

ISOLATION, INTEGRATION, AND ETHNIC BOUNDARIES IN RURAL GUATEMALA

Anne R. Pebley*

University of California at Los Angeles

Noreen Goldman

Princeton University

Arodys Robles

Universidad de Costa Rica

We investigate two perspectives about the effects of reduced discrimination and greater social and economic opportunities on ethnic identity in rural areas of contemporary Guatemala. Our analysis contrasts the effects of new opportunities in Indigenous communities on language use and dress, using data from the 1995 Encuesta Guatemalteca de Salud Familiar (EGSF). While the use of both dress and language has changed substantially in recent years, language use has changed considerably more than dress. We conclude that, in this context, economic opportunities have not necessarily diminished ethnic solidarity, but may have instead reshaped it.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 50 years, social scientists have come to view ethnicity as a social construct, which is produced by continual negotiation both within and between social groups (Waters 1990; Nagel 1994; Harris and Sim 2000). Beginning with the work of Barth (1969), social research has increasingly focused on the role of group interaction and social ecological conditions in producing ethnic boundaries.

In this article, we consider the effects of the social and economic environment on the social construction of ethnicity in contemporary Guatemala. The experience of Indigenous¹ Guatemalans (descendants of Mayans and other pre-conquest groups) provides an important contrast to that of American Indians and aboriginal groups in other countries. Indigenous Guatemalans have been remarkably successful in maintaining a separate social and cultural identity despite almost 500 years of subjugation, first, to the Spanish colonial government, and, subsequently, to a Ladino-dominated² society. The Indigenous comprises at least half of the Guatemalan population,³ speaks more than 22 major Indigenous languages, and has maintained and/or developed unique customs, forms of dress, and ways of living. Nonetheless, there are few phenotypical differences

*Direct all correspondence to Anne R. Pebley, UCLA, Box 951772, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772; e-mail: pebley@ucla.edu

between most Ladino and Indigenous Guatemalans because of a parallel history of intermarriage in which mestizo children were generally identified as Ladino.

Despite the past resilience of the Indigenous population, many observers argue that it is now facing new and greater challenges to ethnic solidarity and separate identity than at any time since the conquest and its aftermath (Smith 1990a; Carlsen 1997; Grandin 1997; Warren 1998). Ironically, these challenges are the consequence of greater economic, social, and political opportunities for Indigenous people in Guatemalan society. Among other symptoms of change, the use of traditional boundary markers of ethnic identity—such as Indigenous language and dress—is declining. A central question for Indigenous leaders and outside observers is whether the price of greater opportunities for integration will be declining ethnic solidarity, and potentially, the loss of separate Indigenous identity.

These concerns are not unique to contemporary Indigenous Guatemalans. In their analysis of social capital in immigrant ethnic communities in the United States, Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) argue that ethnic solidarity is generated and reinforced by outside discrimination and by lack of opportunities outside of the ethnic group. Conversely, greater opportunities for social and economic integration are likely to reduce group members' incentives to continue to identify with the group, to participate in community activities, and to comply with group norms. The theory and empirical evidence marshaled by Portes and Sensenbrenner suggest that the maintenance of a separate Indigenous identity will become increasingly difficult to the extent that social and economic opportunities for the Indigenous population continue to grow.⁴

By contrast, Nagel and Snipp (1993) argue that many American Indian communities facing similar dilemmas have succeeded in maintaining ethnic solidarity despite expanded opportunities in American society through a process that they label as "ethnic reorganization." Ethnic reorganization "occurs when an ethnic minority undergoes a reorganization of its social structure, a redefinition of ethnic group boundaries, or some other change in response to pressures or demands imposed by the dominant culture" (Nagel and Snipp 1993:203). For example, Native Americans have adopted approaches such as expansion of community boundaries, development of pan-Indian, supra-tribal identities, tribal-political mobilization, and blending of Indian and non-Indian cultural and religious practices. When ethnic groups are faced with new situations and challenges to ethnic solidarity, Nagel and Snipp argue, they may survive by constructing a new ethnic identity by, in part, redefining the boundary markers and practices that identify individuals as members or nonmembers of the ethnic group. This perspective suggests that greater social and economic opportunities for the Indigenous population in Guatemala may lead to changes in, rather than abandonment of, a separate ethnic identity.

In this article, we investigate these two alternative perspectives on the effects of reduced discrimination and greater social and economic opportunities on ethnic identity for rural Guatemalan women. We focus on rural Indigenous communities because they have been and remain the center of Indigenous identity in Guatemala. Our analysis contrasts the effects of social and economic opportunities in Indigenous communities on two traditional markers of Indigenous identity in Guatemala: language and dress.⁵ We argue

that Indigenous language use and dress require different levels of investment and have different consequences for individuals and families in the contemporary Guatemalan economy and society. By contrasting the use of language and dress in Indigenous communities, we will test two alternative hypotheses about the effects of social and economic change on Indigenous ethnic identity. The first hypothesis, derived from Portes and Sensenbrenner's analysis, is that Indigenous language use and dress will both be significantly less common in communities and among individuals for which economic opportunities are greater. The second hypothesis, based on Nagel and Snipp's concept of ethnic reconstruction, is that greater economic opportunities will not lead to a wholesale abandonment of ethnic boundary markers, but may instead lead the Indigenous population to retain some ethnic markers and drop or modify others. Our analysis is based on a survey, known as the Encuesta Guatemalteca de Salud Familiar (EGSF), of 45 rural Guatemalan communities and of 2,119 women aged 18 to 35 who live in these communities. As described below, the EGSF was conducted in 1995, and collected data both on women and their households, and on the communities in which they lived.

The next section outlines the theoretical background of this study. Then, we briefly review the history and current status of ethnic relations in Guatemala, and the role of language and dress in Indigenous communities. Next, we describe the data and methods, and present the results. In the final section, we discuss the results and their implications.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES AND ETHNIC BOUNDARIES

Much of the negotiation within and among social groups regarding ethnicity is about group boundaries (Nagel 1995; Lamont and Molnár 2002; Sanders 2002). To attempt to delineate these shifting boundaries, group members and outsiders both use ethnic boundary markers such as national origin, ancestry, phenotypical characteristics, place of residence, and cultural elements such as language, food, values, and practices.

Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) argue that both strong ethnic solidarity and the use of distinctive cultural practices are generally the product of ethnic conflict and exclusion. They identify two types of social capital particularly salient for ethnic groups: (1) "bounded solidarity," which is the sentiment of in-group solidarity created by confrontation with a host society; and (2) "enforceable trust," which is the ability of the in-group to monitor and to control group members' behavior and thus, to facilitate trust among group members. Ethnic group members can use both types of social capital to access resources within the group that are not otherwise available. For example, Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) suggest that these processes underlie the economic success of ethnic enclave businesses in the United States.

However, in-group social capital and the access to resources come at a cost. These costs include constraints on group members' freedom of expression and ability to do business with outsiders, in-group members' free riding on community solidarity, and leveling pressures (i.e., discouragement of individual success). For example, Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) cite the case of indigenous Ecuadoran villages in which owners of garment and leather shops are often Protestant (known in Latin America as

“Evangelical”) rather than Catholic. Becoming Protestant frees the merchant from the traditional obligations of group membership: “The Evangelical convert becomes, in a sense, a stranger in his own community, which insulates him from free riding by others who follow Catholic-inspired norms” (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993:1339).

Because of its significant costs, as well as benefits, for in-group members, ethnic solidarity is likely to be strongest when the ethnic group faces strong external discrimination, limited opportunities to exit ethnic group membership, and limited outside social and economic opportunities.⁶ However, once the ratio of benefits to costs of group membership declines, ethnic solidarity is likely to weaken and ethnic boundaries grow increasingly permeable. An example in the United States is the incorporation of Irish, Polish, and Italian immigrants into the dominant “white” ethnic group (Alba 1990; Waters 1990). Portes and Sensenbrenner’s framework suggests that the opening of greater social and economic opportunities for the Indigenous population in Guatemala is likely to weaken Indigenous ethnic solidarity and lead to a decline in the use of traditional ethnic boundary markers, such as language and clothing.

In contrast, Nagel and Snipp (1993) argue that ethnic groups faced with new situations and challenges to ethnic solidarity often reconstruct a new ethnic identity rather than relinquish it entirely. In the Native American context, ethnic reorganization has changed the meaning and utility of ethnic solidarity from a survival strategy to cope with discrimination and poor external opportunities to a source of distinction, pride, and political activism (Nagel and Snipp 1993; Nagel 1995). While American Indians, particularly in urban areas, have many social and economic opportunities and no longer depend primarily on ethnic communities for access to resources, there are significant new advantages to ethnic group membership created by federal policy and the Red Power political movement (Nagel and Snipp 1993). In some cases, political changes spurred by American Indian political action have also provided group members with access to new economic resources (e.g., income from casinos) that were not previously available. This perspective suggests that greater social and economic opportunities for the Indigenous population in Guatemala may lead to changes in, rather than abandonment of, a separate ethnic identity. In particular, like Native American groups, Indigenous Guatemalans may choose to retain some ethnic cultural practices and to abandon others in order to adapt to new circumstances.

ETHNICITY AND CONTEMPORARY CHANGE IN GUATEMALA

Scholars of Guatemalan social, political, and economic history generally agree that the reason for Indigenous resilience during the colonial (1523 to 1821) and post-independence (1821 to present) periods has been the isolation and relative autonomy of Indigenous communities in Guatemala, particularly in the Western Highlands (Colby and van den Berghe 1969; Lutz and Lovell 1990; Smith 1990b; Carlsen 1997; Grandin 1997). Indigenous communities in the Highland periphery were particularly isolated because the region was seen as having little economic value. Not coincidentally, these are the areas where a majority of the Indigenous population lives today. Colonial and

postcolonial policy led to a particular form of Indigenous social and political structure: the corporate and relatively autonomous Indigenous community (Wolf 1959; Smith 1990c). Government policy was applied to communities as a whole rather than to individuals. Relatively autonomous, isolated, corporate communities provided tools (including the development and maintenance of local cultural traditions) to resist a deeper level of state involvement in their daily lives (Smith 1990c). Since colonial times, affiliation with a rural community rather than “Indigeness” per se has been the central focus of Indigenous identity (Smith 1990b,d; Watanabe 1995; Bourque and Warren 1997; Carlsen 1997; Garzon 1998a). Each Indigenous community has a different dialect of one of the twenty-two Mayan languages as well as other customs, including distinctive dress, which sets it apart from other communities.

Indigenous communities are now facing new and greater challenges to local autonomy and separate identity (Smith 1990a; Carlsen 1997; Grandin 1997; Warren 1998) as a consequence of three interacting forces: (1) economic change as a result of incorporation in the global market economy, (2) massive government military intervention, and (3) the spread of Protestantism. Economic change has had at least two different effects on the Indigenous population. While it has increasingly undermined the traditional structure of the corporate community and transformed long-held definitions of ethnic identity, economic change has also greatly expanded opportunities for improving living standards and upward social mobility for the Indigenous population.

Between 1978 and 1984, Guatemalan military forces attempted to exterminate a guerrilla movement in the Western Highlands. Tens of thousands of Indigenous people were killed, and many more were left homeless or fled in fear for their lives. The violence led to increased Indigenous political involvement and to dramatic growth in the Mayan identity movement that began in the 1970s. Eventually, international condemnation of the violence created pressure for political reform. As a result, the government and the guerrillas signed a peace accord in 1996 that has resulted in halting the democratization of the political and economic system. These changes have opened opportunities for Indigenous political action, but have also fostered an extensive reexamination of what it means to be Indigenous.

The rapid spread of Protestantism has also changed social relations in Indigenous communities (Steigenga 1994; Carlsen 1997). Approximately one third of Guatemalans classify themselves as Protestants. The effects of the Evangelical movement on Indigenous identity are controversial. In many communities, Evangelical religious groups appear to view Indigenous traditions negatively. For example, Carlsen (1997:165) reports that Evangelical churches and missions have generally portrayed traditional Indigenous practices as the root cause of Indigenous poverty and position in Guatemalan society. Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) also suggest, in the example from Ecuador cited above, that converting to Protestantism can be a means of changing identity and escaping the traditional obligations of one's own community.

In response to these changes, Indigenous leaders have created a unified political, economic, and cultural agenda, and are attempting to forge a pan-Mayan identity (Smith 1990a; Cojtí Cuxil 1996; Garzon 1998b). This agenda explicitly calls for social, economic,

political, and cultural reorganization and a realignment of Indigenous-Ladino relations. A central item in this agenda is the development and use of Mayan languages in education, government offices, and the mass media. Like American Indians, Indigenous Guatemalan leaders are also attempting to expand the traditional boundaries of Indigenous ethnicity to include educated, urban, noncommunity-based Indigenous people (Smith 1995).

The effect of these efforts by the elites on individuals, families, and communities is not yet clear. Anthropological research and local area studies suggest that there is an extensive debate about the meaning of ethnicity in Indigenous communities. For example, Grandin (1997:25) notes that "as Indians become organized and represented in nearly all sectors of society, Guatemala is awash in competing definitions of what it means to be Mayan."

LANGUAGE AND DRESS

Indigenous dress and language, which are the focus of this study, have been seen as key ethnic boundary markers by both the Indigenous and Ladino populations for many years. In fact, in Guatemalan censuses and surveys, interviewers generally code respondents' ethnicity based on the observation of language use and dress, rather than asking respondents directly (Robles 1993). Brown (1998a:110) argues that change in the use of Indigenous dress is "one of the most visible indicators of cultural change among the Highland Maya communities. . . ." For example, 50 years ago in the Quinizilapa Valley, Brown reports, all Indigenous men and women wore traditional dress.⁷ Gradually, men adopted Western dress and only elderly men now wear Indigenous attire. On the other hand, the majority of women continue to wear distinctly Indigenous dress on a daily basis, including a *huipil* (hand-made embroidered blouse) and *corte* (woven wrapped skirt) with designs that are specific to their community. However, Brown (1998a:110) reports that "The general trend in the valley is away from *huipil* use," although women not wearing hand-made *huipiles* often wear *cortes* and blouses that are distinctively Indigenous.

A similar change has occurred in language use in Indigenous communities since the 1960s and 1970s. For example, Garzon (1998c) reports that in San Juan Comalapa, younger women are much more likely to be bilingual or monolingual Spanish speakers than older women. Indigenous language acquisition in Guatemala usually occurs early in life (Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales 1995; Garzon 1998b; Wuqu' Ajpub' 1998), because, until recently, Indigenous languages generally have not been taught in school. Thus, the adults' knowledge of Indigenous languages has usually been determined by the choices that their parents made about what language to speak at home. On the other hand, the Indigenous identity movement has brought renewed interest and pride in using Indigenous languages, as well as efforts at systematizing writing systems, publishing in Indigenous languages, and bilingual education. Indigenous adults who did not grow up speaking Indigenous languages have been encouraged to study and use them (Brown 1996; Brown 1998b; Warren 1998). However, little information is available on the practical effects of these efforts.

Choices about dress and language use are likely to be considerably different because of both the initial investment required and the potential economic rewards. Specifically, fluency in a new language requires much greater initial investment than adoption of a new style of dress.⁸ Therefore, changing the style of dress is much easier, although not without cost since a woman abandoning traditional dress may risk social ostracism in some Indigenous communities. On the other hand, the potential economic benefits of using the dominant language are considerably greater than the benefits of changing dress.⁹ Spanish language proficiency remains essential for commerce and employment outside of agriculture. Thus, if greater opportunities contribute to a wholesale decline in the use of ethnic boundary markers, we might expect to see a decreased use of both Indigenous clothing and language among individuals with greater economic opportunities. On the other hand, if individuals respond to increased economic opportunities, but also attempt to maintain their ethnic identity, we would expect that individuals with greater opportunities change language rather than dress, because of the greater economic benefits of language change.

In the analysis below, we examine the effects of local economic opportunities and individual socioeconomic status on use of language and dress. As described above, we test two alternative hypotheses: (1) Individuals with greater opportunities are less likely to use both Indigenous dress and language; and (2) The effects of greater opportunities will differ for language and dress, and specifically, those opportunities are likely to have a greater effect on language use.

DATA

We use data from a survey of women living in rural Guatemalan communities. The 1995 EGSF is a survey of women aged 18 to 35, carried out in rural areas of four departments¹⁰ of Guatemala (Chimaltenango, Totonicapán, Suchitepequez, and Jalapa). The four departments were selected on the basis of social, economic, and environmental diversity, and ethnic composition. In this article, we use data from three of the departments (Chimaltenango, Totonicapán, and Suchitepequez), which are predominantly Indigenous.¹¹ Rural communities in the first two departments are almost exclusively Indigenous, while in Suchitepequez, they are generally mixed Ladino and Indigenous. The two predominant Indigenous languages spoken in these departments, K'iche' and Kaqchikel, are two of the three most common Indigenous languages in Guatemala, spoken by approximately 1.5 million people (Warren 1998:16).

A probability sample of 45 rural¹² communities in the three predominantly Indigenous departments were included in the survey, 15 in each of the selected departments. The sample was designed to be self-weighting within (but not across) departments, and to have sufficiently large cluster sizes (i.e., an average of about 50 women per community), so as to facilitate the estimation of community-level effects (see Peterson, Goldman, and Pebley 1997).

In the three departments, individual interviews were conducted with 2,119 women aged 18 to 35. Among these women, 1,801 identified themselves as Indigenous, as

described below. The individual interview collected information on a wide range of subjects, including the respondents' background, maternal and child health, and family income and economic status. Spanish, K'iche', and Kaqchikel versions of the individual questionnaire were used, and the field teams consisted of bilingual interviewers (either K'iche'/Spanish or Kaqchikel/Spanish). Interviews were conducted in the language that the respondent preferred. A community questionnaire was administered in Spanish to three key informants in each of the 45 communities and provided information on economic activities, wages, infrastructure, services, transportation, migration, and other aspects of community life.

Unlike previous Guatemalan surveys and censuses, the EGSF asked respondents to report their own *self-classification* of ethnic identity. Information collected on ethnicity includes (1) self-identification (i.e., whether the respondent considers herself to be Indigenous, Ladina, or mixed), (2) if married or in a consensual union, ethnic self-identification of partner or husband, (3) language usually spoken at home, and (4) other languages that the respondent can speak. Interviewers were also asked to observe and to record whether or not each respondent was wearing Indigenous dress (defined as *huipil* and *corte*).

METHODS AND RESULTS

As shown in Table 1, the distribution of women's ethnic identity differs among the three departments included in the analysis. Almost 90 percent of respondents in Chimaltenango and almost 99 percent of respondents in Totonicapán identify themselves as Indigenous. Very few in either department describe themselves as being of mixed ethnicity, and less than 1 percent either do not know or refuse to report their ethnicity.

In Suchitepequez, plantation agriculture has, for many years, drawn migrants primarily from the Western Highlands, but also from other areas of the country. The result is an ethnically heterogeneous population, and much more social interaction between the Indigenous and Ladinos. Two thirds of respondents in Suchitepequez identify themselves as Indigenous, a quarter as Ladino, and almost 5 percent as mixed. Furthermore, a slightly

TABLE 1. Percent Distribution of Ethnic Self-Identification by Department

| Self-identification | Chimaltenango | Totonicapán | Suchitepequez | Total sample |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Indigenous | 89.7 | 98.8 | 67.8 | 85.0 |
| Ladino | 8.3 | 0.5 | 25.8 | 11.9 |
| Mixed | 1.1 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 2.1 |
| Unknown | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| Number of women | 731 | 659 | 729 | 2,119 |

Source: EGSF (1995).

Note: The total sample is unweighted and thus does not reflect population size difference among the three departments.

TABLE 2. Percent Distribution of Indigenous Dress and Language Use by Indigenous Women

| | Percent of Indigenous Women |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Wearing Indigenous Clothing?</i> | |
| Yes | 80.6 |
| No | 14.8 |
| Partly | 2.3 |
| Unknown | 2.2 |
| <i>Household Language</i> | |
| Spanish only | 42.5 |
| Spanish/Indigenous | 5.0 |
| Indigenous only | 52.5 |
| <i>Language Ability</i> | |
| Spanish only | 23.6 |
| Spanish/Indigenous | 57.3 |
| Indigenous only | 19.2 |
| Number of women | 1,801 |

Source: EGSF (1995).

larger proportion of respondents in Suchitepequez (almost 2 percent) do not know or do not want to report ethnicity.

In Table 2, we show the frequency of Indigenous language use and dress for the sample of women who identify themselves as Indigenous. The first panel shows the percent of Indigenous respondents who wore Indigenous clothing at the interview (as determined by interviewer observation). Women were classified as wearing full indigenous dress (*huipil* and *corte*) or partial indigenous dress (*huipil* or *corte*, or manufactured clothing—e.g., a blouse or skirt—that was distinctively indigenous in style). The second panel shows the distribution of *current* language use (i.e., the language or languages that respondents reported speaking at home). Of course, current language use depends on respondents' *knowledge* of an Indigenous language and/or of Spanish. Therefore, in the third panel of Table 2, we also examine the distribution of languages that respondents know.¹³

There is considerable variation in language use, but much less variation in clothing. More than half of Indigenous respondents are bilingual, while 24 percent are monolingual Spanish speakers, and 19 percent are monolingual Indigenous-language speakers. Although roughly three quarters of Indigenous respondents are *able* to speak an Indigenous language, only about half speak an Indigenous language at home. By contrast, the vast majority (81 percent) wore full Indigenous dress when they were interviewed, suggesting that changes in language use have affected a larger portion of the population than changes in dress. Nonetheless, almost 15 percent of women in these rural communities, who identified themselves as Indigenous, wore Western attire, suggesting that this cultural element is also changing.

We also examined language use, language knowledge, and dress among respondents who identified themselves as Ladinos and the very small number of women of mixed eth-

nicity (results not shown).¹⁴ Less than 1 percent of women of Ladino and mixed ethnicity use or are able to speak an Indigenous language or wear Indigenous clothing. Among the very small group who would not report ethnicity, most are also monolingual Spanish speakers and wear Western dress. Because the use of Indigenous language and dress is essentially limited to the self-identified Indigenous sample, Ladinos are omitted from the analysis presented below.

Determinants of Indigenous Dress and Language Use

Next, we examine the evidence concerning the two hypotheses, described above, about the effects of socioeconomic opportunities on the use of language and dress, using multivariate statistical methods. The analysis is divided into two sections. First, for the entire Indigenous sample, we examine the effects of respondent and community socioeconomic variables on whether women wear Indigenous clothing. Second, we investigate the effects of these characteristics on language use. Variation in language use at a single point in time is more complex than dress because it depends on the proportion of the population who knows how to speak a given language. As noted above, Indigenous language acquisition usually occurs early in life. Therefore, in this section of the analysis, we look at (1) the effects of childhood characteristics on the ability to speak Spanish and/or Indigenous languages for the entire Indigenous sample, and (2) the effects of contemporary characteristics on whether bilingual respondents report using an Indigenous language at home at the time of the survey.

The distributions of the independent variables used in this analysis are shown in Table 3 for the two samples used in the analysis: the entire Indigenous sample and the bilingual subsample.¹⁵ These variables are grouped into characteristics pertaining to (1) the respondent, (2) the community in which the respondent lived at interview, and (3) the community in which the respondent lived in childhood.

The central focus of this analysis is the effects of social and economic opportunities on the use of Indigenous language and dress. To measure individual opportunities, the analysis includes the respondent's educational attainment as a measure of human capital. Beckett and Pebley (2003) show that educational attainment is strongly related to family economic status in Guatemala, presumably because better educated individuals are more successful in the labor and commercial markets. The respondents' education is divided into three categories: no schooling, primary school only, and more than primary school. Although relatively few respondents had more than a primary school education, those who did are likely to have considerably greater economic opportunities, and we, therefore, include them as a separate category whenever possible.¹⁶

At the community level, we use three variables: (1) a measure of economic opportunities within the community, (2) the distance to Guatemala City, and (3) a measure of the accessibility of transport in the community. The first variable was constructed from responses to the community survey about the most important way that families in the community earn their living. Based on our own experience in these villages, communities were coded 1 if the most important means for earning a living was commercial farming, producing products for sale, factory work, or plantation work, and 0 for more traditional

TABLE 3. Means or Percent Distributions of Variables Used in Multivariate Analyses

| Variables | Total Indigenous Sample (% or Mean) | Bilingual Indigenous Sample (% or Mean) |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Respondent's Characteristics (1995)</i> | | |
| No school | 36.3 | 29.1 |
| Primary School | 58.7 | 65.1 |
| More than Primary | 5.0 | 5.8 |
| Lowest quartile of HH consumption (quetzales) ^a | 25.0 | 27.2 |
| Second quartile | 25.1 | 26.4 |
| Third quartile | 25.0 | 23.9 |
| Highest quartile | 25.0 | 22.4 |
| Lives in place of birth | 65.1 | 67.8 |
| Lives elsewhere | 34.9 | 32.2 |
| Mean age at interview (years) | 25.7 | 25.7 |
| Member of women's group | 15.4 | 19.2 |
| Not a member | 86.6 | 80.8 |
| Evangelical Protestant | 34.7 | 37.8 |
| Catholic or other | 65.3 | 62.2 |
| Husband is Ladino | 4.9 | 2.0 |
| Husband is not Ladino | 74.6 | 75.6 |
| Does not have a husband | 20.5 | 22.4 |
| <i>Community/Municipio Characteristics (1995)</i> | | |
| Greater economic opportunities | 74.2 | 76.9 |
| Poorer economic opportunities | 25.8 | 23.1 |
| Community more accessible ^b | 34.6 | 39.2 |
| Community less accessible | 65.4 | 60.8 |
| Mean distance from Guatemala City (km) | 82.7 | 77.8 |
| Percent Indigenous (in current community) | 90.9 | 94.0 |
| Totonicapán | 35.6 | 35.1 |
| Chimaltenango | 36.2 | 44.7 |
| Suchitepequez | 28.2 | 20.2 |
| <i>Childhood Community Characteristics (1973)</i> | | |
| Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973) | 81.0 | 84.8 |
| Percent literate in place of birth (1973) | 33.7 | 34.2 |
| Mean distance between place of birth and Guatemala City (km) | 88.1 | 77.8 |
| Number of women | 1,745 | 1,003 |

^aPercentages for consumption may not round to 100 percent because of rounding error. The means for consumption were 22.0 quetzales for the total sample and 21.2 for the bilingual sample.

^bMore accessible communities are defined as having a passable main road for 12 months a year and a bus service for at least five years.

Source: EGSF (1995).

means such as subsistence agriculture. The variable is intended to distinguish between communities involved in larger national markets with greater opportunities for entrepreneurial activities and those that rely primarily on more traditional economic activities.

Second, we use a measure of distance between the *municipio* in which the community is located and the national capital, Guatemala City. Guatemala City is the principal urban center and the main source of urban, modern Ladino culture. Communities closer to Guatemala City generally have considerably greater opportunities for employment and commerce. The third variable, which measures the accessibility of communities, is coded 1 for those in which the main road is open all year round and which have had regular bus service for at least five years—and 0 otherwise. Greater accessibility, like proximity to Guatemala, increases opportunities for commerce and employment.

The models also include several other individual- and community-level control variables that are likely to be associated with the use of Indigenous language and dress. The first is household income which is both a product and a potential determinant of economic opportunities. To measure income, we use total household consumption, which is the *per capita* value (in quetzales¹⁷) of all purchased and home-produced goods consumed by household members during the past month. In a poor, rural, and primarily agrarian setting, household consumption provides a better measure of economic well-being than earned income, crop sales, or other measures (Peterson et al. 1997). Second, we also include a measure of the degree to which women have led relatively isolated lives: whether or not they currently live in their village of birth. Third, we include the respondent's age. Ethnographic studies suggest that social change in Indigenous communities has produced a marked cohort effect (i.e., younger women are less likely to use Indigenous language or dress compared with their older sisters and cousins). Fourth, we include a variable describing whether or not the respondent's husband is Ladino. Although Indigenous women with Ladino husbands are a small group (about 3 percent), they may be the least likely to use Indigenous dress and language. A fifth variable measures whether or not the respondent is active in a women's group in the community. In Indigenous communities, women involved in these groups often take a more active role in political and social life in the community. We hypothesize that involvement in these public activities may increase the chances that women wear Indigenous dress in their daily lives. Finally, we include whether the respondent is Evangelical Protestant or Catholic to measure the effects of the growing Protestant movement on choices about language and dress.

At the community level, the variables of central interest are community economic opportunities, accessibility, and distance from Guatemala City, for reasons described above. As a control variable, we include the percent of the population who are Indigenous. Women are more likely, *ceteris paribus*, to use Indigenous language and dress in more highly Indigenous communities. Moreover, given Guatemalan social history, the percent Indigenous is also likely to be associated with community economic opportunities—so it is important to hold this variable constant if we are to assess the association between economic opportunities and Indigenous dress and language. The analysis also

includes dummy variables for department of residence to compensate for the sampling design of the EGSF (i.e., the sample was stratified by department) and also to capture variation across departments that is not measured by other variables in the model.

As described below, in the language acquisition analysis, we are interested in the effects of the village in which each respondent grew up on which languages she has learned. The EGSF collects little information on the characteristics of the community in which the respondent lived in childhood. Instead, as a proxy for these characteristics, we matched data from the 1973 Guatemalan census with the *municipio* in which the respondent was born. The 1973 Guatemalan census was conducted 22 years before the EGSF. Since the average age of the EGSF sample is 26 years, these data approximate conditions in these *municipios* when respondents were, on average, four years old. Given the low geographic mobility rates and the relatively slow pace of social change in the 1970s in rural areas, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that the 1973 *municipio*-level census characteristics represent the type of place in which the respondents were raised. The childhood community characteristics included in the analysis are those that we hypothesize to be most closely associated with language acquisition: the percent Indigenous, the percent literate, and the distance between the community and Guatemala City.¹⁸ This final variable is included as a measure of the isolation of the childhood community from urban, Ladino culture.

In the analyses of Indigenous dress and language use among bilingual respondents, we also include, as a control variable, one characteristic of the respondents' birth *municipio*: the percent Indigenous. As in the case of the ethnic composition of the current community, we anticipate that, *ceteris paribus*, growing up in a more highly Indigenous community increases the odds of using Indigenous dress and language.

A comparison of the full Indigenous sample and the bilingual subsample in Table 3 indicates that the two groups are very similar. Bilingual respondents are slightly more likely to have gone to school, to belong to women's groups, and to live in Chimaltenango.

To test our hypotheses, we estimate binomial and multinomial logit models of Indigenous dress and language use with a procedure that corrects standard errors for clustering. The results are shown in Tables 4 through 6. The EGSF was designed to be highly clustered (an average of 50 households in each of 45 communities). Techniques for estimating standard errors are generally based on the assumption of a simple random sample and, therefore, ignore the effects of clustering. As a result, they produce standard errors that are typically too small and, consequently, Z-statistics that are too large. The standard errors presented in Tables 4 through 6 have been estimated in Stata (StataCorp 1999), based on a robust variance estimator that corrects for the clustering of observations at the community level.

Use of Indigenous Dress

Table 4 shows the results of a binomial logit analysis in which the dependent variable is whether or not the respondent wears Indigenous dress.¹⁹ The estimated coefficients are shown as odds ratios.²⁰ The results suggest that use of Indigenous dress is not related to economic opportunities. Neither the coefficients for educational attainment at the indi-

TABLE 4. Estimated Odds Ratios Derived from a Logit Model of the Probability of Wearing Indigenous Dress

| Variables ^c | Odds Ratio | Z-test |
|---|------------|---------|
| <i>Respondent's Characteristics</i> | | |
| No school | 1.64 | 1.16 |
| Primary School | 1.36 | 1.04 |
| Lowest quartile of HH consumption (quetzales) | 1.49 | 1.72 |
| Second quartile | 1.34 | 1.04 |
| Third quartile | 1.22 | 0.85 |
| Lives in place of birth | 1.06 | 0.18 |
| Age at interview (years) | 1.02 | 0.98 |
| Member of women's group | 0.89 | -0.72 |
| Evangelical protestant | 1.62 | 1.90 |
| Husband is Ladino | 0.31 | -3.59** |
| Does not have a husband | 1.35 | 1.01 |
| <i>Childhood Community Characteristics</i> | | |
| Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973) | 1.04 | 3.41** |
| <i>Community/Municipio Characteristics</i> | | |
| Greater economic opportunities | 0.36 | -1.41 |
| Community more accessible [‡] | 0.43 | -1.42 |
| Distance from Guatemala City (km) | 1.04 | 1.36 |
| Percent Indigenous (in current community) | 1.06 | 3.79** |
| Totonicapán | 3.84 | 1.81 |
| Chimaltenango | 27.74 | 1.77 |
| Number of women | 1,745 | |
| Pseudo-R ² *** | 0.4754 | |

Source: EGSF (1995).

*p < .05, **p < .01.

***Pseudo-R² = 1 - L1/L0 where L0 and L1 are the constant-only and full-model log likelihoods respectively.

Notes: Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

[‡]More accessible communities are defined as those in which the main road is passable 12 months a year and which have had bus service for at least five years.

^cReference categories are: more than primary school, highest quartile of consumption, does not live in place of birth, not a member of a women's group, Catholic or other, husband is not Ladino, poorer economic opportunities, community less accessible, and Suchitepequez.

vidual level nor those for opportunities, accessibility, or distance to Guatemala City at the community level are statistically significant.

Three of the control variables are significantly related to Indigenous dress. As anticipated, women who grew up in a more highly Indigenous community and those who currently live in a highly Indigenous community are, *ceteris paribus*, more likely to wear Indigenous attire. The small proportion of Indigenous women who are married to Ladino men are significantly less likely to wear Indigenous dress.

Monolingualism versus Bilingualism

Next, we examine the effects of individual and community economic opportunities on language use. However, we first need to consider the languages that Indigenous women learned when they were growing up, since only bilinguals have the option of using both languages at home. In Table 5, we examine the factors affecting whether Indigenous women are (1) monolingual in an Indigenous language (K'iche' or Kaqchikel), (2) bilingual in Spanish and in an Indigenous language, or (3) monolingual in Spanish. This analysis is based on a multinomial logit model and on the same sample as in Table 4. "Bilingual" is the base or comparison category for the outcome variable. The independent variables include educational attainment, whether the respondent still lives in her place of birth, age at interview (as a measure of cohort), and characteristics of the *municipio* of birth. In this model, we include education as a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the respondent completed any education, in contrast to the other analyses in this article. The reason is that relatively few monolingual Indigenous-language speakers completed primary school or more ($N = 23$). This small cell size combined with the number of parameters estimated in the multinomial model made it impossible to estimate a separate coefficient for women who completed primary school.²¹

TABLE 5. Estimated Relative Risk Ratios (RRR)[†] Derived from a Multinomial Model of the Probability of Speaking Spanish, an Indigenous Language, or Both^b

| Variables ^c | Monolingual Spanish | | Monolingual in Indigenous Language | |
|--|---------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | RRR | Z-test | RRR | Z-test |
| <i>Respondent's Characteristics</i> | | | | |
| No school | 0.61 | -2.56** | 4.82 | 6.15** |
| Lives in place of birth | 0.74 | -1.25 | 0.91 | -0.46 |
| Age at interview (years) | 0.95 | -2.23* | 1.03 | 1.95 |
| Totonicapán | 0.08 | -3.74** | 4.61 | 1.56 |
| Chimaltenango | 0.19 | -1.60 | 7.17 | 1.97* |
| <i>Characteristics of Childhood Municipio of Residence</i> | | | | |
| Percent literate | 1.03 | 1.06 | 0.91 | -3.72** |
| Percent Indigenous | 0.96 | -2.01* | 1.07 | 1.09 |
| Distance to Guatemala City (km) | 1.00 | -0.22 | 1.01 | 0.77 |
| Pseudo-R ^{2***} | 0.3503 | | | |

Source: EGSF (1995).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

***Pseudo-R² = $1 - L1/L0$ where L0 and L1 are the constant-only and full model log likelihoods respectively.

‡The total sample for this analysis is 1,745, including 420 monolingual Spanish speakers, 322 monolingual Indigenous language speakers, and 1,003 bilingual women.

Notes: Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

†RRRs are calculated relative to the base category of bilingual speakers.

^cReference categories are: some school, does not live in place of birth, and Suchitepequez.

The coefficients suggest a continuum between monolingual Spanish on one hand, and monolingual Indigenous language on the other, with bilinguals in the middle. For example, completing at least some education is clearly related to language acquisition: In comparison with bilingual women, those with no education have lower relative risks than their more educated counterparts of being monolingual Spanish speakers, and significantly higher relative risks of being monolingual Indigenous language speakers. The cohort effect observed in earlier ethnographic research is also readily apparent, with older women having lower relative risks than younger women of being a monolingual Spanish speaker.

Two characteristics of place of birth appear to be important. Being born in a more literate *municipio* is significantly associated with lower relative risks (relative to those born in less literate areas) of knowing an Indigenous language. Women born in a predominantly Indigenous community have lower relative risks than those born in a more heterogeneous community of being monolingual in Spanish. Distance to Guatemala City is not significantly related to language acquisition, suggesting that physical distance from this center of urban, Ladino culture during childhood is not a key factor.

Home Language Use for Bilingual Women

Finally, we examine the effects of individual and community factors on the use of an Indigenous language at home. This analysis, shown in Table 6, is limited to bilingual women (approximately 57 percent of the sample), since only they have the possibility of using either Spanish or an Indigenous language at home. Bear in mind that bilingual respondents are not a random sample of Indigenous-language speakers. The results in Table 3 indicate that the two groups of respondents are very similar, but bilingual respondents are somewhat more likely to be educated and to have grown up in more highly literate communities compared with the Indigenous sample as a whole. The same independent variables as in Table 4 are included in this analysis.

In contrast to the results for Indigenous dress, two measures of economic opportunities are strongly related to language use among bilinguals. Women's educational attainment has a significant effect on the use of an Indigenous language at home. Women with no education have almost four times the odds of speaking an Indigenous language at home, compared with women who had more than a primary education. Although neither the community economic opportunities nor the community accessibility measures have significant effects, the coefficient for distance to Guatemala City is statistically significant. These results provide mixed support for the idea that economic opportunities reduce the use of Indigenous language, as discussed below. While we interpret distance from Guatemala City as a proxy for economic opportunity, it may also measure broader factors such as community isolation from urban Ladino culture.

Several of the other variables were also significantly related to language use. Women who live in the poorest households (lowest quartile of household consumption), those who live in the same community in which they were born, and those in a more highly Indigenous community, are significantly more likely to use an Indigenous language at home than their respective counterparts. In contrast, the percent Indigenous in the child-

TABLE 6. Estimated Odds Ratios Derived from a Logit Model of the Probability of Speaking an Indigenous Language at Home, Based on Bilingual Indigenous Respondents

| Variables ^c | Odds Ratio | Z-test |
|---|------------|---------|
| <i>Respondent's Characteristics</i> | | |
| No school | 3.87 | 3.24** |
| Primary School | 2.70 | 2.77** |
| Lowest quartile of HH consumption (quetzales) | 1.52 | 2.16* |
| Second quartile | 0.94 | -0.31 |
| Third quartile | 1.15 | 0.66 |
| Lives in place of birth | 1.70 | 2.38* |
| Age at interview (years) | 0.96 | -2.04* |
| Member of women's group | 1.27 | 1.20 |
| Evangelical Protestant | 0.55 | -3.40** |
| Husband is Ladino | 0.41 | -1.88 |
| Does not have a husband | 1.44 | 1.25 |
| Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973) | 1.02 | 1.63 |
| <i>Community/Municipio Characteristics</i> | | |
| Greater economic opportunities | 0.60 | -1.08 |
| Community more accessible [‡] | 0.93 | -0.21 |
| Distance from Guatemala City (km) | 1.05 | 1.97* |
| Percent Indigenous (in current community) | 1.04 | 2.26* |
| Totonicapán | 0.70 | -0.55 |
| Chimaltenango | 19.99 | 2.25* |
| Number of women | 1,003 | |
| Pseudo-R ^{2***} | 0.1339 | |

Source: EGSF (1995).

*p < .05, **p < .01.

***Pseudo-R² = 1 - L1/L0 where L0 and L1 are the constant-only and full model log likelihoods respectively.

Notes: Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

[‡]More accessible communities are defined as those in which the main road is passable 12 months a year and which have had bus service for at least five years.

^cReference categories are: more than primary school, highest quartile of consumption, does not live in place of birth, not a member of a women's group, Catholic or other, husband is not Ladino, poorer economic opportunities, community less accessible, and Suchitepequez.

hood *municipio* is unrelated to current language use. Thus, the ethnic composition of the childhood community primarily affects language use by affecting language acquisition (see Table 5). Surprisingly, older bilingual women are *less* likely to speak an Indigenous language at home than are younger women. We speculate that the reason is that older Indigenous women are more likely to be monolingual in an Indigenous language than younger women, as suggested by the results in Table 5. We conjecture that because it was less common in the past to be bilingual, older Indigenous-language speakers who did in

fact learn Spanish may have done so because they had to use it. By contrast, younger women may have had greater opportunity to learn both languages.

Bilingual Evangelical Protestants are significantly less likely to use an Indigenous language at home. These results are consistent with Carlsen's (1997) reports that Evangelical group members discourage use of traditional practices among members. However, as shown earlier, if evangelicals do discourage traditional practices, it is not apparent in differences in the use of traditional dress.

DISCUSSION

In this article, we have presented a cross-sectional picture of the contemporary use of two ethnic boundary markers—language and dress—in Indigenous rural communities in Guatemala. During the centuries since the conquest, the physical and social isolation and the relative autonomy of Indigenous communities provided the means to maintain a separate ethnic identity. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the effects of this isolation were reinforced by severe discrimination faced by Indigenous people outside of their communities. More recently, expanding opportunities for participation and integration of Indigenous men and women into Guatemalan society and its economy pose a greater challenge to a separate ethnic identity than the Indigenous population has faced since the conquest.

Comparison of the results presented here with earlier studies in the Western Highlands of Guatemala suggests that there has been considerable change in the use of language and dress by Indigenous women. While previous studies suggest that Indigenous dress and language were universally used in the past by women in these Highland areas, our results show that a significant minority did not wear traditional dress or speak an Indigenous language at the time of the survey in 1995.²² Nonetheless, Indigenous dress remains much more common than Indigenous language use: while 80 percent of rural women wear Indigenous dress, only a little more than half use an Indigenous language at home. Furthermore, almost one quarter are monolingual Spanish speakers.

The analysis tested two alternative hypotheses drawn from the literature on ethnic solidarity in the face of social and economic change: (1) Economic opportunities reduce ethnic solidarity overall, and, therefore, make it likely that the use of ethnic boundary markers such as Indigenous language use and dress declines; and (2) Economic opportunities do not necessarily diminish ethnic solidarity, but may instead reshape it: Growing economic opportunities may have quite different effects on the use of Indigenous language and on dress, as Indigenous communities and individuals make choices about retaining some cultural practices and dropping others. The substantial difference between our results for Indigenous dress and language provides support for the second hypothesis, at least as of 1995, when data for this analysis were collected. While the use of Indigenous dress remains widespread among rural women and is not significantly related to any of our measures of economic opportunities (or to most other variables), Indigenous language use among bilinguals is less common and more closely related to women's educational attainment and to one measure of community economic opportunities: dis-

tance from Guatemala City. Moreover, Indigenous language use is most common among the most economically disadvantaged, traditional, and isolated women: those in the poorest households, non-Evangelical women, and women who live in the community in which they were born.

These results must be treated with caution for at least three reasons. First, only one of the three measures of community-level economic opportunities is significantly associated with language use. Moreover, while this measure—distance to Guatemala City—undoubtedly is associated with economic opportunities in rural communities, it may also reflect more general factors such as isolation from mainstream Ladino society. We attempted to control for exposure to Ladino society by holding constant the proportion of the population that was Indigenous, but there may be other aspects of proximity to urban Ladino life that discourage Indigenous language use.

A second reason for caution relates to educational attainment. We treat educational attainment as an indicator of human capital and, therefore, of individual economic opportunities inside (and outside) of one's community. However, because all education until recently took place in Spanish, educational attainment may also directly affect language use by bilingual women because schools may have discouraged the use of Indigenous languages. Furthermore, more educated women are more likely to speak Spanish well and may therefore be more likely to use it.

Third, this analysis is a cross-sectional snapshot of an ongoing process of social and economic change in Guatemala. Thus, both the opportunity structure and the Indigenous Guatemalans' response to it may change considerably in the next few decades.

Nonetheless, the differences in the results for use of Indigenous dress and Indigenous language are striking. Language use appears considerably more vulnerable to social and economic change than Indigenous dress. Although language has long been an important component of Indigenous identity in Guatemala, fluency in Spanish in contemporary Guatemala offers greater access to expanding economic opportunities for the Indigenous population. The importance of Spanish for Indigenous social mobility is unlikely to diminish, even if efforts to use Indigenous language as the principal teaching language in Indigenous schools and to increase the use of multiple languages in government, media, and social services succeed.

By contrast, the use of Indigenous dress continues to be common among rural women regardless of educational experience or other social characteristics. Indigenous dress is a highly visible ethnic boundary marker, particularly in a society in which phenotypical differences are relatively minor. The fact that women continue to use Indigenous dress provides evidence that Indigenous ethnic solidarity remains very important in rural communities, despite the wave of social and economic changes that have occurred in recent years. The differences between the results for language and dress suggest that the Guatemalan Indigenous population may be undergoing the type of ethnic reorganization which Nagel and Snipp (1993) describe for American Indians, although the specific cultural and social elements (e.g., dress) may be different.

Our results also suggest that Evangelical Protestantism is significantly related to Spanish-language use among bilingual Indigenous women, although not to the use of

Indigenous dress. Roughly, a third of the EGSF Indigenous sample is Evangelical. Our results show that bilingual evangelicals are significantly *less* likely to speak an Indigenous language at home. This finding may be related to the characteristics of Indigenous women who become Evangelical and/or to the cultural practices or beliefs of Evangelical churches, and deserves further study.

Like many other native peoples, Indigenous Guatemalans are faced with the formidable task of finding a place in a commercial, industrializing, and urbanizing society in order to take advantage of educational opportunities, to improve living standards, and to gain a new type of autonomy and control which is not dependent on isolation, while at the same time, retaining a separate ethnic identity. In rural Guatemalan communities, our results suggest that at least so far, increased opportunities have not led to a wholesale decline in Indigenous ethnic solidarity and abandonment of all ethnic boundary markers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge support provided for this project from NICHD grant R01 HD27361 to RAND and R01 HD31327 to Princeton University, and from Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grants to Princeton University, RAND, UCLA, and the University of Costa Rica. The data for this project were collected in collaboration with colleagues at the Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá under the direction of Dr. Hernán Delgado. We also thank Elena Hurtado, Marie Ruel, and many other INCAP colleagues for their important contributions to the survey design and fieldwork. David R. Harris, Donald Treiman, and three anonymous reviewers provided very helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

NOTES

¹As in other societies, the terminology used to identify Guatemalan ethnic groups is in dispute. We have chosen “Indigenous” (from the Spanish “*indígena*”) as a relatively neutral term. For a thoughtful discussion, see Warren (1998). We capitalize “Indigenous” because we use it to refer to a relatively recent composite ethnic identity, such as “Asian American” or “Latino” in the United States, rather than as a generic designation for prequest ethnic groups.

²*Ladino* is the term used to refer to those who are not Indigenous.

³The 1994 Census indicates that 42.8 percent of the 8.3 million inhabitants of Guatemala were Indigenous, but many observers argue that the proportion is much higher (see Lovell and Lutz 1994). Most other Guatemalans consider themselves to be “Ladino”—see footnote 2. By contrast, between 1 to 3 percent of the U.S. population classifies itself as Native American (U.S. Census Bureau 2002) and estimates of the size of the Indian population in Mexico range from 7 to 12 percent (Yashar 1996; INEGI 2002). Many Mexican Indians, like Indigenous Guatemalans, are Mayan in origin.

⁴Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993:1336) also recognize that individuals may maintain affiliations with their ethnic community even when prejudice and discrimination is reduced or eliminated because of the social and economic opportunities available through these communities.

⁵As described below, most Indigenous women wear distinctive blouses called *huipiles* and skirts called *cortes*, which feature designs unique to the town or village where they live.

⁶Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) also argue that groups are likely to be even more successful in building in-group solidarity if they have a strong autonomous cultural repertoire (e.g., cultural elements such as language, values, and practices) and substantial in-group economic resources.

⁷We use the term “traditional” to refer to clothing that was commonly used by the Indigenous population during the past hundred years. Like other aspects of culture, dress has evolved substantially over time. While contemporary Indigenous dress contains preconquest elements, it also includes both European and completely novel elements as well (Otzoy 1996).

⁸However, learning to weave and embroider one’s own *huipiles* (a common practice) can take considerable time.

⁹Although we examine the use of language and dress when individuals are at home, economic incentives may nonetheless affect these behaviors. For example, Garzon (1998d) reports that some bilingual parents speak Spanish at home to ensure that their children have a solid grounding in the language, which leads to the greatest educational and economic opportunities.

¹⁰Departments are a major geopolitical subdivision in Guatemala. There are a total of 22 departments in Guatemala. Departments are further subdivided into *municipios*. The sample was restricted to four departments because a national sample would have necessitated interviewing in more than 22 Indigenous languages spoken in Guatemala.

¹¹Almost all Jalapa residents identify themselves as Ladino and virtually none report speaking an Indigenous language or wearing Indigenous attire.

¹²Rural communities are defined in the EGSE as having between 200 and 10,000 inhabitants.

¹³The questions on language were “What language do you normally speak at home?” and “Do you speak any other language? What other language?”

¹⁴Ladino respondents were also asked about their parents’ ethnic identity. It is worth noting that, at least in these communities, virtually no Ladino respondents reported that their parents were Indigenous or mixed.

¹⁵As Table 2 indicates, there are 1,801 EGSE respondents who report themselves to be Indigenous. A total of 56 respondents were excluded from subsequent tables because of missing data on one or more variables, primarily on the consumption index and/or women’s group membership. Thus, the multivariate analysis includes a total of 1,745 Indigenous respondents. The analysis of language use in the household is limited to the subset of 1,003 of these respondents who are bilingual.

¹⁶In preliminary analyses, we subdivided the primary school group into multiple categories, but found that it did not change the results. For the sake of parsimony, we include all respondents who did not go beyond primary school in one category in the models.

¹⁷At the time of the EGSE, a quetzal was approximately equivalent to between 18 and 20 cents U.S.

¹⁸We also considered including the percent urban in the *municipio*, but did not because this variable is highly correlated with the percent literate.

¹⁹The small number of respondents (2.3 percent of the sample) reported to be wearing “partly” Indigenous clothing were classified as not wearing Indigenous clothing.

²⁰All estimates are presented in terms of exponentiated coefficients. In the case of the binomial logit models shown in Tables 4 and 6, these are referred to as odds ratios. The odds ratio of 1.64 in Table 4 indicates that the odds of wearing Indigenous clothing for respondents with no schooling are 1.64, as large as the corresponding odds for respondents with more than a primary school education (the omitted category). For the multinomial model presented in Table 5, the exponentiated

coefficients are conventionally referred to as relative risk ratios and are interpreted relative to a base category (in this case, the category of bilingual speakers).

²¹To ensure comparability between Table 5, which includes only one education dummy variable, and Tables 4 and 6, which include two, we reestimated the models in Tables 4 and 6 using only the single education dummy used in Table 5. The results are very similar to those shown in the Tables and do not change the interpretation of the findings.

²²Given the limitation of the sample to three departments, these results cannot be generalized to all Indigenous rural communities in the Western Highlands. In particular, Kaqchikel areas are much closer to Guatemala City and other more urban areas, and, therefore, Kaqchikeles have been less isolated than other Indigenous-language groups. By contrast, Mam, Q'eqchi', and Q'anjob'al communities are generally much more isolated. Therefore, we would expect women in these communities to be more likely to use Indigenous language and attire.

REFERENCES

- Alba, R. D. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales. 1995. *Educación Rural en Guatemala: Situación Actual y Perspectivas (Rural Education in Guatemala: Current Situation and Perspectives)*. Guatemala: Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales.
- Barth, Frederik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Beckett, M. and A. R. Pebley. 2003. "Ethnicity, Language, and Economic Well-Being in Rural Guatemala." *Rural Sociology* 68(3): 434–58.
- Bourque, S. C. and K. B. Warren. 1997. "Denial and Reaffirmation of Ethnic Identities: A Comparative Examination of Guatemalan and Peruvian communities." Manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Brown, R. M. 1996. "The Mayan Language Loyalty Movement in Guatemala." Pp. 165–177 in *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*, edited by E. Fischer and R. M. Brown. Austin: University of Texas.
- . 1998a. "Case Study Two: San Antonio Aguas Calientes and the Quinizilapa Valley." Pp. 101–128 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1998b. "Mayan Language Revitalization in Guatemala." Pp. 155–170 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1998c. "A Brief Cultural History of the Guatemalan Highlands." Pp. 44–61 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Carlsen, R. S. 1997. *The War for the Heart and Soul of a Highland Maya Town*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Cojtí Cuxil, D. 1996. "The Politics of Maya Revindication." Pp. 19–50 in *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*, edited by E. F. Fischer and R. M. Brown. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Colby, B. N. and P. van den Berghe. 1969. *Ixil Country: A Plural Society in Highland Guatemala*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Garzon, S. 1998a. "Indigenous Groups and Their Language Contact Relations." Pp. 9–43 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'Ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1998b. "Conclusions." Pp. 188–199 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'Ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1998c. "Case Study Three: San Juan Comalapa." Pp. 129–154 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'Ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1998d. "Introduction." Pp. 1–8 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu'Ajpub. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Grandin, G. 1997. "Ethnic Transformation." *Latin American Perspectives* 24(2): 7–34.
- Harris, D. R. and J. J. Sim. 2000. "An Empirical Look at the Social Construction of Race: The Case of Mixed-Race Adolescents." PSC Report No. 00-452. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) Estados Unidos de México. 2002. *XII Censo General de Población y Vivienda, 2000 (12th General Population and Housing Census, 2000)* (Retrieved February 15, 2005, <http://www.inegi.gob.mx>)
- Lamont, M. and V. Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167–95.
- Lovell, W. G. and C. H. Lutz. 1994. "Conquest and Population: Maya Demography in Historical Perspective." *Latin American Research Review* 29(2): 133–40.
- Lutz, C. and G. Lovell. 1990. "Core and Periphery in Colonial Guatemala." Pp. 35–51 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State, 1540–1988*, edited by C. A. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Nagel, J. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41(1): 152–76.
- . 1995. "American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity." *American Sociological Review* 60(6): 947–65.
- Nagel, J. and C. M. Snipp. 1993. "Ethnic Reorganization: American Indian Social, Economic, Political and Cultural Strategies for Survival." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16(2): 203–35.
- Otzoy, I. 1996. "Maya Clothing and Identity." Pp. 141–155 in *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*, edited by E. F. Fischer and R. M. Brown. Austin: University of Texas.
- Portes, A. and J. Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action." *The American Journal of Sociology* 98(6): 1320–50.
- Peterson, C., N. Goldman, and A. R. Pebley. 1997. *The 1995 Guatemalan Survey of Family Health (EGSF): Overview and Codebook*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Robles, A. 1993. *Child Health among Indigenous Populations of Bolivia, Guatemala, and Chile*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Sanders, J. 2002. "Ethnic Boundaries and Identity in Plural Societies." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 327–57.
- Smith, C. A. 1990a. "Conclusions: History and Revolution in Guatemala." Pp. 258–285 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*, edited by C. A. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1990b. "Origins of the National Question in Guatemala: A Hypothesis." Pp. 72–95 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*, edited by C. A. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1990c. "Social Relations in Guatemala over Time and Space." Pp. 1–30 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*, edited by C. A. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- . 1990d. "Class Position and Class Consciousness in an Indian Community: Totonacapan in the 1970s." Pp. 205–229 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*, edited by C. A. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1995. "Race-Class-Gender Ideology in Guatemala: Modern and Anti-Modern Forms." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(4): 723–49.
- StataCorp. 1999. Stata Statistical Software: Release 6.0. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.
- Steigenga, T. 1994. "Protestantism, the State, and Society in Guatemala." Pp. 143–172 in *Coming of Age: Protestantism in Contemporary Latin America*, edited by D. Miller. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2002. *Census 2000 Summary File 1*, Matrices P3, P4, PCT4, PCT5, PCT8. (Retrieved February 15, 2005, <http://factfinder.census.gov>)
- Warren, K. B. 1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activities in Guatemala*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Watanabe, J. 1995. "Unimagining the Maya: Anthropologists, Others, and the Inescapable Hubris of Authorship." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14(1): 25–45.
- Waters, M. C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wolf, E. 1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wuqu' Ajpub'. 1998. "Language Contact Experiences of a Mayan Speaker." Pp. 171–187 in *The Life of Our Language*, edited by S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. Becker Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub'. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Yashar, D. 1996. "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America." Pp. 87–105 in *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s*, edited by J. Domínguez and A. Lowenthal. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.