

immigration and assimilation: the Greeks of Lowell

Thesis

by

Eleni Drakopoulou

*Lawyer, Member of
Athens Bar Association*

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts, 1970
Boston College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. J. Oscar Alers for all his invaluable assistance throughout this study. Without his continuous suggestions, advice, comment, and laborious working over the manuscript, the present study would never have been completed.

Dr. Seymour Leventman has also made many valuable suggestions and comments.

I am also deeply grateful to the forty respondents for their contribution. Special thanks go to the Reverend John Sarantos of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Holy Transfiguration in Lowell, who gave much of his time and shared many of his experiences.

PREFACE

Among modern nations the United States presents a classic example of the problems and opportunities of immigration. The entire course of American history has been shaped by successive waves of immigrants, representing diverse nationalities from the whole world. Almost every national group has taken its place in American culture.

Upon settling in a strange land, the new immigrant faces several serious crises. He is legally and socially an alien. He embodies a cultural heritage that includes a different language, political tradition, values and goals. He brings a strange style and standard of living. He expresses a temperament which allows him to accept change or reject it. The life of the new immigrant is precarious.

In view of this situation certain practical and theoretical factors intervene concerning his adjustment. The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate the problem of assimilation with respect to a particular national group and place: the Greek minority in Lowell, Massachusetts. The thesis employs, as a major dependent variable, the degree of assimilation. Important independent variables include: (1) sex of the immigrant, (2) reasons for emigration, (3) ties with the original country, (4) length and intention of stay in the United States, (5) type of migration, and (6) regional and occupational mobility.

The study is based in part on a representative sample of native-born Greeks, obtained from the membership lists of the Greek Orthodox Church. Some forty cases, representative of four hundred members, are utilized in the study.

Other significant concerns of the thesis include a description of Greek immigrant patterns in the United States and an evaluation of previous definitions of assimilation.

I. general characteristics of immigration

Throughout the whole history of mankind, migration has been an even recurring phenomenon. The economic causes of immigration are the earliest and

by far the most important. They arise in connection with man's efforts to make his living, and concern all interests which are connected with his productive efforts.

According to the United States Bureau of Immigration, an immigrant is «an alien officially admitted into the United States whose last permanent residence was in some foreign country and who comes with the declared intention of residing permanently.» Fairchild defines immigration as follows:

Immigration is a movement of people, individually or in families, acting on their own personal initiative and responsibility... passing from one well-developed country (usually old and thickly settled) to another well-developed country (usually new and sparsely populated) where living conditions are more favorable with the intention of residing permanently.¹

The definition found in the Dictionary of Sociology generally follows Fairchild's definition with few major distinctions: it stresses the voluntary character of immigration and it adds the condition of crossing a political boundary, if it is to be «true immigration.»² The major characteristics of immigration then are: (a) a peaceful movement of peoples, individuals of groups, from one country to another; (b) the movement is voluntary.³

The total number of immigrants admitted to the United States throughout its history is not known. In 1820 the government began to keep a record of immigration, but until 1907 the enumerations suffered from serious limitations. Accordingly only a rough approximation of total immigration to the country can be gained from federal sources. These data are presented in Table 1.

Until the depression years of the 1890's the volume of immigration generally increased each decade. Immigration remained high until the passage of restrictive legislation in the 1920's which set ceilings upon the number of migrants to be admitted from each nation. In the period from 1783 to 1830 the white population of the United States included few Germans and Dutch, and even fewer French Canadians, Belgians, Swiss, Mexicans, and Swedes.

The period from 1830 to 1882 was marked by a great increase in immigration. The rapid industrialization created major demands for unskilled labor to build canals, railroads and roads, to work in factories and carry on many non-mechanized tasks.

1. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Immigration* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1925, rev. ed.), p. 30.

2. Henry Pratt Fairchild, ed., *Dictionary of Sociology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1944), p. 150.

3. This point needs additional qualifications. Although most immigration is voluntary, there are instances, especially during the period under consideration, when people were compelled to leave their homelands: the Jewish immigrant of the thirties and the political refugees of permanent settlement in the importing country.

TABLE 1. *Immigrants by Country of Origin: 1820-1963*

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|
| All countries | 42,702,328 | Portugal | 843,867 |
| | | Spain | 188,974 |
| Europe | 34,896,219 | Sweden | 1,255,296 |
| | | USSR | 3,344,998 |
| Austria and Hungary | 4,280,863 | Yugoslavia | 69,834 |
| Belgium | 191,981 | | |
| Czechoslovakia | 129,704 | Asia | 1,160,758 |
| Denmark | 354,331 | China | 411,585 |
| Finland | 28,358 | Japan | 338,087 |
| France | 698,188 | America | 6,218,831 |
| Germany | 6,798,313 | Canada and | |
| Great Britain | 3,844,058 | Newfoundland | 3,697,649 |
| Greece | 499,465 | Mexico | 1,291,922 |
| Ireland | 4,693,009 | West Indies | 684,175 |
| Italy | 5,017,625 | Africa | 53,186 |
| Netherlands | 338,722 | Australia and | |
| Norway | 843,867 | New Zealand | 84,468 |
| Poland | 451,010 | Pacific Islands | 22,332 |

Source: US Bureau of the Census, «Statistical Abstract of the United States», 1964, p. 94.

The year 1882 represents a turning point in the history of American immigration. It marked the beginning of the large-scale movement of migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. Included in the so-called new migration (as opposed to the «Old» migration from England, Germany, Scandinavia, France, Holland, etc.) were the Italians, Poles, Jews, Greeks, Portuguese, Russians, and other Slavs.

History of Greek Immigration

Immigration to the United States from Greece was chiefly a product of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The exact number of Greeks who came to the United States will never be known. The failure of the Greek government to keep accurate records and the difficulties of defining a «Greek» account for most of the confusion.

The question of who is a «Greek» has become a complex one and the answers range from the strict legalistic definitions of citizenship to such broad definitions as that of prime minister Venizelos given at the Versailles Peace Conference. According to his definition «A Greek is a person who wants to be a Greek, feels he is a Greek and says he is a Greek.»⁴

So nationality, according to the Greeks, is eternal: it cannot be transferred or obliterated. The United States, on the other hand, accepts the country of a man's birth as the criterion of nationality.

Immigration from Greece was most intense between 1905 and 1915 with the peak year being 1907, when 36,580 persons were recorded as immigrants from Greece, i.e., about 1.5 percent of the total pop-

4. George Vournas, as quoted in «Greeks in America,» Congressional Record; Proceedings and Debates of the 86th Congress, 2nd Session, p. A 137.

ulation (2,631,950) of Greece for the same year.¹ This exodus was precipitated by the decline of currants, the principal export crop. Changes in the commercial policies of France and Russia, the big currant customers, dealt a severe blow to the economy. Matters became still more complicated because of the Balkan wars and after them. The response of many Greeks to this depressed state of affairs was emigration.

Reasons for Emigration

Although the economic hardship has been expressed as «push» and employment or improving economic conditions as «pull» factors, there are some other reasons that gave rise to the motivation for emigration.

1. Economic reasons

The great exodus from Greece, as we mentioned before, was a result of the economic crisis brought about by the complete failure of the currant crop and the Balkan wars. In addition to heavy taxes and the general economic conditions the people also had to bear the crushing weight of the traditional dowry system. So father and brother worked hard to secure money and provide dowries for their daughters and sisters. The opportunity of earning and saving money in the United States persuaded many fathers and sons to emigrate in the hope of facing these domestic obligations. Women seeking husbands and unable to provide dowries also emigrated, hoping to find suitable mates.

The economic motive was therefore the main reason for emigration and prompted Fairchild to write: «Stated succinctly, Greece has always been a splendid place to go away from to make a fortune.»²

2. The Effect of Communication

A further cause of emigration was the effect of the letters sent by the immigrants in America to their homes in Greece. The reports of their success spread in exaggerated form, as if people could sweep up gold in the streets or pick it up anywhere.

Gradually it became a fashion to go to America. Besides people made comparison of wages and value. Sums of money comparatively insignificant in the United States seemed very substantial in Greece. They could not take into consideration the relative

values and the difference of the circumstances in Greece and America.

Representatives of relatives and friends in the United States also helped swell the immigration tide. Once an immigrant reached his destination, he wrote his parents immediately, within a few more days he followed up this initial letter with a small sum of money borrowed without any reference to work or working conditions.

This had a chain reaction. It persuaded others to leave for America in the hope that they, too, would obtain ready money to forward to their families.³

3. Religious Factors

This reason is due to the conflict between Christianity and Islam, especially to the immigrants from Turkey. To accept Islam would end the troubles and persecutions of Christians. Like the persecuted Puritans of England, the Huguenots of France, the victims of oppression in Germany and other lands, the Greek Christian young man sought shelter, refuge, and liberty in the «Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.»⁴

Greeks in the United States

It is very difficult to estimate the actual number of «foreign born» Greeks in the United States, since reports differ. The total of 494,721 foreign-born Greeks was distributed by the 1960 Census as shown in Table 2. It can be seen from this table that Greeks are heavily concentrated in the northeast and north-central parts of America. Table 3 shows the distribution of Greeks in these areas.

Although the majority of the Greek immigrants were villagers, very few settled in agriculture. It was not so much the fact that much of the land had already been distributed among the Old immigrants. The Greek immigrant peasant ran away from his barren land to avoid the capriciousness and unpredictability of his agricultural profession.⁵ The Greeks were scattered in cities all over the United States with a heavy concentration in large urban centers (see Table 4). The distribution of Greeks in large centers is also a result of the social background of the Greek immigrants.

3. Article from the Greek Newspaper *Akropolis*, Athens, June 7, 1901.

4. J. P. Xenidis, *The Greeks in America* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922), p. 40.

5. Evangelos C. Vlachos, «The Assimilation of Greeks in the United States: with special reference to the Greek Community of Anderson, Indiana» (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964), p. 87.

1. Theodore Giannakoutis, «Introduction to the History of Greek-Americans» (in Greek), *Argonauts*, vol. A (1959), p. 165.

2. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911), p. 9.

TABLE 2. *Foreign Born Greeks by States*

| | | | |
|------------------|--------|----------------|---------|
| Alabama | 715 | Montana | 341 |
| Alaska | 63 | Nebraska | 454 |
| Arizona | 596 | Nevada | 383 |
| Arkansas | 229 | New Hampshire | 2,000 |
| California | 14,491 | New Jersey | 7,396 |
| Colorado | 903 | New Mexico | 321 |
| Connecticut | 3,459 | New York | 36,571 |
| Delaware | 374 | North Carolina | 1,549 |
| Dis. of Columbia | 1,774 | North Dakota | 106 |
| Florida | 3,720 | Ohio | 8,872 |
| Georgia | 884 | Oklahoma | 387 |
| Hawaii | 48 | Oregon | 897 |
| Idaho | 209 | Pennsylvania | 8,816 |
| Illinois | 16,660 | Rhode Island | 858 |
| Indiana | 3,517 | South Carolina | 739 |
| Iowa | 1,145 | South Dakota | 183 |
| Kansas | 431 | Tennessee | 426 |
| Kentucky | 400 | Texas | 2,034 |
| Louisiana | 356 | Utah | 1,537 |
| Maine | 482 | Vermont | 141 |
| Maryland | 2,818 | Virginia | 1,709 |
| Massachusetts | 13,519 | Washington | 1,918 |
| Michigan | 7,782 | West Virginia | 1,292 |
| Minnesota | 1,176 | Wisconsin | 1,891 |
| Mississippi | 247 | Wyoming | 489 |
| Missouri | 1,833 | Total | 159,153 |

SOURCE: «The World Almanac and Book of Facts», Luman H. Long, ed. (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1961), p. 599.

TABLE 3. *Distribution of the Greek Ethnic Stock for Major Regions in the United States, 1960*

| Region | Total Greek Stock | Percent |
|--------------|-------------------|---------|
| Northeast | 168,315 | 44.5 |
| Northcentral | 104,326 | 27.5 |
| South | 49,517 | 13.0 |
| West | 56,428 | 15.0 |
| Total | 378,586 | 100.0 |

SOURCE: «US Census, 1960», Summary detailed characteristics (percentage calculated).

TABLE 4. *Foreign Born Greeks in United States Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1969*

| | | | |
|-----------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Boston | 7,787 | Los Angeles | 4,849 |
| Chicago | 14,995 | New York | 32,250 |
| Cleveland | 2,212 | Philadelphia | 2,962 |
| Detroit | 5,873 | San Francisco | 4,740 |
| Total | | | 75,668 |

SOURCE: «World Almanac and Book of Facts», op. cit., p. 593.

The Greeks were rooted to the soil and bound by customs that had been handed down from generation to generation. They obtained their living from the family lands which they all helped to cultivate. Beyond the family was the village, which also fastened its hold on them.¹ The first kinship concentrations (gatherings of close relatives at the same place) were followed by the locality (village or town) aggregations.

The Greek community therefore has to be under-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

stood not as an overall cohesive totality but rather as a federation of diversified sub-groups, determined basically by place of origin in Greece.

II. the nature of assimilation

The Concept of Assimilation

The concept «assimilation» has been used by sociologists for at least sixty years, particularly with reference to immigrant groups in the United States. It is one of the most elusive concepts employed in the study of race and ethnic relations. The process of Greek assimilation is of central interest to this study.

There are numerous conceptual formulations of the assimilation process and in all cases there is agreement that assimilation is a special class of social interaction between the immigrants and members of the receiving society.

An early and influential definition of «assimilation» by the two sociologists Robert Park and Ernest Burgess reads as follows:

Assimilation is a process of interaction and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments and attitudes of others and, by sharing their experience, and a history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life.²

Marden defines assimilation as

the fusion of two or more groups into one group; the interpenetration of divergent habits, attitudes, ideas, and social relationships into a common unity.³

Both these definitions imply an active desire to assimilate by members of the «newcomer» group and a simultaneous acceptance of this group by members of the receiving society.

Gobetz, in his 1962 study of Slovenes, concluded that the essence of assimilation was «reciprocal identification.» He considered all other aspects of assimilation relevant only to the extent to which they help to develop reciprocal identifications:

It has been demonstrated in the course of this study that the final test of assimilation is the development of habitual unreserved reciprocal identification between minority and majority group members. Reciprocity of identifications is, of course, to be understood in the sense specified, i.e., it is usually in the direction of incorporation into the dominant group.⁴

2. Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), p. 735.

3. Charles F. Marden, *Minorities in American Society* (New York: American Book Company, 1932), p. 40.

4. Giles E. Gobetz, «Adjustment and Assimilation of Slovenian Refugees» (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962), p. 184.

There are two important parts to Gobetz's interpretation: the axiom of «reciprocal identification» and his assertion that the direction of assimilation is toward the dominant group. *The Dictionary of Sociology* emphasizes the latter point.

Social assimilation is the process by which different cultures are merged into a homogenous unit.... Social assimilation does not require the complete identification of all the units, but such modifications as eliminate the characteristics of foreign origin and enable them all to fit smoothly into the typical structure and function of the new cultural unit.... In essence, assimilation is the substitution of one nationality pattern for another. Ordinarily the modification must be made by the weaker or numerically inferior group.¹

The question is to what are the different nationalities in the United States expected to conform?

Obviously both definitions imply a distinctive culture that makes up the stronger, numerically superior, or «majority group» in American society. Jessie Bernard points out that the minority cultures did not change the basic pattern of American institutions. Their contributions were assimilated, not transformed into an Irish, Jewish, Polish, French, or Italian culture.² She does not deny the truth that many cultures have contributed to the American culture but she insists that it is a distinctive culture. Otherwise, the many minorities in the United States in essence make «modifications» necessary for their assimilation into the majority culture. Bernard's defence of this argument, briefly quoted, is as follows:

As a matter of fact, whether one likes it or not, the American culture is a distinctive entity. It was created originally by English speaking people who brought their own legal, religious and political patterns with them and it has been molded by a distinctive set of historical forces. The culture which finally prevailed remains essentially a modification of an Anglo-Saxon culture. That is, it retains the common law, the jury system, traditional rights guaranteed by great English documents and institutions from the Magna Charta down to a parliamentary form of government, and traditional veneration for, and for a long time of a colonial attitude toward the literature of England. On this base, the American frontier operated to produce a characteristic American culture.³

Herberg agrees with Bernard's statement about assimilation and states «that our cultural assimilation has taken place not in a «melting pot» but rather in a «transmuting pot» in which all ingredients have been transformed and assimilated to an idealized «Anglo-Saxon mode.»⁴

Fairchild also saw the process of assimilation as a one-way street in which no reciprocal cultures, as between the body and food, no consequence occurs. It appears that in social assimilation, as in physiological, the receiving body sets the pattern, and the assimilation does require that all foreigners must be adopted to fit into the integral whole without friction or disturbance.⁵

The Process of Assimilation

Proceeding from the «concept» of assimilation to the «process» of assimilation, we are confronted with the problem of abstracting and investigating characteristics related to the assimilation process. Park suggested that whenever and wherever different racial and ethnic groups continuously meet, they inevitably pass through a series of irreversible stages. «The race relations cycle takes the form of contacts, competition, accommodation, and then eventual assimilation.»⁶

According to Milton Gordon, a recognized authority on the Sociology of Assimilation, it is a process divided into seven basic sub-processes sequentially related to each other.

(1) *Cultural or Behavioral Assimilation— Acculturation.* This means the change by the members of an ethnic minority from ethnic culture patterns to those of the major «core» society. There is no reference to reciprocal influences. As a sub-process of assimilation, acculturation denotes change of cultural patterns to those of the host society.⁷

(2) *Structural Assimilation.* This variable as a sub-process consists of «large scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society on the primary group level.»⁸ This variable is later referred to by the author as «the cluster of phenomena associated with participation in cliques or organizations, and institutions which we have called structural assimilation.»⁹

(3) *Marital Assimilation.* This sub-process is marked by large scale intermarriage. Gordon suggests an «indissoluble connection,» in the time order indicated, between structural assimilation and marital assimilation. That is, entrance of the minority group into the social cliques, clubs and institutions of the core society at the primary group level inevitably will lead to a substantial amount of intermarriage.

5. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Race and Nationality* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), pp. 109-112.

6. Robert Ezra Park, *Race and Culture* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1950), p. 150.

7. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 71.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

1. Fairchild, *Dictionary of Sociology*, pp. 276-277.

2. Jessie Bernard, *American Community Behavior* (rev. ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1962), pp. 240-241.

3. *Ibid.*

4. William Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955), pp. 33-34.

(4) *Identificational Assimilation—Development of a Sense of Peoplehood.* Gordon distinguishes between a historical identification or sense of peoplehood, and a participational identification with those of the same ethnic group and social class, or «ethclass». The ethnic group is the locus of historical identification: «I am ultimately bound up in the fate of these people.» The ethclass is the locus of a sense of participational identification. «These are the people I feel at home with and can relax with.»¹

(5) *Attitude Receptional Assimilation—Absence of Prejudice.* In this stage of assimilation the minority, having taken on the majority core culture, entered into primary and secondary associations of the major society, intermarried freely and frequently, and throw off any sense of ethnic peoplehood, now encounter no prejudice. «They are no longer distinguishable culturally or structurally from the rest of the population.»²

(6) *Behavior Receptional Assimilation—Absence of Discrimination.* Two principal areas of discrimination are of interest here. The first is discrimination on the part of government at any level and by any agency or program; the second is discrimination on the part of private institutions. Gordon regards it as the government's responsibility to eliminate ethnic criteria «in the operation of all its facilities and services at all levels, national, state, and local.»³

With regard to the use of ethnic criteria of association by private institutions such as voluntary associations, Gordon views some selective criteria as «no discrimination but simply a functionally relevant definition of membership.»⁴

(7) *Civic Assimilation—Absence of Value and Power Conflict.* In this sub-process the ethnic minority «do not raise by their demands concerning the nature of... public or civic life any issues involving values or power conflict with the original» population.⁵ Value differences in private behavior, in areas of no public relevance, are not indicative of lack of civic assimilation.

Gordon goes further and takes a look at the seven assimilation processes from this point of view, that «cultural assimilation or acculturation is likely to be the first of the types of assimilation to occur when a minority group arrives on the scene.» It may take place even when none of the other types of assimilation occurs simultaneously or later, and this condition of «acculturation only» may continue indefinitely.⁶ Gordon concludes that the keystone of the arch of

assimilation, is not acculturation but rather structural assimilation, the large-scale entrance by ethnic minorities into cliques, clubs and primary group institutions of the «core» subsociety comprised of white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

So far, American society has undergone widespread ethnic acculturation but with regard to the other six subprocesses, assimilation has advanced considerably less. Eisenstadt, who prefers to use the term «absorption,» distinguishes three main indices of full absorption.

(1) *Acculturation*, which applies to Gordon's first stage and indicates the extent to which the immigrant learns the various roles, norms, and customs of the absorbing society.

(2) *Personal adjustment*, which encompasses the effects that the process of absorption has on the personality of the immigrant, his coping with frustrations.

(3) *Institutional dispersion*, the level at which absorption finds its culminating point in the complete loss of ethnic identity of the immigrant group in the content of the new society.⁷

Bernard offers a list of indices of assimilation.

(1) *Occupational adjustment*, which indicates the diversity of jobs held by the members of the ethnic group, tenure and rent and general economic status.

(2) *Relations between the immigrant and the law*, i.e., the crime rate in the ethnic group, the pattern of crime, and the conformity to the criminal patterns of the general population.

(3) *Education*, which includes the knowledge of English, average years of schooling, and I. Q. of the members of the ethnic group.

(4) *Health*, expressed mostly in the death rate, institutional commitments and hospitalization.

(5) *Family life*, as indicated by marital status and the birth rate.

(6) *Intermarriage*, i.e., the increasing interfaith and interethnic marriages.

(7) *Naturalization and eagerness for the acceptance of the American citizen.*⁸

Petersen, who prefers to talk about «acculturation,» provides the following list of indices of assimilation.

(1) *Education* and the influence of the public schools in establishing the English language.

(2) *Decline of the immigrant press*, as an index of the discontinuation of the use of the foreign language.

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-54.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 248.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 252.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 77.

7. S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Absorption of Immigrants* (Glen coe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955), p. 11.

8. William J. Bernard, ed., *American Immigration Policy: A Reappraisal* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 112.

(3) *Rate of naturalization*, which he considers somehow ambiguous.

(4) *Voting record* and the feelings of identification with the ethnic background.

(5) *High rate of intermarriage*.¹

Nancy Krueger abstracted from assimilation studies various factors used by investigators in their attempts to determine the degree to which the immigrant had been assimilated. Her exploration revealed the following primary indices:

(1) Proficiency in spoken English

(2) Education received since immigration

(3) Naturalization status

(4) Property ownership in the United States

(5) Income

(6) Group membership and the composition of these groups

(7) Nativity of five close friends

(8) Degree of Americanization in folkways.²

Using the eight indices, Krueger constructed an assimilation scale based upon the assumption that degrees of assimilation could be plotted on a continuum from no assimilation to complete assimilation.

Each respondent in her Columbus study was assigned a score for each of the eight items, the Index of Assimilation being the sum of the item scores, higher or lower scores indicating more or less assimilation.

Also, as a process, assimilation can be seen operating both on the individual and on the collective level. Such a distinction emphasizes the additional difference in the time span for assimilation between the particular individual and the total ethnic group. Borrie observes:

The individual may become «invisible» in all sorts of social contexts (e. g., work situation, church cultural associations) but still retain contact with a group (ethnic club, language society) which may be visible as a group. Action and interaction are involved here, but generally in the sense of «visibility», group assimilation may be a much longer process than individual assimilation.³

Eisenstadt's main conclusion is that the immigrants and their ethnic group in general can be considered as well adapted within the larger society to the extent that the structure of their group is balanced to the total structure. Eisenstadt points out:

A balance can be maintained by an ethnic community in so far as the members perform the universal roles of the so-

1. William Petersen, *Population* (New York : Macmillan, 1961), p. 138.

2. Nancy M. Krueger, «Assimilation and Adjustment of Post-War Immigration in Franklin County, Ohio» (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1955), p. 6.

3. W. D. Borrie and Associates, *The Cultural Integration of Immigrants* (Paris: Unesco, 1959).

ciety, its particularistic tendencies agree with the normative premises of the absorbing social structure and its structural peculiarities fall within the legitimate institutional limits of the society.⁴

Factors Affecting Assimilation

The process of adjustment dealing with the complete integration of ethnic groups into the normative society is not a one-way process: it involves both the immigrant and the member of the receiving society.

The typical immigrant settling in any country is faced with many problems. He is an alien in fact, as well as by law. He brings a cultural heritage, such as his language, his ideals and traditions, his concept of government, his standard of living that another society has worked out. On the other side, ethnocentrism by the members of the normative society influences their understanding of the newcomer's cultural traditions. This is the social setting in which the assimilation process takes place.

The rate of a group's assimilation within American society is a function of many variables. While several scientists are generally in agreement that assimilation is a complex phenomenon, they are not necessary in agreement as to just what factors tend to be most crucial in influencing the speed with which a group is assimilated. McIver divides minorities into three fissure lines. The first, «the sheer caste line,» applies to Negroes, Orientals, American Indians and Mexicans. The second, «the deepfissure line,» marks off Jews. The third, «the minor fissure line,» separates the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe from the rest of the population.⁵

The following salient factors are the conclusions of numerous studies on the assimilation process: (1) the physiognomic factor; (2) the cultural similarity factor; (3) the concentration factor; and (4) the recency factor.⁶

I. The Physiognomic Factor

Williams notes that «physiognomic visibility» is the strongest factor retarding assimilation.⁷

He continues that the rate of assimilation for Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and West Indians

4. Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

5. Robert M. MacIver, *The More Perfect Union* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1948), pp. 25-26.

6. W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, *The Social System of American Ethnic Groups* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945); MacIver, *op. cit.*; Maurice R. Davie and Samuel Koenig, «Adjustment of Refugees to American Life,» *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 1949, 257 : 159-165.

7. Robbin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (New York: Social Science Research Council Bulletin, 1947), p. 58.

is very slow and there is no predictable time when they will disappear into the total population. Lighter-skinned peoples from these same islands, although possessing cultural traits similar to the Negroid populations, have a more rapid rate of assimilation.¹ Warner and Srole, on the basis of the Yankee City research, suggested that «if the biological traits are highly divergent from those of the group will be very great, their sub-system strong, the period of assimilation long, and the processes slow and usually painful.»² MacIver's «deepest fissure line» separates the «colored» from all others.³

2. The Cultural Similarity Factor

«The more distinctive the racial features of immigrants the slower the rate of assimilation.»⁴ MacIver's «deep fissure line,»⁵ marking off Jews is due to the fact that they are not Christians. Warner and Srole point out that: «the greater the difference between the host and the subordinate, the greater the strength of the ethnic social system, and the longer the period necessary for the assimilation of the ethnic group.»⁶

They also employed language and religion as criteria in ascertaining the degree of subordination of minority groups.

3. The Concentration Factor

Gordon points out that the American experience suggests that «If a minority group is spatially isolated and segregated (whether voluntarily or not) in a rural area, as is the case with the American Indians still on reservations, even the acculturation process will be slow.»⁷ Where groups are concentrated in large numbers they tend to coalesce and perpetuate their native cultures. Where they are scattered, they are less capable of insulating themselves from the larger community and of preserving their native institutions, customs, and intermarriage patterns.

Park observes that:

Cities offer the individual freedom and the urban industrial concerns introduce him to the «grand division of labor» which separates one man from another, permits the immigrant to emancipate himself from the controls of co-ethnic individuals and groups.⁸

These freedoms found in the modern cities could not be found in closely-knit, primitive societies.

Most modern immigrants have settled in segregated immigrant colonies in cities.

Hughes brings in the role of the working environment in the assimilation process, noting that «industry is always a grand mixer of peoples.»⁹

Treudley suggests that membership in formal organizations (including factories, stores, and civic and professional clubs) introduces the immigrant to the American pattern and facilitates his adjustment.¹⁰

Additional factors affecting the degree of assimilation and not included in the broad categories could be: the immigrants motives for emigration and his consequent «image» of the new country. This is of crucial importance for understanding his initial attitudes and behavior in his new setting. It is the initial motivation that constitutes the first stage of the process of social change inherent in any migration and in the absorption of the immigrants. This first stage largely influences the subsequent stages inasmuch as it decides the immigrant's orientation and degree of readiness to accept change.

Petersen makes a distinction between emigrees and refugees. The former regard their exile as temporary and have little or no motivation to assimilate, the latter have no place to return to and intend to settle permanently.¹¹ An immigrant who does not intend to settle permanently will usually make little effort to assimilate. Another factor is the attitude that the immigrant develops after arrival as a result of the treatment he experiences in his relations with the members of the host society. The public school is also of considerable importance. It has an indirect but crucial effect upon the rate of assimilation. Not only does the school child learn English and the use of American cultural materials, but he also acquires many American ways through association with native American children. It influences the modification of parental roles and it accelerates, in most cases, the assimilation process.

III: previous research and hypotheses

The migratory movements of the peoples of the world are as old as man himself. The typical immigrant settling in any country is faced with many problems. The donor and the receiving societies are faced with the perplexing questions of social adjustment affecting both of them.

9. Everett C. Hughes, «Queries Concerning Industry and Society Growing out of Study of Ethnic Relations in Industry.» *American Sociological Review* (1949), 14, 211.

10. Mary Bosworth Treudley, «Formal Organizations and the Americanization Process with Special Reference to the Greeks of Boston.» *American Sociological Review* (1949), 14:44-53.

11. William Petersen, «A General Typology of Migration.» *American Sociological Review* (1958), 23:256-266.

1. *Ibid.*, p. 58

2. Warner and Srole, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-286.

3. MacIver, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

4. Park, *Race and Culture*, p. 353

5. MacIver, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

6. Warner and Srole, *op. cit.*, pp. 290-292.

7. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

8. Park, *Race and Culture*, p. 353.

The Hellenic States endeavored to protect their homogeneity; the Ionian cultures differentiated between the favorable temporary privileges accorded to foreign merchants and the unfavorable reaction to his acquiring formal status as a citizen.

All strangers were considered as somehow different and alien to the normative society. They were often different in language, religion, mores, folkways, and frequently in skin color. As the racial characteristics were the most noticeable and of considerable permanence, they gave rise to theories explaining social facts through the use of biological or racial doctrines.

The leading professional students of human behavior about the turn of the century interjected into their studies of majority and minority relations their theoretical and value orientations. They were primarily «grand theorists,» interested in the construction of sets of theoretical principles which would explain all human behavior. Consequently, they failed to develop specific theories dealing with specific phases of group activities. Furthermore the issues of migration and assimilation were often treated indirectly, in conjunction with problems of race relations and their effects upon the society.

William Graham Sumner

William Graham Sumner posited that the differences between racial and ethnic groups are fixed and that groups are primarily separated by their different mores. The mores are obeyed blindly without any questioning on the part of the individual. The individual learns and obeys the mores of his society while he is still too young to question them: when he is old enough to question and challenge the mores he is already a staunch believer in them. The society is composed of in-groups and out-groups. Any in-group or we-group is a number of individuals who have mutual feelings of belonging together as a unit. Strong in-group feeling results in ethnocentrism, that is the belief held by a group that its ways of behaving are superior to those of other groups. Scientific knowledge, legislation, and reform efforts can have very little effect upon the existing situation.

Thus the rigidity of the pattern of intergroup relations was convincingly stated by one of the most influential writers of the period.¹

1. Sumner developed his theoretical schemes through the analysis of relatively stable primitive societies. The oft-made transference of explanations of social processes characteristic of primitive societies to modern and complex social groups constitutes an ever-present danger in studies of social phenomena. For a detailed exposition of Sumner's views see William Graham Sumner, *Folkways* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940).

Thomas and Znaniecki

Thomas and Znaniecki are not interested, as Sumner is, in a conceptual description of the mores. They are interested primarily in changes of the mores and folkways: the conditions under which these of the processes by which they are effected. What someone reviewing these five volumes actually finds is a study of the changes that are taking place in the cultural life of the Polish peasant in Poland and in America.² To state it in the language of Sumner, it is a study of the mores of a peasant community which, owing to the breakdown of its historic isolation and to its «contact with the more complex and fluid world,» is in process of evolution.

The Polish peasant brings to America a body of tradition and custom in which, as Thomas would say, the situation has a definition different from that of the native population. Gradually he accommodates himself to the customs of the country. He acquires new attitudes and new values.

Charles Horton Cooley

Charles Horton Cooley discusses the problem of race, immigrants, and acculturation in the broader context of social organization. He insists that we have no positive knowledge of racial differences, and although he admits cautiously that there may be some «subtle differences between races,» he hastens to conclude that all races are very much alike.³

Cooley views immigration and immigrant adjustment in the more general context of social change. As in the continuous process of social change, so in all phases of immigrant adjustment social types are disintegrated, old ones going to pieces and new ones (are) not perfected. Cooley's fragmentary but important contributions to the area of immigration and the immigrant like in his attempts (1) to disassociate sociological investigation of those phenomena from the biased but widely espoused racialist doctrines; (2) to attribute the differences between various racial and cultural groups to differential racial conditions, and not to heredity; (3) to emphasize the importance of immigration and immigrant adjustment to the economic and cultural development of the receiving society; and (4) to stress the «insidious» power of the immediate social milieu and its effects upon individual adjustment to the new situation.

2. William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (5 vols.; Boston: R. G. Badger and Co., 1918-1920).

3. Charles H. Cooley, *Social Organizations* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956), p. 28.

Robert Ezra Park

Robert Ezra Park contributed many ideas for the analysis of racial relations and cultural contacts. Introducing his readers to the problem of immigration and assimilation, Park made an insightful distinction between the various categories of immigrants found in America: (a) the settlers, (b) the colonists, (c) the migrant industrials, and (d) the exotics.¹ The rural «settlers,» according to Park, were the first to assimilate, and did so with amazing speed and completeness.² The rate of assimilation of «colonists» and the «migrant industrial» was somewhat slower due to continuing cultural contacts with good-sized immigrant colonies and geographical proximity to their homelands, as well as the unresolved problems of the permanence of their stay. The «exotic» immigrants, as a result of their racial differences, were isolated and removed from contact and participation in American life.

The «settlers» were represented by the Germans and Scandinavians. By this term Park denotes those immigrants who came to settle on the land with a definite intent to remain in the United States and to break their connections with the home country. The «colonists» might include the Spanish-Mexicans who have crossed the border from Mexico in the south, and the French-Canadians who have come down from the Province of Quebec in the north. They were seasonal laborers, a number of whom remained each year in the United States as permanent residents but who nevertheless retained strong national sentiments and ties with their home countries. These cultural ties are yearly reinforced by the returning waves of seasonal laborers. The third division of «migrant industrials» were composed of the Italian and Slavic populations. These are the people who compose or did compose before the war that great drifting body of laborers which formerly moved back and forth across the Atlantic in response to the changing demands of American industry. They left their own country, but they have not quite settled in this. In the fourth category of the «exotic» are included the people from the Near East and the Orient. Their settlement in America had a character of permanence, but their physiological features hampered their acceptance by American society.

Park views assimilation as a long-lasting process of general adjustment which is experienced by all, immigrants and non-immigrants alike. The non-immigrant experiences assimilation every time he

changes his immediate milieu. To the immigrant assimilation involves a more thorough change in his way of life than it does for the old residents. For both, however, «it is a period of inner turmoil and intense self consciousness... [only] in the case of the immigrant this period of crisis is relatively permanent.»³

The process of acculturation and assimilation does not begin with the immigrant's arrival into the receiving society nor does it proceed with the same speed in all cases. Park points out that «the Americanization of the immigrant begins long before he reaches America» as every immigrant has his own perception of America gained from his contacts with those who went before him. This image of America is a personal image, not the «America we know (but) it is immigrant America.»⁴

Park attributed the variations in assimilation rates to two main-factors: 1) the prevalence of ethnocentrism in the receiving society, the greater the ethnocentrism of the receiving society the longer it takes the immigrants to assimilate;⁵ 2) differences in physiological features, the more distinctive the racial features of immigrants the slower the rate of assimilation.⁶

With the discussion of Park's contributions to the area of majority-minority relations, the problems of assimilation and the salient consideration of the theoretical propositions advanced by early sociologists is concluded.

Research on Greek Assimilation in the United States

Generally speaking the Greeks in America have not been subjects of many sociological studies. Most of the studies analyzing Greeks in the United States have been of a historical nature and descriptive character.

Their emphasis is mainly on historical accounts of the Greek minority, with some general information on the numerical, geographical, and occupational distribution of the Greeks in the United States, some prominent Greek-Americans, Greek organizations, etc., with passing remarks on the cultural and social aspects of their life in this country.⁷

3. Park, *Race and Culture*, p. 354.

4. Park, *The Society*, p. 163.

5. Park, *Race and Culture*, p. 77.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 208. Regarding the Negroes and Orientals, Park writes that the chief obstacle to assimilation are not mental but physical traits. The trouble is not the Japanese mind but the Japanese skin. The «Jap» is not the right color.

7. Louis Adamic, *A Nation of Nations* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945), pp. 266-286; H. G. Duncan, *Immigration and Assimilation* (Boston: Heath and Co., 1933); Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States*; Fairchild, *Immigrant Background*; F. J. Brown and J. S. Roucek, *One*

1. Robert Ezra Park, *Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 153-154. First published in *American Review* (1925), 3:143-152.

2. Edmund deS. Brunner, *Immigrant Farmers and Their Children* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1925).

There are also a number of articles that depict aspects of the history and life of Greeks in the United States. Of these, only a small number could be considered as important from the sociological point of view, for the methods they employ, the material they use, and the ideas they analyze.

Abbott made an early analysis of the Greek immigrants in Chicago, with particular emphasis on the problem of adjustment of peasants to a highly industrialized society.¹ Balk, on the other hand, turned her attention to the economic contributions of the Greeks to the United States.² Saloutos, a historian with a long-standing interest in Greek-American affairs, wrote a preliminary historical introduction to Greek immigration in the United States and to the place of the Greek ethnic group in American society in recent years.³

Turning our attention now to the limited sociological material in the Greeks, we find some noteworthy contributions. Fairchild's *Greek Immigration in the United States* presented the first systematic, extended analysis of the Greek ethnic group, the pattern of immigration, and various major developments in their first years in the new continent.

Mary Treudley, in an article about the Greek colony of Boston makes an analysis of the importance of formal organizations as the crucial agencies in the transformation of character from peasants to citizens of a modern state. The author's thesis is that voluntary organizations of ethnic groups, and especially those of the Greeks, have been successful in bringing about changes in personality desired by the larger society as contrasted to the authoritarian structures imported by the immigrants.⁴

Helen Laquier made an attempt to measure the nature and degree of cultural assimilation among three generations of Greeks living in San Antonio. Her main conclusions is that though there is considerable variation between generations, religion and the family seem to be the two institutions largely responsible for preserving the Greek culture into the third generation.⁵

Theodoratus made a study of the influence of the homeland on the social organization of a Greek com-

munity with special emphasis on the kinds of ties existing between the immigrant and the mother country. These ties, according to Theodoratus, are cultural, i.e., religion, ceremonies, food, etc.; sociological, i.e., kinship organizations, etc.; and psychological, i.e., feelings of ethnic identity. Such ties, it is argued, have been influential in the formation and maintenance of various institutions, social divisions, factions, modes of thought, values, and patterns of social interaction.⁶

Vlachos' study on the assimilation of the Greek community of Anderson, Indiana, investigates the relationship between exposure, as resulting from migration and assimilation. The author's conclusion was that «because of their central role in the life of Greek-Americans, many cultural patterns associated with religion and the family remain distinctly Greek and in many respects are more tenaciously conserved than in Greece proper. On the other hand, assimilation especially «structural» one, in the institutional areas of economic status-vocations, organizations and formal associations, politics, education and language, has been very rapid.⁷

IV: Greek assimilation at a local level

The general problem of this study is the assimilation of the Greek ethnic group in Lowell, Massachusetts. Gordon defines assimilation as behavioral acculturation and structural assimilation, which indicates the entrance of the immigrants and their descendants into the social cliques, organizations, institutional activities, and general civic life of the receiving society. This is the working definition accepted for this study.

The Assimilation Variables

A study of Greek assimilation is of particular interest for the following reasons:

1. An intensive study of a particular Greek community (in Lowell) offers the opportunity for a closer look at the variables and other factors involved in the process of assimilation and may broaden and clarify the theoretical presentation and the national statistical picture.

2. The study of the American Greek has implications for rural-urban processes. The average Greek immigrant comes from a rural background. He is an illiterate, unskilled peasant from Greece where the cooperative farm-household was the back-bone of his economy.

6. Robert J. Theodoratus, «The Influence of the Homeland on the Social Organization of a Greek Community in America» (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1961).

7. Vlachos, *op. cit.*

America, The History Contributions and Present Problem of Our Racial and National Minorities (New York: Prentice Hall, 1945), pp. 242-257.

1. Grace Abbott, «A Study of the Greeks in Chicago,» *American Journal of Sociology*, XV (1909), pp. 379-393.

2. Helen H. Balk, «Economic Contributions of the Greeks to the United States,» *Economic Geography*, XIX (1943), pp. 270-275.

3. Theodore Saloutos, «The Greeks in the United States,» *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLIV (1945), pp. 69-81.

4. Treudley, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

5. Helen Capanidon Laquier, «Cultural Change Among Three Generations of Greeks,» *American Catholic Sociological Review*, XXII (1961), pp. 223-232.

As we mentioned before, while social scientists are generally in agreement that assimilation is a complex phenomenon, they are not necessarily in agreement as to just what factors tend to be most crucial in influencing the speed with which a group is assimilated.

Our major interest is to examine the relationship between assimilation and the following variables: (1) sex; (2) reasons for emigration; (3) educational and occupational background; (4) ties with country of origin; (5) intention to remain in America; (6) type of migration (e.g., closely-knit family groups, etc.); (7) occupational and regional mobility.

Hypothesis

1. *Sex.* Regarding the variable sex, women should be expected to be less assimilated than men. «Greek women are not expected to be interested in anything outside of the home and children.»¹ This hypothesis is based also on Drachler's study in New York City concerned with the rate of intermarriage. As against the rate of intermarriage for the total Greek ethnic group of 22.14, male Greek-Americans have a rate of intermarriage of 34.73, while American females have a rate of intermarriage of only 3.53.²

2. *Reasons for emigration.* On the basis of Eisenstadt's study of immigrants to Israel, the motives have been distinguished as «survival,» «socio-economic,» and «political.»³ Survivals were least assimilated and political next, while the socio-economic were very well assimilated. This hypothesis has been tested by DeGroot⁴ in his study of post-war immigrants in Atlanta, Georgia. We make the same hypothesis. The historical evidence suggests that Greeks will give sheer «survival,» in the *economic sense*, as the primary reason for emigrating.

3. *Educational and Occupational Background.* This hypothesis refers to Weistock's suggestion that «the higher the educational, income, and occupational levels of the incoming group, the more rapid its assimilation.»⁵ DeGroot found that in the Greek group the professionals and proprietors had the highest assimilation scores. We also hypothesize that the immigrants who engage in professional, managerial, clerical, and sales occupations will be more

highly assimilated than immigrants engaged in agricultural, skilled, or semiskilled occupations.

4. *Ties with Country of Origin.* We hypothesize that those who have relatives in the homeland with whom they maintain communicative ties will be less assimilated than those who do not. When the donor country is distant and communication between the immigrant and his homeland is rare and fragmentary his assimilation will proceed at a rapid pace. Otherwise the continuous flow of information and co-ethnic newcomers will tend to *retard* assimilation and reinforce immigrant loyalties to his native land.

Visits of immigrants to their original homes may enable them to avoid deeply rooted ties and commitments within the new homeland. It also enables them to experience a reinforcement of previous cultural traditions and life patterns.⁶

Warner and Srole conclude that because of the geographical proximity of Quebec and Mexico, French-Canadian assimilation in New England and Mexican assimilation in the Southwest have been slowed.

5. *Intention to Remain in the United States.* Our hypothesis is that an immigrant who does not intend to settle permanently will usually make little effort to assimilate. The «rural settlers,» according to Park, who came to settle in the United States and to break their connections with the home country were assimilated with amazing speed and completeness.⁷ Treudley, in her study of Armenian-Americans, indicates that their assimilation was fast because they were hostile to their past experiences of living under Turkish rule and eager to become members of the American society.⁸

6. *Type of Migration.* We hypothesize that when migration takes place in closely-knit family groups, from one neighborhood or village, they also tend to settle in closed communities where they reestablish their traditional country life and its folkways and traditions. The process of group transformation among these immigrants will be very slow. Eisenstadt, studying the agricultural immigrants in Europe, particularly France and Belgium, observed that «when they emigrated in family groups they tended to maintain many of their traditional elites, whose cultural orientation was even more strongly directed towards their country of origin.»⁹

7. *Regional and Occupational Mobility.* We hypothesize that these factors are often associated with decreasing ethnic identification and increasing assimilation. The practice of breaking original bonds

1. Warner and Srole, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 109.

2. Julius Drachler, *Democracy and Assimilation. The Blending of Immigrant Heritages in America* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920), appendix.

3. Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.

4. Dudley E. DeGroot, «The Assimilation of Post-War Immigrants in Atlanta, Georgia» (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1957).

5. Alexander Weistock, «Some Factors that Retard or Accelerate the Rate of Acculturation,» *Human Relations*, XVII (1964), pp. 321-340.

6. Warner and Srole, pp. 100-101.

7. Park, *Society*, pp. 153-154.

8. Mary B. Treudley, «An Ethnic Group's View of the American Middle Class,» *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), pp. 715-724.

9. Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-231.

with the environment allows people to adjust to any situation, to counteract psychological dependence, and to change. For example, the Jewish people illustrate this hypothesis. Historically, they have been able to adjust to new situations economically and culturally while retaining their religious identity. Montesquieu, writing on the causes of assimilation, points out that

the more communicative people are the more easily they change their habits, because each one is in greater degree a spectacle to the other and the singularities of individuals are better observed. The climate which influences one nation to take pleasure in being communicative makes it delight in change.¹

Historical and Sociological Perspective of the Greek Ethnic Group in Lowell

Lowell is a city and one of two seats of Middlesex County (the other is Cambridge) in the northeast section of Massachusetts, twenty-five miles northwest of Boston and seven miles from the New Hampshire boundary. It is on the Merrimack River at the mouth of the Concord River.

The Lowell Metropolitan Area—at this moment including Lowell city and the towns of Billerica, Chelmsford, Dracut, Tewksbury, and Tyngsborough—was first settled about 1633 in an area that is today part of Chelmsford. The town was incorporated in 1826 and named after Francis Cabot Lowell, regarded as the originator of American cotton manufacturing.

For many years agriculture was the principal occupational pursuit of the settlers in the area. The boot and shoe industry also became an important segment of the area's economic base, but an important change came when the Middlesex Canal was built. This canal ran from the Merrimack River, just above Pawtucket Falls, to Boston and was a very important factor in the establishment of manufacturing in this area, although with the beginning of the Boston and Lowell Railroad in 1835, competition undermined the canal trade.

The manufacturing industry flourished and many laborers moved into the city. However, when the textile industry began to recede, the population decreased. Many mills had moved to the Southern States by the mid-twentieth century, causing a decline in population.

In the nineteenth century large numbers of foreign workers were attracted by the textile industry. Nowhere in the country was the proportion of foreign

born to the total population higher than in the Merrimack Valley area.²

The immigrants came in three groups. Before the Civil War, the Irish, fleeing famine at home, settled along the Merrimack River. They continued to come after the war and were joined by French-Canadians, English and Germans. Between 1890 and 1912 the earlier immigration slowed as Greeks, Italians, Lithuanians, Czechs, Scots, Armenians, Portuguese, Franco-Belgians and Chinese rounded out the immigrant society of the region.

Greek immigration to Lowell began in 1880. It is said that the first Greek was someone named Depoutis, who was better known by the Americanized name Peter. He opened a grocery store and married an Irish woman but did not have any children. By the year 1890 two more Greeks came, and they also engaged in the grocery business.³ In the next year a few Greeks from Boston and New York, unable to afford the hard work of «salesman,» took refuge in Lowell. They looked for jobs in the cotton mills of the city but they were not more numerous than fifty.

Greeks began to arrive in mass about 1892 and by 1900 there were about 1,800 Greeks in Lowell, of whom only fifty were women. There were about thirty families. In the section about Market Street every store was operated by a Greek and every dwelling was inhabited by Greeks.⁴ According to the State census of 1905 it is estimated that foreign born Greeks were 1,694 males and 326 females, or a total of 2,020.⁵

The great majority of these Greeks come from Mani or Laconia, the mountainous south and western part of Peloponnesus, which is rocky and barren. «Only by the most careful terracing can olive trees be made to grow on the hillsides, and this is the only district of the Peloponnesus where the vine is not cultivated.»⁶ The inhabitants of this region claim to be the purest blooded descendants of the ancients of any of the modern Greeks and pride themselves on their language and independent spirit. The «Maniates» followed people from Macedonia, Thessaly, and other sections of Greece. Fairchild wrote in 1911 that the Greek colony of Lowell was probably the most exclusive and distinctively Greek settlement of any considerable size in the United States.⁷

2. Donald P. Cole, *Immigration City* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1963), p. 11.

3. *Dedication of the Hellenic-American School* (in Greek) (Lowell, Mass., 1959), p. 17.

4. Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States*, p. 134.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 134.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

1. Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des loix*, tr. by Thomas Nugent, vol. I, pp. 317-318.

If the building of the church can be taken as the mark of the beginning of organized community life, the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church in Lowell is the fourth oldest Greek Orthodox parish in the nation. The church structure was completed in 1908 and served the religious needs of all Greeks for many years. With the peak of the conflict, in Greece, between the royalists and the democrats (venizelists), in 1920, the respective tensions grew among the immigrants. The result was an eruption of the same conflict in Lowell, thus preventing unified worship in the Orthodox parish. The democrats formed a new church in 1922, by the name of Holy Transfiguration. Today there are four parishes with a combined membership of 1,665.

In 1908 the parish built the Hellenic-American Parochial School which has been in operation since 1909. The annual enrollment is 250 students, originally and presently. Aside from the Orthodox parishes, the Greeks in Lowell, especially the newly-arrived immigrants, retain their identity in coffee houses, Greek clubs, etc. Table 5 shows the percentage of the Greek minority today.

Compared with the other persons of foreign born stock, the Greek community is a rather large group in Lowell. In view of the unique culture in Lowell, the Patriarch Athenagoras, in 1952 when he was Archbishop of North and South America, named Lowell the «Metropolis of Hellenism» in the United States.¹

TABLE 5. *Mother Tongue of the Foreign Born Population in Lowell City*

| Foreign Born | %* | Foreign Born | %* |
|----------------|------|--------------|-------|
| English | 24.7 | Lithuanian | 1.6 |
| Norwegian | 0.1 | Finnish | — |
| Swedish | 0.8 | Yiddish | 2.8 |
| Danish | — | Greek | 11.1 |
| Dutch | — | Italian | 2.8 |
| French | 26.4 | Spanish | 0.4 |
| German | 2.2 | Portuguese | 3.8 |
| Polish | 7.7 | Japanese | — |
| Czech | — | Chinese | 0.3 |
| Hungarian | — | Arabic | 1.0 |
| Serbo-Croatian | — | All Other | 2.3 |
| Russian | 0.8 | No Report | 8.6 |
| Ukrainian | 0.1 | Total | 100.0 |

* Percentages lower than 0.1 are not recorded.

Source: United States Census, 1960.

Socio-economically the Greek immigrant group in Lowell started at the bottom. At first the Irish immigrants who had fled Ireland during the famine became laborers and domestics. During the Civil War a great influx of French-Canadians replaced the Irish in the mills and settled quickly in «little Canada» at

the western end of the island created by the River and Pawtucket Canal. The Irish moved up to jobs inside the factories and took on positions as salesmen, clerks, and machine operators. After 1890 followed the Greeks. Each generation of immigrants confronts discrimination by the previous generations. In Lowell the Greeks faced the Irish first and the French-Canadians later. They remember as high school students thirty-five years ago being insulted by Irish teachers, i.e., «Hey, you Greeks», and discouraged from going to College in favor of attending the commercial schools. About ten years ago, Greeks successfully requested a law be enacted to hire teachers by test and not by group association.

V: a sample survey of the Greeks of Lowell

Methods

This study is semi-quantitative in nature as it combines statistical analysis of certain of the data with some historical events.

The author participated also for a year in many functions of the community and had many informal talks with priests, leaders, and other active members there.

Fieldwork was carried out from December 1969 to March 1970, on the basis of questionnaires personally administered by the author.

The questionnaire was designed with major quantitative items (age, education, length of residence in the United States, etc.) at the beginning so that these might be quickly collected. The qualitative items (style of life, motives for emigration, etc.), many of which were in the form of open-ended questions, followed the quantitative.

The interviews by means of the questionnaires lasted one hour to two and a half hours. In most cases they were conducted in the residence of the interviewee. This provided an opportunity to make visual checks on the style of life and folkways of those respondents. Some preferred to be interviewed at their place of business, whether a grocery store or a restaurant.

The study is based on a ten percent random sample of the 400 native born Greeks who are registered in one of the four parishes. The questionnaire was answered by the head of the household. Women were not excluded from the sample since we had to compare them with men as concerned with variable sex.

Findings

This section is devoted to the presentation of some of the major characteristics of the Lowell sample of forty native born Greeks.

Thirty-three of the 40 immigrants are male, 7 female. The mean age for the sample was 66 years;

1. *Dedication of the Hellenic-American School*, p. 17.

the median, with a range of 35-90 years, was 70. Males had a mean age of 64, and a median age of 68, with a range of 35-90 years. The females had a mean age of 78, a median of 75, and a range of 67-90 years.

Twenty-seven individuals in the sample were married; 12 had been previously married, and one was single. None of them had married a foreigner. The average length of residence in the United States at the time of the interviews was 41 years for men, with a range of 68 to 2, and 58 for women, with a range of 65 to 51.

Educationally there were 15 males who had a partial or total grade school education, 12 who had attended or completed high school, and six who had attended college or University. Of the women there were four who had attended some or total grammar school, two some high school, and one some college.

There were 21 wives of the male respondents who had a partial or total grade school education; 5 who had attended or completed high school; and 1 who had attended college. The average education for their male children was some years of college; for the females it was high school.

The average educational background of their fathers was less than graduation from grammar school; for their mothers it was two years of grammar school.

In all the above cases males ranked highest in education. Two males were vocationally unskilled: 4 were classifiable as skilled; 15 possessed clerical, managerial, or sales skills; and 12 were either professionals or proprietors in their vocational experience.

Three females were classified as unskilled: 1 as clerical; 2 as professionals or proprietors; and 1 as a housewife. The above occupational classification represents the last occupation in each case.

Thirty-three of their fathers were reported as doing farming, fishing, and cattle breeding; three as semi-skilled; and four as small proprietors.

Twenty-seven came from villages with a population less than 2,000; 7 from semi-urban areas with a population less than 4,999; three from small towns with a population less than 9,999; and three from larger cities.

Fourteen of them came from Mani; 9 from Macedonia; 6 from Thessaly; and 11 from other places, including Asia Minor.

Almost all of the immigrants had relatives, compatriots, or friends in Lowell before their emigration. Twenty-six reported «a close relative»; eight relatives not «very close» while 3 had only compatriots and friends; and 3 had none of the above.

Almost all of them indicated that they have relatives or friends in Greece, but only 10 kept in touch with them.

Most of the sample belonged to Greek organizations rather than to American ones; Greek organizations consisted of local chapters of national ethnic lodges, churches, charities, and one political fraternal order.

They all send their children to the daily or afternoon school to learn the Greek language. For Greeks language and religion are the most important.

When the respondents were asked if their children would marry a foreigner they answered, «No,» due to the religious factor. They dislike intermarriage with Catholics because they would lose membership in the Greek church.

When they were asked which group they identify themselves with—Greeks, Greek-Americans, or Americans—37 of the 40 indicated the first. Three were not able to specify any group, since they emigrated before age eight. When asked whether they would vote for a Greek running for political office, regardless of party or issue, 33 said «Yes,» while 7 answered that they would vote for the party.

From formal and informal discussions with members of Lowell's Greek community, as well as analyses of the data, the following conclusions arise: Greeks came to Lowell in two principal migratory movements. Most of them arrived before 1925, the rest mainly after 1947. This distinction emerges subjectively in the Greek experience: i.e., Greeks call themselves «old» or «new» immigrants, respectively.

The old immigrants claimed that they tried to keep their Hellenic identity in the face of Irish and French-Canadian discrimination and Protestant evangelism. That is why their community was tight, close-knit. Despite their meagre income, they managed to raise enough money to build churches, thus representing their Hellenism to Protestants. This activity occurred among the immigrants themselves without outside support or welfare. The new immigrants sought American citizenship and participation, while avoiding Orthodox Church membership, contributions, and ethnic solidarity.

Because of these tendencies, it is worthwhile to describe and analyze the two groups, using statistical data. In the following tables, which compare the two, women are excluded. Table 6 presents the distribution of the Greek male stock which arrived in Lowell from 1900 to 1970.

As seen from Table, 6 Greek immigration to Lowell began in 1900 for this sample. The decade 1910-1919 represents the highest proportion of Greece-born population in Lowell. Although unrestricted immigration had been more or less the rule in the past, with the beginning of World War I a new policy of restriction started developing, which is also reflected in the Greek immigration figures of the

TABLE 6. *Distribution of Male Sample, by Decade of Arrival to Lowell*

| Decade | Frequency | % |
|-----------|-----------|-----|
| 1900-1909 | 6 | 19 |
| 1910-1919 | 10 | 30 |
| 1920-1929 | 3 | 9 |
| 1930-1939 | 3 | 9 |
| 1940-1949 | 3 | 9 |
| 1950-1959 | 5 | 15 |
| 1960-1970 | 3 | 9 |
| Total | 33 | 100 |

Source: Appendix, p. 77, q. 1.

TABLE 7. *Motivation for Emigration of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Reason for Emigration | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Economic | 14 | 3 | 60 | 30 |
| Socio-economic | 4 | 6 | 19 | 50 |
| Other Reasons | — | 1 | — | 10 |
| Decision Made by Others | 5 | — | 21 | — |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 77, q. 7.

period. Between 1920 and 1929 only a small percentage of Greeks arrived in Lowell, apparently the effect of the restrictive legislation. After World War II and the Civil War that followed in Greece, Greek emigration was increased. America was an «escape» from the ruins of the war and the political and economic instability.

The data in Table 7 indicate that the majority of the old immigrants emigrated for sheer economic survival. The economic picture at the time of mass immigration (Table 6) was indeed poor. Agricultural methods in Greece were primitive and trade was insignificant, partly because of changes in the commercial policies of France and Russia, the big currant customers, but mainly the result of the Balkan wars. In this depressed state Greeks responded with emigration. In contrast, the new immigrants came mostly to improve their living standards. They are different from the old immigrants who came in the days of mass immigration. They are not illiterate and unskilled peasants and laborers but semi-professional, clerical, and sales workers.

Table 8 shows that the old immigrants had intended to work hard, prosper, and return to Greece. The new immigrants anticipated a permanent stay in reaction to the situation of Greece during World War II and the civil war.

In Table 9 we note that the educational background of the new immigrants is higher than the old.

TABLE 8. *Intention to Stay of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Intention | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| To Stay | 7 | 5 | 30 | 50 |
| To Go Back | 12 | 3 | 52 | 30 |
| No Definite Decision | — | 2 | — | 20 |
| Decision Made by Others | 4 | — | 18 | — |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 77, q. 6.

TABLE 9. *Educational Background of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| School Years | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Partial Grade School | 7 | 1 | 30 | 10 |
| Grade School | 5 | 2 | 22 | 20 |
| Partial High School | 5 | 4 | 22 | 40 |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 4 | 20 |
| Partial College | 3 | — | 14 | — |
| College | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| University | 1 | — | 4 | — |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 78, qs. 10A, 10B.

TABLE 10. *Occupational Background of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Occupational Background | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Unskilled, Semi-skilled | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| Skilled | 3 | 1 | 14 | 10 |
| Clerical, Managerial, Sales | 10 | 5 | 43 | 50 |
| Professional, Proprietor | 9 | 3 | 39 | 30 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 79, q. 21.

This is due to the fact that most of them came to improve their economic status (Table 7), rather than for sheer economic survival.

In comparing the old to the new immigrants we notice that there is no basic difference in their occupational status. But, it has to be taken into consideration that the average stay of the old immigrant in this country is twice as long as the average stay of the new immigrant. Thus, the old immigrant had more time to improve his occupational status. There are two other alternatives that could be examined: a) to compare the old and the new immigrants as to their occupational status before they emigrated, and b) to compare the same group as to their first occupation when they arrived in Lowell.

Occupational Status of Immigrants before Immigration

If a comparison is going to be made, a basic fact to be taken into consideration is that the old immigrant came here in his teens (average age, 17.5), while the new immigrant came here in his manhood (average age, 37.5). The old immigrants came without any professional training other than basic agricultural skills, while the new immigrants, because of their longer stay in Greece, and its recent urbanization, had the opportunity to develop some skills which permit them to adjust better in the new environment.

The only real comparison that can be made is of a small segment of old and new immigrants who came here between the ages of 20-30 years. In our study there were 8 of the old. Seven of them were occupationally classified as farmers and cattle breeders, and only 1 was a skilled worker. In contrast, 1 of the 3 new immigrants was a proprietor while the others were skilled workers. The other alternative is the first occupation in the United States. The following table gives us some data.

TABLE 11. *First Occupation in Lowell, of Male Sample, by Year of Arrival*

| First Occupation, Lowell | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Unskilled, Semi-skilled | 16 | 2 | 70 | 20 |
| Clerical, Managerial, Sales | 2 | 7 | 9 | 70 |
| Professional, Proprietors | 5 | 1 | 21 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 79, q. 21.

The above data show that the new immigrants started with higher occupations. The following three reasons could be suggested to explain this statement. (1) The new immigrant came to this country better equipped to deal with a more complex environment; (2) the new immigrant found already established relatives and friends who helped him into earlier occupational adjustment; and (3) the new immigrant did not face the discriminatory environment the old immigrant faced.

TABLE 12. *Regional Mobility of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| No. of Movements | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| 1-2 | 17 | 4 | 74 | 40 |
| 3-4 | 6 | 5 | 26 | 50 |
| 5-6 | — | 1 | — | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 79, q. 22.

TABLE 13. *Occupational Mobility of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| No. of Movements | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| 1-2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 3-4 | 6 | — | 26 | — |
| 5-6 | 5 | 4 | 22 | 40 |
| 7-8 | 7 | 5 | 30 | 50 |
| 9 and over | 3 | 1 | 13 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 79, q. 21.

Comparing Tables 12 and 13 we show that Lowell is not the first stop for the new immigrants as it was for the old. They arrived in Lowell after moving to and from other places. The new immigrants also changed their occupational status more frequently than the old.

Acculturation and assimilation have been defined in various ways by a number of authors. Gordon notes the range of social and cultural phenomena denoting both continuity and change which can be recorded in the social and cultural life of immigrants.¹

Cultural Assimilation-Acculturation

Two dimensions of cultural behavior investigated to measure the degree of assimilation in these two groups were: a) language and food, and b) ideas of good manners and holidays celebrated.

TABLE 14. *Language Spoken in the Home of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Language Spoken | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greek | 19 | 9 | 83 | 90 |
| American | — | — | — | — |
| Fairly Equal | 4 | 1 | 17 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 82, q. 40.

The data in Table 14 indicate that Greek was the language most used by 19 of 23 immigrants and by 9 of 10 new immigrants. Major use of Greek in the home by 83% of the old immigrants and 90% of the new indicates that acculturation in the area of language is far from complete. On the matter of language, as an old timer said:

1. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

Of course we speak Greek in the home; we are proud of our heritage. After all, do not forget that the New Testament was written in Greek.

Only in a few cases of old immigrants who came here at an early age, acculturation to the use of English in the home has been substantial.

TABLE 15. *Food Preferences of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Food Preference | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greek | 22 | 10 | 96 | 100 |
| American | — | — | — | — |
| Fairly Equal | 1 | — | 4 | — |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 82, q. 39.

Ethnic food preferences appear to predominate among both the old and the new immigrants. Only 4% of the old immigrants prefer both styles of cooking on an equal basis. For both groups acculturation has been least marked in the type of food served in the home. In general, in these measures, there is no significant difference in the degree of acculturation.

TABLE 16. *Ideas of Good Manners of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Manners | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greek | 19 | 8 | 83 | 80 |
| American | — | — | — | — |
| Fairly equal | 4 | 2 | 17 | 20 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 82, q. 39.

Table 16 shows that the majority of both groups retain this cultural characteristic.

In both groups, only the young immigrants show a tendency to adopt the American ideas of good manners. A young man said:

I like the way that American husbands treat their wives. It is not a shame to stay home and baby-sit the children. Women are human beings and need some free time.

With regard to observance of Greek festivals, only one of the old immigrants celebrated Greek and American holidays the same. He pointed out: «My daughter married a foreigner, so I have to associate with her world.»

TABLE 17. *Participation of Male Sample in Festivals or Other Holidays, by Year of Arrival*

| Festivals/Holidays | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greek | 22 | 10 | 96 | 100 |
| American | — | — | — | — |
| Fairly Equal | 1 | — | 4 | — |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 80, q. 26.

The data in all the above tables corroborate the hypothesis that the process of acculturation, with the loss of Greek patterns and the acquisition of American patterns, has not succeeded completely among the native born Greeks.

Structural Assimilation

In the discussion of Gordon's structural assimilation in an earlier chapter, it was noted that there are two dimensions to this variable. Structural assimilation in primary groups is the first, and perhaps the most important. Structural assimilation in secondary groups, such as voluntary associations, is the second dimension. The most structurally assimilated individuals would fall into that cell denoted by major society association memberships and non-Greek friends. Using these two variables, the following tables of structural assimilation may be drawn.

TABLE 18. *Ethnic Background of Best Friend of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Best Friend | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greeks | 21 | 9 | 93 | 90 |
| Americans | — | — | — | — |
| Fairly Equal | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 81, q. 32.

The old immigrants as well as the new tend to choose a Greek as best friend. An old immigrant said:

I would never feel close to an American as a friend because their customs are different. They measure everything in a business-like manner. We feel we like to help our friends. Look at me in my dirty clothes. I just came back from helping a friend to paint his house. When the time comes to make wine he will come to help me. This I consider friendship.

The above results indicate a strong tendency for primary group relationships within the ethnic group. This is due to the following factors: a) the primary relationships of all immigrants is strengthened be-

cause of baptisms, which according to the Greek Orthodox Church, require ritualistic expressions of friendship in numerous nameday parties and gift giving; b) the best man («Κουμπαρός») has a stronger connotation in terms of friendship in that it requires attendance in nameday family gatherings, and birthday gift giving. Since the mobility of the Greeks in Lowell is very small, this has intensified the strength of their primary relationships.

TABLE 19. *Participation in Associations of Male Sample by Year of Arrival*

| Associations | Old Frequency | New Frequency | Old % | New % |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Greek only | 17 | 6 | 72 | 60 |
| American | — | — | — | — |
| Both Types of Ass'n. | 3 | 3 | 14 | 30 |
| No membership in Ass'ns. | 3 | 1 | 14 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 10 | 100 | 100 |

SOURCE: Questionnaire, Appendix, p. 82, q. 42.

The data in Table 19 show that the new immigrants are moving toward structural assimilation, establishing membership in non-Greek associations. A new immigrant stated:

Four years ago I joined the Masons. It is a wonderful association; you get to know a lot of good people there who can help each other. A friend of mine, however, who just came recently, who I tried to initiate in to the Masonic Order, has refused to join, and I know that he needs help.

In contrast, an old immigrant said:

It was hard for us to remain Greeks. In the early days the Protestant groups offered us to join in their associations. We usually refused because we thought that in doing so we are going to forfeit our heritage.

Conclusions

The present research has been devoted to the testing of seven major hypotheses. The analysis is based not only on the general data but also on an evaluation of each case.

The first hypothesis deals with the relationship between sex and the degree of assimilation. It presupposes Drachler's argument that the rate of intermarriage among males is higher than that of females. This contention has been supported also by Warner and Srole, who show that Greek women express little interest in anything but family life. Although the sample of women is meagre, having surveyed seven out of forty, and numerous comparisons with men are not statistically sound, the data reveal that they keep the traditional attitudes just as men do. Women tend to hold their ties with the Greek Church and

civil charities more often than men. This follows in that many are retired or widowed, and therefore they engage in non-family activities.

The second hypothesis is based upon the propositions advanced by Eisenstadt on the motives of emigration. This is to suggest that the socio-economic patterns of emigration correspond to a higher degree of assimilation than that of the «survivals.» The socio-economic category of the emigrants derives from their intention to integrate and compete with the native element. They wish to settle permanently until they satisfy their purpose. Then they often lose interest in returning to their original country. If they go back, they might be accused of failure. To prevent this accusation they work diligently to become integrated. The data corroborate this hypothesis as an effective factor in the assimilation process.

The third hypothesis explores the relationship between educational and occupational background and the speed of the assimilation process. It has been assumed that the immigrants who engage in professional, managerial, clerical, and sales roles will assimilate more rapidly than those working in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. The first broad category comprises occupations which require a longer period of formal education and a greater degree of direct interaction between the immigrant and native-born Americans.

Studies have shown that the educational and occupational level constitutes a discriminating variable which is related to the degree of change in cultural patterns like language and other habits. This does not mean, however, that the educational or occupational level *per se* indicates the assimilation. It depends on how close the ties are that they maintain with the ethnic society, because of their occupation—i.e., professionals dealing with predominately Greek clients or proprietors selling Greek products—or having leadership roles in the Greek community.

The fourth hypothesis concerns the ties with the country of origin particularly correspondence and visits, and the degree of assimilation. The frequent connections with the original country can be considered as discriminating factors affecting assimilation. Such connections as visits enable immigrants to avoid deep relationships with the new country and to reinforce their native traditions. The same conclusion may be posited with regard to the third hypothesis. But this is in itself not an absolute necessity for assimilation since transportation has improved only recently, thus ruling out travel possibilities for the «old» immigrants. Correspondence does not necessarily enhance assimilation, because the attitudes of the persons writing the letters may conform to those of the new culture.

The sixth hypothesis explores the relationship be-

tween the type of migration and the degree of assimilation. This is based on Eisenstadt's propositions that when families emigrate they tend to retain their traditional attitudes, and the process of group transformation among those immigrants will be very slow. Generally, Greek immigration is a «chain» immigration. Most of them come from three main regions of Greece—Mani, Macedonia, and Thessaly—and they are related to each other through family ties. Since the exceptions in the data are very few, they do not permit us to test this hypothesis.

The final hypothesis deals with the relationship of regional and occupational mobility to the speed of assimilation. It is based on Montesquieu's point that the more communicative people are the more easily they change their habits. The same conclusion must be drawn as with regard to the third hypothesis, dealing with the educational and occupational background. This does not mean that regional and occupational mobility *per se* indicates adjustment in the new environment. It indicates a drive and desire for change since the person who moves is to a greater degree a spectacle to the others and the singularities of individuals are better observed.

Suggestions for Further Research

Additional studies of the assimilation behavior patterns of Greeks should be highly encouraged. Those studies may well focus upon the following summary-hypotheses:

1. The earlier in life an individual is removed from the environment in which he is deriving a certain nationality the more quickly and completely can he acquire the nationality of the new environment in which he is placed.
2. The ethnic sub-society and the major society, as well as the influence of the native country, play a role in the maintenance of in-group identification.
3. Ethnic identity increases during threats to the community. The negation affirms identity.
4. The assimilation speed of more recent immigrants is greater than the assimilation speed of earlier immigrants.
5. The socio-economic reasons for emigration in relation to the intention of staying permanently in the new country promote assimilation.
6. The occupational and educational level of immigrants is not responsible *per se* for the varying rapidity of their assimilation. It constitutes, however, a discriminating variable which is directly related to the speed with which the immigrants get acculturated.
7. Ties with country of origin affect assimilation, if the new country is close and communication is easy.
8. The type of immigration, in relation to the concentration factor, may retard assimilation, if immigrants tend to exhibit and reinforce cultural patterns of their native country.
9. Occupational and regional movements affect the flexibility of people to make efforts in adjusting to new environments.

APPENDIX

Interview Schedule

Confidential

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
BOSTON COLLEGE
BOSTON, MASS.

QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME:
ADDRESS:
PHONE:
CHURCH:
CITIZENSHIP:

MEMBERS LIVING WITH THE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD

| (1) Full Name | (2) Sex | (3) Birth Date | (4) Birth Place | (5) Educa- tion | (6) Reli- gion | (7) Last Job | (8) Marital Status | (9) Relat. Head | (10) Birth place | (11) Educa- tion | (12) Last Job | (13) Reli- gion | (14) Address |
|------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT LIVING WITH THE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD

| (1a) | (2a) | (3a) | (4a) | (5a) | (6a) | (7a) | (8a) | (9a) | (10a) | (11a) | (12a) | (13a) | (14a) |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

1. When did you come to the United States?

2. Did you have relatives or friends in Lowell before you came?

Yes 1
No 2

If Yes, what kind of relatives?

Child or children 1
Parent or parents 2
Brothers or sisters 3
Husband or wife 4
Uncles or aunts 5
Friends 6
Others 7

3. Who came after you? Did you invite any of the above relatives or friends?

4. When did they come? Give dates:

5. How did you decide to emigrate?

6. When you first came, did you plan to stay permanently, or to go back to Greece?

7. Do you still have relatives in Greece?

Yes 1
No 2

If Yes: Specify the relationship.

8. Since you came to the United States, how many times have you visited Greece?

9. How do you keep in touch with your relatives or friends in Greece?

Letters , How often?
News from others Others?
I do not keep in touch
No relatives or friends in Greece.....

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

10. A. Education obtained in Greece:

Some years of elementary school 1
Elementary school completed 2
Some years of high school and
technical education 3
High school completed 4
High school and technical education 5
Some years of the University 6
University completed 7
Other 8

10. B. Education obtained in the United States.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

11. Where was your father born?
12. Where was your mother born?
13. In what place did your father spend most of his life?
14. In what place did your mother spend most of her life?
15. What was your father's education?
16. What was your mother's education?
17. What was your father's job?
18. Would you tell me something about your grandparents?
Where did they spend most of their lives?
 - a. Your paternal grandfather?
 - b. Your maternal grandfather?
19. What was your paternal grandfather's job?
20. What was your maternal grandfather's job?

VOCATIONAL BACKGROUND

21. And now let us come back to the time when you started working. How old were you then?
What was your first job?

THE QUESTION IS REPEATED FOR ALL JOBS TILL NOW

| Kind of Job | Duration | Residence |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |

REGIONAL MOBILITY

22. In what other places (except Lowell) have you ever been? Let us begin with the place you were born.

LIST ALL INFORMATION ABOUT MOVEMENTS MORE THAN SIX MONTHS

| Place | Duration |
|-------|----------|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |

PARTICIPATION IN THE GREEK COMMUNITY

23. Are you a member of any Greek organization?

Yes 1
No 2

If Yes: To what organizations do you belong? (List below):

24. Do you have a special honor?
25. How often do you go to church?

Every Sunday 1
Once a month 2
Big holidays 3

26. Do you participate in any Greek Dance, or other activity?
 Yes 1
 No 2
- If yes: How often?
 Every time it takes place 1
 Sometimes 2
 Rarely 3
27. Do you know how many marriages between Greeks or a Greek and persons of other nationality took place in Lowell year?
 Knows very well, gives the number exactly 1
 Knows about 2
 Does not know 3
28. Do you know how many Greeks in Lowell died this year?
 Knows very well, gives the number exactly 1
 Knows about 2
 Does not know 3
29. How many baptisms?
 Knows very well, gives the number exactly 1
 Knows about 2
 Does not know 3
30. If he (or she) gave any number of the above: In how many marriages, funerals, or baptisms did you participate?
 Marriages
 Funerals
 Baptisms.....
31. In your present home and neighborhood, how relatively numerous are Greeks?
 Mostly Greeks 1
 Relatively few 2
 None 3
32. Are your closest friends predominately:
 Greeks 1
 Americans 2
 Fairly equal 3
 Foreigners 4
33. Do you identify yourself mostly with Greeks, Americans, or *both* about the same?

ATTITUDES

34. Do you think it is important for a Greek of Greek heritage in the United States to marry a person of Greek background?
 If Greek, why?
 If you do not care, why?
35. Do you think girls should get married by dating someone or by parental arrangement?
36. What about boys?

For those who answered above that they would prefer Greek.

37. In the case that they could not find the proper person among Greeks, what other nationality would you prefer? Why this nationality?
38. Did your children attend (or do they attend) the daily or any other afternoon Greek school?
 Yes 1
 No 2

If Yes: Why did you send (or do you send) them there?
 If No: Why didn't they (or don't they) attend Greek School?

DEGREE OF AMERICANISM

39. Is the following list of customs and usages completely American, mostly of your nationality, or a mixture of both?
- | | American | Greek | Both |
|------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| How name is spelled | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| How name is pronounced | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Food you enjoy most | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Sports you like | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Celebrations or holidays | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Ideas of good manners | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| How family should treat each other | _____ | _____ | _____ |

40. What language is spoken most at home?

With wife or husband 1
With children 2
Other relatives

41. Do you eat Greek bread at home?

Only Greek bread 1
Mostly Greek bread 2
No preference 3

42. Do you belong to any American organizations?

Yes 1
No 2

If Yes: To what organizations do you belong?

FACTORS OPPOSING ASSIMILATION

43. What do you think that a Greek (or person of Greek heritage) in the United States should try to retain most? What next?

Here is a list: Greek traditions
Country
Nationality
Language
Religion

Why this first? Ask the same question for all.

ATTITUDES TOWARD AMERICAN LIFE

44. What did you know about America before you came?

45. What aspects of American life do you LIKE best?

46. What aspects of American life do you DISLIKE?

47. What was the greatest difficulty you faced in adjusting to American life?

48. If a Greek was a candidate for political office in the United States, would you vote him even if he does not belong to the party that you normally support?

49. If a friend or relative in Greece wanted to come to the United States, would you recommend to him:

To come: Why?

To stay there: Why?

50. Do you plan to go back and stay in Greece for the rest of your life?

If Yes: Why?

If No: Why?

51. Would you like your children to live in Greece?

If Yes: Why?

If No: Why?

52. After being in Lowell or in America until now, do you still identify yourself as a Greek in Greece or do you think that you have changed?

If changed: In what way?

53. The interviewer's comments and observations about the respondent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abott, Grace. «A Study of the Greeks in Chicago.» *American Journal of Sociology*, XV (1909), 379-393.
- Adamic, Louis. *A Nation of Nations*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- Akropolis* (Athens). Article, June 7, 1901.
- Balk, Helen H. «Economic Contributions of the Greeks to the United States.» *Economic Geography*, XIX (1943), 270-275.
- Bernard, Jessie. *American Community Behavior*. Rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Bernard, William J., ed. *American Immigration Policy: A Reappraisal*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Borrie, W. D. and Associates. *The Cultural Integration of Immigrants*. Paris: Unesco, 1959.
- Brown, F. J. and Roucek, J. S. *One America, The History Contributions and Present Problem of our Racial and National Minorities*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1945.
- Brunner, Edmund deS. *Immigrant Farmers and Their Children*. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1925.
- Cole, P. Donald. *Immigration City*. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina, 1963.
- Cooley, Charles H. *Social Organizations*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950.
- Davie, Maurice R. and Koening, Samuel. «Adjustment of Refugees to American Life.» *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, CCLVII (1949), 159-165.
- Dedication of the Hellenic American School*, in Greek. Lowell, Mass., 1959.
- DeGroot, E. Dudley. «The Assimilation of Post-War Immigrants in Atlanta, Georgia.» Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1957.
- Drachsler, Julius. *Democracy and Assimilation: The Blending of Immigrant Heritages in America*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920.
- Duncam, H. G. *Immigration and Assimilation*. Boston: Heath and Company, 1933.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. *The Absorption of Immigrants*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt. *Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1944.
- . *Greek Immigration to the United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911.
- . *Immigrant Backgrounds*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1927.
- . *Immigration*. Rev. ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925.
- . *Race and Nationality*. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.
- Giannakoutis, Theodore. «Introduction to the History of Greek-Americans». In Greek. *Argonauts*, A (1959), 165.
- Gobetz, Giles E. «Adjustment and Assimilation of Slovenian Refugees.» Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Herberg, William. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955.
- Hughes, Everett C. «Queries Concerning Industry and Society Growing Out of Study of Ethnic Relations in Industry.» *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 44-53.
- Krueger, Nancy M. «Assimilation and Adjustment of Post-War Immigrants in Franklin County, Ohio.» Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1955.
- Laquier, Helen Capanidon. «Cultural Change Among Three Generations of Greeks.» *American Catholic Sociological Review*, XXII (1961), 223-232.
- MacIver, Robert M. *The More Perfect Union*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948.
- Marden, Charles F. *Minorities in American Society*. New York: American Book Company, 1932.
- Montesquieu. *De l'esprit des loix*. Translated by Thomas Nugent. Vol. I.
- Park, Robert Ezra. *Race and Culture*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Ill., 1950.
- . *Society*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Park, Robert E. and Burgess, Ernest W. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.
- Petersen, William. «A General Typology of Migration.» *American Sociological Review*, XXIII (1958), 256-266.
- . *Population*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1961.
- Salouts, Theodore. «The Greeks in the United States.» *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLIV (1945), 69-81.
- Sumner, William Graham. *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940.
- Theodoratus. «The Influence of the Homeland on the Social Organization of a Greek Community in America.» Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1961.
- Thomas, William I. and Znaniecki, Florian. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. 5 vols. Boston: R. G. Badger, and Co., 1918-1920.
- Treudley, Mary Bosworth. «An Ethnic Group's View of the American Middle Class.» *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 715-724.
- . «Formal Organizations and the Americanization Process, with Special Reference to the Greeks of Boston.» *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 44-53.
- United States Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1966.
- United States Bureau of the Census. *United States Census of Population*, 1960.
- Vlachos, Evangelos C. «The Assimilation of Greeks in the United States: with special reference to the Greek Community of Anderson, Indiana.» Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1964.
- Vournas, George. «Greeks in America.» Quoted in the Congressional Record, 2nd Session, 26th Congress.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Srole, Leo. *The Social System of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Weinstock, Alexander. «Some Factors that Retard or Accelerate the Rate of Acculturation.» *Human Relations*, XVII (1964), 321-340.
- Williams, Robin M. Jr. *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council Bulletin, 1947.
- The World Almanac and Book of Facts*. Luman H. Long, ed. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association Inc., 1969.
- Xenidis, J. P. *The Greeks in America*. New York: George E. Doran Co., 1922.