view of the present and predicted socioeconomic changes. What kind of preparation could help to proactively interfere with ethnic aging long before having to face the ethnic aged!

It would seem that attention should be directed to the suburban aged, the aged in institutions, to the "how" they experience aging, to factors relating to ethnic aging such as intermarriage, acculturation issues, mobility and its related lack of structural opportunity for contact and close interaction, just to name a few areas of research concern and interest. Ethnicity is not about to disappear as an important element in the lives of ethnic families and the aged in particular. What may change is the manner in which the generations view ethnic heritage, the means by which they choose to express it, and the effect that it has in interrelationships and family solidarity over the life course. The more knowledge we have about aging in ethnic families the more successful the journey.

The State of Greek American Assimilation: Towards Symbolic Ethnicity

NIKOS ALEXIOU

Introduction

Ethnic diversity is an essential component of American culture, shaping the basic nature of American society. Recently a revived interest in ethnic group studies has brought into light a significant amount of information about their contribution to the social, economic, and political history of the country.

Within the American sociological tradition, much attention has concentrated on the process of ethnic group assimilation and the impact of immigration on the pluralist structure of American society. However, Americans of Greek descent have not been the subject of many systematic sociological studies,¹ and therefore little knowledge is available concerning processes of maintaining or weakening of Greek ethnic identity, within the United States.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the concept of ethnicity among the Greek-Americans of the New York metropolitan area, which has the largest numbers of Greek Americans in the United States. It explores two alternative hypotheses concerning the state of assimilation of Greek Americans.

The first hypothesis follows Gordon's theory of ethnic group assimilation, according to which, ethnic groups go through a series of successive stages of assimilation. He identifies the first stage to be cultural assimilation. While all ethnic groups eventually experience cultural assimilation,

¹ Evangelos Vlachos, *The Assimilation of Greeks in the United States* (Athens, 1968) p. 29; Charles C. Moskos, *Greek Americans, Struggle and Success* (2nd ed. New Brunswick 1980) p. 188.

they may remain at this stage indefinitely, or, may continue through six successive stages of assimilation (such as structural and marital assimilation).

Following Gordon's theory of assimilation we would therefore expect that the latest generations of Greek Americans have at least undergone thorough cultural assimilation and may have even attained some of the successive stages that follow.

The second hypothesis, is derived from the work of Greek American scholars, such as Moskos, who argues² that Greek Americans do not follow the pattern of assimilation identified by Gordon, but rather, they have undergone structural assimilation, without experiencing the first step of cultural assimilation.

Theoretical Framework

In general, within the American sociological tradition, the aspect of ethnicity has been explored by various theories. A diverse range of theories of ethnic (and race) relations can be broadly classified as order theories. These theories support patterns of integration and assimilation of ethnic groups to the dominant culture of the host society. According to these theories, assimilation is viewed as the process by which culturally distinct groups within the larger society adopt the language, values, and norms of the host society and gain equal status in its institutions.³

Two major theories which influenced later assimilation studies in general, especially studies of European ethnics, are Milton Gordon's theory of the concept of assimilation, and Herbert Gans' theory of symbolic ethnicity.

Gordon developed a theoretical framework to examine assimilation among different ethnic groups. In his work *Assimilation in American Life*⁴ he distinguished seven assimilation dimensions: cultural assimilation or acculturation, structural assimilation, marital assimilation or amalgamation, identificational assimilation, attitude receptional assimilation, behavior receptional assimilation, and civic assimilation. Moreover, Gordon in his multidimensional model of assimilation advanced certain hypotheses about the assimilation process concerning white European ethnic groups. Cultural assimilation or acculturation is likely assimilation to occur. Second, cultural assimilation or acculturation may take place even when none of the other types of assimilation occur simultaneously or later, and this condition acculturation only may continue indefinitely.⁵

²Ibid p. 147.

³Robert Park, "Assimilation, Social," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1935) 2, pp. 281-82.

Acculturation refers to changes by the immigrants and their descendants of their cultural patterns such as language, norms, customs to those of the host society. Structural assimilation refers to large scale entrance of the ethnics to the fabric of host society; into the social cliques, and economic and political associations and institutions of the host society on primary group level.

According to Gordon the early process of assimilation occurs by the taking on of the language, and American behavior patterns. If the process is completed, then minority groups enter into the core of society at the primary group level. Consequently, that inevitably will lead to substantial amount of intermarriage (amalgamation). If full marital assimilation follows structural assimilation, then the minority group loses its ethnic identity into the host society. Research on various European ethnic groups supports Gordon's typology.

Gans in his paper "Symbolic Ethnicity"⁶ expands Gordon's theory of assimilation by confirming that acculturation and assimilation continue to take place among European ethnics. Moreover, Gans argues that ethnic characteristics that used to matter for one's ethnic identification have undergone a radical change among the latest generations of Americans with European ancestries. As a result, a different kind of ethnicity has emerged; Gans defines the turning ethnic identity of white Europeans as symbolic ethnicity — a condition which could persist for generations.

Symbolic ethnicity, unlike earlier forms of ethnic identification, leads to a detachment of ethnicity from ethnic networks, organizations and neighborhoods; it is an identification without strong commitments to ethnic behavior or strong social ties.

This paper attempts to trace the type of ethnicity Greeks have, symbolic or traditional, in order to confirm whether Greeks are culturally assimilated.

Alternative Theories of Greek Americans

The first systematic Greek immigration movement to the United States occurred essentially in late nineteenth century, early twentieth century. In general, Greeks were among the last to emigrate to America compared to other European groups, and present day Greek-Americans comprise a relatively small ethnic group in comparison to the total immigrant population of the United States.

⁶Herbert Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (January, 1979) 1-20.

Studies on Greek Americans reveal that Americans of Greek descent have achieved educational and occupational mobility.⁷ Furthermore these studies support the hypothesis that besides their upward mobility and identification with American society, Greek Americans maintain a relatively strong attachment to their ethnicity. In other words Americans of Greek descent have experienced structural assimilation, but not cultural assimilation (acculturation).

"Acculturation, has probably lagged behind assimilation."⁸

In this paper I will examine whether Greeks in America like other white Europeans, have been culturally assimilated first, and show some degree of structural assimilation, or, whether they have followed a different pattern of assimilation, as some scholars argue. My suggestion here is that rather, Greek Americans are adopting a new type of ethnic identity moving in the direction of symbolic ethnicity. I argue that due to cultural assimilation, tremendous changes have occurred between generations in terms of individuals' ethnic identity and attachment to a cohesive ethnic community and culture. Greek American ethnic identity no longer is related to an attachment to ethnic culture and a cohesive ethnic community. As Harry Psomiades suggests, "Later generations, and they are the majority of Greek American Community, have a more symbolic identification with their ancestry."⁹ Therefore I examine two alternative hypotheses:

First, that the farther Greek Americans are from the immigrant experience, the more they will exhibit characteristics of cultural assimilation, as well as some degree of structural assimilation. Second, among Americans of Greek descent younger generations experience a high degree of structural assimilation, but cultural assimilation remains limited.

Sample and Data

The data were derived from a study of 283 Greek-Americans living in the New York Metropolitan area and was conducted by Dr. Maria Nicolaidēs in 1988. Respondents were selected from various mailing lists that were provided by Greek-American organizations (such as churches, professional organizations, colleges and universities). The questionnaire in this mail interview study was prepared in English and Greek. An attempt was made to sample subjects of varied demographic characteristics, such as age, par-

⁷Vlachos, *The Assimilation*; Alice Scourby, "Three Generations of Greek-Americans: A Study of Ethnicity," *International Migration Review* 14 (1980) 43-52; Moskos, *Greek Americans*.

⁸Ibid. p. 147.

ents' and grand-parents' place of birth, occupation, socioeconomic status. Also, the questionnaire included items for the measurement of assimilation. Indices were then constructed on language use, occupation, neighborhood composition, friends and coworkers, participation in formal organizations.

Of the 283 Greek Americans who responded to the survey, 52% were females and 48% males. Most of them were between 25 and 45 years old. Their patterns of residence indicate that most of the Greek Americans were concentrated in New York City, especially in Manhattan and Queens, and in neighboring New Jersey. Twenty four percent reported as immigrants, 60% were first generation, and 14% second and third generation.

Measures of Assimilation

In this study the degree of cultural assimilation or acculturation was measured by a number of dimensions such as level of education and language use, number of friends and co-workers. Structural assimilation measured by variables such as income and occupation, neighborhood composition, and participation in formal ethnic organizations.

Findings

We examine whether the different generations of Greek Americans show differences in socio-economic status characteristics and in their degree of attachment to ethnic cohesive communities, to Greek culture and to Greek-American ethnic identification.

Overall, the educational, occupational, and income attainment of immigrants and first generation Greek-Americans is fairly close. A stronger distinction is apparent between those two groups and the second generation Greek-Americans.¹⁰ A slightly higher percentage of second generation Greek-Americans are college graduates than the first generation and immigrant groups.

Some occupational differences exist between the generations. A higher percentage of second generation Greek-Americans are managers or administrators, as well as professionals, than the first or immigrant generations.

Despite the higher levels of education and professional/ administrative positions of second generation Greek-Americans, first generation immigrants reported higher level of income than them. About 26% of immigrants and first generation reported incomes between \$50,000 and \$75,000, where only about 8% of second generation Greek Americans reported the

same income.

Overall, it seems that the educational and occupational attainment of Greek-Americans does not vary greatly among generations. Moreover, the relationships between generations and the above socio-economic status indicators are not statistically significant. Although the lack of statistical significance may be due to the small sample size, it is also possible that it reflects new patterns of Greek immigration that have occurred since 1965. After the new immigration law of 1965, we did not only experience a new Greek immigration movement, but also the new immigrants had relatively high levels of educational and occupational training.

Tables 2-7 also provide data on Greek-Americans' attachment to a cohesive ethnic community, culture, and ethnic identification, by generation. Surprisingly, it is the first generation and not the immigrant group that has the lowest incidence of intermarriage; 63% of first generation have a Greek spouse as opposed to 54% of immigrant generation. As expected, second generation Greek Americans have the highest intermarriage rates.

The immigrant generation reports a higher percentage of their acquaintances being Greek than first or second generation. The relationship seems to be linear, with fewer acquaintances being Greek as generations increase. However, these last two relationships are not statistically significant.

There is a clear association between generation and percentage of coworkers being Greek-American. This is a basic distinction between immigrants and the other two groups. About 20% of immigrant generation reported that 50-89% of their coworkers were Greek while only 4% of first generation and no one from the second generation report such a high percentage of Greek coworkers. Conversely, 95% of second generation and 86% of first generation Greek Americans report that very few of their coworkers were Greeks. This is a highly statistically significant relationship which indicates that occupational segregation greatly diminishes with the first generation of Greeks who were born in the United States.

In general, the immigrant generation tends to live in neighborhoods with higher concentration of Greek Americans than first or second generation Greeks.

A strong relationship exists between Greek school attendance and generation. Almost three quarters of Greek immigrants have attended all day Greek schools, while 61% of first and second generation Greek Americans attended afternoon schools. The highest percentage of people who did not attend any Greek school occurs among second generation Greek Americans. This is a highly statistically significant relationship.

tion and generation. Only a slightly higher percentage of immigrants reported no membership to Greek organization than the other two groups.

In order to explore bivariate and multivariate relationships between the four variables indicating use of Greek language, I combined these variables into an additive index. This index of language use shows a highly significant linear relation between generation and use of the Greek language in the expected direction.

In general, attachment to a cohesive ethnic group is strongest among immigrant Greek-Americans. The main distinction in terms of attachment to a cohesive ethnic community occurs between the immigrants and the subsequent generations. It is only the immigrant Greek-Americans that experience a relatively high degree of residential and occupational segregation. They also show the strongest cultural attachment, as indicated by Greek school attendance and language use. Thus, it seems that ethnic segregation and cultural attachment greatly diminishes with the first generation of Greek-Americans who are born in the US. The question remains, though, whether ethnic identification as a Greek American also weakens among the members of the US born generations. The data on ethnic identification by generation that are presented in Tables 1-7, show that this is not necessarily the case.

Out of the five dimensions of ethnic identity, only nationalism has significant relation with generation. The relationship between nationalism and generation is strong, about one standard deviation unit between immigrant and first generation, while difference between first and second generation is much smaller (1/5th of a standard deviation).

The next research question pertains to the examination of the degree to which ethnic identification among Greek Americans has a strong instrumental component or not. That is, I will examine whether Greek American ethnic identification is affected by whether or not individuals belong to a cohesive ethnic community and maintain a strong cultural attachment.

Table 9 shows the multivariate regression analysis of the five factors indicating ethnic group identity¹¹ on indicators of group cohesiveness as well as with some key demographic characteristics. It is important to know that High scores in the Factors of ethnic group identification mean Low degree of identification.

Overall, four independent variables are found to have a significant relationship with the factor Nationalism; they are: language use (LANGCOMP),

¹¹Nationalism, Appropriate Cultural and Sex Roles, Group Belongingness and

participation in Greek American Organizations (GRKORG), generation (GEN), and income (INCOME).

Individuals with high levels of language use, high participation in Greek American organizations, as well as immigrant groups, tend to have high level of nationalism. On the other hand, participants with high income have low level of nationalism.

Three variables had a statistically significant effect on the factor of Group Belongingness: participation in Greek American organizations (GRKORG), having Greek friends (SOCIAL), and age (AGE).

Respondents with more participation in Greek American organizations, and with more Greek friends tend to have higher levels of ethnic group belongingness. On the contrary, as age respondents express less belongingness to the ethnic group.

The next factor of ethnic identification is Group Conflict; four independent variables are found to have a statistically significant relationship with this factor. They are: Greek School (GRKSCHL), participation in Greek American organizations (GRKORG), education (EDUC), and income. Individuals who attend Greek school more, or participate in ethnic organizations, and people with high education, tend to experience less group conflict. On the other hand, people with high level of income experience group conflict. With regard to the fifth factor, self identification, none of the independent variables had a statistically significant relationship.

Overall, few of the variables which indicate group cohesiveness and attachment to cultural experiences had an effect on the factors of ethnic identity. The most influential variables were: Language use (LANGCOMP), participation to Greek American organizations (GRKORG), and having Greeks friends (SOCIAL). In addition, education (EDUC), and income (INCOME), also had some significant effect. The aspect of ethnic identification that was mostly affected by the variables introduced in the regressions was Nationalism. However the last factor (Self Identification) remained unaffected by all of the above variables.

Summary and Conclusions

In summary, Greek immigrants tend to live in more ethnically segregated neighborhoods than first or second generation Greek Americans, although all generations do not live in highly segregated ethnic communities. The main distinction in terms of attachment to a cohesive ethnic community occurs between the immigrants and the subsequent generations. It is only the immigrant Greek Americans that experience a somewhat high de-

gree of residential and occupational segregation. The immigrant generation also shows the strongest cultural attachment, as indicated by Greek school attendance and language use. It seems that ethnic segregation and cultural attachment greatly diminishes with the first generation of Greek Americans who are born in the United States. Ethnic identification of Greek Americans, however does not weaken as generations become more removed from their immigrant ancestors, but becomes symbolic because is not based on need.

Overall, although members of the immigrant generation have higher levels of nationalism and culturally appropriate norms, they tend to have similar levels of identification as Greek Americans, ethnic group belongingness and perception of cultural conflict with members of the later generations.

Data analysis also examined whether Greek American ethnic identification is affected by whether or not individuals belong to a cohesive ethnic community and maintain a strong cultural attachment. Few of the variables which indicate group cohesiveness and attachment to cultural experiences had an effect on the different dimensions of ethnic identity. The most influential variables were: Language use, participation to Greek American organizations, and having mostly Greeks friends. Educational attainment and income also had some significant effects. These variables mostly affected the nationalist aspect of ethnic identification as well as adherence to culturally appropriate norms and sex roles. The dimension indicating self identification as a Greek-American was not affected by any of the independent variables introduced in the data analysis.

Thus, we can conclude that the Greek American community, along with the other groups of European ancestry, tends to move towards the model of 'symbolic' ethnic identification. Despite the fact that Greek Americans are relatively newcomers to the United States, their ethnic identity is no longer on the traditional characteristics of attachment to cultural values and ethnic solidarity.

Numerous scholars examining ethnic identity have argued that ethnicity among groups of European ancestry is undergoing a transformation (Gans 1982; Alba 1990; Waters 1990). In earlier generations, ethnic identity was based on group solidarity and ethnic cohesiveness as indicated by occupational and social segregation of ethnic groups. Recent changes among white ethnic groups indicate the emergence of a "symbolic ethnicity" which does not signify strong attachment to ethnic culture and language, ethnic networks, organizations, and neighborhoods.

The findings of the present study supported the initially stated hypoth-

esis, derived by Gordon's theory of assimilation. First, Greeks are cultural assimilated, without a completed stage of structural assimilation. Second, Americans of Greek descent experience symbolic ethnicity. This is because traditional structural and cultural commitments of ethnicity have undergone change. Greek Americans retain a degree of ethnic identification and attachment with their ethnic background but without structural commitments to ethnic ties. Because of cultural assimilation and some degree of structural assimilation ethnic identity is based on few symbolic identifications. Symbolic ethnicity does not influence peoples lives because it is peripheral to them, and is rather a matter of personal choice.

Data analysis of the present paper also replicates some other findings of previous research on Greek Americans (Vlachos:1968, Scourby:1980, Moskos:1989) which show that Greek Americans as generations go by have achieved higher educational, occupational, and economic status. However, the findings of the present study are not compatible with those of other studies which suggest that besides their upward mobility, Greek Americans have retained a relatively strong attachment to their ethnic background.

American society still remains multicultural and multiracial, therefore there is a strong indication that the importance of ethnicity as a general characteristic of American society will continue. However, there is a transformation of ethnicity for the Americans of European descent, including those of Greek background. Despite the fact that assimilation and detachment from various ethnic structures increases, ethnic identification among white Americans continues, but in a more personal way.

APPENDIX A

Definition of Terms

Ethnic Identity—One's self-perception that has been formed from the conscious and unconscious experiences of feeling an attachment to and being a member of a particular ethnic group.

Greek American—A person who is born in Greece or in the United States and one or more of whose parents or grandparents were born in Greece.

Greek Immigrant who is born in Greece and entered the United States and one or more of whose parents were born in Greece.

First Generation—A person who is born in the United States and one or more of whose parents were born in Greece.

Over-First Generation—A person who is born in the United States and both of whose parents were born in the United States also.

Table 1: Bivariate Relationships with Generation

1.1 EDLEVEL(Collapsed Education Level)					GEN(GENERATION IN US	
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
H.S	1 0.36 3.23 2.56	18 6.41 58.06 10.59	12 4.27 38.71 17.91	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		31 11.03
Some College	4 1.42 8.00 10.26	39 13.88 78.00 22.94	7 2.49 14.00 10.45	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		50 17.79
College Grad	34 12.10 17.00 87.18	113 40.21 56.50 66.47	48 17.08 24.00 71.64	5 1.78 2.50 100.00		200 71.17
Total	39 13.88	170 60.50	67 23.84	5 1.78		281 100.00

Frequency Missing = 2

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	6	15.206	0.019

Effective Sample Size = 281

Frequency Missing = 2

1.2 TABLE OF OCCUP BY GEN

OCCUP(Occupation) GEN(Generation in US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over st	Fir st	First t	Immigran t	11	2	Total
Housewife	0	10	4	0			14
	0.00	3.88	1.55	0.00			5.43
	0.00	71.43	28.57	0.00			
	0.00	6.41	6.78	0.00			
Student	6	6	3	0			15
	2.33	2.33	1.16	0.00			5.81
	40.00	40.00	20.00	0.00			
	15.38	3.85	5.08	0.00			
Retired or Unemployed	0	10	2	0			12
	0.00	2.71	0.39	0.00			4.65
	0.00	83.30	16.66	0.00			
	0.00	5.41	3.38	0.00			
Own business	1	3	2	0			6
	0.39	1.16	0.78	0.00			2.33
	16.67	50.00	33.33	0.00			
	2.56	1.92	3.39	0.00			
Academic	1	14	6	0			21
	0.39	5.43	2.33	0.00			8.14
	4.76	66.67	28.57	0.00			
	2.56	8.97	10.17	0.00			
Professional	13	45	13	3			74
	5.04	17.44	5.04	1.16			28.68
	17.57	60.81	17.57	4.05			
	33.33	28.85	22.03	75.00			
Manager/Administr	9	31	8	1			49
	3.49	12.01	3.11	0.39			16.28
	18.36	63.26	16.33	2.04			
	23.08	19.87	13.56	25.00			
Other	7	31	20	0			56
	4.27	12.02	7.77	0.00			22.49
	12.50	55.30	35.70	0.00			
	17.94	19.87	27.11	0.00			
Arts/Entertainme	2	6	1	0			9
	0.78	2.33	0.39	0.00			3.49
	22.22	66.67	11.11	0.00			
	5.13	3.85	1.69	0.00			
Total	39	156	59	4			258
	15.12	60.47	22.87	1.55			100.00

Frequency Missing = 25

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	54	51.648	0.566

1.3 TABLE OF INCOME BY GEN

INCOME(Annual income) GEN(Generation in US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over st	Fir st	First t	Immigran t	11	2	Total
< \$10,000	7	15	5	0			27
	2.54	5.43	1.81	0.00			9.78
	25.93	55.56	18.52	0.00			
	17.95	9.04	7.58	0.00			
\$10,000-\$24,999	5	20	11	1			37
	1.81	7.25	3.99	0.36			13.41
	13.51	54.05	29.73	2.70			
	12.82	12.05	16.67	20.00			
\$25,000-\$49,999	17	53	20	0			90
	6.16	19.20	7.25	0.00			32.61
	18.89	58.89	22.22	0.00			
	43.59	31.93	30.30	0.00			
\$50,000-\$74,999	3	44	17	2			66
	1.09	15.94	6.16	0.72			23.91
	4.55	66.67	25.76	3.03			
	7.69	26.51	25.76	40.00			
\$75,000-\$99,999	2	11	6	0			19
	0.72	3.99	2.17	0.00			6.88
	10.53	57.89	31.58	0.00			
	5.13	6.63	9.09	0.00			
> \$100,000	5	23	7	2			37
	1.81	8.33	2.54	0.72			13.41
	13.51	62.16	18.92	5.41			
	12.82	13.86	10.61	40.00			
Total	39	166	66	5			276
	14.13	60.14	23.91	1.81			100.00

Frequency Missing = 7

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	15	17.152	0.310

TABLE 2: SPSGREEK BY GEN

SPSGREEK(Is subject's spouse or partner Greek?)
GEN(GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
Yes	7 3.63 6.14 38.89	76 39.38 66.67 63.33	28 14.51 24.56 54.90	3 1.55 2.63 75.00		114 59.07
No	11 5.70 13.92 61.11	44 22.80 55.70 36.67	23 11.92 29.11 45.10	1 0.52 1.27 25.00		79 40.93
Total	18 9.33	120 62.18	51 26.42	4 2.07		193 100.00

Frequency Missing = 90

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	4.721	0.193

TABLE 3: SOCIAL BY GEN

SOCIAL(Percentage of Greek acquaintances)
GEN(GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
90-100%	4 1.41 11.11 10.00	20 7.07 55.56 11.70	12 4.24 33.33 17.91	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		36 12.72
51%-89%	7 2.47 10.29 17.50	38 13.43 55.88 22.22	23 8.13 33.82 34.33	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		68 24.03
20%-50%	16 5.65 17.58 40.00	57 20.14 62.64 33.33	16 5.65 17.58 23.88	2 0.71 2.20 40.00		91 32.16
0-20%	13 4.59 14.77 32.50	56 19.79 63.64 32.75	16 5.65 18.18 23.88	3 1.06 3.41 60.00		88 31.10
Total	40 14.13	171 60.42	67 23.67	5 1.77		283 100.00

TABLE 4: COWORKER BY GEN

COWORKER(Percentage of Greek coworkers)
GEN(GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
90-100%	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	4 1.52 50.00 2.60	4 1.52 50.00 6.15	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		8 3.04
51%-89%	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	6 2.28 31.58 3.90	13 4.94 68.42 20.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		19 7.22
20%-50%	2 0.76 9.09 5.13	12 4.56 54.55 7.79	8 3.04 36.36 12.31	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		22 8.37
0-20%	37 14.07 17.29 94.87	132 50.19 61.68 85.71	40 15.21 18.69 61.54	5 1.90 2.34 100.00		214 81.37
Total	39 14.83	154 58.56	65 24.71	5 1.90		263 100.00

Frequency Missing = 20

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	9	30.494	0.000

Effective Sample Size = 263

Frequency Missing = 20

TABLE 5: NBRHDCMP BY GEN

NBRHDCMP (Greek composition of neighborhood)
GEN (GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
Over 50%	5 1.82 20.83 13.52	13 4.73 54.16 7.79	6 2.18 25.00 9.1	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		24 8.73
20%-50%	1 0.36 3.70 2.70	14 5.09 51.85 8.38	12 4.36 44.44 18.18	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		27 9.82
0-20%	31 11.27 13.84 83.78	140 50.91 62.50 83.83	48 17.45 21.43 72.73	5 1.82 2.23 100.00		224 81.45
Total	37 13.45	167 60.73	66 24.00	5 1.82		275 100.00

Frequency Missing = 8

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	9	11.191	0.263

TABLE 6: GRKSCHL BY GEN

GRKSCHL (Did subject attend Greek school?) GEN (GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
No	11 3.99 21.57 28.21	32 11.59 62.75 18.82	8 2.90 15.69 12.90	0 0.00 0.00 0.00		18
Yes, afternoons	24 8.70 17.02 61.54	105 38.04 74.47 61.76	9 3.26 6.38 14.52	3 1.09 2.13 60.00		51
Yes, all day	4 1.45 4.76 10.26	33 11.96 39.29 19.41	45 16.30 53.57 72.58	2 0.72 2.38 40.00		30
Total	39 14.13	170 61.59	62 22.46	5 1.81		100

Frequency Missing = 7

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	11.191	0.263

TABLE 7: GRKORG BY GEN

GRKORG (# of memberships in Greek organizations)
GEN (GENERATION IN US)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Over Fir st	First	Immigran t	11	2	Total
0	16 5.69 14.68 40.00	63 22.42 57.80 37.06	29 10.32 26.61 43.94	1 0.36 0.92 20.00		109 38.79
1	10 3.56 14.49 25.00	46 16.37 66.67 27.06	12 4.27 17.39 18.18	1 0.36 1.45 20.00		69 24.56
2	6 2.14 10.91 15.00	36 12.81 65.45 21.18	12 4.27 21.82 18.18	1 0.36 1.82 20.00		55 19.57
3	3 1.07 14.29 7.50	13 4.63 61.90 7.65	4 1.42 19.05 6.06	1 0.36 4.76 20.00		21 7.47
> 4	5 1.78 18.50 7.50	10 3.56 3.70 5.89	3 3.27 11.11 13.64	1 0.36 3.70 20.00		27 9.61
Total	40 14.23	170 60.50	66 23.49	5 1.78		281 100.00

Frequency Missing = 2

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	21	17.887	0.656

Table 8: Index of Language Use by Generation

Level of GENERATION	N	Mean	SD
First	169	3.40532544	1.00366948
Immigrant	63	4.66269841	0.69872974
Over First	39	2.75641026	1.25064086

Table 9: Multivariate Regressions of the Five Factors of Ethnic Identification

9.1 Dependent Variable :FACT1

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value
Model	12	8719.93723	726.66144	8.580
Error	196	16599.57473	84.69171	
C Total	208	25319.51196		

Root MSE	9.20281	R-square	0.3444
Dep Mean	38.23445	Adj R-sq	0.3043
C.V.	24.06942		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > T
INTERCEP	1	42.837381	9.54332269	4.489	0.0001
GREEKSP	1	-2.221292	1.66598932	-1.333	0.1840
GRKSCHL	1	-1.697037	1.20990821	-1.403	0.1623
LANGCOMP	1	-2.099127	0.78385921	-2.678	0.0080
GRKORG	1	-1.056602	0.46174327	-2.288	0.0232
NBRHDCMP	1	0.788328	0.95947553	0.822	0.4123
SOCIAL	1	0.565392	0.75241029	0.751	0.4533
COWORKER	1	-0.072040	0.95981905	-0.075	0.9402
GEN	1	-4.446248	1.27244501	-3.494	0.0006
GENDER	1	1.791837	1.41168924	1.269	0.2058
EDUC	1	0.205320	0.47555875	0.432	0.6664
INCOME	1	1.175698	0.51963882	2.263	0.0248
AGE	1	0.099719	0.05708068	1.747	0.0822

9.2 Dependent Variable: FACT2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	12	4074.02998	339.50250	4.875	0.0001
Error	207	14416.85639	69.64665		
C Total	219	18490.88636			

Root MSE	8.34546	R-square	0.2203
Dep Mean	44.52273	Adj R-sq	0.1751
C.V.	18.74426		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > T
INTERCEP	1	33.240918	8.28324202	4.013	0.0001
GREEKSP	1	-1.867511	1.42991647	-1.306	0.1930
GRKSCHL	1	-0.712790	1.05526833	-0.675	0.5001
LANGCOMP	1	-0.250156	0.68278276	-0.366	0.7145
GRKORG	1	-0.329840	0.44520239	-0.741	0.4596
NBRHDCMP	1	-0.766343	0.83593166	-0.917	0.3603
SOCIAL	1	1.728134	0.66692621	2.591	0.0102
COWORKER	1	-0.682131	0.84950602	-0.803	0.4229
GEN	1	-1.884293	1.14284865	-1.649	0.1007
GENDER	1	0.205650	1.24207115	0.166	0.8687
EDUC	1	1.323034	0.38637000	3.424	0.0007
INCOME	1	0.683176	0.46622473	1.465	0.1443
AGE	1	-0.095470	0.04882771	-1.955	0.0519

9.3 Dependent Variable: FACT3

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	12	2967.84671	247.32056	5.176	0.0001
Error	198	9460.77888	47.78171		
C Total	210	12428.62559			
Root MSE	6.91243	R-square	0.2388		
Dep Mean	27.36019	Adj R-sq	0.1927		
C.V.	25.26456				

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > T
INTERCEP	1	24.534122	7.24245314	3.388	0.0009
GREEKSP	1	-0.563793	1.20477742	-0.468	0.6403
GRKSCHL	1	-1.098930	0.89718449	-1.225	0.2221
LANGCOMP	1	-0.860615	0.57529239	-1.496	0.1363
GRKORG	1	-1.195225	0.35501918	-3.367	0.0009
NBRHDCMP	1	-0.930284	0.73031765	-1.274	0.2042
SOCIAL	1	1.574940	0.55911808	2.817	0.0053
COWORKER	1	-0.849356	0.76581545	-1.109	0.2687
GEN	1	-0.347853	0.96097322	-0.362	0.7178
GENDER	1	-0.731589	1.05293795	-0.695	0.4880
EDUC	1	0.492311	0.32699515	1.506	0.1338
INCOME	1	0.633024	0.38958739	1.625	0.1058
AGE	1	0.109135	0.04147914	2.631	0.0092

9.4 Dependent Variable: FACT4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	12	437.06008	36.42167	1.912	0.0345
Error	208	3961.48290	19.04559		
C Total	220	4398.54299			
Root MSE	4.36413	R-square	0.0994		
Dep Mean	12.32579	Adj R-sq	0.0474		
C.V.	35.40645				

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > T
INTERCEP	1	5.850586	4.46678365	1.310	0.1917
GREEKSP	1	0.213036	0.74875944	0.285	0.7763
GRKSCHL	1	1.566937	0.54820667	2.858	0.0047
LANGCOMP	1	-0.460419	0.36177778	-1.273	0.2046
GRKORG	1	0.522597	0.23361095	2.237	0.0263
NBRHDCMP	1	0.412324	0.44523647	0.926	0.3555
SOCIAL	1	0.092177	0.34819195	0.265	0.7915
COWORKER	1	-0.608984	0.48491486	-1.256	0.2106
GEN	1	-0.345914	0.59566154	-0.581	0.5621
GENDER	1	0.652200	0.64984431	1.004	0.3167
EDUC	1	0.391672	0.20208067	1.938	0.0540
INCOME	1	-0.454261	0.24265521	-1.872	0.0626
AGE	1	-0.001869	0.02611097	-0.072	0.9430

9.5 Dependent Variable: FACT5

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	12	140.30637	11.69220	1.078	0.3796
Error	216	2341.90324	10.84214		
C Total	228	2482.20961			
Root MSE	3.29274	R-square	0.0565		
Dep Mean	11.69869	Adj R-sq	0.0041		
C.V.	28.14624				

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > T
INTERCEP	1	8.536034	3.19379315	2.673	0.0081
GREEKSP	1	0.154063	0.55612053	0.277	0.7820
GRKSCHL	1	-0.521405	0.40311385	-1.293	0.1972
LANGCOMP	1	0.196452	0.26442035	0.743	0.4583
GRKORG	1	-0.128261	0.16060865	-0.799	0.4254
NBRHDCMP	1	0.271595	0.32656829	0.832	0.4065
SOCIAL	1	0.375078	0.25771923	1.455	0.1470
COWORKER	1	0.062322	0.32594089	0.191	0.8485
GEN	1	-0.281020	0.44118205	-0.637	0.5248
GENDER	1	-0.436115	0.47931076	-0.910	0.3639
EDUC	1	0.226508	0.15036415	1.506	0.1334
INCOME	1	-0.122278	0.17997781	-0.679	0.4976
AGE	1	-0.010595	0.01904349	-0.556	0.5786

Crucial Time-Lags in the Philosophy of the State's Role in Development

YANNIS CALOGHIROU
STAVROS IOANNIDES
ANTIGONE LYBERAKI

Introduction

The study of Greek economic development after 1974 raises a crucial question. Why did it take economic policy-makers so long to realize that macroeconomic constraints tended to make active interventionist policies increasingly ineffective in the period 1974-90? Or, to put the same question differently, why did economic policy fail to realize the insurmountable nature of macroeconomic constraints, although the problem was becoming increasingly evident as the country approached the 1990's? We will argue in this paper that the possible answer lies in the realization that economic philosophy in Greece has always lagged behind what was, in different periods, considered to be the "orthodox" paradigm in Western Europe.

The "orthodox" paradigm of economic policy in Western Europe from the end of the war to the mid-1970s was characterized by its confidence in the ability of governments, on the one hand, to ensure economic stability through demand-management policies and, on the other, to promote industrial development aiming at long-term growth and competitiveness. This paradigm was consistently advocated in Greece by the monthly journal *Nea Oikonomia*, which appeared in 1946 and ceased its publication in 1967 because of the dictatorship. We will review the model of economic development proposed by the journal, as it provides ample evidence of the time-lag we referred to above. Although the emphasis placed by this model on the state's role in development evolves during the 20 years of the journal's publication, with the emphasis on planning and central control of the economy giving way to a more favorable attitude towards the private sector, the model is consistently characterized by its conviction in the effec-