RACIAL IDEOLOGIES AND ETHNORACIAL SOCIAL INCLUSION POLICY IN MEXICO AND PERU

by
Abby Michelle Bruce

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for completion
Of the Bachelor of Arts degree in International Studies
Croft Institute for International Studies
Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College
The University of Mississippi

Oxford
May 2018

Approved by

_____
Advisor: Dr. Oliver Dinius

_____
Reader: Dr. Yael Zeira

_____
Reader: Dr. Jeffrey Jackson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Edward Telles for allowing me to work with survey data that he and other members of the PERLA team designed and collected. The PERLA research is extremely fascinating and provides new, valuable insight into ethnoracial issues in Latin America. I am very humbled to have been able to work with this data as an undergraduate student.

I want thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Dinius, for all of his support, patience, and guidance throughout this thesis writing process. He constantly challenged and pushed me to put forth my best work and thanks to this my writing and editing skills have improved. I truly appreciate all the time he set aside to meet with and advise me this year. Without his guidance, I would have been lost, and I would not have gotten access to the PERLA data. I hope to have written a work that will make him proud.

I would also like to thank Dr. Zeira, my second reader, for helping guide me towards the appropriate statistical methodology and for her additional comments on the overall direction of the thesis. From watching my older sisters, I recognize that working while being a brand new mother is not an easy task and I admire Dr. Zeira's dedication.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Jackson, who agreed to be my third reader despite having never taught me before. His knowledge of racial issues, Latin America, and statistics has been invaluable, especially in these last few weeks. I am especially grateful for the time and assistance he was able to provide me.

Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Cotelo for his constant support in all my endeavors since early freshman year. In his history of race and ethnicity and Latin America class, I was exposed to the themes that would later turn into my thesis topic. Without his guidance, I probably would not have chosen to study abroad in Peru, a place that I now cherish.

ABSTRACT

ABBY MICHELLE BRUCE:

Racial Ideologies and Ethnoracial Social Inclusion Policy in Mexico and Peru

(Under the direction of Dr. Oliver Dinius)

My study examines the covariation of racial ideologies and ethnoracial social inclusion policies with ethnoracial identity in Peru and Mexico. I begin by studying the history and evolution of racial ideologies in Latin America generally and then in Mexico and Peru more specifically. I use this research to help guide and inform my bivariate tabular analysis of data collected by the Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America (PERLA). From the PERLA survey questionnaires for Mexico and Peru, I choose questions pertaining to ethnoracial identity and attitudes towards specific social inclusion policies and racial ideologies. I measure the covariation of ethnoracial social inclusion policies and racial ideologies with ethnoracial identity to determine how highly supported they are in contemporary Mexico and Peru and, consequently, if the "shift" from mestizaje to multiculturalism is as prominent as the literature suggest. If there has been a shift to recognition of the multicultural nature of society that is unique from the mestizaje narratives of the past that has consequently led to the development and adoption of ethnoracial social inclusion policies in Latin America, the data should show high levels of support for ethnoracial social inclusion policies and low levels of support of mestizaje ideals. I control for ethnoracial identity to compensate for any variation in attitude between ethnoracial groups. My study results will hopefully provide greater insight into support for ethnoracial social inclusion policies as linked to the historical patterns of racial ideologies.

PROLOGUE

Growing up in the American South, I have always been aware of the role racial stratification and discrimination can play in society. Although I gleaned from my studies that racial perceptions vary regionally, it was not until I studied abroad that I began to understand. In one class, we used Michael Banton's *Racial Theories* (1987) as the theoretical base around which to center our discussion of racial perceptions in other countries. We discussed the mestizaje narrative of racial mixture which many Latin American countries share that shaped race relations and the independence movement. Peru, where I studied abroad, is very much racially mixed but also home to racial inequality. Although my mestizo classmates had indigenous ancestry, it is still uncommon that someone from a rural indigenous community gets access to university to compensate for economic disparity. In the US, affirmative action policies were created in the 60s and 70s to compensate for racial barriers to education. I could not help but wonder if similar policies existed in Peru, and if they did, if they would be effective. This prompted me to explore racial perceptions and social inclusion policies in Peru and Latin America more broadly.

Since the 2000s, Latin American countries have been recognizing and promoting their multicultural and multi-ethnic populations. Global models of economic development have exposed the countries to more outside pressure from private international organizations and UN human rights committees, legislation, and forums (Telles 2014). Beyond mere recognition of their multicultural or multiethnic societies in reformed constitutions as seen in Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Venezuela (Sieder 2002), some states have implemented ethnoracial social inclusion policies in an attempt to retroactively amend racial inequalities. The most notable case is that of Brazil with their affirmative action policies in higher education in the early 2000s. Many social scientists have referred to this as a shift from the nationalist mestizaje ideologies of the independence era to something new, unseen before in Latin America. Others, more recently, claim that the move towards multiculturalism is merely another face of mestizaje that is viewed more favorably under representative democracy.

Given the region's complex racial history and increased pressure to address indigenous and ethnic rights, it is increasingly interesting to study how the region will address racial discrimination and multiculturalism in the twenty-first century. Racial narratives intertwined into each nation's national identity will continue to contribute to the acceptance or disapproval and success or failure of ethnoracial social inclusion policies aimed at counteracting centuries of damage created by complex ethnoracial social institutions. As more ethnoracial social inclusion policies are adopted, it is important to study and understand contemporary racial ideologies and how they relate to the support (or lack of support) for such policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii
Abstract iv
Prologue v
List of Tables vii
Chapter I: Historical Background of Racial Ideology in Latin America 1
1.1 Importance 1
1.2 Origins of Mestizaje 4
1.3 Positive Reinterpretation of Mestizaje 6
1.4 Critiques of Mestizaje 7
1.5 Emergence of Multiculturalism 9
1.6 Problems with Multiculturalism 11
Chapter II: Data and Methodology 13
2.1 Data: The Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America 13
2.2 Analysis of PERLA Data 16
2.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses 19
2.4 Methodology 20
2.5 Research Goals 21
Chapter III: Data Analysis 23
3.1 Introduction 23
3.2 Ethnoracial Classification 23
3.3 Racial Ideologies 30
3.4 Ethnoracial Social Inclusion Policies 35
Chapter IV: Conclusion 42
4.1 Summary of Research Purpose and Design 42
4.2 Research Findings 42
Bibliography 46
Appendix 49

List of Tables

Table 2.1: List of Racial Ideologies and Ethnoracial Social Inclusion Policy Questions.....18

Table 3.1: Percentage of Population for Each Combination of Self and Outside Identification (Mexico).....26

Table 3.2: Percentage of Population for Each Combination of Self and Outside Identification (Peru).....26

Table 3.3: Percentage of Total Survey Population (Outside Identification).....27

Table 3.4: Percentage of Total Survey Population (Self Identification).....27

Table 3.5: Average Skin Tone Shades (Mexico).....29

Table 3.6: Average Skin Tone Shades (Peru).....29

Table 3.7: The Mixture of People with Distinct Origins or Races is Good for my Country.....32

Table 3.8: Indigenous People Should Marry White People in Order to 'Better the Race' ...34

Table 3.9: Universities Should Guarantee Places for Indigenous Students.....37

Table 3.10: The Government Should Establish Stricter Laws to Prevent the Mistreatment of Indigenous People.....39

Chapter 1

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RACIAL IDEOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICA

1.1 Importance

Ethnoracial relations are and always have been at the core of Latin American society. European settlers imposed rigid social hierarchies in order to maintain social order and power. An individual's place in the hierarchy was determined by ethnoracial characteristics. The structure and organization of social hierarchies varied throughout the region due to the varying ethnoracial compositions and governmental structures of each colony. Ethnoracial ideologies helped to enforce and justify the societal structure. Today, as Latin America faces increasing outside pressures from private international organizations and the United Nations to address racial inequality and adopt multicultural reforms, the strong ideological narratives of the past still haunt the region and complicate the road to ethnoracial equality.

Systemic racial inequalities in Latin America go back to the onset of colonization. Although the term "race" was not used nor conceptualized until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, systems of domination and power based on lineage were present during early colonization (Telles 2014). When the Spaniards colonized New Spain, or current day Mexico, they created socio-political institutions such as "Reducciones," "Encomiendas," "Repúblicas de Indios," and "Repartimientos," to regulate and establish

control over the territory and its native indigenous populations (Telles 2014). These institutions corralled Indian communities into controlled environments so that the Spanish could more easily govern, tax, and christianize them while harnessing their labor.

In the 17th century, Spanish colonial authorities also established the *castas*, or caste, system which denoted an individual's place in the social hierarchy by his or her quantity of Spanish blood. It established the social order as well as defined the rights, responsibilities, and restrictions of various ethnic groups (Telles 2014; Kellogg 1995). An individual's place in the *castas* system determined the offices he/she could obtain as well as the amount he/she was taxed (Telles 2014). The Spanish (Peninsulares) and their descendants (Creoles) maintained power by placing themselves at the top of the social hierarchy. There was flexibility within the system. One could move up the social hierarchy through marriage with someone of a higher social strata, "mejorar la raza," or one could "buy" whiteness through payments known as "gracias al sacar" (Chasteen 2011). The system was not standard across the colonies as each *audiencia*, or court, could introduce and impose its own regulations (Telles 2014). The castas system created the first conceptualization of race in Latin America, loosely built upon ancestry, lineage, and pedigree.

The *castas* system was suspended when the Spanish crown adopted the new, liberal Constitution of 1812. Although never fully implemented, the constitution threatened the social order of the colonies. Latin American elites, or Spanish American Creoles, feared the liberal reforms would lead to dissension from their predominantly non-white populations. In Peru, many creoles were still haunted by the fears of the Tupac Amaru revolution in the 1780s and preferred to live under the iron fist of Spanish

absolutism than unleash the forces of revolution and rebellion (Larson 2004). Consequently, the Independence movements arose from the conflict between the Creoles and new Spanish crown. "The Creole elites of those societies were motivated more often by their fear of local political disorder and social unrest than their desire for political freedom" (Larson 2004). Creoles wished to maintain their position of authority in the colonies and therefore sought to create independent nations.

The Peruvian independence war took place from 1811 until 1826 and was marked by constant debate and conflicting ideas about the role of indigenous people in the new republic (Larson 2004). Then, the guano boom lead to a period (1950-1970s) of free market reform which challenged the ideals of indigenous communal lands (Larson 2004). The War of the Pacific (1879-1883) helped to shape national identity as indigenous peasants took part in fighting for "the universal promise of a national-democratic project" (Schaefer 2017). The period was marked by a constant conflict "between free-trade ideologies and authoritarian impulses, between assimilative programs and segregationist projects, and between economic optimism and racial anxiety" (Larson 2004).

In Mexico, similar tumultuous liberal reform took place after the war of independence which lasted from 1810 until 1821. At the beginning of the century, Mexico abolished slavery and granted nearly universal male suffrage, however both of these accomplishments would be reversed by the end of the century (Schaefer 2017). From 1876 to 1911 under Porfirio Diaz's authoritarian regime, "perceptions of race and class organized the central aspects of social life" (Schaefer 2017). The global liberal discourse took hold across Latin America and "indigenous peasants were willing to go to war and die for their concept of the nation" (Schaefer 2017). Peasants (predominantly of

indigenous descent) in Peru and Mexico welcomed the promise of equality, but after the wars ended, their Creole elite allies turned on them (Schaefer 2017).

1.2 Origins of Mestizaje

As a way to separate themselves from Spain, Creole elites had to create and promote a unifying message of nationhood. The politics of the Confronting their large non-white populations which had often been seen as obstacles to national development, Creoles decided to promote the historical and biological process of racial and cultural mixing. Rather than the non-white populations being seen as a detriment, they were placed at the core of the national identity. Creoles and Indians alike could share in and take pride in their mixed, shared heritage. The biological and cultural mixing between peoples in Latin America is referred to as mestizaje. The nationalistic racial ideology of mestizaje allowed Creoles to maintain and rationalize the existing social hierarchies and their positions of power.

Both Mexico and Peru had particularly strong mestizaje ideologies. However, while both glorified their indigenous heritages as the crux of their identities, both countries still maintained a strong sense of 'otherness' which cast Indigenous peoples as outside of the larger society. In what is now present day Mexico, institutions like the "Repúblicas de Indios" segregated indigenous people from the rest of the colonial population, allowing for the preservation of indigenous languages and culture and consequently making it difficult for Indians to integrate into the larger society (Zavala et al. 1954; Cope 1994 [1980]). In contrast, Africans, imported to Mexico to compensate for labor shortages due to deaths of indigenous peoples caused by disease and harsh labor

conditions, were able to integrate into the larger Spanish society more easily since they did not develop a unified, separate language and culture (Telles 2014).

Mexican mestizaje nationalism experienced a revitalization in the early twentieth century as a result of the unrest of the Mexican Revolution of 1910. In order to help modernize the country, the state established the Instituto Nacional Indigenista (INI) in 1948 with the mission of transforming indigenous peoples into "Mexicans" (Telles 2014). The INI is a strong example of how the Mexican state enforced mestizaje and how the Indian was not seen as mestizo until "modern."

The Peruvian mestizaje narrative, while also strong, was weaker in comparison to its Mexican neighbor and did not fully develop until the 20th century. While Mexican mestizaje nationalism arose from a need to distinguish Mexico from Europe during the Mexican Revolution, Peruvian mestizaje arose as a reconciliatory discourse out of a conflict between the two competing ideologies of hispanismo and indigenismo (Telles 2014). Even though elites in Peru would come to embrace a mestizaje that glorified an indigenous past, they saw Hispanismo as the dominant element into which indigenous people could and would assimilate, achieving a "living synthesis of the Peruvian people" (Belaúnde 1987 [1987]; Telles 2014).

In Peru, indigenous blood was also important in determining one's place in society. While the Spaniards subordinated the indigenous populations during colonization, the crown also recognized the titles of nobility of the Indian elite and allowed them to maintain some degree of power (Telles 2014). The Spaniards exploited systems of power already put in place by the Inca empire such as the *mita* labor draft system (Chasteen 2011). However, after the Tupac Amaru uprising in the 1780s, the

privileged Indian elite were removed from their status of power, but Indians still remained outside of the larger society (Telles 2014). While the Incas and their empire were the foundation of the national narrative, the indigenous population was simultaneously placed outside the definition of "Peruanidad" (Telles 2014). In Peru, the racial category "mestizo" does not necessarily equate to someone who is no longer Indian. Rather, once an Indian has undergone socialization and successfully integrated into national life, one is considered "mestizo" instead of "Indian." Mestizaje referred to indigenous integration as much as, if not more than, it did to racial and cultural mixing. The value of the term "mestizo" was in its ambiguity in a society that still theoretically organized along binaries (Larson 2004).

1.3 Positive Reinterpretation of Mestizaje

Mestizaje nationalisms varied across Latin America, with some versions going so far as to claim that there was racial harmony in the region. The Peruvian mestizaje ideology is especially this way. The dark portrayal of Spanish colonialism that had been dominant during the 19th century was replaced with a kind, paternalistic view that portrays a harmonious encounter between the colonizers and the indigenous peoples. Peruvian intellectual Víctor Andrés Belaúnde claimed Peru was a spiritual and historic harmonic entity formed from the racial and spiritual encounter between the Hispanics and indigenous peoples (Belaúnde 1987 [1942]; Telles 2014). The Peruvian state attempted to deny the existence of discrimination and racism by erasing ethnoracial categories from legal and fiscal documents. After independence in 1821, the term "indio" was removed in an effort to show that "Indians" were simply "Peruvian" (Telles 2014).

In Mexico, there was a shared common belief among intellectuals that having endorsed a mestizaje ideology allowed Mexico to become a modern and just nation (Telles 2014). By the late 19th century, Vicente Riva Palacio of Mexico claimed that the mestizo race is biologically superior to the white race (Telles 2014). He also believed that Mexico needed linguistic, cultural, and racial homogeneity for successful national development (Telles 2014). Manuel Gamio wrote *Forging the Fatherland* in 1916, a year before the 1917 Mexican Constitution was established, and called for the creation of a new nationality that is neither European nor indigenous, but Mexican (Telles 2014). Other Mexican intellectuals, inspired by Gamio's work, took slightly different approaches in conceptualizing mestizaje. José Vasconcelos, in *La raza cósmica* (1982 [1925]) claims that the new, mixed race was biologically superior to all other "pure" races. Moisés Sáenz in *México integro* (1939) said that the only way cultural mixing could be achieved is through a strong school system. Elites in Mexico had strong capacities to disseminate mestizaje ideals through educational and cultural campaigns (Telles 2014; Mallon 1992; Wade 2009; Telles and Garcia 2013).

1.4 Critiques of Mestizaje

Mestizaje ideologies began to face criticism in the late 20th century for blanketing over ethnoracial conflict and inequality. Growing democratization, coupled with a transition to more neoliberal and globalized models of economic development during the 70s, 80s, and 90s, led to more increased external pressure and scrutiny from both private international organizations and the United Nations (Van Cott 2000; Telles 2004; Hooker 2005). There was a recognition that the mestizaje ideal did not necessarily equate to

racial harmony, but rather an ignorance of inequality between racial groups and the factors driving it.

At its core, mixture reinforces ideas of origins or purities. In order for something to be mixed, it must first come from a combination of two (at minimum) pure substances. In the same manner, mestizaje as a biopolitical process also reinforced racial and cultural origins, purities, and differences (Wade 2017). While mestizaje nationalisms promoted racial equality, they also promoted differences between races and cultures. "Mixture has a dual aspect: when it exists in the context of hierarchy and purifications, it can reproduce these structures; when powered by difference as an endless proliferation, it can undermine them" (Wade 2017). While said to eliminate racial conflict, racial hierarchies still existed and were strengthened. Mestizaje ideologies masked underlying narratives of white miscegenation. Although mestizaje ideologies shed a positive light on racial mixing, they masked white supremacist ideologies and did not actually make societies more egalitarian (Miller 2004; Wade 2016). Even Belaúnde with his harmonious view of Peru, claimed that there were "superior" and "inferior" elements to racial and cultural mixing (Telles 2014). The superior elements were those of hispanic origins while the inferior elements were those of indigenous origin.

By claiming there were no races, but rather a single, mixed race people, any claims to racial discrimination were made illegitimate (Miller 2004). The lack of racial categories did not eliminate racial inequality, but rather made it more difficult to identify and combat discrimination. Since the term "indio" was stricken from Peru's legal and fiscal documents, there was a lack of a clear definition. "Indian" came to refer to an inferior "race" that Peru needed to attend to in order to become a viable, unified, and

civilized nation (Kristal 1987; Telles 2014). Callirgos (1993) claims that although Peruvians disavow the existence of racism and many racial categories have been removed from official language, Peruvians constantly label themselves and each other by racial labels that govern social interactions. Unofficially agreed-upon constructions of race, ethnicity, class, and mestizaje have enabled various forms of discrimination in Peru (Young 2014).

1.5 Emergence of Multiculturalism

With heightened scrutiny of mestizaje ideals, the region began to shift toward multicultural policies. "Multiculturalism is the politics of recognition which takes the form of public policy, notably in the spheres of education and law, and also a more intangible set of initiatives designed to redress the balance between hegemonic cultures and the lifeworlds, languages, belief systems, and cultural heritage of subordinate populations, in Latin America notably indigenous people" (Lehmann 2016). The distinction between the socio-political ideologies of mestizaje and multiculturalism is important, because multiculturalism recognizes the presence of distinct ethnoracial groups and conversely allows for the recognition of ethnoracial inequalities and discrimination whereas mestizaje focuses on the mixture or blending into one, coherent race and culture. While culture is the attitudes and behaviors characteristic of a specific social group, this group does not necessarily have to be defined by race. Consequently, race and culture often play out synonymously given the parallel development of cultures in regions starkly divided by racial categories. "Difference now becomes a basis on which to claim special rights and establish or reinforce ethnic communities, which can be portrayed as representing modern political democracy, rather than being an obstacle to it"

(Wade 2016). Rather than ignoring racial differences and promoting racial homogeneity and harmony, multiculturalism brings ethnoracial discrimination to the foreground and gives strength to those organizations that can challenge it.

In response to increasing pressure from human rights groups and the UN to recognize indigenous and afro-latino groups, many countries declared themselves multicultural in their constitutions as part of their democratization process (Telles 2014; Hooker 2005; Sieder 2002). "Since 1986 new constitutions, or amendments to existing charters have been passed in Bolivia (1994), Colombia (1991), Ecuador (1998), Mexico (1992), Nicaragua (1986), Paraguay (1992), Peru (1993), and Venezuela (1999) recognising the multi-ethnic and pluricultural nature of those societies" (Sieder 2002). There are three main reasons, as outlined by Juliet Hooker (2005), that countries in Latin America adopted multicultural policies during this period: neo-liberal economic reforms challenged indigenous local autonomy and led to increased ethnic mobilization (Brysk and Wise 1997), multicultural citizenship reforms were promoted as a means of enhancing domestic legitimacy of the state (Van Cott 2000), and meeting certain demands by indigenous groups was thought to potentially de-legitimize more radical claims (Hale 2002).

Since ethnoracial discrimination has been recognized, at least officially, inter and intra regional pressures to create equal opportunities have grown (Telles 2014). Different forms of social inclusion policies, although some more symbolic than transformative, are taking shape throughout the region. Buvinic (2004) points to the Colombian constitution of 1991, affirmative action policies in higher education in Brazil, anti-discriminatory legislation in Mexico, and a 1997 law in Peru which made discrimination a crime.

Brazil's affirmative action policies in higher education are seen as the most radical form of ethnoracial social inclusion policy within the region, there have been similar policies in higher education in other countries within the region, most notably in Colombia (Leon 2004). Mala Htun (2004) views the Brazilian case as a transition from "racial democracy" to affirmative action.

The Mexican state's "shift" to multiculturalism followed the second reason outlined by Hooker: it wanted to promote its legitimacy. After recurrent economic crises in the 1980s the state endorsed pluralism, giving birth to the beginning of Mexican multiculturalism (Telles 2014). The state made several reforms to the constitution which would penalize perpetrators of discrimination as well as recognize Mexico's "multicultural and pluriethnic" nature to ensure the equality of opportunity for all members of society (Buvinic 2004; Telles 2014). The multicultural movement has not had as formative of a role in Peru. Even into the twentieth century, Peru contained strong images of mestizaje. Due to the etymological complexity of racial categories in Peru, it would be difficult to create and enforce effective social inclusion policies.

1.6 Problems with Multiculturalism

Some argue that multiculturalism is a new version of mestizaje, reconfigured to fit the agenda of modern political democracy umbrella rather than appearing to be an obstacle to it (Hale 2002; Wade 2016; Wade 2017). Wade (2016) claims that the image of the mestizo nation coexists alongside multicultural representations of difference, because difference was always already present in the idea of the mestizo nation. He points to the continual existence of tension between inclusion and exclusion of both the mestizaje ideology and modern multicultural policy. While multicultural policies

recognize ethnic minority rights, they also simultaneously facilitate capitalist exploitation of ethnic group territories (Wade 2016). "Like mestizaje, multiculturalism is a variation played on the theme of sameness and difference, and it does not evade the play of power that always operates between these two" (Wade 2017). Perhaps it is the fact that multiculturalism is the extension of mestizaje practices that many multicultural policy changes taken by the states are more symbolic than transformative.

Chapter 2

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data: The Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America:

The Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America (PERLA) was created "in an effort to collect and analyze survey data to explore a wide range of ethnoracial issues in the region" and to provide "much-needed data on ethnoracial conditions in the region (Telles 2014). The PERLA team took a multi-disciplinary approach due to the multidimensional nature of ethnoracial issues. Although each researcher had his/her own research interests, all had ethnoracial classification at the core of their research and understood that a multidisciplinary approach is the most effective when studying a multifaceted topic like race. The four countries analyzed by the project are Mexico, Colombia, Peru, and Brazil: countries in which there have been significant indigenous and afro-descendant demands to be recognized and included in national censuses.

The first two years of the project were dedicated to designing the survey questionnaires while the last three years of the project were spent analyzing the data collected and writing the book, *Pigmentocracies: Ethnicity, Race, and Color in Latin America*. It summarizes the team's findings in order "to inform academic analysis, official and other data collection efforts, policy making, and public opinion" (Telles 2014). The surveys were recorded around the year 2010, placing the respondents' answers in the middle of this "transition" away from mestizaje which started with the move towards representative democracies in the late 90s and early 2000s.

The PERLA survey questionnaires are cross-national, allowing not only analysis within a country, but also the first cross-national comparison of race and ethnicity within the region. Since the project was dedicated to ethnoracial issues, the survey questionnaires contained questions on a wide variety of related topics where a national census only has space for two to three questions on ethnoracial classification and discrimination. The PERLA data provide deeper, more integrated insight into ethnoracial issues that other data, like that provided by national censuses, cannot. While a national census does record demographic information, it does not ask questions regarding support of racial ideologies and ethnoracial social inclusion policies, nor can it measure ethnoracial identity in multiple ways.

In a region where race and ethnicity have not been consistently categorized or recorded, it is extremely useful that the PERLA surveys measure race in three different ways. PERLA measures ethnoracial classification in two different ways: outside-identification in which the interviewer chooses from a list of given ethnoracial categories the one to which he/she thinks the respondent pertains and self-identification in which the respondent chooses the ethnoracial classification with which he/she identifies. The ethnoracial categories included on the survey are white, indigenous, mestizo, mulatto, black, other, and does not know. Mulato, like mestizo is a mixed racial category. However, mulato refers to the mixture between people of white and black ancestry while mestizo refers to the mixture between Spaniards and Native Americans. The interviewer chooses his own response before asking questions to the respondent. In addition to these two measures, the PERLA survey questionnaires also ask the interviewer to choose on a scale of 1-11 which skin tone shade the respondent's facial skin tone most closely

corresponds. The interviewers were trained and instructed on how to use the color palette and to disregard the respondent's style of dress, way of speaking, and place of origin. Facial skin tone, like outside-identification, was measured before the interviewer asked the respondent questions. This question, coupled with individual outside identification, allows for a separation of the often entangled concepts race and ethnicity. In this case, race refers to skin tone while ethnicity refers to cultural identity.

Each survey questionnaire is composed of approximately 180 questions: Brazil with 171, Colombia 176, Mexico 181, and Peru 190. Although each of the country survey questionnaires contains some overlapping questions, the Brazilian and Colombian questionnaires have more questions pertaining to afro-descendants while the Mexican and Peruvian questionnaires focus more on indigenous peoples. The total number of individual survey responses tally 5,500: 1,500 responses each for Colombia, Mexico, and Peru and 1,000 responses for Brazil. The data allows for both aggregate and individual level analysis.

Surprisingly, *Pigmentocracies* does not provide any specific information on the sampling method used for the project. There is no information given about how individuals were selected to participate in the survey. Given that it does say, "Representative surveys like these are very important because of their fairly large samples and their ability to measure a variety of phenomena that can be generalized to the entire population," I assume PERLA uses a form of simple random sampling in order to create a sample representative of each respective country population, however, it is not explicitly stated in the book.

2.2 Analysis of PERLA Data:

My study focuses on Mexico and Peru specifically. These countries are comparable given their demographics and historical trajectory: they both have large indigenous populations and a history of strong mestizaje nationalism in the early 20th century. While Brazil is known for having implemented ethnoracial social inclusion policies like racial quotas in higher education and significant research has been conducted into Brazilian race relations, Mexico and Peru have not been as well studied. Indigenous political rights activism has grown in both countries, but much of the recognition by the state, such as amendments to the constitution which acknowledge the multicultural or multi-ethnic nature of the state, has been more symbolic than actually transformative.

In Mexico and Peru, citizens have undergone decades long socialization to mestizaje nationalisms. The proposed "shift" to multiculturalism in Latin America has not led to much ethnoracial social inclusion policy implementation in Mexico or Peru. Therefore, both country environments are interesting for studying attitudes towards ethnoracial social inclusion policies and racial ideologies as linked to ethnoracial identity.

Ethnoracial inequality exists among afro-descendants in both countries as well as indigenous peoples, however, there has not been as much research conducted which explores race relations with regards to afro-descendants as there has been with regards to indigenous peoples at the national level. Given that little research has been done into overall ethnoracial inequalities until recently, research tends to focus on the indigenous populations in these countries, which tend to be larger than their counterparts, rather than all discriminated ethnoracial groups. As this area of study advances, more research should be conducted with regards to the afro-descendant populations, Asian-descendant

and other ethnoracial groups in Mexico and Peru as well as Latin America more generally.

In order to determine which measure of ethnoracial classification included on the PERLA survey questionnaire yields the most useful results, I measure the covariance between the two measures of ethnoracial classification and use facial skin tone as a control variable. For each possible combination of ethnoracial classifications (with one coming from the outside-identification method and the other from self-identification), I calculate the average facial skin tone shade. In this manner, I view not only the consistency with which individuals are classified as the same ethnoracial category by themselves and by the interviewer, but also if the ethnoracial categories in Latin America are as inconsistent and unreliable as the literature suggest. For those individuals who change classification based on the measurement method used, I am able to compare their average skin tone to that of those who are consistently categorized and observe any patterns. From this analysis, I determine which classification method provides the most useful classification of the individuals surveyed for my needs.

I then use five questions from the PERLA survey questionnaire which are listed in the table below to observe support for racial ideologies and ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

Table 2.1:

Racial Ideologies
The mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country.
Indigenous people should marry white people in order to 'better the race.'
Ethnoracial Social Inclusion Policy
Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students.
The government should establish stricter laws to prevent the mistreatment of indigenous people.
I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights.

The responses for each question are measured on a Likert type scale from strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. For my study, I combine the category "strongly agree" with "agree" and "strongly disagree" with "disagree." This decision was mainly driven by the differences between the Peruvian and Mexican results; Peruvian individuals were less likely to choose the extremes, however, the sums of the two categories (i.e. "strongly agree" and "agree") for the two countries were more or less equal. Also, for the questions selected, I did not see that there would be a large ideological difference between those individuals who "agree" and those who "strongly agree." Both groups agree with the ethnoracial social inclusion policy or racial ideology. The strength of individual agreement is not of importance for the scope of my study.

Each question targets a different racial ideology and social inclusion policy. Most importantly, the statement, "the mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country," corresponds with the mestizaje ideology of racial mixing. The other racial ideology question, "Indigenous people should marry white people in order to 'better the race,'" focuses on underlying sentiments of white superiority within the idea of racial mixing. These two questions on racial ideology cover the main ideas of

mestizaje as an ideology and consequently allows me to see how influential it is among individuals in contemporary Mexico and Peru.

2.3 Research Question and Hypotheses:

My main interest is whether or not there has been a shift in racial ideology in Latin America. Recent scholarship has contested the idea that the recognition of multicultural and multiethnic societies marks a new and unique shift in the underlying racial ideologies in Latin America. While older literature suggested that the mestizaje narrative of racial mixing and blending would stand in contrast to multicultural policies (e.g. ethnoracial social inclusion policies), newer literature suggest that multiculturalism is just a rebranding of mestizaje that is viewed more favorably under representative democracy (Wade 2016). Thus, my main research question is:

RQ1: Does an acceptance of multicultural policies (e.g. ethnoracial social inclusion policies) mark a shift in racial ideology in Latin America?

In order to answer this question, I must first measure whether mestizaje and ethnoracial social inclusion policies have high support in contemporary Mexico and Peru. I break the mean research question down into two sub-questions:

RQ2: Do the ideals of mestizaje as a racial ideology have high support in contemporary Mexico and Peru?

RQ3: Do ethnoracial social inclusion policies have high support in contemporary Mexico and Peru?

Given that both racial ideology and support of ethnoracial social inclusion policy could be shaped by an individual's ethnoracial identity or nationality, I control for both of these factors. Therefore, I also have the research questions:

RQ4: Does ethnoracial identity covariate with an individual's support of particular racial ideologies or ethnoracial social inclusion policies?

RQ5: Does nationality covariate with an individual's support of particular racial ideologies or ethnoracial social inclusion policies?

In concordance with the recent literature (notably Wade 2016), I suspect that contemporary support of ethnoracial social inclusion policy will be high, while contemporary support of racial ideologies that correspond with mestizaje ideals will also be high. Therefore, my hypotheses are:

H1: The acceptance of ethnoracial social inclusion policies does not mark a major shift in racial ideology in Latin America.

H2: The ideals of mestizaje as an ideology have high support in contemporary Mexico and Peru.

H3: Ethnoracial social inclusion policies have high support in contemporary Mexico and Peru.

H4: Ethnoracial identity covariates with an individual's support of particular racial ideologies or ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

H5: Nationality covariates with an individual's support of particular racial ideologies or ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

2.4 Methodology:

I conduct tabular analysis on data collected by the Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America (PERLA) in order to test my hypotheses. My independent variables, racial ideologies and ethnoracial social inclusion policies, are both measured on a Likert scale. I control for ethnoracial identity, in order to compensate for any variation between

various ethnoracial groups. From my bivariate tabular analysis, I describe the data, taking into account the null hypothesis of no covariation at all.

To determine the statistical significance of my findings, I calculate chi-square values. "The chi-square test is an inferential statistical technique designed to test for the significant relationships between two variables organized in a bivariate table" (Leon-Guerrero and Frankfort-Nachmias 2012). The chi-square test is calculated using observed frequencies and expected frequencies and then analyzed using degrees of freedom and a *P* value. While a chi-square test does suggest a relationship, weak or strong, it does not indicate the strength of the relationship (Leon-Guerrero and Frankfort-Nachmias 2012).

For all of my calculations, there are 3 degrees of freedom. I use a *P* value of 0.05, which tells me that, if my results are statistically significant, there is a .001 probability that the difference in results could have been due to sampling error. The *P* value of .05 at 3 degrees of freedom give a critical value of 7.815. In other words, when my chi-square values are higher than the critical value of 7.815, I can reject the null hypothesis that there is no covariance between the variables. While I provide chi-square values in the tables included in the text, the full calculations can be found in the appendix.

2.5 Research Goals:

Each question on ethnoracial social inclusion policy targets a different facet. While the first two target specific policy types: racial quotas and anti-discrimination laws, the last question targets political activism of indigenous groups, which, theoretically, would lead to increased indigenous political involvement and more

inclusionist policies. All three topics describe various forms of social inclusion policy that have been implemented throughout Latin America: racial quotas in higher education in Brazil, educational reforms in Mexico, anti-discrimination laws in Peru, and political activism of indigenous groups throughout Latin America. Analyzing all three questions allows me to view support for ethnoracial social inclusion policies from different angles and glean a more holistic view of the overall sentiments of the population.

While many sociologists and researchers have claimed there has been a shift in Latin America from mestizaje to multiculturalism, others (notably Wade 2017) claim that multiculturalism is merely a new form of mestizaje. I use tabular to observe how much support these racial ideologies have in contemporary Mexico and Peru among ethnoracial groups in order to measure if a shift has in fact taken place. I also use tabular analysis to measure the support of various ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

In measuring the popularity of racial ideologies and of ethnoracial social inclusion policies in contemporary Peru and Mexico, I test the assumptions made in the literature. While one might think that an ideology of racial mixing stands in stark contrast to the ideals of ethnoracial social inclusion policies, the data may prove otherwise. With more research into the relationship between contemporary racial ideologies and support for ethnoracial social inclusion policies, policy makers in Latin America could be more informed to make policy recommendations that would be well accepted by their population based on their racial ideologies.

Chapter 3

DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, I measure the covariation of ethnoracial social inclusion policies and racial ideologies with ethnoracial identities as indicated by the PERLA data. I start by comparing the three different measurements of ethnoracial classification included on the PERLA surveys to determine which classification provides the least variable results. Next, I use tabular analysis to break down the survey results for each question pertaining to racial ideology by ethnoracial category. Likewise, I then break down the survey results for each question pertaining to ethnoracial social inclusion policy by ethnoracial category. I calculate chi-square values to determine if the differences in how each ethnoracial group responds to the question on ethnoracial social inclusion policy or racial ideology have statistical significance.

3.2 Ethnoracial classification:

Ethnoracial classification in Latin America has been a difficult category for researchers to work with because of the great variety of categories and systems of categorization, which have led to a fundamental lack of consistency in collected data. To understand how the ethnoracial category of a respondent may be related to how one answers a question pertaining to racial ideology or social inclusion policy, I first look at ethnoracial classification methods. The PERLA data seek to resolve some of the

inconsistency issues by measuring race and ethnicity three different ways: self-identification, outside-identification, as well as facial skin tone.

One question, which I will refer to as outside-identification, asks the interviewer to choose which ethnoracial category they would use to describe the respondent. A later question then asks the interviewer to choose the skin tone from an eleven-shade palate that best matches the facial skin tone of the respondent. Each interviewer has been trained and instructed to not take into account any other factors such as the style of dress or the accent of the interviewer. The third form of ethnoracial categorization on the survey, self-identification, is part of the portion where the interviewer reads out the questions and records the answer given by the respondents.

Each one of the measures of ethnoracial classification provides a unique insight into the way ethnoracial classification is conceptualized in Latin America. Which method is most reliable when measuring opinions across different ethnoracial groups? A measurement method with high variation in how one is classified would not yield clear nor reliable results for how each ethnoracial group conceptualizes the ideology or policy at hand. Therefore, I seek to use the measure of ethnoracial classification that provides the least variable, or most stable, classification of individuals. Which method best classifies individuals into clear, distinct ethnoracial categories?

Given that skin tone shade is an objective measurement, I use it as a reference point to compare the variation between outside-identification and self-identification. While the measurement of facial skin tone does provide a clear classification of an individual's race, as defined as one's skin color, it does not sort individuals into ethnoracial classifications, which are commonly used to discuss racial inequalities and

discrimination. Therefore, I seek to determine which, outside-identification or self-identification, best categorizes individuals into ethnoracial categories by facial skin tone. I start by first evaluating the variation between the two classification methods. Are individuals consistently categorized as the same ethnoracial category both by themselves and by the interviewer or is there a high level of variance? Of the individuals who are classified inconsistently, to what extent does their average facial skin tone vary from those individuals who are consistently categorized?

The variation in how individuals self-identify and are classified by the interviewer shows the fluidity of ethnoracial classifications in Latin America. Of the 1497 Mexicans whose race was measured in all three ways, 62% were classified as the same ethnoracial category for both self and outside identification. The other 38% have variation between the way they classify themselves and the way the interviewer classifies them. Also interesting is that 5% of Mexicans either claimed that they were unsure of their ethnoracial classification, or chose not to answer the question. The uncertainty of individuals also shows how inconsistent and variable ethnoracial classification in Mexico can be. Of the 1500 Peruvians surveyed for all three measures of race, 77% were classified as the same ethnoracial category by themselves and by the interviewer. The classifications with the most variation were white and mestizo, with more individuals being classified as white and less being classified as mestizo by the interviewer than those who classified themselves as white and mestizo.

Table 3.1:

Percentage of Population for Each Combination of Self and Outside Identification (MEXICO)							
		Outside Identification					
		White	Indigenous	Mestizo	Mulatto	Black	Other
Self Identification	White	43	4	8	3	33	0
	Indigenous	9	64	16	20	0	13
	Mestizo	43	16	66	37	33	38
	Mulatto	1	1	1	27	0	0
	Black	0	2	1	7	17	0
	Other	1	7	5	3	0	31
	Does not know/No response	3	6	4	3	17	19

Table 3.2:

Percentage of Population for Each Combination of Self and Outside Identification (PERU)							
		Outside Identification					
		White	Indigenous	Mestizo	Mulatto	Black	Other
Self Identification	White	48	2	4	4	0	0
	Indigenous	0	37	3	0	0	0
	Mestizo	48	51	89	43	44	0
	Mulatto	1	0	1	41	11	0
	Black	1	2	1	8	44	0
	Other	0	5	1	0	0	100
	Does not know/No response	1	2	1	4	0	0

Table 3.3:

Percentage of Total Survey Population			
		Mexico	Peru
Outside Identification	White	10	14
	Indigenous	26	6
	Mestizo	61	75
	Mulatto	2	3
	Black	0	1
	Other	1	0

Table 3.4:

Percentage of Total Survey Population			
		Mexico	Peru
Self Identification	White	10	10
	Indigenous	28	5
	Mestizo	49	78
	Mulatto	2	2
	Black	1	2
	Other	5	1
	Does not know/ No response	5	1

Given that the number of individuals who were categorized as mulatto, black, and other by the interviewer make up 3% of the total Peruvian population surveyed and 4% of the total Mexican population surveyed, I focus my analysis on responses for the other three categories of white, indigenous, and mestizo, which make up 97% and 96% respectively of the Mexican and Peruvian populations surveyed. With each of these categories having a population size of 94 or more individuals, stronger more affinitive conclusions can be made about the covariation of variables. I leave the other categories and their results in tables, but the reader should not draw any broad conclusions from those statistics without further research.

Out of white, indigenous, and mestizo, the ethnoracial category which had the least amount of variation between the two classification methods of self and outside identification in Mexico is mestizo. Of those classified as mestizo by the interviewer, 66% also chose mestizo as their personal identification. White was much more variable, with only 43% of individuals classified as white by the interviewer also identifying themselves as white.

In Peru, the mestizo category had the lowest level of variation, with 89% consistency. The white and indigenous categories are much more variable, with 48% and 37% consistency respectively. The strong mestizaje nationalism of Peruvian independence, coupled with the notion of the "modern" Indians being mestizo, the majority of the population is both classified as, and classifies as, mestizo.

Of those individuals that are inconsistently categorized, there is a clear skin tone gradient in how their classification changes. In other words, for each ethnoracial category for outside classification, individuals with facial skin tones at the extremes tend to be the ones that self-identify as a different classification. Individuals whose skin tones are closer to the average for the ethnoracial category for outside identification tend to also self-identify as the same ethnoracial category. So, although there is variation in ethnoracial classification based on the measurement method used, classification still mostly follows a scale of skin tone shade.

In Peru, of those classified as mestizo by the interviewer, those with lighter skin tones on average self-identified as white, while those with darker skin tones on average self-identified as indigenous. The same pattern holds true when we look at the inverse relationship. Of those who self-identified as mestizo, those with lighter skin tones on

average were classified as white while those with darker skin tones on average were classified as indigenous. Average skin tones also show clear patterns in the variations of the white and the indigenous categories. There is a clear graduation of lightest to darkest skin tone and ethnoracial classification: white, mestizo, indigenous. In Mexico, the pattern is a little less clear, but also follows the same general pattern.

Table 3.5:

Average Skin Tone Shades (Mexico)					
		Outside Identification			
		White	Indigenous	Mestizo	Average
Self Identification	White	3.2	5.8	4.3	4.4
	Indigenous	3.7	5.4	4.7	4.6
	Mestizo	3.1	5.1	4.5	4.2
	Average	3.3	5.4	4.5	

Table 3.6:

Average Skin Tone Shades (Peru)					
		Outside Identification			
		White	Indigenous	Mestizo	Average
Self Identification	White	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.3
	Indigenous	3.0	6.1	5.0	4.7
	Mestizo	3.3	5.3	4.7	4.4
	Average	3.0	5.0	4.5	

From this analysis, I conclude that the outside-identification method has several strengths over the self-identification method of measuring ethnoracial identity. Given that the interviewer did not have "does not know/no response" as an ethnoracial classification to choose from, every individual is assigned to a specific ethnoracial group, creating a larger sample size than would self-identification. Outside-identification more clearly follows a consistent gradation of facial skin-tone. Also, the outside-identification

method most likely provides a more accurate view of how the general population would view and consequently discriminate the individual than would self-identification. Therefore, I use outside-identification to control for ethnoracial identification when looking at results from other questions from the PERLA survey pertaining to racial ideologies and ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

3.3 Racial Ideologies:

With discussions about racial discrimination becoming ever more prominent in Latin American contemporary discourse, it is important to understand the racial ideologies that shape individuals' outlooks as well how favorably individuals view ethnoracial social inclusion policies. Using questions located on the PERLA survey questionnaires, I analyze to what extent opinions on these topics vary between ethnoracial groups.

The PERLA survey supports the notion that in both Mexico and Peru, national narratives based on racial mixture have been influential. Across ethnoracial groups, an average of 69% of Mexicans and 70% of Peruvians claiming they either agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country." I use this question to measure support of mestizaje as a racial ideology in contemporary Mexico and Peru.

In Mexico, the data show that the indigenous population responses to racial mixing are statistically significant in comparison to both the white and mestizo populations. The Mexican indigenous population choose more often not to respond or that they do not know which answer to pick than did the other two ethnoracial groups. This could suggest that Mexican indigenous people do not identify with the racial

ideology of mixing to the same extent do the other ethnoracial groups. Either, there has been a shift in indigenous thinking with the "shift" to multiculturalism, or the Mexican indigenous population was never quite fully indoctrinated in the ideology to begin with. I reject the null hypothesis that ethnoracial identity and mestizaje do not covariate in Mexico.

In Peru, the white and mestizo populations respond similarly to the indigenous population, but there is a statistically significant difference in how they respond with respect to one another. In other words, the white and mestizo population statistically significantly differ. Despite the fact that mestizo is a mixed ethnoracial classification, they were less likely to claim that they the mixture of people with distinct races is good for their country than white individuals were. This could be because Peruvian mestizaje as an ideology contains elements of white miscegenation that would "better the race." Consequently, I reject the null hypothesis that ethnoracial identity does not affect an individual's view of mestizaje in Peru.

When I compare the responses for each ethnoracial group across the two countries, I find there is a statistically significant difference not only for the indigenous populations, but also the mestizo populations. It would make sense that these two ethnoracial groups would differ significantly between the two countries. Mestizaje ideology affects indigenous and mestizo individuals more than it does white people. The mestizo ethnoracial category exists as the result of racial and/or cultural mixing. Meanwhile, the indigenous population is the one that can more easily become "mestizo" by cultural assimilation. The white population, by contrast, still maintains its autonomy as a superior and desirable "pure" race. Also, as claimed in the literature, the countries'

mestizaje ideologies differ, which would lead to different response results for the ethnoracial groups in the two countries.

Table 3.7:

The mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country. (Percentages)						
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Chi-Square Test
Mexico	Indigenous	11	9	69	11	25.547*
	White	9	22	66	2	
	White	9	22	66	2	4.941
	Mestizo	9	15	73	2	
	Mestizo	9	15	73	2	51.300*
	Indigenous	11	9	69	11	
Peru	Indigenous	12	18	64	6	7.580
	White	9	12	77	2	
	White	9	12	77	2	9.659*
	Mestizo	9	19	68	4	
	Mestizo	9	19	68	4	1.961
	Indigenous	12	18	64	6	

Scholars have also claimed that an underlying belief in white superiority influences racial attitudes in Mexico and Peru. When asked their agreement with the statement, "Indigenous peoples should marry white people in order to 'better the race,'" an average of 39% of all Mexicans surveyed disagree while an average of 34% agree. In

Peru, an average of 42% disagree and an average of 30% agree. An influence of an underlying belief in white superiority appears to affect all ethnoracial groups more or less equally in both countries, with the exception of the Mexican indigenous population.

The chi-square tests reveal that in Mexico, there is a statistically significant difference in how the indigenous population responds in comparison to both the white and mestizo populations. The Mexican indigenous population is polarized in how it responds to the question, with a smaller percentage of individuals choosing that they neither agree nor disagree than for other ethnoracial groups in Mexico. This finding is interesting, given the proclaimed biological superiority of the mestizo race over the white race proposed by Vicente Riva Palacio and José Vasconcelos. The null hypothesis that there is no covariance between ethnoracial identity and how individuals respond to the idea of racial whitening to "better the race" is rejected for Mexico.

In the case of Peru, there is a failure to reject the null hypothesis that ethnoracial classification covariates with support of racial whitening. There is no statistically significant difference in how the ethnoracial groups respond. Each has more or less the same percentage for each level of agreement. The influence of an underlying belief in white superiority is evenly spread out within and across racial groups. My previous analysis that Peruvian whites are more inclined to agree that racial mixing is good for their country than mestizos due to an underlying belief in bettering the race through white miscegenation does not hold.

The null hypothesis that nationality does not affect how an individual views racial whitening is rejected, as the Mexican and Peruvian indigenous populations differ in a statistically significant way. While similar percentages of the Peruvian indigenous

population choose that they both disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and agree to the statement, the Mexican indigenous population is polarized in its responses. Racial whitening appears to be more of a contentious issue among the Mexican indigenous population than for other racial groups in Mexico and their indigenous counterparts in Peru.

Table 3.8:

Indigenous people should marry white people in order to 'better the race.' (Percentages)						
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Chi-Square Test
Mexico	Indigenous	39	13	39	9	23.189*
	White	37	28	32	2	
	White	37	28	32	2	2.121
	Mestizo	41	26	30	4	
	Mestizo	41	26	30	4	43.231*
	Indigenous	39	13	39	9	
Peru	Indigenous	38	26	31	5	4.647
	White	45	23	30	1	
	White	45	23	30	1	5.629
	Mestizo	43	24	28	5	
	Mestizo	43	24	28	5	0.904
	Indigenous	38	26	31	5	

3.4 Ethnoracial Social Inclusion Policies:

Many countries, the USA and Brazil most notably, have implemented various forms of racial quotas in higher education in order to compensate for historical, systemic racial inequalities. Would such policies have support in countries like Mexico and Peru, that were built on the strong ideal of racial mixture? I analyze the results for questions pertaining to various types race based social inclusion policies to measure the potential political climate.

Racial quotas in higher education appear to have high levels of support. An average of 91% of Mexicans and an average of 86% of Peruvians surveyed responded that they either agree or strongly agree to the statement, "Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students." Surprisingly, despite that the policy would only benefit indigenous people, there is no notable difference in how the three ethnoracial groups respond to the question in Peru.

In Mexico, however, while there is similarity in how whites and mestizos respond to the question, there is a statistically significant difference in how the indigenous population responds. A smaller percentage of the indigenous respondents claim to agree with the statement than do whites and mestizos. This is very interesting given that the statement is in favor of universities guaranteeing places for indigenous students. Perhaps Mexican indigenous people view racial quotas in higher education as an insult to their intelligence, because it assumes that they would not be able to get into the university based on merit alone. Granted, the question does not imply any specific system (i.e. the number of places universities should guarantee), which could potentially yield more variation in the results.

Consequently, the null hypothesis that ethnoracial identity and responses to "Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students" do not correlate is rejected for the Mexican population, but not for the Peruvian population. In Mexico, responses to the statement do correspond with ethnoracial identity while in Peru they do not.

When I conduct chi-square tests on the two countries' ethnoracial groups, I find that the Mexican and Peruvian mestizo population results statistically significantly differ from one another. In Mexico I observe that the mestizo population responded similarly to the white population, but differently from the indigenous population while in Peru I observe that there is no notable difference between the ethnoracial groups. A greater percentage of the Mexican mestizo population agrees with racial quotas in higher education for indigenous students than does the Peruvian mestizo population. I therefore reject the null hypothesis that there is no covariation of nationality and views on racial quotas in higher education.

Table 3.9:

Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students. (Percentages)						
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Chi-Square Test
Mexico	Indigenous	2	3	89	5	8.297*
	White	5	1	92	1	
	White	5	1	92	1	7.306
	Mestizo	3	5	92	1	
	Mestizo	3	5	92	1	24.861*
	Indigenous	2	3	89	5	
Peru	Indigenous	5	5	86	3	4.221
	White	11	3	84	1	
	White	11	3	84	1	3.514
	Mestizo	8	4	87	1	
	Mestizo	8	4	87	1	2.549
	Indigenous	5	5	86	3	

For the statement, "The government should establish stricter laws to prevent the mistreatment of indigenous peoples," there is lots of variation in how the ethnoracial groups respond in both countries. Consequently, the null hypothesis that ethnoracial identity and support of anti-discrimination laws do not covariate is rejected for both cases. In Mexico, the mestizo and indigenous populations respond similarly to the white population, but not with one another. Unsurprisingly, the indigenous population has the highest percent agreement of the three ethnoracial groups. The laws mentioned would protect indigenous people and theoretically have no effect on the other two ethnoracial groups.

In Peru, the chi-square tests reveal that while the mestizo and indigenous population respond similarly, the white population statistically significantly differs in its responses. The white population has a much smaller percent of disagreement and higher level of agreement than do the other two ethnoracial groups. Perhaps in Peru, there is a social pressure for whites to agree with anti-discrimination laws.

The null hypothesis that nationally does not affect how ethnoracial groups respond to the statements is also rejected. The Mexican and Peruvian white populations differ statistically significantly in their responses to the statement. Whites in Mexico are less favorable of antidiscrimination laws than whites in Peru.

Table 3.10:

The government should establish stricter laws to prevent the mistreatment of indigenous people. (Percentages)						
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Chi-Square Test
Mexico	Indigenous	4	3	91	2	6.383
	White	8	4	87	1	
	White	8	4	87	1	1.683
	Mestizo	6	5	89	1	
	Mestizo	6	5	89	1	10.777*
	Indigenous	4	3	91	2	
Peru	Indigenous	6	9	82	3	9.137*
	White	1	7	90	1	
	White	1	7	90	1	7.949*
	Mestizo	5	7	86	2	
	Mestizo	5	7	86	2	2.145
	Indigenous	6	9	82	3	

When it comes to support of indigenous political groups, there is less enthusiasm across the board than there is for the other forms of ethnoracial social inclusion policy. While indigenous political groups are not a direct form of ethnoracial social inclusion policy, they would theoretically lead to the implementation of more social inclusion policy favorable for the indigenous population. The majority still responded in agreement with the statement, "I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights" the percentages are much lower than for racial quotas in higher education and anti-discrimination laws.

The null hypothesis that there is no covariance of ethnoracial identity and responses to the statement "I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights" is rejected for the Mexican population but not for the Peruvian population. In Mexico, the indigenous population responses vary statistically significantly for both the white and mestizo population responses. Intuitively, it makes sense that a larger percentage of indigenous people would agree to the statement than whites or mestizos, because indigenous political groups would fight for their political rights, while potentially appearing to "threaten" the political rights of other ethnoracial groups. In Peru there is no statistically significant difference in how the ethnoracial groups respond.

The null hypothesis that there is no covariation of nationality and responses to the statement is rejected because there is statistical significance in how Mexicans and Peruvians respond to the statement for all three ethnoracial groups. In Mexico, the ethnoracial groups are more inclined to choose that they disagree and less inclined to choose that they neither agree nor disagree than are the ethnoracial groups in Peru. This question is clearly marked by nationalistic differences.

Table 3.11:

I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights. (Percentages)						
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Chi-Square Test
Mexico	Indigenous	18	3	73	6	28.815*
	White	28	13	55	4	
	White	28	13	55	4	7.229
	Mestizo	22	9	66	2	
	Mestizo	22	9	66	2	29.605*
	Indigenous	18	3	73	6	
Peru	Indigenous	14	13	73	0	2.283
	White	15	15	68	2	
	White	15	15	68	2	6.517
	Mestizo	9	15	73	3	
	Mestizo	9	15	73	3	4.464
	Indigenous	14	13	73	0	

Chapter 4

CONCLUSION

4.1 Summary of Research Purpose and Design:

The purpose of my study was to glean greater insight into the proposed "shift" in racial ideology from mestizaje to multiculturalism in Latin America. I use data gathered by the Project on Ethnicity and Race in Latin America (PERLA) for Mexico and Peru and conduct bivariate tabular analysis to observe the covariation of various racial ideologies and specific ethnoracial social inclusion policies with ethnoracial identity. Is the racial ideology of mestizaje compatible with the new ethnoracial social inclusion policies in Latin America? Has there been a shift in thinking on race to one of "multiculturalism" or is it merely a new form of the same?

4.2 Research Findings:

In accordance with Wade (2016), I determine from my analysis of the PERLA data that the so-called "transition" from an ideology of mestizaje to multiculturalism is not so much a transition as it is just a new face of mestizaje. When I conduct bivariate tabular analysis of each ethnoracial social inclusion policy and racial ideology with ethnoracial identity, I find that levels of support are mostly high for all, with a few exceptions.

The idea that racial mixing is beneficial for one's country is still highly agreed upon, despite high agreement with racial quotas in higher education, anti-discrimination laws, and indigenous peoples creating political groups. The idea of bettering one's race

through racial whitening, however, appears to have low support in contemporary Mexico and Peru. Unlike the earlier literature would suggest, acceptance of mestizaje as a racial ideology does not necessarily stand in opposition to support of ethnoracial social inclusion policy.

The PERLA data show that individuals are more likely to respond favorably to broad, social and cultural questions than more specific policy questions. For example, the statement on racial quotas in universities does not address the specific quantity of places that a university should provide for indigenous students, and received high approval. Meanwhile, the statement on indigenous political groups, which is more closely tied to specific policy changes as indigenous peoples would be more involved in making policy changes specifically on their own behalf, has more varied results. Individuals surveyed in the PERLA study also respond less uniformly on the statements about racial ideologies than the statements about ethnoracial social inclusion policies.

The most notable difference between the Mexican and Peruvian survey results for racial ideologies can be found in the responses of their respective indigenous populations. The Mexican indigenous individuals tend to be more polarized in their levels of agreement than are their Peruvian counterparts (see tables 3.7 and 3.8). This finding emphasizes the difference in the mestizaje narratives in the two countries in regards to their inclusion/exclusion of indigenous peoples.

In Mexico, it appears that racial mixing refers more to the biological process and in Peru it refers more to the cultural assimilation process. In Peru, mestizo and indigenous are not mutually exclusive terms. A "Indian" can be considered "mestizo" once he/she has undergone socialization and become "modern." In contrast, in Mexico,

mestizaje was also seen as a means to modernize the country, but focused more heavily on biological mixing.

Support of racial ideologies in Peru does not clearly follow any ethnoracial lines. For racial mixture, the indigenous and mestizo populations differ, but for "bettering the race" through marrying white people, there was no covariation with ethnoracial identity. The Peruvian mestizaje ideology has been used to claim and promote racial harmony. Given that there is not much differentiation in opinion between ethnoracial groups, maybe this idea of "equalness" causes distinct ethnoracial groups to converge in opinion.

In Mexico, however, the indigenous population tends to significantly differ on questions pertaining to racial ideology. This holds true both for the question pertaining to racial mixing and racial whitening. Therefore, in Mexico, I observe that ethnoracial identity and racial ideologies do covariate.

For ethnoracial social inclusion policies, the overall trend is a little less clear. Perhaps this is due to very distinctive nature of each of the individual questions. In Mexico, the indigenous population responses are statistically significantly different from the other ethnoracial group responses for the statements pertaining to racial quotas in higher education and indigenous political groups.

In Peru, the white population responses are statistically different for the statement regarding anti-discrimination laws. Ethnoracial social inclusion policies can correlate with ethnoracial identity, but it is very dependent on the policy. Further research would need to be conducted into the current education policies, anti-discrimination laws, and indigenous political movements in Mexico and Peru in order to make further extrapolations.

That being said, on the national level of comparison, there is a statistically significant difference for every ethnoracial social inclusion policy studied. The perception and acceptance of ethnoracial social inclusion policy appears to be very much linked with nationality. While both Mexico and Peru have high levels of support for ethnoracial social inclusion policies, the trends vary due to their different cultural perceptions of the various policies.

From my study, it can be concluded that racial ideology in Peru is more or less consistent for all ethnoracial groups, racial ideology in Mexico varies the most with its indigenous population which tends to be polarized in its responses, ethnoracial social inclusion policies are highly supported in both countries with the exception of indigenous political groups but support varies for the various ethnoracial groups, and the two countries differ in their racial ideologies for certain ethnoracial groups. I hope that my study provides more insight into the role of mestizaje and the views on ethnoracial social inclusion policies in contemporary Mexico and Peru.

Bibliography

Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo. *Obra Antropológica VI. El Proceso de aculturación y Cambio Sociocultural en México*. Gobierno del Estado de Veracruz / Universidad Veracruzana / INI / FCE, Mexico City, 1992 [1957].

Belaúnde, Víctor Andrés. *Peruanidad*. Comisión del Centenario de V.A., Lima, 1987 [1942].

Brading, David. *The First America: Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots and the Liberal State, 1492-1967*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

Brysk, Alison, and Carol Wise. "Liberalization and ethnic conflict in Latin America." *Studies in Comparative International Development (SCID)* vol. 32, no. 2, 1997, pp. 76-104.

Buvinić, Mayra, et al. *Social Inclusion and Economic Development in Latin America*. Inter-American Development Bank, 2004.

Callirgos, Juan Carlos. *El racismo: La cuestión del otro (y de uno)*. Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo, Lima, 1993.

Chasteen, John C. *Born in Blood and Fire: A Concise History of Latin America*. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 2011.

Cope, R. D. *The Limits of Racial Domination: Plebeian Society in Colonial Mexico City, 1660-1720*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1994 [1980].

Cortina, Regina. *Indigenous Education Policy, Equity, and Intercultural Understanding in Latin America*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2016.

de la Peña, Guillermo. "Social and Cultural Policies toward Indigenous Peoples: Perspectives from Latin America." *Annual Review of Anthropology* vol. 34, 2005, pp. 717-739.

Hale, Charles R. "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2002, pp. 485– 524.

Hooker, Juliet. "Indigenous Inclusion/Black Exclusion: Race, Ethnicity and Multicultural Citizenship in Latin America." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2005, pp. 285-310.

Htun, Mala. "From Racial Democracy to Affirmative Action: Changing State Policy on Race in Brazil," *Latin American Research Review* vol. 39, no. 1, 2004, pp. 60-89

Kellogg, Susan. *Law and the Transformation of Aztec Cultura, 1550-1700*. University of Oklahoma Press, Tulsa, 1995.

Kellstedt, Paul M., and Guy D. Whitten. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Kristal, Efrain. *The Andes Viewed from the City: History and Political Discourse on the Indian in Peru, 1848-1930*. Peter Lang, New York, 1987.

Larson, Brooke. *Indígenas, élites y estado en la formación de las Repúblicas Andinas*. IEP, PUCP, Lima, 2002.

Larson, Brooke, and Charles E. Noyes. *Trials of Nation Making: Liberalism, Race, and Ethnicity in the Andes*, 1810-1910. Cambridge University Press, New York;Cambridge, U.K;, 2004.

Lehmann, David. *The Crisis of Multiculturalism in Latin America*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2016.

León, Magdalena, and Jimena Holguín. "La Acción Afirmativa En La Universidad De Los Andes: El Caso Del Programa." *Revista De Estudios Sociales*, vol. 1, no. 19, 2004, pp. 57-70.

Leon-Guerrero, Anna, and Chava Frankfort-Nachmias. *Essentials of Social Statistics for a Diverse Society*. Sage Publications, 2017.

Mallon, Florencia. "Indian Communities, Political Cultures, and the State in Latin America, 1780-1990." *Journal of Lain American Studies* vol. 24, 1992, pp. 35-53.

Martínez-Alier, Verena. *Marriage, Class and Colour in Nineteenth-Century Cuba: A Study of Racial Attitudes and Sexual Values in a Slave Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1974.

McCaa, Robert, Stuart B. Schwartz, and Arturo Grubessich. "Race and Class in Colonial Latin America: A Critique." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* vol. 21, no. 3, 1979, pp. 421-433.

Méndez, Cecilia. *Incas sí, Indios no: Apuntes para el estudio del nacionalismo criollo en el Perú*. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima, 1993.

Miller, Marilyn G. *Rise and Fall of the Cosmic Race: The Cult of Mestizaje in Latin America*. University of Texas Press, Austin, 2004.

Olivé, León. *Multiculturalismo y pluralismo*. Paidos Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, 1999.

Reiter, Bernd, and Paula Lezama. "Transferencias Condicionales y Políticas De Acción Afirmativa En Latinoamérica: La Diferencia Que Políticas De Inclusión Pueden Hacer." *Revista Investigación & Desarrollo*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2013, pp. 453-478.

Rowe, John. "El movimiento nacional Inca del siglo XVIII." *Revista Universitaria* vol 107, 1954, pp. 17-47.

Sáenz, Moisés. *México integro*. Torres Aguirre, Lima, 1939.

Schaefer, Timo H., *Liberalism as Utopia: The Rise and Fall of Legal Rule in Post-Colonial Mexico, 1820-1900*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2017.

Sieder, Rachel. *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity, and Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2002.

Telles, Edward E., et al. *Pigmentocracies: Ethnicity, Race, and Color in Latin America*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2014.

Telles, Edward E. *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2004.

Telles, Edward, and Denia Garcia. "Mestizaje and Public Opinion in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* vol. 48, no. 3, 2013, pp. 130-152.

Thurner, Mark. *From Two Republics to One Divided: Contradictions of Postcolonial Nationmaking in Andean Peru*. Duke University Press, Durham, 1997.

Van Cott, Donna Lee. *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 2000.

Vasconcelos, José. *La raza cósmica*. Siglo XXI, Mexico City, 1982 [1925].

Villoro, Luis. *Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en México*. FCE, Mexico City, 1996 [1950].

Wade, Peter. *Degrees of Mixture, Degrees of Freedom: Genomics, Multiculturalism, and Race in Latin America*. Duke University Press, Durham, 2017.

Wade, Peter. "Mestizaje, Multiculturalism, Liberalism, and Violence." *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2016, pp. 323-41.

Wade, Peter. *Race and Sex in Latin America*. Pluto Press London, 2009.

Walker, Charles. "The Patriotic Society: Discussions and Omissions about Indians in the Peruvian War of Independence." *Americas* vol 55, no. 2, 1988, pp. 275-98.

Young, Philip D and Stefanie Wickstrom. *Mestizaje and Globalization: Transformations of Identity and Power*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona, 2014.

Zavala, Silvio, José Miranda, and Alfonso Caso. "Métodos y resultados de la política indigenista en México." *Memorias del Instituto Nacional Indigenista*, 1954, pp. 29-112.

Appendix:

The mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Mexico	Indigenous	42	35	270	43	390	25.547
	Expected	40.595	49.294	266.766	33.346		
	Chi-square	0.049	4.145	0.039	2.795		
	White	14	33	98	3	148	
	Expected	15.405	18.706	101.234	12.654		
	Chi-square	0.128	10.922	0.103	7.365		
	Totals	56	68	368	46	538	
	White	14	33	98	3	148	4.941
	Expected	13.709	23.921	107.013	3.357		
	Chi-square	0.006	3.446	0.759	0.038		
	Mestizo	84	138	667	21	910	
	Expected	84.291	147.079	657.987	20.643		
	Chi-square	0.001	0.560	0.123	0.006		
	Totals	98	171	765	24	1058	
	Mestizo	84	138	667	21	910	51.300
	Expected	88.200	121.100	655.900	44.800		
	Chi-square	0.200	2.358	0.188	12.644		
	Indigenous	42	35	270	43	390	
	Expected	37.800	51.900	281.100	19.200		
	Chi-square	0.467	5.503	0.438	29.502		

	Totals	126	173	937	64	1300	
	Indigenous	11	17	60	6	94	7.580
	Expected	9.461	13.123	68.364	3.052		
	Chi-square	0.250	1.145	1.023	2.848		
	White	20	26	164	4	214	
	Expected	21.539	29.877	155.636	6.948		
	Chi-square	0.110	0.503	0.449	1.251		
	Totals	31	43	224	10	308	
	White	20	26	164	4	214	9.659
	Expected	18.727	38.414	148.375	8.483		
	Chi-square	0.087	4.012	1.645	2.369		
Peru	Mestizo	97	214	763	49	1123	
	Expected	98.273	201.586	778.625	44.517		
	Chi-square	0.016	0.765	0.314	0.451		
	Totals	117	240	927	53	1337	
	Mestizo	97	214	763	49	1123	1.961
	Expected	99.658	213.158	759.432	50.752		
	Chi-square	0.071	0.003	0.017	0.060		
	Indigenous	11	17	60	6	94	
	Expected	8.342	17.842	63.568	4.248		
	Chi-square	0.847	0.040	0.200	0.722		
	Totals	108	231	823	55	1217	

The mixture of people with distinct origins or races is good for my country.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Indigenous	Mexico	42	35	270	43	390	7.849
	Expected	42.707	41.901	265.909	39.483		
	Chi-square	0.012	1.137	0.063	0.313		
	Peru	11	17	60	6	94	
	Expected	10.293	10.099	64.091	9.517		
	Chi-square	0.049	4.715	0.261	1.299		
	Totals	53	52	330	49	484	
White	Mexico	14	33	98	3	148	6.853
	Expected	13.901	24.122	107.116	2.862		
	Chi-square	0.001	3.268	0.776	0.007		
	Peru	20	26	164	4	214	
	Expected	20.099	34.878	154.884	4.138		
	Chi-square	0.000	2.260	0.537	0.005		
	Totals	34	59	262	7	362	
Mestizo	Mexico	84	138	667	21	910	12.812
	Expected	81.018	157.560	640.089	31.333		
	Chi-square	0.110	2.428	1.131	3.408		
	Peru	97	214	763	49	1123	
	Expected	99.982	194.440	789.911	38.667		
	Chi-square	0.089	1.968	0.917	2.761		
	Totals	181	352	1430	70	2033	

Indigenous people should marry white people in order to 'better the race.'							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Mexico	Indigenous	152	51	152	35	390	23.189
	Expected	150.056	67.416	144.981	27.546		
	Chi-square	0.025	3.997	0.340	2.017		
	White	55	42	48	3	148	
	Expected	56.944	25.584	55.019	10.454		
	Chi-square	0.066	10.534	0.895	5.314		
	Totals	207	93	200	38	538	
	White	55	42	48	3	148	2.121
	Expected	60.291	38.469	44.344	4.896		
	Chi-square	0.464	0.324	0.301	0.734		
	Mestizo	376	233	269	32	910	
	Expected	370.709	236.531	272.656	30.104		
	Chi-square	0.076	0.053	0.049	0.119		
	Totals	431	275	317	35	1058	
	Mestizo	376	233	269	32	910	43.231
	Expected	369.6	198.8	294.7	46.9		
	Chi-square	0.111	5.884	2.241	4.734		
	Indigenous	152	51	152	35	390	
	Expected	158.4	85.2	126.3	20.1		
	Chi-square	0.259	13.728	5.230	11.045		

	Totals	528	284	421	67	1300	
	Indigenous	36	24	29	5	94	4.647
	Expected	40.286	22.584	28.688	2.442		
	Chi-square	0.456	0.089	0.003	2.681		
	White	96	50	65	3	214	
	Expected	91.714	51.416	65.312	5.558		
	Chi-square	0.200	0.039	0.001	1.178		
	Totals	132	74	94	8	308	
	White	96	50	65	3	214	5.629
	Expected	93.155	51.219	60.343	9.283		
	Chi-square	0.087	0.029	0.359	4.253		
Peru	Mestizo	486	270	312	55	1123	
	Expected	488.845	268.781	316.657	48.717		
	Chi-square	0.017	0.006	0.069	0.810		
	Totals	582	320	377	58	1337	
	Mestizo	486	270	312	55	1123	0.904
	Expected	481.681	271.292	314.661	55.366		
	Chi-square	0.039	0.006	0.023	0.002		
	Indigenous	36	24	29	5	94	
	Expected	40.319	22.708	26.339	4.634		
	Chi-square	0.463	0.073	0.269	0.029		
	Totals	522	294	341	60	1217	

Indigenous people should marry white people in order to 'better the race.'							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Indigenous	Mexico	152	51	152	35	390	10.153
	Expected	151.488	60.434	145.847	32.231		
	Chi-square	0.002	1.473	0.260	0.238		
	Peru	36	24	29	5	94	
	Expected	36.512	14.566	35.153	7.769		
	Chi-square	0.007	6.110	1.077	0.987		
	Totals	188	75	181	40	484	
White	Mexico	55	42	48	3	148	2.433
	Expected	61.735	37.613	46.199	2.453		
	Chi-square	0.735	0.512	0.070	0.122		
	Peru	96	50	65	3	214	
	Expected	89.265	54.387	66.801	3.547		
	Chi-square	0.508	0.354	0.049	0.084		
	Totals	151	92	113	6	362	
Mestizo	Mexico	376	233	269	32	910	3.747
	Expected	385.844	225.150	260.064	38.942		
	Chi-square	0.251	0.274	0.307	1.238		
	Peru	486	270	312	55	1123	
	Expected	476.156	277.850	320.936	48.058		
	Chi-square	0.203	0.222	0.249	1.003		
	Totals	862	503	581	87	2033	

Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Mexico	Indigenous	9	12	349	20	390	8.297
	Expected	12.323	10.149	351.580	15.948		
	Chi-square	0.896	0.338	0.019	1.030		
	White	8	2	136	2	148	
	Expected	4.677	3.851	133.420	6.052		
	Chi-square	2.362	0.890	0.050	2.713		
	Totals	17	14	485	22	538	
	White	8	2	136	2	148	7.306
	Expected	4.336	6.295	135.970	1.399		
	Chi-square	3.095	2.930	0.000	0.258		
	Mestizo	23	43	836	8	910	
	Expected	26.664	38.705	836.030	8.601		
	Chi-square	0.503	0.477	0.000	0.042		
	Totals	31	45	972	10	1058	
	Mestizo	23	43	836	8	910	24.861
	Expected	22.4	38.5	829.5	19.6		
	Chi-square	0.016	0.526	0.051	6.865		
	Indigenous	9	12	349	20	390	
	Expected	9.6	16.5	355.5	8.4		
	Chi-square	0.038	1.227	0.119	16.019		
	Totals	32	55	1185	28	1300	

	Indigenous	5	5	81	3	94	4.221
	Expected	8.851	3.662	79.656	1.831		
	Chi-square	1.675	0.489	0.023	0.746		
	White	24	7	180	3	214	
	Expected	20.149	8.338	181.344	4.169		
	Chi-square	0.736	0.215	0.010	0.328		
	Totals	29	12	261	6	308	
	White	24	7	180	3	214	3.514
	Expected	17.447	8.803	184.709	3.041		
	Chi-square	2.462	0.369	0.120	0.001		
Peru	Mestizo	85	48	974	16	1123	
	Expected	91.553	46.197	969.291	15.959		
	Chi-square	0.469	0.070	0.023	0.000		
	Totals	109	55	1154	19	1337	
	Mestizo	85	48	974	16	1123	2.549
	Expected	83.048	48.906	973.513	17.532		
	Chi-square	0.046	0.017	0.000	0.134		
	Indigenous	5	5	81	3	94	
	Expected	6.952	4.094	81.487	1.468		
	Chi-square	0.548	0.201	0.003	1.600		
	Totals	90	53	1055	19	1217	

Universities should guarantee places for indigenous students.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Indigenous	Mexico	9	12	349	20	390	4.151
	Expected	11.281	13.698	346.488	18.533		
	Chi-square	0.461	0.211	0.018	0.116		
	Peru	5	5	81	3	94	
	Expected	2.719	3.302	83.512	4.467		
	Chi-square	1.914	0.874	0.076	0.482		
	Totals	14	17	430	23	484	
White	Mexico	8	2	136	2	148	5.246
	Expected	13.083	3.680	129.193	2.044		
	Chi-square	1.975	0.767	0.359	0.001		
	Peru	24	7	180	3	214	
	Expected	18.917	5.320	186.807	2.956		
	Chi-square	1.366	0.530	0.248	0.001		
	Totals	32	9	316	5	362	
Mestizo	Mexico	23	43	836	8	910	27.036
	Expected	48.342	40.733	810.182	10.743		
	Chi-square	13.285	0.126	0.823	0.700		
	Peru	85	48	974	16	1123	
	Expected	59.658	50.267	999.818	13.257		
	Chi-square	10.765	0.102	0.667	0.567		
	Totals	108	91	1810	24	2033	

The government should establish stricter laws to prevent the mistreatment of indigenous people.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
	Indigenous	14	13	354	9	390	6.383
	Expected	18.848	13.773	350.130	7.249		
	Chi-square	1.247	0.043	0.043	0.423		
	White	12	6	129	1	148	
	Expected	7.152	5.227	132.870	2.751		
	Chi-square	3.285	0.114	0.113	1.114		
	Totals	26	19	483	10	538	
	White	12	6	129	1	148	1.683
	Expected	8.813	7.414	130.794	0.979		
	Chi-square	1.153	0.270	0.025	0.000		
Mexico	Mestizo	51	47	806	6	910	
	Expected	54.187	45.586	804.206	6.021		
	Chi-square	0.187	0.044	0.004	0.000		
	Totals	63	53	935	7	1058	
	Mestizo	51	47	806	6	910	10.777
	Expected	45.5	42	812	10.5		
	Chi-square	0.665	0.595	0.044	1.929		
	Indigenous	14	13	354	9	390	
	Expected	19.5	18	348	4.5		
	Chi-square	1.551	1.389	0.103	4.500		
	Totals	65	60	1160	15	1300	

	Indigenous	6	8	77	3	94	9.137
	Expected	2.442	7.325	82.403	1.831		
	Chi-square	5.186	0.062	0.354	0.746		
	White	2	16	193	3	214	
	Expected	5.558	16.675	187.597	4.169		
	Chi-square	2.278	0.027	0.156	0.328		
	Totals	8	24	270	6	308	
	White	2	16	193	3	214	7.949
	Expected	9.924	15.046	185.829	3.201		
	Chi-square	6.327	0.061	0.277	0.013		
Peru	Mestizo	60	78	968	17	1123	
	Expected	52.076	78.954	975.171	16.799		
	Chi-square	1.206	0.012	0.053	0.002		
	Totals	62	94	1161	20	1337	
	Mestizo	60	78	968	17	1123	2.145
	Expected	60.902	79.357	964.285	18.455		
	Chi-square	0.013	0.023	0.014	0.115		
	Indigenous	6	8	77	3	94	
	Expected	5.098	6.643	80.715	1.545		
	Chi-square	0.160	0.277	0.171	1.371		
	Totals	66	86	1045	20	1217	

The government should establish stricter laws to prevent the mistreatment of indigenous people.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Indigenous	Mexico	14	13	354	9	390	7.015
	Expected	16.116	16.921	347.293	9.669		
	Chi-square	0.278	0.909	0.130	0.046		
	Peru	6	8	77	3	94	
	Expected	3.884	4.079	83.707	2.331		
	Chi-square	1.152	3.771	0.537	0.192		
	Totals	20	21	431	12	484	
White	Mexico	12	6	129	1	148	13.84
	Expected	5.72	8.99	131.65	1.64		
	Chi-square	6.88	1.00	0.05	0.25		
	Peru	2	16	193	3	214	
	Expected	8.276	13.006	190.354	2.365		
	Chi-square	4.760	0.689	0.037	0.171		
	Totals	14	22	322	4	362	
Mestizo	Mexico	51	47	806	6	910	6.224
	Expected	49.685	55.952	794.068	10.295		
	Chi-square	0.035	1.432	0.179	1.792		
	Peru	60	78	968	17	1123	
	Expected	61.315	69.048	979.932	12.705		
	Chi-square	0.028	1.161	0.145	1.452		
	Totals	111	125	1774	23	2033	

I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Mexico	Indigenous	69	12	284	25	390	28.815
	Expected	79.740	22.472	265.316	22.472		
	Chi-square	1.446	4.880	1.316	0.284		
	White	41	19	82	6	148	
	Expected	30.260	8.528	100.684	8.528		
	Chi-square	3.812	12.860	3.467	0.749		
	Totals	110	31	366	31	538	
	White	41	19	82	6	148	7.229
	Expected	34.272	13.989	95.822	3.917		
	Chi-square	1.321	1.795	1.994	1.108		
	Mestizo	204	81	603	22	910	
	Expected	210.728	86.011	589.178	24.083		
	Chi-square	0.215	0.292	0.324	0.180		
	Totals	245	100	685	28	1058	
	Mestizo	204	81	603	22	910	29.605
	Expected	191.1	65.1	620.9	32.9		
	Chi-square	0.871	3.883	0.516	3.611		
	Indigenous	69	12	284	25	390	
	Expected	81.9	27.9	266.1	14.1		
	Chi-square	2.032	9.061	1.204	8.426		
	Totals	273	93	887	47	1300	

	Indigenous	13	12	69	0	94	2.283
	Expected	13.734	13.429	65.617	1.221		
	Chi-square	0.039	0.152	0.174	1.221		
	White	32	32	146	4	214	
	Expected	31.266	30.571	149.383	2.779		
	Chi-square	0.017	0.067	0.077	0.536		
	Totals	45	44	215	4	308	
	White	32	32	146	4	214	6.517
	Expected	21.928	31.692	155.098	5.282		
	Chi-square	4.626	0.003	0.534	0.311		
Peru	Mestizo	105	166	823	29	1123	
	Expected	115.072	166.308	813.902	27.718		
	Chi-square	0.882	0.001	0.102	0.059		
	Totals	137	198	969	33	1337	
	Mestizo	105	166	823	29	1123	4.464
	Expected	108.886	164.251	823.103	26.760		
	Chi-square	0.139	0.019	0.000	0.187		
	Indigenous	13	12	69	0	94	
	Expected	9.114	13.749	68.897	2.240		
	Chi-square	1.657	0.222	0.000	2.240		
	Totals	118	178	892	29	1217	

I approve of indigenous people organizing for their political rights.							
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Does not know/No response	Total Count	Obtained chi-square
Indigenous	Mexico	69	12	284	25	390	21.036
	Expected	66.074	19.339	284.442	20.145		
	Chi-square	0.130	2.785	0.001	1.170		
	Peru	13	12	69	0	94	
	Expected	15.926	4.661	68.558	4.855		
	Chi-square	0.537	11.555	0.003	4.855		
	Totals	82	24	353	25	484	
White	Mexico	41	19	82	6	148	11.125
	Expected	29.845	20.851	93.215	4.088		
	Chi-square	4.169	0.164	1.349	0.894		
	Peru	32	32	146	4	214	
	Expected	43.155	30.149	134.785	5.912		
	Chi-square	2.883	0.114	0.933	0.618		
	Totals	73	51	228	10	362	
Mestizo	Mexico	204	81	603	22	910	74.371
	Expected	138.313	110.561	638.298	22.828		
	Chi-square	31.196	7.904	1.952	0.030		
	Peru	105	166	823	29	1123	
	Expected	170.687	136.439	787.702	28.172		
	Chi-square	25.279	6.405	1.582	0.024		
	Totals	309	247	1426	51	2033	