



The Crucible within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation among Children of Immigrants

Author(s): Ruben G. Rumbaut

Source: *International Migration Review*, Vol. 28, No. 4, Special Issue: The New Second Generation (Winter, 1994), pp. 748-794

Published by: The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547157>

Accessed: 05/04/2010 16:53

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

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cmigrations>.

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

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Migration Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

*The Crucible Within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation Among Children of Immigrants*¹

Rubén G. Rumbaut
Michigan State University

Focusing on the formation of ethnic self-identities during adolescence, this article examines the psychosocial adaptation of children of immigrants from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. The data are drawn from a survey carried out in the San Diego and Miami metropolitan areas of over 5,000 children of immigrants attending the eighth and ninth grades in local schools. The sample is evenly split by gender and nativity (half are U.S. born, half foreign born). The results show major differences in their patterns of ethnic self-identification, both between and within groups from diverse national origins. Instead of a uniform assimilative path, we found segmented paths to identity formation. Detailed social portraits are sketched for each ethnic identity type. Multivariate analyses then explore the determinants of assimilative and dissimilative ethnic self-identities and of other aspects of psychosocial adaptation such as self-esteem, depressive affect, and parent-child conflict, controlling for gender, socioeconomic status, and national origin. The theoretical and practical implications of these results – especially the effects of acculturation, discrimination, location and ethnic density of schools, parental socialization and family context, upon the psychosocial adaptation of children of recent immigrants to the United States – are discussed.

I wish I knew some other way to render the mental life of the immigrant child of reasoning age . . . What the child thinks and feels is a reflection of the hopes, desires, and purposes of the parents who brought him overseas, no matter how precocious and independent the child may be . . . My parents knew only that they desired us to be like American children . . . In their bewilderment and uncertainty they needs must trust us children to learn from such models as the tenements afforded. More than this, they must step down from the throne of parental authority, and take the law from their children's mouths; for they had no other means of finding out what was good American form. The result . . . makes for friction, and sometimes ends in breaking up a family . . . This sad process of disintegration of home life may be observed in almost any immigrant family of our class and with our

¹Research supported by grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, and the National Science Foundation.

traditions and aspirations. It is part of the process of Americanization . . . It is the cross that the first and second generations must bear . . . These are the pains of adjustment, as racking as the pains of birth. And as the mother forgets her agonies in the bliss of clasping her babe to her breast, so the bent and heart-sore immigrant forgets exile and homesickness and ridicule and loss and estrangement, when he beholds his sons and daughters moving as Americans among Americans.

(*Antin, 1912:198, 271–272*)

Ironically, Mary Antin's popular autobiography, written before she was 30, was serialized in *The Atlantic Monthly* in the same year the Immigration (Dillingham) Commission presented its 42-volume report to the U.S. Congress, including five volumes on children of immigrants, fueling fears about the danger to the nation posed by a putatively inferior stock of inassimilable "new" immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. A Russian Jew who immigrated at a young age to Boston with her family in 1894 and went to public schools in Chelsea, Antin was the precocious and independent daughter of a petty trader confined to the "Pale of Settlement" in the empire of the czars, and her book is at once perceptive about the "the mental life of the immigrant child" and pregnant with the unabashed patriotism and newfound freedom of a former stateless person who finds in America, despite many hardships, "a nest to homeless birds" (1912:231).

Nearly a century later a huge new generation of immigrant children, now from Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, is growing up in American cities in contexts that seem both familiar and sharply different from those reported long ago by Antin. Once again, questions are raised about the assimilability of the newcomers – because of their race, language, culture, or supposed unwillingness to speak English. Procrustean, one-size-fits-all panethnic labels – such as Asian, Hispanic, Black – are imposed willy-nilly by the society at large to lump ethnic groups together who may hail variously from Vietnam or Korea, India or China, Guatemala or Cuba, Haiti or Jamaica, and who differ widely in national and class origins, phenotypes, languages, cultures, generations, migration histories, and modes of incorporation in the United States. Their children, especially adolescents in the process of constructing and crystallizing a social identity, are challenged to incorporate what is "out there" into what is "in here," often in dissonant social contexts. In California, on the opposite coast from Mary Antin's, a ninth-grade Filipino immigrant girl, eager to fit in her new milieu, reports that "our parents don't come [to school functions] because they don't know any English. I don't even tell them when they are supposed to come. They dress so different and I don't want our parents to come because the others will laugh at them and tease us. We are ashamed" (Olsen, 1988:82). When Lao teens in a San Diego junior high school are teased by white classmates and told to "go back to China," the Lao kids fire back: "Go

back to Europe!" And a 16-year-old Cambodian girl, a survivor of Cambodia's "killing fields" of the late 1970s living in an inner-city neighborhood in San Diego with her widowed mother and unlikely to finish high school, is puzzled by a question about American identity: "How could I be American? I black skin, black eyes, black hair . . . My English not good enough and my skin color black" (quoted from case histories in Rumbaut and Ima, 1988; cf. Hatcher and Troyna, 1993).

BACKGROUND

In some respects, especially in the racial-ethnic diversification and stratification of the American population, the current transformation may be unprecedented in the American experience. Class, not color, shaped the fates of the "white ethnics" – Italians, Poles, Greeks, Russian Jews, and many others – whose arrival by the millions during the previous peak period of immigration of the pre-World War I era culminated in the restrictionist national-origins quota laws of the 1920s. The groups that had then occasioned such vitriolic alarms were European whites whose assimilation, amalgamation, and absorption into the mainstream of American life over the succeeding decades, notably in the aftermath of World War II, was aptly captured in the subtitle of Richard Alba's 1985 study of *Italian Americans: Into the Twilight of Ethnicity*. For those white Americans, at least, one outcome of widespread social mobility and intermarriage in a span of three or more generations is that ethnic identity has become an optional, familial, leisure-time form of symbolic ethnicity (Alba, 1990; Gans, 1979; Waters, 1990). Our conventional models of immigrant acculturation and self-identification processes largely derive from the historical experience of those (and earlier) European immigrants and their descendants.

Today's new and rapidly accelerating immigration to the United States is extraordinary in its diversity of color, class, and national origins. The 1990 U.S. census counted 19.8 million immigrants, an all-time high. In terms of color, most new immigrants self-reported as nonwhite in the 1990 census (cf. Franklin, 1993). The proportion of white immigrants declined from 88 percent of those arriving before 1960, to 64 percent in the 1960s, 41 percent in the 1970s, and 38 percent in the 1980s.² This changing racial-ethnic makeup will change

²Black immigrants increased from 2% of pre-1960 arrivals to over 8% in the 1980s; Asians from 5% pre-1960 to 31% in the 1980s; and other-race groups from 5% pre-1960 to 23% in the 1980s. Immigrants from the Americas are the most racially mixed, with less than 45% self-reporting as white (mostly from Argentina and Cuba, then Colombia and Nicaragua), 13% as black (most from Haiti, Jamaica and the English-speaking Caribbean, then the Dominican Republic), and 41% as other (predominantly mixed populations of mestizos from Mexico and certain countries in Central and South America; mulattoes from the Spanish-speaking Caribbean). Significantly, half of all black immigrants in the U.S. are concentrated in the New York metropolitan area and another 16% in Miami; half of the mestizo and Asian populations are concentrated in California, above all along the megalopolitan corridor stretching from San Diego to Los Angeles (Rumbaut, 1994).

in still more complex ways due to rapidly increasing rates of ethnic intermarriage.³ In terms of class, today's immigrants include by far the most educated groups (Asian Indians, Taiwanese) and the least educated groups (Mexicans, Salvadorans) in American society, as well as the groups with the lowest poverty rates in the U.S. (Filipinos) and with the highest (Laotians and Cambodians) – a reflection of polar-opposite types of migrations embedded in very different historical and structural contexts. They also differ greatly in their English language skills, age/sex structures, patterns of fertility, and forms of family organization. In terms of national origins, and for the first time in U.S. history, by 1990 Latin American and Caribbean peoples had replaced Europeans as the largest immigrant population in the country by far, and the total born in Asia also surpassed the total born in Europe. Over half of these non-European immigrants arrived during the 1980s alone. Mexicans alone accounted for 22 percent (4.3 million) of the total foreign-born population, and 26 percent of all immigrants arriving since 1970. Filipinos ranked second, with close to one million immigrants and 5 percent of the total. Mexicans and Filipinos comprise, as a result, the largest Hispanic and Asian immigrant groups in the U.S. today. In fact, just over a dozen countries have accounted for over two-thirds of all immigrants since 1970: Mexico, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and Haiti in the Caribbean Basin; and the Philippines, Vietnam, South Korea, China, Taiwan and India in Asia. Given current trends, the immigrant population will grow at a still faster rate and its composition will be further diversified during the 1990s (Rumbaut, 1994).

Moreover, while immigrants made up barely 8 percent of the total 1990 U.S. population – a much lower proportion than was the case earlier in this century – their effects are more pronounced than may seem at first glance because of their patterns of concentration in particular states and localities. Of the 19.8 million foreign-born persons counted in the 1990 census, fully 5 million – 25 percent of the total – resided in the Los Angeles and New York metropolitan areas alone. Orange and San Diego Counties, just south of Los Angeles, added 1 million immigrants, while Dade County in South

³Hirschman (1994) has recently reported that, according to 1990 census data on married persons, the proportions of Hispanics married to non-Hispanic persons were 25% for those self-identifying as Cuban, 28% for Mexican, 35% for Puerto Rican, and 44% for other Hispanics; those figures do not include the significant number of Hispanics married to a member of a different Hispanic group (such as a Cuban-Mexican intermarriage). The proportion of Asians married to non-Asians was similar: 25% to 50% for different nationalities and generational groups. The numbers of black-white intermarriages have been edging upward as well, from 1.9% in 1970 to 3.4% in 1980 and 6.2% in 1990. Current intermarriage rates seem bound to rise even further in the future, creating a growing pool of persons with mixed ethnic ancestry and raising significant questions about the meaning and construction of ethnic identities among their children, and of classifications based on ascriptive and increasingly tenuous categories such as Hispanic and Asian.

Florida contained 875,000 immigrants, including the two cities with the greatest proportion of foreign-born residents in the U.S.: Hialeah (70%) and Miami (60%). It is precisely in these areas of dense concentration in which heated public debate about the costs and benefits of immigration has intensified, as illustrated most dramatically in California in 1994 by the passage of Proposition 187 (the initiative that would deny public education, health care, and other social services to illegal immigrants and their children). And as in the past, the perception of immigrants as a threat to domestic well-being involves not only economic and fiscal issues but psychocultural and symbolic concerns, especially those touching on language, loyalty, and national identity.

Research about these new immigrants and refugees has focused largely on the situation of first-generation adults. However, much less is known about their children, even though they are already a very visible presence in the schools and in the streets of many American communities, and even though they will form an increasingly important component of the American population and society. Few in-depth studies have been conducted so far on the adaptation process of immigrant children and of their prospects for the future; and what is known about their actual adaptation patterns to date is fragmentary. Even less is known about the subjective aspects of the children's experience, as processed within their phenomenal field – what we refer to here as the “crucible within” – including their modes of ethnic or national self-identification, perceptions of discrimination, aspirations for their adult futures, cultural preferences, forms of intergenerational cohesion or conflict within their families, self-esteem and psychological well-being, and how these may be related to more objective indices of their experience, such as their school and work performance and language shifts from the mother tongue to English, in given social contexts.

This article is an effort to contribute to our empirical knowledge in those areas of immigrant psychosocial adaptation, focusing on identity formation during adolescence. The findings reported are from a 1992 survey – the first wave of a planned longitudinal study – of over 5,000 teenage children of immigrants in the San Diego and Miami metropolitan areas. Most of the major groups of new immigrants – from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean – are amply represented in San Diego and Miami; in fact, for many of those groups, San Diego and Miami are either the primary area of settlement in the U.S. (*e.g.*, the Lao in San Diego; Cubans and Nicaraguans in Miami) or they are among the top urban areas in the country in degree of concentration (*e.g.*, Mexicans, Filipinos, Vietnamese and Cambodians in San Diego; Haitians, Colombians, and Jamaicans in the greater Miami area). This permits a broader comparative assessment of the adaptation of diverse groups of children of immigrants on both East and West coasts, in ethnic enclaves, inner-city and suburban communities of the United States.

For this diverse sample, the paper addresses these principal research questions: What are their ethnic (or panethnic) self-identity choices? What characteristics (demographic, geographic, socioeconomic, ethnocultural, generational, familial, academic, linguistic, psychological) distinguish the different national origins groups from each other, and the different types of ethnic (or panethnic) identities from each other? And among those characteristics, which are the main predictors of different types of ethnic identities, and of self-esteem, depressive symptoms, and parent-child conflict? Some theoretical issues guide our analysis of ethnic identity, self esteem, and assimilation, and we will briefly consider these before turning to the presentation of results.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

It is of more than passing interest to note that the concept of identity – which, like ethnicity, was not in common use as recently as 1950 – was developed by an immigrant, Erik H. Erikson, in his well-known *Childhood and Society* (1950) and many subsequent works. Indeed, Erikson observed that his coinage of the terms identity and identity crisis was inspired by “the experience of emigration, immigration, and Americanization,” in a country “which attempts to make a super-identity of all the identities imported by its constituent immigrants” (quoted in Gleason, 1981:31). But he applied the concepts to analyze adolescent development rather than immigrant adaptation. Adolescence spans a period of identity crisis (Erikson, 1968), a passage to adulthood marked by major physical, emotional, and social changes. An essential task of development during this time of heightened self-consciousness, when the self-concept is most malleable, is the formation of a healthy sense of identity (Rosenberg, 1979; *see* Phinney, 1990, for a review of various developmental models of identity formation). For children of immigrants, that developmental process can be complicated by experiences of intense acculturative and intergenerational conflicts as they strive to adapt in social identity contexts that may be racially and culturally dissonant.

Recent scholarship has suggested that the incorporation of today’s new second generation is likely to be segmented and to take different pathways to adulthood, depending on a variety of conditions and contexts, vulnerabilities and resources (Gans, 1992; Portes and Zhou, 1993; *cf.* Abramson, 1981). As Portes and Zhou argue, “the question is to what sector of American society a particular immigrant group assimilates” (1993:82). Thus, one path may follow the relatively straight-line theory (or “bumpy-line theory,” as Gans [1992] suggests may be a more apt term) of assimilation into the white middle-class majority; an opposite type of adaptation may lead to downward mobility and assimilation into the inner city underclass; yet another may

combine upward mobility and heightened ethnic awareness within solidary immigrant communities. We would expect that such divergent modes of incorporation will be accompanied by changes in the character and salience of ethnicity – from linear to reactive processes of ethnic solidarity and identity formation (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990) – and hence by divergent modes of ethnic self-identification. Thus, ethnicity may for some groups become optional and recede into the social twilight, as it did for the descendants of the white Europeans, or it may become for others a resilient resource or an engulfing master status. Still other variants may range from the formation of bilingual-bicultural-binational identities to panethnogenesis and the eventual acceptance of such officially constructed supranational categories as Hispanic and Asian (*cf.* Espiritu, 1992).

Theories of social identity and self-esteem have suggested various social psychological mechanisms underlying the formation of ethnic self-images (*cf.* Bernal and Knight, 1993; Phinney, 1991; Porter and Washington, 1993; Rosenberg, 1979; Tajfel, 1981). Youths see and compare themselves in relation to those around them, based on their social similarity or dissimilarity with the reference groups that most directly affect their experiences – *e.g.*, with regard to such visible and socially categorized markers as gender, race, accent, language, class, religion, and nationality. Ethnic self-awareness is heightened or blurred, respectively, depending on the degree of dissonance or consonance of the social contexts which are basic to identity formation. For youths in a consonant context, ethnicity is not salient; but contextual dissonance heightens the salience of ethnicity and of ethnic group boundaries, all the more when it is accompanied by disparagement and discrimination. In theory, self-esteem should be lower in dissonant social contexts – that is, where the level of social dissimilarity is higher along with exposure to negative stereotypes and reflected appraisals about one's group of origin – but mechanisms of perceptual defense are deployed to protect self-esteem (which is seen as a basic human drive; *cf.* Rosenberg, 1979). The youth may cope with the psychological pressure produced by such dissonance by seeking to reduce conflict and to assimilate (literally, to become similar) within the relevant social context. An alternative reaction may lead in an opposite direction to the rise and reaffirmation of ethnic solidarity and self-consciousness – *e.g.*, as has occurred among Korean American youths in Los Angeles in the aftermath of the 1992 riots (Min, 1995; *cf.*, Portes, 1984).

Historical and contemporary field studies have portrayed the complexity of multiple paths to identity resolution in the second generation. Such segmented adaptations have been observed for the same ethnic group, in the same ethnic neighborhood, the same school, and even in the same family. For example, in a classic psychological study of second-generation Italian immigrants in New Haven in the late 1930s, Child (1943) described

three main reactions to the dilemma of remaining within the sphere of the immigrant family of origin or breaking out of it altogether: the “rebel” (who assimilated into the American milieu), the “in-group” type (who retained an Italian ethnicity), and the “apathetic” or marginal reaction, each shaped by a set of centripetal and centrifugal social forces. Another classic ethnography, done at about the same time in Boston’s Italian “slum district” (Whyte, 1955), detailed the divergent trajectories of the “college boys,” who assimilated out of the ethnic colony and into the larger society, and the “corner boys,” who were loyal above all to their peers and stayed behind (*cf.* Macleod, 1987, for a parallel recent ethnography of divergent ethnic fates in an inner-city neighborhood). Fieldwork in the 1980s with Mexican-descent students in a California high school distinguished five different ethnic identity types – from recently arrived and longer-term Mexican immigrants, who did especially well in school, to assimilated U.S.-born Mexican Americans and the more troubled Chicanos and Cholos – all of whom differed profoundly in their achievement and aspirations (Matute-Bianchi, 1986). Other field studies of Mexican-origin youth have observed that even in the same family each child may resolve identity issues and conflicts differently and occupy a spectrum from Cholo to anglicized, from bilingual to Spanglish-speaking to English-only-speaking, from assimilated youths to gang members (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Vigil, 1988).

For our purposes in this study, some specific hypotheses can be derived from the available theoretical literature on ethnic identification and assimilation. In perhaps the most influential statement on assimilation in American life, Milton Gordon (1964) considered “identificational assimilation” – *i.e.*, a self-image as an unhyphenated American – as the end point of a process that begins with acculturation, proceeds through structural assimilation and intermarriage, and is accompanied by an absence of prejudice and discrimination in the core society. For Gordon, once structural assimilation has occurred, either in tandem with or subsequent to acculturation, “the remaining types of assimilation have all taken place like a row of tenpins bowled over in rapid succession by a well placed strike” (1964:81). For the children of white European immigrants, in fact, the acculturation process was so “overwhelmingly triumphant” that “the greater risk consisted in alienation from family ties and in role reversals of the generations that could subvert normal parent-child relationships” (1964:107). If predictions from so-called “straight-line assimilation theory” (*see also* Warner and Srole, 1945; but *cf.* Abramson, 1981; Glazer, 1993; Gleason, 1980) apply to the current waves of immigrants from Asia and the Caribbean Basin, then we would expect that the greater their level of acculturation – as indicated by fluency in, preference for, and use of English in social life, by U.S. nativity and citizenship – the greater the probability of identificational assimilation. A variant of assimilation theory predicts that identity shifts would tend to be

from lower to higher status groups; where social mobility is blocked by prejudice and discrimination, lower status group members may instead reaffirm their ethnic identity or adopt a panethnic label, even despite a high degree of acculturation (Yinger, 1981). As a corollary, all other things being equal, we hypothesize that the children of higher status immigrant parents (who form a sizeable proportion of contemporary immigrants) will be less likely to assimilate into the dominant group ethnicity, and more likely to identify with the ethnicity of their parents.

A segmented identificational assimilation perspective, however, takes issue with the assumption of a relatively unilinear if not unidirectional process of identification into the dominant group ethnicity. Instead, as described above, multiple ethnic identities may emerge, corresponding to distinct modes of immigrant adaptation and social contexts of reception. One of those paths leads to assimilation into white middle class society, and we would expect the above predictions of straight-line theory to apply. However, as Portes and Zhou (1993) have argued, some of the contextual factors that are most likely to shape the prospects of the new second generation have to do with the presence or absence of racial discrimination, location in or away from inner-city areas (and hence differential association with the reactive adversarial subcultures of underclass youths), and the presence or absence of a strong receiving coethnic community. Contexts that combine the positive features of those factors (*e.g.*, as in Cuban Miami, a well-established economic enclave that provides a wide range of resources and role models to their children, including private bilingual schools, and insulates them both from native minorities and general prejudice) may be hypothesized to lead to a resilient sense of ethnic identity. By contrast, contexts that combine the negative features of those factors (*e.g.*, as in Miami's Little Haiti, a large but disadvantaged ethnic community, official hostility and widespread racial discrimination, their children concentrated in inner city schools where native peer groups undercut the immigrant ethos of their parents) may be expected to lead to assimilation into the oppositional identities of native racial minorities (Portes and Zhou, 1993; cf. Fordham and Ogbu, 1987).

In this study we are concerned with the influence of relevant social contexts on self-concept, self-regard, and psychological well-being. The discussion above has focused attention on contexts and processes outside the family that may influence modes of ethnic self-definition. However, how these youths think and feel about themselves is critically affected by the parents' modes of ethnic socialization and by the strength of the attachment that the child feels to the parents and to the parents' national origins. Ethnic self-identity is, among other things, a measure of the degree of the children's sense of identification with their parents. Indeed, we expect that family structure, parental characteristics, and the quality of parent-child relationships should have significant effects on this and all other aspects of

the psychosocial adaptation process. Psychologically, we hypothesize that factors that may reduce contextual dissonance – *e.g.*, acculturation (especially in English competency), U.S. nativity, citizenship – would have positive effects on self-esteem and psychological well-being. Those that increase contextual dissonance and expose the youth to negative reflected appraisals from significant others, especially parents and peers – such as discrimination and conflictual relations with parents – would have negative effects. We expect that the most recently arrived immigrant families will be most exposed to dissonant social contexts and to dissonant messages about themselves; hence we would expect the psychosocial adaptation of those teens to be more difficult and to affect their sense of self-worth. These general hypotheses will be tested through multivariate analyses of ethnic self-identifications, self-esteem, and depressive symptoms, controlling for gender, age, national origin, and a variety of individual and family characteristics. We turn first, however, to a brief discussion of the sample and measures used in this research.

DATA AND METHODS

The data presented below are derived from the first phase of a study of children of immigrants enrolled in schools located in two research sites in Southern California and South Florida. The students sampled in the initial survey were in the eighth and ninth grades, a level at which dropout rates are still relatively low, to avoid the potential bias of differential dropout rates between ethnic groups at the senior high school level. The survey was conducted during Spring 1992 in collaboration with the unified school districts of San Diego, California, and of Dade (Miami) and Broward (Fort Lauderdale) Counties in South Florida. As mentioned above, the groups sampled include most of the major immigrant and refugee populations in the United States today and reflect their diverse origins and patterns of concentration in those sites. In San Diego, the sample includes children of the two largest immigrant groups in the United States today – Mexicans and Filipinos – as well as children of the largest refugee populations to be resettled in the United States since 1975, the Vietnamese, Laotians, and Cambodians (*cf.* Rumbaut, 1990, 1991, 1995). In Miami, where immigrants form a majority of the population of the metropolitan area and have fundamentally transformed it over the past three decades, the sample is representative of a huge and highly diversified Cuban exile community, as well as of the second largest concentration of immigrants from the Afro-Caribbean, who have entered under very different circumstances – especially from Haiti, Jamaica and other English-speaking West Indian island nations – and of sizable, recently-arrived groups from Nicaragua, Colombia, and elsewhere in Latin America (*see* Portes and Stepick, 1993; Portes and Zhou, 1993). Florida's Broward County provides a contrasting

setting as a location away from the main centers of immigrant concentration in Miami and Hialeah, but is also the source of more than half of the Jamaican students in the sample.

Sample Selection

To be eligible for inclusion in the study, a student had to be either foreign born or U.S. born with at least one foreign-born parent. Since the school districts do not collect information on the nativity or immigration status of parents, a brief initial survey of all eighth and ninth graders was carried out to determine eligibility. All eligible students then took parental consent forms home; these were returned signed by three-fourths of the parents in San Diego and two-thirds of the parents in South Florida. Those students, in turn, were administered the survey questionnaire at school during the Spring 1992 semester. The final sample of students who completed the survey totaled 5,264: over 2,400 Mexican, Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, and other Asian and Latin American students in San Diego city schools; and over 2,800 Cuban, Haitian, Jamaican, Nicaraguan, Colombian, and other Latin American and West Indian students in Dade and Broward Counties. About 200 of the students in the Miami sample (primarily upper middle-class Cubans) were enrolled in two bilingual private schools. All others attended public schools which ranged from predominantly nonwhite central city schools to predominantly white schools in the suburbs, including middle, junior high, and magnet schools. The sample represents dozens of different nationalities of origin, roughly corresponding to the varying concentrations of particular immigrant groups in the San Diego and Miami metropolitan areas, as noted earlier. However, for the purposes of this article, we exclude from the analysis a small mixed group of 137 respondents in the Miami area with a parent born in any one of several dozen countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, Australia, and Canada. Thus, we report data here for the sample of 5,127 children of immigrants from Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean, focusing analytically on the largest ten national-origin groups from these regions.⁴

At the time of the survey, most of the respondents were 14 or 15 years old (the mean age was 14.2, with an age range from 12 to 17), and were born in 1977 or 1978. The total sample is evenly split by gender, grade, and

⁴In the data presented (Tables 2 through 7), smaller national-origins groups from these regions are aggregated for ease of analysis and presentation. Other Latin Americans includes most Central and South American countries, but primarily Dominicans, Hondurans, Argentinians, Peruvians, Ecuadorans, Chileans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans. Other Asians includes mainly Chinese (from the mainland, as well as Taiwan and Hong Kong), Japanese, Koreans, and Indians. Other West Indians come mainly from Trinidad and Tobago, the Bahamas, and Belize.

generation: half are U.S.-born children of immigrant parents (the second generation), and half are foreign-born youths who immigrated to the United States before age twelve (what Thomas and Znaniecki referred to long ago as the half-second generation [1958:1776], and we have called the one-and-a-half or 1.5 generation [Rumbaut and Ima, 1988]). Among the foreign-born youth, the sample is also evenly split by age at arrival about half had lived in the U.S. for ten years or more (that is, they were preschool age at arrival), while the other half had lived in the United States nine years or less (that is, they had reached elementary school age in their native country but arrived in the United States before reaching puberty/adolescence). Thus, time in the United States for these immigrant children is not solely a measure of length of exposure to American life, but also an indicator of different developmental stages at the time of immigration (on the importance of these different ages and stages at arrival among immigrant children, see Cropley, 1983). The sample reflects a wide range of socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, migration histories and contexts of reception, as well as types of family structures, schools, and neighborhoods (including inner city and suburban areas, and, notably for Cubans in the Miami area, dense immigrant enclaves).

Measures

The survey gathered data on respondents' demographic characteristics, the nativity and citizenship of both the respondents and their parents, family size and structure, socioeconomic status (parents' education and occupation, home ownership), the respondents' perceptions of their parents' migration motives and ethnic self-identities, and respondents' peer relationships, language use and proficiency, hours spent daily on homework and watching television, educational and occupational aspirations, perceptions and experiences of discrimination, and a range of attitudinal and other psychosocial variables, including measures of self-esteem and depression. In addition, school data on grade point averages, Stanford reading and math achievement test scores, LEP/FEP (English Language Proficiency) classification, gifted and handicapped status, and related variables were obtained from the respective school systems for all students in the sample.

The items and response formats composing the major scales used in the analysis, along with their scoring and reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas), are detailed in Table 1. Some are standardized instruments widely used in the research literature. Self-esteem was measured using the ten-item Rosenberg scale (Rosenberg, 1965, 1979). Depressive symptoms were measured with a four-item subscale from the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) scale; these items have been found to be predictive of major depression among adolescents (Vega *et al.*, 1993; *cf.* Vega and

Rumbaut, 1991). The Pearson correlation between self-esteem and depression was $-.39$ ($p < .0001$) for the sample as a whole. An English language proficiency index was developed using four items measuring the respondent's self-reported ability to speak, understand, read, and write English; scoring each item from 1 to 4 (1, not at all; 2, not well; 3, well; and 4, very well), with an overall index score calculated as the mean of the four items. This English proficiency index was strongly correlated ($.42$, $p < .0001$) with the objective Stanford reading achievement test score, providing evidence of its validity. A foreign language proficiency index was similarly constructed, assessing the respondent's ability to speak, understand, read, and write the parental native language also scoring each of the four items from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very well) with the overall index score as the mean of the four items. Educational aspirations are measured as the mean of two items asking for the highest level of education the respondent would like to achieve and the highest level realistically expected; the score ranges from 1 (less than high school) to 5 (a graduate degree), with 4 equal to finishing college. Finally, as a data reduction technique, sets of attitudinal variables were also factor-analyzed using varimax rotation, and main factors with eigenvalues greater than one and factor loadings greater than $.50$ were identified. We report findings from three scales thus created, each containing three items and measuring familism, American preferences, and parent-child conflict (see Table 1 for specific items composing these scales, response formats, and scoring).

Perceptions and experiences of discrimination were measured by several items. Here we report results from responses to a direct question about actually having been discriminated against (and if yes, why and by whom), and to a key item about expected discrimination: No matter how much education I get, people will still discriminate against me (scored from 1, not true at all to 4, very true). Respondents' perceptions of their family's economic situation compared to five years ago were measured on a scale from 1, much better, to 5, much worse. Hours per weekday spent on homework and hours per weekday watching television are here scored: 0, less than 1 hour, 1, 1 to 2 hours, and so on through 5, 5 or more hours. Finally, an item measuring feelings of being embarrassed by one's parents, a not uncommon experience among immigrant children (as illustrated at the outset of the article) (read as follows:

Linda and Luis are both students whose parents are foreign-born. Linda says, I am sometimes embarrassed because my parents don't know American ways. Luis says: "I am never embarrassed by my parents; I like the way they do things." Which comes closest to how you feel? [Linda, Luis, or neither].

In this analysis, answers checking Linda were scored 1 and the others were scored 0.

TABLE 1
COMPOSITION AND RELIABILITY OF SCALES

Scale and Scoring	Cronbach's Alpha	Items and Measures
English Proficiency Index (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.92	How well do you (speak, understand, read, write) English? 1=Not at all; 2=Not well; 3=Well; 4=Very well
Foreign Language Index (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.93	How well do you (speak, understand, read, write) [foreign language]? 1=Not at all; 2=Not well; 3=Well; 4=Very well
Educational Aspirations Scale (2 items; scored 1 to 5)	.80	What is the highest level of education you would like to achieve? And realistically speaking, what is the highest level of education that you think you will get? 1=Less than high school; 2=High school; 3=Some college; 4=Finish college; 5=Finish a graduate degree
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (10 items: scored 1 to 4)	.81	I feel I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others. I feel I have a number of good qualities. I am able to do things as well as most other people. I take a positive attitude toward myself. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. All in all, I am inclined to think I am a failure [<i>reverse score</i>]. I feel I do not have much to be proud of [<i>reverse score</i>]. I wish I could have more respect for myself [<i>reverse score</i>]. I certainly feel useless at times [<i>reverse score</i>]. At times I think I am no good at all [<i>reverse score</i>]. 1=Disagree a lot; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Agree a lot
CES-D Depression Subscale (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.74	[<i>How often during the past week:</i>] I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor. I could not "get going." I felt depressed. I felt sad. 1=Rarely; 2=Some of the time (1 or 2 days); 3=Occasionally (3 or 4 days); 4=Most of the time (5 to 7 days)
Familism Scale (3 items: scored 1 to 4)	.57	One should find a job near his/her parents even if it means losing a better job somewhere else. When someone has a serious problem, only relatives can help. In helping a person get a job, it is always better to choose a relative rather than a friend. 1=Disagree a lot; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Agree a lot
American Preference Scale (3 items: scored 1 to 4)	.57	Believe there is no better country to live in than the United States. How often you prefer American way of doing things. How often your parents prefer American way of doing things. 1=Never; 2=Sometimes; 3=Most of time; 4=All of the time
Parent-Child Conflict Scale (3 items: scored 1 to 4)	.56	In trouble with parents because of different way of doing things. My parents are usually not very interested in what I have to say. My parents do not like me very much. 1=Not true at all; 2=Not very true; 3=Partly true; 4=Very true

FINDINGS

Results are summarized below in six tables of data. Table 2 presents the various types of ethnic self-identification chosen by the respondents, broken down by the nativity of the children (U.S. born vs. foreign born) and the national origins of their parents. Table 3 then provides a detailed portrait of the major national origins groups, including all of the measures discussed above plus other basic individual characteristics and type and location of schools. Table 4 breaks down those same variables by the different types of self-reported ethnic identities. Table 5 presents logistic regressions predicting the odds of selecting four main types of ethnic self-identity. Finally, Table 6 presents the results of multiple linear regressions predicting self-esteem scores and depressive symptoms, while Table 7 provides a similar analysis of parent-child conflict outcomes. Only selected findings from these tables are highlighted for discussion.

Perhaps the first result to be highlighted concerns the determination of ethnic groups by national origins, and the assignment of the respondents to their respective ethnic groups. Who is Cuban, Filipino, Haitian, Laotian, or Mexican turns out to be a complicated methodological problem rather than a simple matter of fact. In principle, the determination of ethnicity should be straightforward and unambiguous, based in the first instance on the birthplace of foreign-born respondents, or, if U.S. born, on the birthplace of their parents. However, reflecting the fluidity of ethnicity and the increasing patterns of intermarriage noted (*see* Note 3, *supra*), only three-fourths (76.9%) of the children in the sample had parents who were conationals (and these rates of homogamy vary widely by nationality, as is shown in Table 3). In 12.6 percent of the cases, one parent was U.S. born; sometimes these involved coethnic marriages (*e.g.*, a Mexican immigrant married to a U.S.-born woman of Mexican descent), but often they did not (*e.g.*, a black American serviceman married to a Filipina woman, a Cuban-born man married to an Anglo wife, a Haitian married to a Dominican). Other cases reflected a variety of mixed nationalities; in some, ethnicity cut clearly across nationality (*e.g.*, a Chinese man from Hong Kong married to an ethnic Chinese woman from Burma) but not in most. In still others, birthplace was not a proxy for ethnicity (*e.g.*, those involving ethnic minorities from the countries of origin, such as the Hmong from Laos and ethnic Chinese from Vietnam, or involving unique historical circumstances, such as the fact that many Cambodian and Laotian children in the sample were born in refugee camps in Thailand or elsewhere in Southeast Asia). In these cases, languages spoken, surnames, and other indicators had to be checked to determine ethnicity. Where none of the above steps resolved the ambiguity involved in ethnic group assignment – especially in cases of mixed marriages and in stepfamilies – the nationality of the mother took precedence (unless she was U.S. born), reflecting both the mother's more influ-

ential role in the children's socialization (a pattern that is documented further below) and the fact that fathers were absent in fully 30 percent of the homes in the sample. In the much smaller number of mixed cases where the mother was absent but the father was not, the nationality of the father was given precedence (unless he was U.S. born) in assigning respondents by national origin. As should become clear, what is a methodological problem to the researcher is a central psychosocial problem to an adolescent in arriving at a meaningful ethnic self-definition.

Ethnic Identities

An open-ended question was asked to ascertain the respondent's ethnic self-identity, and the answers were subsequently coded and quantified. The results (and the wording of the question) are presented in Table 2, broken down by the respondents' nativity and their parents' nationality. Four main types of ethnic self-identities became apparent, which may be characterized as follows: (1) an ancestral, immigrant, or national-origin identity (*e.g.*, Jamaican, Nicaraguan, Hmong); (2) an additive, syncretic, or hyphenated identity (*e.g.*, Cuban-American, Filipino-American, Vietnamese-American); (3) an assimilative or American national identity, without the hyphen; and (4) a dissimilative racial or panethnic identity (*e.g.*, Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, Black, Asian). The first two of these explicitly identify with the immigrant experience and original homeland, if at different degrees of closeness, whereas the last two are exclusively identities "made in the U.S.A." The first three also focus chiefly on national identifications (whether of origin or of destiny, or a bridging of both); the fourth reflects a denationalized identification with racial-ethnic minority groups in the country of destination, and self-conscious differences in relation to the white Anglo majority population. For the sample as a whole ($N=5,127$), without regard to the nativity of the respondents, just over a quarter (27%) identified by national or ethnic origin; a plurality (40%) chose a hyphenated-American identification; just over a tenth (11%) identified as "American;" and over two-tenths (21%) selected racial or panethnic self-identifications (or, in less than 4% of the cases, indicated a mixed or other identity not classifiable among the four main types). Seen another way, two-thirds of the respondents ethnically self-identified with their or their parents' immigrant origins; the remaining one-third reported either assimilative or dissimilative identities that are not connected to those origins, but to their American present.

Whether the respondent was born in the United States or not – that is, whether the respondent is a member of the second generation, or of the half-second or 1.5 generation – makes a great difference in the type of ethnic identity selected. Among the foreign born, as Table 2 shows, 43 percent

TABLE 2
SELF-REPORTED ETHNIC IDENTITY OF CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH FLORIDA, 1992,
BY NATIVITY OF THE CHILDREN AND NATIONAL ORIGIN OF THEIR PARENTS

Ethnic Identity by Nativity ¹	Latin America and Caribbean											Asia					Total
	Mexico	Cuba	Nicaragua	Colombia	Latin America	Haiti	Jamaica	West Indies	Philippines	Laos			Cambodia	Other Asia			
										Vietnam	Lao	Hmong					
Total Foreign-Born (FB)	N = 301	354	318	105	236	101	98	35	368	313	153	50	93	76	2,396		
Total U.S.-Born (US)	N = 456	873	26	122	242	77	62	71	450	58	2	3	3	86	2,531		
% "American"	FB 0	3.7	5.0	1.9	9.3	3.0	7.5	8.6	0.5	2.2	1.3	4.0	2.2	1.3	3.2		
	US 3.9	28.5	50.0	32.0	35.5	26.0	22.6	28.2	5.8	10.3	0	0	33.3	20.9	20.2		
% Hyphenated-American ²	FB 16.3	46.3	13.2	24.8	17.8	31.7	22.6	31.4	51.6	41.9	27.5	26.0	45.2	35.5	32.0		
	US 38.8	55.8	23.1	34.4	21.1	44.2	40.3	29.6	65.6	67.2	50.0	33.3	33.3	58.1	48.6		
% National Origin ³	FB 36.2	39.8	35.8	39.0	33.9	42.6	63.4	48.6	39.4	48.6	61.4	62.0	40.9	56.6	42.6		
	US 8.1	6.2	0	9.8	10.3	13.0	22.6	14.1	21.8	19.0	50.0	66.7	33.3	10.5	11.2		
% Racial/Panethnic or Mixed Identity ⁴	FB 47.5	10.2	45.9	34.3	39.0	22.8	6.5	11.4	8.4	7.3	9.8	8.0	11.8	6.6	22.1		
	US 49.1	9.5	26.9	23.0	33.1	16.9	14.0	28.2	6.9	3.4	0	0	0	10.5	20.0		
% "Hispanic" ⁵	FB 41.2	7.6	42.5	29.5	36.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.5		
	US 20.6	7.9	19.2	19.7	26.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.1		
% "Chicano" ⁶	FB 3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4		
	US 24.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.4		
% "Black"	FB 0	0	0	0	0	8.9	3.2	5.7	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.6		
	US 0.4	0.1	0	0.8	0.8	14.3	9.7	15.5	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	1.5		
% Mixed Identity, Other	FB 2.7	2.5	3.5	4.8	3.0	13.9	3.2	5.7	7.9	7.3	9.8	8.0	11.8	6.6	5.6		
	US 3.5	1.5	7.7	2.5	5.8	2.6	4.8	12.7	6.2	3.4	0	0	0	10.5	4.0		
Total Sample	N = 757	1,227	344	227	478	178	155	106	818	371	155	53	96	162	5,127		

¹Responses to the open-ended survey question: "How do you identify, that is, what do you call yourself?" See text for analysis.

²For example, "Mexican-American," "Cuban-American," "Filipino-American," "Hmong-American," etc.

³For example, "Mexican," "Cuban," "Filipino." The Hmong are an ethnic minority group from Laos who identified as Hmong, not as Laotian; they are here distinguished from the Lao (the ethnic majority group from Laos). Similar distinctions, though not reflected in the table, apply to ethnic Chinese from Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

⁴For example, "Hispanic," "Chicano," "Latino," "Black." Only 11 respondents (0.2%) identified as "Asian" or "Asian-American," they are here included under "Mixed, Other."

⁵A total of 681 respondents indicated a "Hispanic" ethnic identity, while only 28 (18 of Mexican origin) chose "Latino." The latter are here included under "Hispanic."

⁶The 123 respondents choosing "Chicano" were all Mexican-origin youth in San Diego. They differ significantly from those choosing "Latino," "Hispanic," or other identities.

identify by their own national origin, but that proportion drops sharply to 11 percent among the U.S. born. By contrast, hyphenated-American identities increase from 32 percent among the foreign born to a prevailing 49 percent of the U.S.-born second generation. Assimilative "American" self-identifications jump sharply from a miniscule 3 percent among the foreign born to over 20 percent among the U.S. born – double the proportion of the U.S. born who still identify in terms of their parents' nationalities. These findings are suggestive of a significant assimilative trend in ethnic self-identification from one generation to the next. The most assimilative groups in this regard appear to be the Latin Americans, with the very notable exception of Mexicans. Among the U.S. born, less than 4 percent of Mexican-descent youth identified as American (the lowest proportion of any group), in sharp contrast to 29 percent of the Cubans, 32 percent of the Colombians, and even higher proportions of the Nicaraguans and other Latin Americans. Asian-origin groups, especially the Vietnamese and Filipinos, are the most likely to opt for additive or hyphenated ethnic identities, as are the Cubans. Jamaicans are most likely to sustain a national-origin identity into the second generation, although even among them the percentage so identifying drops from 63 percent among those born in Jamaica to 23 percent among those born in the United States.

At the same time, a substantial proportion of the sample – about one fifth of the foreign born and an equal proportion of the U.S. born – opt for racial or panethnic modes of self-definition, but again there are significant variations within as well as between national-origin and regional-origin groups. Among the 1,655 Asian-origin youth surveyed, only 11 chose the panethnic labels Asian or Asian American; at least among these Asian-origin adolescents, Asian panethnicity is a moot issue (*cf.*, Espiritu, 1992). By contrast, of the 3,033 youth of Spanish-speaking Latin American origins, 631 (21%) identified as Hispanic, and another 28 (0.9%) as Latino. The Hispanic identity label appears to be tied to Spanish language use among the less sizable and more recently arrived Latin American immigrant groups and to decline very rapidly (as does Spanish language use) from the immigrant 1.5 generation to the nonimmigrant second generation. It remains, however, a significant label for all Latin American nationalities except the Cubans. Among the Cubans, who form a numerical majority in the Miami area, racial or panethnic forms of self-definition are by far the least common of all those groups. Among the 757 Mexican-origin youth, a very substantial number (123) identified as Chicano, virtually all of them U.S. born and all of them in California; in fact, a quarter of all Mexican-descent second-generation students self-defined as Chicano, a historical and problematic identity unique to that group which adds to the complexity of Mexican ethnic identities in the U.S. context (*see* Hurtado, *et al.*, 1994; Matute-Bianchi, 1986, 1991; Sánchez, 1993; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-

Orozco, 1995). Finally, a Black or Black American racial identity is observable essentially only among the youth from the Afro-Caribbean: Haiti, Jamaica and the other West Indies. Here, however, the pattern is the reverse of that seen for Hispanic self-identification: that is, the choice of a Black identity significantly increases for all of these groups among the U.S. born, although it is chosen by a relatively small minority and it is particularly rare among the Jamaicans. Of the 439 youths from the Afro-Caribbean in our sample, only 10 percent identified as Black. Still, among the U.S. born, more Haitian-origin and other West Indian youths already identify as Black than they do as Haitian or West Indian. This is a pattern that appears likely to expand over time and that may reflect processes of identificational assimilation with native minority peer groups in inner city areas (*cf.* Woldemikael, 1989).

Characteristics of Children of Immigrants by National Origin Groups

Table 3 sketches a broad psychosocial portrait of all of the major national-origin groups. These data make clear, first of all, the distinct patterns of geographic concentration of these groups, and their basic demographic characteristics. All of the groups from the Afro-Caribbean without exception differ from the others in their disproportionately high number of females in the sample (*cf.* Foner, 1987). The Nicaraguans and the Indochinese are the most recent arrivals, the majority coming during the 1980s, and few of the teenagers are yet U.S. born. (The relatively small number of U.S. born Vietnamese are children of the elite first wave of 1975 refugees.) The Cubans, on the other hand, have been here the longest, and over 70 percent of them were born in the United States – a higher proportion by far than any other. The large size of the Cuban sample (1,227) accurately reflects their preponderance in Dade County schools; indeed, the Cubans were the only ethnic group in the sample who constituted a majority of the population in their community.

There are wide differences in socioeconomic status among them. Levels of parental education are lowest for the Mexicans, the Haitians, and the Indochinese, especially the Laotians and the Cambodians; the Indochinese by far have the highest proportions of parents who are not in the labor force, a reflection of the fact that they exhibit the highest rates of poverty and welfare dependency in the United States (Rumbaut, 1994). The Filipinos and the Other Asians (mainly Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Indians) show the highest proportions of college graduates among mothers and fathers, and their families are much more likely to own rather than rent their homes. Reflecting their families' lower class status, Mexican and Indochinese respondents (especially the Cambodian, Hmong, and Lao

youths, then the Vietnamese) were by far the most likely to be attending inner city schools in San Diego, followed by Haitian students in the Miami area. The Filipinos, Jamaicans and Colombians were the least likely to be exposed to schooling in inner city contexts, while a much higher proportion of the Cubans sampled were enrolled in private schools in Miami than any of the other national-origin groups.

Table 3 also presents information on patterns of English and foreign language use and proficiency. With the obvious exception of immigrants from the English-speaking Caribbean, and a nontrivial number of Filipinos and Other Asians, very few of the respondents spoke English only (7.3% of the total sample). However, nearly three-fourths of the total sample preferred English, including substantial majorities in every group and nearly nine out of ten Filipinos; the single exception are the Mexicans, who are the most loyal to their mother tongue, although even among them 45 percent preferred English. More than one-third speak English only with their parents, although, interestingly, a smaller proportion speak English only with their close friends (who in most cases are also children of immigrants). The Hmong are perhaps the most dramatic opposite example: virtually no Hmong parent speaks in English with their children and the families are the most linguistically isolated, according to 1990 census data; but over one-third of the Hmong children report speaking English only with their friends. The Laotians and the Cambodians also have the lowest scores in both the four-item English language proficiency index and in the Stanford reading achievement test scores. (The Stanford standardized test data in Table 3 reflect national percentiles.) All of the Latin American groups have higher scores in the four-item foreign language proficiency index (Spanish) than any others, with the Mexicans scoring highest in their self-reported Spanish ability.

Various indicators of educational attainment and aspirations are provided in Table 3. The other Asians show a level of ability in the Stanford math achievement test that is well above national norms, followed by the Vietnamese, Filipinos, Cubans, and Colombians; the Hmong, Mexicans, and Cambodians are well below national math norms, followed by the Lao and the Haitians. The student rankings in math test scores generally reflect the socioeconomic status of their parents. The association between social class and educational attainment outcomes does not similarly extend, however, to academic grade point averages (GPAs). For example, despite their poor performance on achievement tests, the Hmong had earned the highest academic GPAs of all the groups except for the high-achieving Vietnamese and other Asians. One measure of effort in Table 3 provides a main reason: the Hmong devote by far more hours per day to homework than any other group. In general, Asian-origin students put in the most homework time and Latin American students the least, with those from the

TABLE 3
SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH FLORIDA, 1992, BY NATIONAL ORIGIN OF PARENTS*

Social Characteristics	N =	Latin American and Caribbean										Asia					Total (5,127)
		Mexico (757)	Cuba (1,227)	Nicaragua (944)	Latin America (478)		Haiti (178)	Jamaica (155)	West Indies (106)	Philippines (818)	Vietnam (371)	Laos			Cambodia (96)	Other Asia (162)	
					Colombia (227)	Central America (251)						Lao (155)	Hmong (53)	Laos (162)			
Location																	
% San Diego County		96.3	0.2	1.2	1.8	11.9	0.6	5.8	8.5	98.7	97.8	99.4	100.0	99.0	72.2	46.9	
% Dade County		3.2	97.5	97.7	88.1	75.7	80.9	41.9	61.3	1.0	1.3	0.6	0	1.0	19.1	47.6	
% Broward County		0.5	2.4	1.2	10.1	12.3	18.5	52.3	30.2	0.4	0.8	0	0	0	8.6	5.6	
Gender and Age																	
% Males		51.6	52.6	48.6	48.0	44.8	37.6	36.1	33.0	49.8	52.3	48.4	50.9	43.7	50.0	49.0	
Age (years)		14.2	14.1	14.4	14.2	14.4	14.4	14.2	14.2	14.1	14.3	14.6	14.1	14.5	14.1	14.2	
Nativity and Citizenship																	
% U.S.-Born		60.2	71.1	7.6	53.7	50.6	43.3	40.0	67.0	55.0	15.6	1.3	5.7	3.1	53.1	49.4	
% U.S. citizen		69.2	77.8	27.0	63.0	66.9	53.9	54.8	81.1	78.0	34.5	17.4	9.4	11.5	66.0	62.8	
% Less than 10 years in U.S.		28.4	9.0	57.9	26.9	30.2	28.8	36.1	20.7	28.7	42.4	44.5	33.9	48.0	27.7	27.8	
% Both parents co-nationals		73.1	76.3	85.8	63.4	75.3	82.0	76.8	49.1	76.3	89.5	94.8	90.6	80.2	66.7	76.9	
% One parent is U.S.-born		17.3	10.1	1.5	11.9	19.0	5.6	11.6	23.6	19.6	3.2	0.6	0	0	27.2	12.6	
Socioeconomic Status																	
% Father is college graduate		7.3	25.4	38.4	24.2	28.0	10.1	23.9	17.9	29.0	15.1	10.3	1.9	5.2	42.0	22.3	
% Mother is college graduate		4.2	20.9	28.5	19.4	22.0	11.2	30.3	23.6	38.1	8.6	3.9	0	4.2	25.9	20.0	
% Father not in labor force		21.1	17.0	22.7	19.4	20.5	30.3	27.1	30.2	17.4	45.6	67.1	75.5	78.1	13.0	24.7	
% Mother not in labor force		44.8	29.7	29.4	26.9	27.2	27.5	18.1	19.8	13.9	59.6	74.2	88.7	87.5	37.0	33.8	
% Own home		32.5	67.2	33.4	53.3	57.3	64.6	63.9	58.5	73.7	34.5	24.5	1.9	11.5	71.0	53.7	
Language																	
% speak English only		2.4	0.7	0.6	1.3	4.2	4.5	47.1	56.6	18.0	1.6	0	0	0	19.1	7.3	
% prefer English		45.2	82.3	74.4	70.5	73.6	80.9	71.0	85.9	88.3	51.5	52.3	64.2	65.6	75.3	71.7	
% speak English with parents		19.3	36.8	11.1	19.8	33.1	44.4	74.8	88.7	84.4	9.7	7.7	1.9	12.5	53.1	38.3	
% speak English with friends		12.8	17.4	15.4	25.6	26.8	29.2	59.4	76.4	62.8	29.4	15.5	34.0	13.5	69.1	30.5	
English Proficiency Index (1-4)		3.47	3.85	3.69	3.82	3.79	3.80	3.91	3.93	3.84	3.35	3.27	3.13	3.37	3.70	3.70	
Foreign Language Index (1-4)		3.24	3.06	3.15	3.10	3.00	2.34	2.07	1.65	2.12	2.61	2.38	2.67	2.42	2.18	2.76	
Education																	
Stanford Reading test (percentile)		26.6	47.5	38.0	44.7	42.9	30.4	47.8	43.0	51.1	37.6	22.3	15.2	14.0	62.0	41.2	
Stanford Math test (percentile)		31.9	58.5	55.4	58.4	55.3	45.0	55.5	49.8	59.1	60.4	42.1	29.7	35.7	74.3	52.9	
Grade point average (GPA)		2.24	2.28	2.32	2.33	2.31	2.28	2.58	2.45	2.93	3.04	2.86	2.95	2.72	3.24	2.52	
Hours daily on homework (0-5)		1.16	1.21	1.28	1.24	1.21	1.82	1.90	1.46	1.87	2.00	1.84	2.32	1.73	1.96	1.48	
Hours-of-homework-to-TV ratio		0.88	0.81	0.82	0.89	0.87	0.88	1.06	0.87	1.02	1.31	1.24	1.53	1.29	1.29	0.96	
Educational aspirations (1-5)		3.90	4.42	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.44	4.51	4.41	4.40	4.18	3.70	3.52	3.93	4.51	4.29	

Family and Parents															
% Both natural parents at home	59.3	58.7	62.8	58.6	57.3	44.9	39.4	46.2	79.5	78.1	71.6	77.4	68.8	77.8	63.3
% Father absent from home	35.3	34.7	29.4	33.5	37.7	44.9	51.0	51.9	14.9	19.1	16.8	18.9	25.0	16.1	30.1
Family-household size	4.8	3.4	4.5	3.7	3.7	5.0	3.8	3.9	4.5	5.3	5.7	6.9	5.4	3.5	4.3
Familism values scale (1-4)	2.07	1.79	1.83	1.81	1.83	1.79	1.77	1.77	1.87	2.09	2.15	2.12	2.11	1.77	1.89
% Parents are main school help	24.0	36.4	29.1	29.1	33.3	23.0	38.1	37.7	27.4	13.2	7.1	1.9	6.3	30.9	28.0
% Embarrassed by parents	8.1	16.5	16.9	16.3	12.1	25.3	6.5	13.2	17.2	25.9	20.7	35.9	31.3	33.3	16.7
Parent-child conflict scale (1-4)	1.69	1.63	1.63	1.67	1.67	1.91	1.71	1.76	1.76	1.85	1.80	1.96	1.94	1.72	1.71
Ethnic Identity of Mother															
% Identify as "American"	20.2	24.1	15.7	18.1	33.5	16.3	26.5	45.3	20.8	15.6	5.8	17.0	10.4	24.7	21.8
% as Hyphenated-American	12.0	29.6	9.3	22.5	13.8	25.3	9.0	12.3	27.9	16.2	21.9	9.4	20.8	15.4	20.4
% National Origin Identity	58.3	43.4	65.1	55.1	41.6	55.1	57.4	35.8	47.8	59.8	67.1	69.8	64.6	55.6	51.7
% Racial/Panethnic/Mixed	9.5	2.9	11.9	4.4	11.0	3.4	7.1	6.6	3.6	8.3	5.2	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.1
Schools															
% In inner-city schools	61.0	20.0	23.8	8.4	23.0	36.0	8.4	24.5	5.5	48.5	66.5	83.0	91.7	18.5	29.5
% In bilingual private schools	0.1	14.9	1.2	3.1	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0
Discrimination and Views of U.S.															
% been discriminated against	64.9	38.1	51.2	45.3	48.7	62.7	74.2	61.9	63.5	67.2	72.1	55.8	59.6	56.4	55.1
Expects discrimination (1-4)	2.12	1.67	1.81	1.74	1.83	2.37	2.59	2.31	2.21	2.15	2.31	2.28	2.09	2.13	2.00
U.S. is best country (1-4)	2.65	3.03	2.57	2.50	2.70	2.11	2.04	2.31	2.81	2.90	2.91	2.89	2.77	2.86	2.75
American preference scale (1-4)	2.33	2.56	2.33	2.27	2.45	2.21	2.20	2.47	2.60	2.49	2.41	2.55	2.39	2.61	2.46
Psychological Status															
Self-esteem scale (1-4)	3.17	3.40	3.37	3.41	3.33	3.36	3.49	3.44	3.25	3.10	3.07	2.99	3.07	3.32	3.29
CES-D depression subscale (1-4)	1.68	1.60	1.68	1.66	1.66	1.75	1.70	1.68	1.68	1.69	1.59	1.65	1.66	1.56	1.66

*All the differences between national origin groups are significant at the .0001 level for all variables, except for the CES-D depression score which is significant at the .05 level. See text and Table 1 for description of items composing specific scales and their scoring.

Afro-Caribbean in between. The highest GPAs are found for students with the highest ratios of homework-to-television-watching hours (all the Asian-origin groups plus the Jamaicans). Significantly, over time and generations in the United States, reading achievement test scores go up but the number of hours spent on homework goes down, as do GPAs – a finding that confirms similar findings among immigrant students in California and elsewhere (Caplan *et al.*, 1991; Gibson, 1989; Olsen, 1988; Rumbaut, 1990, 1995; Rumbaut and Ima, 1988; Suárez-Orozco, 1989; Sung, 1987). Most of the national origins groups report very high educational aspirations, led by the Jamaicans and other Asians; the Laotians, Cambodians, and Mexicans, on the other hand, exhibit notably lower aspirations than all other groups.

Table 3 also presents data on family size and structure, and on the quality of parent-child relationships. There is a notable contrast between all Asian-origin groups and the rest of the sample in the higher proportion of families with both natural parents at home; the somewhat higher incidence of father absence among the Hmong and especially the Cambodians is due not to divorce but to the death of the father prior to arrival in the United States, a reflection of the extraordinarily harsh contexts of exit (Rumbaut, 1991). About one-half of all families from the Afro-Caribbean have no father present at home. The research literature has pointed to the high levels of familism – of a deeply ingrained sense of obligation and orientation to the family – among Mexican immigrants in particular (*e.g.*, see Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Vega, *et al.*, 1983). A high score in this measure of collectivistic obligations to the family contrasts with the pull of individualistic values in the American milieu. Our data here confirm that Mexican respondents exhibit significantly higher scores on the familism values scale than any other group, with one major exception: all of the Indochinese groups, who also have the largest family-households, score even higher on that scale. Yet the lack of parental resources among the Indochinese is underscored by the fact that their parents are least likely by far to be the main source of help to their children with their school work. At the same time, Indochinese children are the most likely by far to report feeling embarrassed by their parents (including 36% of the Hmong) and to exhibit the highest parent-child conflict scale scores, along with Haitian children. Cuban parents, along with English-speaking Jamaican and other West Indian parents, are the most likely to be the principal source of school-related help to their children. Cubans and Nicaraguans report the lowest levels of parent-child conflict as measured by our scale. Jamaican and Mexican youths are the least likely to feel embarrassed by their parents.

A crucial dimension of our exploratory study involves perceptions and experiences of racial-ethnic discrimination reported by our respondents. Substantial majorities of practically every group – including about three-fourths of the Jamaicans and two-thirds of the Mexicans, Haitians, Filipinos,

and Indochinese-reported having felt discriminated against and many also expected to be discriminated against no matter how much education they might earn. Cuban, Colombian, Nicaraguan, and other Latin Americans in Miami reported lower levels of prejudice and generally disagreed with the statement that people would discriminate against them regardless of educational merit. The Cubans and then the Indochinese – state-sponsored refugee groups who have been the recipients of substantial public assistance – reported the highest level of agreement with the statement that “There is no better country to live in than the United States.” Those groups, along with the Filipinos and other Asians, also scored highest on the American preferences scale (indicating preferences for “American ways”). Haitians and Jamaicans, at the other extreme, scored by far the lowest on those measures.

Finally, Table 3 presents the scores on the Rosenberg self-esteem scale and on the CES-D depression subscale for all of the nationality groups. Significantly, the Mexicans and especially the Indochinese showed the lowest global self-esteem scores, with the lowest score in the sample found for the Hmong. The highest self-esteem scores were found among the respondents from Jamaica and the other English-speaking West Indies, followed by Haiti, Cuba, and the other Latin American groups. However, the Haitians and the Jamaicans – the principal groups from the Afro-Caribbean, who reported the most experiences with and expectations of racial discrimination in the sample – also exhibited the highest depression scores. Self-esteem and depression are inversely related, but they are *not* simply two sides of the same psychological coin; this issue will be examined further below through multiple regression analyses of these two variables.

Characteristics of Children of Immigrants by Ethnic Identity

Table 4 presents data on the same set of variables as in Table 3, but broken down by the major types of ethnic identities reported by the respondents. Table 4 makes it quite clear that each identity type has a statistically significant and distinct social profile. Briefly, a few main points should be highlighted here and then examined more closely in the logistic regressions that follow.

While less than one-half the sample is in the Dade County (Miami) area, 82 percent of all respondents identifying as American were in Dade County (as were most phenotypically white respondents). Respondents self-identifying as American are much more likely to be U.S.-born males, with at least one U.S.-born parent who also (especially if it is the mother) self-identifies as American, living in smaller households, and higher social status families. These respondents are more linguistically assimilated, with high educational aspirations despite comparatively mediocre grades and lesser effort

TABLE 4
SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH FLORIDA, 1992, BY SELF-REPORTED ETHNIC IDENTITY*

Social Characteristics	N=	Ethnic Identity Types				Racial/Panethnic or Mixed Identity Types				Total Sample (5,127)								
		"American" (992)		Hyphenated- American (2,062)		National Origin (1,391)		Racial/ Panethnic or Mixed Identity (1,082)			"Hispanic" (659)		"Chicano" (123)		"Black" (53)		Mixed/Other (247)	
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Location																		
% San Diego County	12.8	49.4	54.9	50.5	37.6	100.0	26.4	65.2	46.9									
% Dade County	82.3	45.4	37.6	45.5	58.1	0	67.9	29.6	47.6									
% Broward County	4.9	5.6	7.5	4.1	4.2	0	5.7	5.3	5.6									
Gender and Age																		
% Males	63.0	47.1	47.1	47.2	43.1	60.2	37.7	33.9	49.0									
Age (years)	14.1	14.2	14.3	14.3	14.4	14.1	14.3	14.4	14.2									
Nativity and Citizenship																		
% U.S.-Born	86.2	59.6	20.4	46.9	38.9	91.1	69.8	40.9	49.4									
% U.S. citizen	91.1	74.0	36.3	60.0	52.5	95.9	81.1	57.5	62.8									
% Less than 10 years in U.S.	8.9	19.8	43.3	33.7	40.6	13.8	13.2	29.6	27.8									
% Both parents nonnationals	53.7	76.8	90.2	72.6	77.7	76.4	56.6	60.3	76.9									
% One parent is U.S.-born	25.8	14.6	3.5	13.3	8.5	16.3	28.3	21.5	12.6									
Socioeconomic Status																		
% Father is college graduate	30.6	23.3	22.9	15.3	17.0	4.1	18.9	15.8	22.3									
% Mother is college graduate	25.7	22.5	19.4	12.7	12.6	3.3	17.0	16.6	20.0									
% Father not in labor force	17.9	23.4	28.0	26.8	23.2	22.8	30.2	37.7	24.7									
% Mother not in labor force	28.7	30.0	39.6	36.6	33.2	51.2	28.3	40.1	33.8									
% Own home	67.9	61.7	46.2	40.2	38.4	29.3	47.2	49.0	53.7									
Language																		
% speak English only	10.6	8.8	5.8	4.8	0.3	2.4	28.3	13.0	7.3									
% prefer English	89.9	78.4	60.6	63.4	61.6	43.9	88.7	72.5	71.7									
% speak English with parents	55.2	47.1	28.2	25.2	16.7	14.6	75.5	44.5	38.3									
% speak English with friends	42.1	34.1	26.4	22.6	13.1	8.9	67.9	42.9	30.5									
English Proficiency Index (1-4)																		
Foreign Language Index (1-4)	3.87	3.79	3.58	3.60	3.58	3.56	3.90	3.62	3.70									
	2.61	2.62	2.85	2.99	3.23	3.14	1.98	2.47	2.76									
Education																		
Stanford Reading test (percentile)	49.2	44.3	38.9	34.1	34.8	22.0	35.9	38.3	41.2									
Stanford Math test (percentile)	60.8	55.4	52.8	44.0	45.9	27.8	47.0	47.1	52.9									
Grade point average (GPA)	2.99	2.61	2.63	2.29	2.30	1.93	2.23	2.49	2.52									
Hours daily on homework (0-5)	1.37	1.59	1.56	1.23	1.19	0.89	1.64	1.39	1.48									
Hours-of-homework-to-TV ratio	0.89	0.96	1.05	0.85	0.84	0.66	0.73	0.99	0.96									
Educational aspirations (1-5)	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.12	4.20	3.63	4.36	4.09	4.29									

Family and Parents										
% Both natural parents at home	61.5	66.4	66.2	54.8	55.7	59.4	41.5	53.0	63.3	
% Father absent from home	31.9	28.0	26.0	38.4	38.2	34.2	50.9	38.1	30.1	
Family-household size	3.6	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.3	
Family values scale (1-4)	1.81	1.84	1.95	1.95	1.93	2.10	1.82	1.98	1.89	
% Parents are main school help	35.1	31.7	22.7	23.8	24.9	15.4	28.3	24.3	28.0	
% Embarrassed by parents	20.6	17.2	17.9	12.3	9.7	9.8	11.3	20.7	16.7	
Parent-child conflict scale (1-4)	1.68	1.70	1.75	1.72	1.67	1.85	1.71	1.78	1.71	
Ethnic Identity of Mother										
% Identify as "American"	50.2	21.7	9.2	22.6	22.0	10.6	41.5	26.3	21.8	
% as Hyphenated-American	23.3	33.1	5.9	13.3	12.4	12.2	17.0	15.4	20.4	
% National Origin Identity	22.6	41.2	80.9	50.3	52.0	64.2	30.2	42.9	51.7	
% Racial/Panethnic/Mixed	3.9	4.0	4.0	13.7	13.5	13.0	11.3	15.4	4.1	
Schools										
% in inner-city schools	19.9	24.3	31.1	42.5	42.8	66.7	43.4	29.6	29.5	
% in bilingual private schools	11.5	5.6	0.9	0.8	1.2	0	0	0.4	4.0	
Discrimination and Views of U.S.										
% been discriminated against	37.9	54.0	62.2	57.5	54.3	71.5	63.5	57.9	55.1	
Expects discrimination (1-4)	1.75	1.98	2.13	2.00	1.89	2.27	2.49	2.06	2.00	
U.S. is best country (1-4)	3.08	2.86	2.55	2.62	2.60	2.72	2.51	2.67	2.75	
American preference scale (1-4)	2.78	2.53	2.27	2.38	2.32	2.34	2.58	2.49	2.46	
Psychological Status										
Self-esteem scale (1-4)	3.41	3.31	3.23	3.27	3.28	3.15	3.45	3.25	3.29	
CES-D depression subscale (1-4)	1.59	1.64	1.69	1.68	1.69	1.63	1.75	1.67	1.66	

* All differences between ethnic identity groups are significant beyond the .0001 level for all variables, except for the CES-D depression subscale score and the parent-child conflict scale which are significant at the .01 level. See text and Table 1 for description of items composing specific scales, and their scoring.

invested in homework (but more in leisure time activities, such as television), least likely to be attending schools in the inner city or to have experienced discrimination, most likely to view the United States as the best country in which to live, to endorse individualistic values (lowest familism scores), and to have a robust psychosocial profile (higher self-esteem, lower depression). This general picture, in fact, describes rather well the hypothesized expectation of one form of assimilation to one sector of American society, the white middle-class mainstream (*cf.* Alba, 1990; Gans, 1992; Portes and Zhou, 1993).

Indeed, with most of the variables listed in Table 4, there appears to be a linear progression as one moves along the continuum from a national origin identity to hyphenated-American to American. The strong impression that these data give at this bivariate level of analysis is that of a generational movement – increasingly distant from the original immigration experience and its ethos – toward greater identificational assimilation or identificational Americanization accompanied by upward socioeconomic mobility, increasing acculturation, decreasing discrimination, and greater psychological well-being. The binational hyphenated-American identity, in Table 4, appears as a transitional intergenerational identity. It can be seen as a middle position between the ancestral and the assimilative national identities, although perhaps more difficult to maintain – and perhaps even as inherently unstable as bilingualism and other additive adaptations have proven to be in American life (*cf.* Child, 1943:67; Cropley, 1983:90; Woldemikael, 1989:105ff). That remains to be seen empirically, however, and hinges on a variety of factors – not the least on future patterns of intermarriage among these cohorts – as the process unfolds over the course of the next generation. The sustained development of vibrant, institutionally complete immigrant communities as in Cuban Miami may yet be able to provide fertile ground for the long-run maintenance of such syncretic adaptations. But while it is well to keep in mind that only 592 respondents out of 5,127 (11%) identified as American, in comparison with the 2,062 (40%) who crafted an additive or hyphenated-American identity, and the 1,391 (27%) who remained loyal to a national-origin identity, the evidence pointing to potentially large-scale generational shifts cannot be ignored.

On the other hand, the profile shown in Table 4 for the dissimilative racial and panethnic identities reported by another 1,082 respondents (21%) does not at all fit the seemingly linear movement toward identificational assimilation into the mainstream. The category absorbs a variety of distinct racial-ethnic minority group self-identifications (Chicano, Black, Hispanic) that are shaped by and ultimately must be examined in their own concrete social and historical contexts. Chicano and Black emerge in these data as chiefly U.S. born second-generation reactive ethnic identities (*cf.* Portes and Rumbaut, 1990:131-139), while Hispanic appears as a more inclusive, panethnic alternative for foreign born (1.5 generation) youths of smaller

national-origin groups from the Spanish-speaking Americas (such as Nicaraguans and Colombians). Discrimination is experienced and expected to a greater extent by respondents identifying as Chicano and Black than by any other, as Table 4 shows, while that is not the case for those identifying as Hispanic (or other mixed identities).

The everyday school contexts and associated peer subcultures of students who identify in racial or panethnic terms, however, stand in sharp contrast to those of youths who select ancestral, additive, or assimilative identities. A much greater proportion of Chicano-identified youths (67%) are concentrated in inner city schools than of any other identity type, and they are followed by youths self-identifying as Black and Hispanic (43% of whom attend inner city schools). The acquisition of such counteridentities among these adolescents in inner-city neighborhoods may thus reflect processes of differential association within their relevant social contexts, including the development of oppositional or adversarial subcultures and outlooks, and of assimilation into the urban underclass (Fordham and Ogbu, 1987; Matute-Bianchi, 1986, 1991; McLeod, 1987; Ogbu, 1974, 1987, 1991; Portes and Zhou, 1993).

Predictors of Ethnic Identities: An Odds Ratio Analysis

Table 5 presents the results of maximum-likelihood logistic regressions predicting the odds of selecting each of the four main types of ethnic self-identification. Several sets of predictor variables – measuring gender, nativity and citizenship, aspects of relationships with parents and ethnic socialization, language and acculturation, and experiences/expectations of discrimination – are entered to test the hypothesized effects on ethnic identity choices. A measure of socioeconomic status is provided by a dummy variable for parents who work in high-status professions. (Parents' education and home ownership are not included in Table 5 but had no significant effects in earlier runs.) Dummy variables for all of the major national-origin groups are also included in the equations (Cubans serve as the comparison group), as well as for San Diego and Broward County locations (Dade County serves as the comparison group), and for inner city and private school contexts. Of course, especially with measures of subjective perceptions and preferences, ethnic self-identification may have the effect of influencing as well as being influenced by them; with cross-sectional data it is not possible to disentangle such reciprocal effects unambiguously. For our purposes here, the multivariate results presented in Table 5 should be construed not as direct causal influences but as relationships between ethnic identity and selected factors.

A first intriguing finding is that gender makes a significant difference in the choice of most forms of ethnic self-identification. Males are more likely

TABLE 5
PREDICTORS AND ODDS OF SELECTING FOUR TYPES OF ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS:
RESULTS OF MAXIMUM-LIKELIHOOD LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

Predictor Variables	"American"			Hyphenated-American			National-Origin			Racial/Panethnic/Mixed		
	B	Sig.	Odds	B	Sig.	Odds	B	Sig.	Odds	B	Sig.	Odds
Gender, Nativity, and Citizenship Gender (1= male; 0=female)	0.54	a	1.71	-0.26	a	0.77	0.20	c	1.22	-0.11	NS	
U.S.-born	2.01	a	7.48	0.61	a	1.84	-1.56	a	0.21	0.07	NS	
Naturalized U.S. citizen	0.57	c	1.77	0.44	a	1.56	-0.46	a	0.63	0.08	NS	
Parents and Ethnic Socialization												
Both parents conational	-0.84	a	0.43	0.33	b	1.39	0.58	a	1.79	-0.42	b	0.66
One parent U.S.-born	-0.49	b	0.61	0.25	c	1.29	0.18	NS		-0.28	NS	
Mother identifies as												
"American"	0.68	a	1.97	0.05	NS		-0.26	c	0.77	0.23	b	1.26
Hyphenated-American	0.26	NS		0.66	a	1.93	-0.71	a	0.49		NI	
Nationality of origin	-0.11	NS		-0.11	NS		0.56	b	1.74	0.10	NS	
Racial/panethnic minority	0.39	NS		-0.17	NS		-0.71	b	0.49	0.87	a	2.39
Mixed or other ethnic identity		NI			NI			NI		0.64	a	1.90
Parents are professionals	0.04	NS		-0.19	b	0.83	0.19	b	1.21	-0.06	NS	
Parents are main homework help	-0.24	c	0.79	0.26	b	1.29	-0.00	NS		-0.32	b	0.73
Embarrassed by parents	0.38	b	1.46	0.01	NS		0.00	NS		-0.18	NS	
Language and Acculturation												
Speaks English with friends	0.41	b	1.50	-0.19	c	0.83	-0.06	NS		0.00	NS	
Prefers English	0.52	b	1.68	0.13	NS		-0.28	b	0.76	0.08	NS	
English Proficiency Index (1-4)	-0.16	NS		0.37	a	1.45	-0.13	NS		-0.16	NS	
Foreign Language Index (1-4)	-0.06	NS		-0.11	b	0.89	0.09	c	1.10	0.02	NS	
American preference scale (1-4)	0.66	a	1.94	0.03	NS		-0.45	a	0.64	-0.04	NS	
Discrimination												
Been discriminated against	-0.37	b	0.69	-0.04	NS		0.12	NS		0.12	NS	
Expects discrimination (1-4)	-0.03	NS		-0.04	NS		0.08	c	1.09	-0.00	NS	
Location												
In inner-city schools	0.05	NS		-0.06	NS		-0.31	b	0.74	0.36	a	1.43
In private schools	0.17	NS		0.04	NS		-0.70	c	0.50	-0.94	b	0.39
In San Diego County	-1.60	a	0.20	-0.52	b	0.59	0.20	NS		1.24	a	3.46
In Broward County	-0.94	b	0.39	0.33	c	1.39	0.43	c	1.54	-0.23	NS	
In Dade County		NI			NI			NI			NI	

to identify in unhyphenated terms as American or by national origin, whereas females are more likely to choose an additive binational (hyphenated) identity label. Moreover, in separate analyses of different types of racial/panethnic identities among the Latin American-origin youths in our sample, females were significantly more likely to choose a Hispanic identity; among Mexican-origin youths, males were much more likely to identify as Chicano. In a review of 70 empirical studies in the relevant research literature, Phinney (1990) found only fragmentary results that allow no firm conclusions about gender differences in ethnic identity. However, in a recent study of the intersection of gender, race, and ethnicity among adolescent children of black Caribbean immigrants in New York, Waters (forthcoming) reports that gender shapes the meanings attached to different types of ethnic self-identity, including an American identity. She suggests that the boundaries between different types of identity are more fluid and permeable for girls than for boys and that the task of developing a racial and ethnic identity is bound up with issues of gender identity as well.

Nativity (the word share with “nation” and “nation” a common root, meaning “birth”) is very closely linked to identity. Indeed, the evidence of generational discontinuities in the self-identity profiles of U.S.-born vs. foreign-born children of immigrants – and of their varying attachment to the homeland of their parents – is a finding that merits underscoring in our analysis. Table 5 shows that being born in the United States (*i.e.*, second generation rather than 1.5 generation status) is by far the strongest predictor of identifying as American (odds or probability ratio of 7.48 to 1). It is a significant positive predictor of selecting a hyphenated-American label (odds-ratio of 1.84 to 1). In addition, U.S. birth is the strongest negative predictor of identifying by national origin (odds of 1 in 5), controlling for all other variables in the equations.

Becoming a naturalized U.S. citizen (which for legal immigrants requires a minimum waiting period of five years after arrival or admission to permanent residency) adds moderately to this pattern. Citizenship matters, over and above nativity. It may be interpreted here as signaling a stake in the society as a full-fledged member, legally as well as subjectively, with an accompanying shift in one’s frame of reference. Indeed, these variables – nativity and citizenship – have far stronger effects on ethnic self-identification than our measure of years in the United States, suggesting that it is not so much the length of time in the country, but rather the nature of one’s sociopolitical membership status that is more determinative of the psychology of identity.

The parents’ own nativity itself exerts a strong influence in the ethnic socialization of the child. Having both parents born in the same nation significantly boosts the odds that the child will identify with the parents’ nationality and, more moderately, the odds of keeping part of it by identi-

fyng binationally. It also significantly decreases the odds of self-defining assimilatively as an unhyphenated American. Having one parent born in the United States and the other foreign born significantly increases the probability that the children will adopt a strategy of choosing a binational rather than an unhyphenated American identity. An even stronger and very clearcut pattern evident in Table 5 is the influence of the mother's own ethnic identity. Respondents who perceive their mother identifying herself as American increase their odds of identifying in the same manner – and, by roughly similar 2-to-1 odds, they increase their chances of identifying as a hyphenated-American, by national origin, or of adopting a racial or panethnic minority label if they believe their mother self-identifies in that way as well.⁵ The effect of the mother's perceived identity was stronger than the father's, pointing to the possibly stronger effect of mothers in ethnic (and other) socialization processes, along with the actual absence of fathers in a substantial number of these families.

Immigrant parents who are higher-status professionals are significantly more likely to influence their children's selection of a national origin identity, while reducing the odds of choosing a hyphenated-American identity. In such upper middle-class immigrant families the child may have more reason to associate social honor with and to feel pride in the national identity of the parents. As Rosenberg has observed (1979:13), the child's sense of self-worth is in part contingent on the prestige of the elements of social identity. In this instance, the net result suggests a linear extension and reaffirmation of the cultural past rather than an emergent reaction to the American present. This finding is in accord with theoretical expectations that identity shifts tend to be from lower to higher status groups, all other things being equal (Yinger, 1981; *see* Waters, this volume, for a related analysis of the relationship of status and identity). In addition, parents who are the main source of help or social support with their children's school work – and hence perhaps more involved, interested, and influential in other aspects of the children's lives, including their ethnic socialization – significantly reduce the odds that their children will pick up either an American self-identity or a racial/panethnic label. On the other hand, respondents who report feeling embarrassed by – and hence not proud of – their parents are much more likely to identify assimilatively as American.⁶ In short, the above set of variables involving parental resources and the quality of parent-child relationships underscore the fundamental influence of the family as a crucible of ethnic socialization processes in this diverse sample of children of immigrants (*cf.* Alba, 1990; Rumbaut and Rumbaut, 1976).

Language is also closely, and affectively, connected to the formation and maintenance of ethnic identity – both within and without the family (see Cropley, 1983; Phinney, 1990, 1991; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco,

1995). Respondents who prefer English and who speak only English with their close friends are significantly more likely to identify as American, and less likely to self-define by national origin. Conversely, youths who do not prefer English and who report greater fluency in their parents' native languages are most apt to identify by national origin. Indeed, acquiring English may entail abandoning not only a mother tongue but also a personal identity. In the middle, are the bilingual children who choose additive or hyphenated-American identities. The likelihood of selecting that type of identity is associated with both a greater level of English proficiency and having close friends (also children of immigrants) with whom they do not speak only in English. Thus, these identity choices reflect not only linguistic acculturation patterns but also how and which languages are used with close friends in interpersonally relevant social contexts. Net of language preferences, another measure of acculturation in our data set was also significantly associated with ethnic self-identity – those youths with higher scores in the American preferences scale (*i.e.*, who prefer American ways) are more apt to identify themselves as unhyphenated Americans; youths with lower scores are apt to self-identify by ancestral origin.

What are the effects of discrimination on ethnic self-identity among these youths? As Table 5 shows, respondents who have experienced discrimination are significantly less likely to identify as American. Respondents who expect that people will discriminate against them no matter the level of education they may achieve are also more likely to maintain a national-origin identity. Such experiences/perceptions of exclusion and rejection on racial-ethnic grounds – on ascribed rather than achieved statuses – clearly undercut the prospect of identificational assimilation into the mainstream. On the other hand, among the various racial and panethnic identity types, perceptions of discrimination were significantly associated only with the selection of a Chicano self-identity. Location – that is, the social contexts of school and community in which these youths are growing up – also counts a great deal, as Table 5 shows. Attending inner city schools where most students are racial-ethnic minorities significantly increases the odds of developing a racial or panethnic identity (particularly for youths reporting a Black self-identity) while decreasing the odds of identifying ancestrally by national origin. Precisely the opposite effect is seen for those attending the two upper middle-class private schools. These results provide empirical support for a segmented assimilation perspective (Portes and Zhou, 1993), here applied to the process of ethnic self-definition. In addition, compared to the Miami area, respondents in San Diego are much less likely to identify

⁵See Alba (1990:187–194) for related results on the effects of parents' ethnic identity status.

⁶This familiar latter result reflects Child's (1943) depiction of the "rebel" reaction to intergenerational conflicts among second-generation Italian Americans.

as American with or without a hyphen, but much more likely to identify in racial or panethnic minority terms. Ironically, the Miami area, despite its extraordinarily high proportion of immigrants, turns out to be more conducive to the development of assimilative mainstream identities among the teenage respondents in our sample than expected.

Finally, with all other predictor variables controlled in these equations, Table 5 examines the influence of national origins on the mode of ethnic self-identification. This is an important issue, since if ethnic identification was determined by acculturation, discrimination, and related social processes, we would expect to find few if any nationality effects. To a large extent this is the case for the two unhyphenated national identities (*i.e.*, American and national origin). Becoming American in particular is largely accounted for by predictor variables already discussed above; almost all nationalities wash out of that analysis, with the notable exceptions of Mexicans and Filipinos (who are less likely to call themselves mainstream Americans). The Jamaicans emerge here as the group most likely to identify in national-origin terms.

However, the effects of particular nationalities are very pronounced in the selection of additive/hyphenated and racial/panethnic identities. Two broad patterns emerge here. First, compared to Cubans in Miami (the reference group in these analyses), the Asian-origin groups, especially the Vietnamese and Filipinos, are far more likely to develop additive binational identities; all of the Latin American and Afro-Caribbean groups, except for the Mexicans, are significantly less likely to do so. On the other hand, coming from any of the Asian-origin nations greatly decreases the odds of self-defining in racial or panethnic minority terms; coming from certain Latin American countries, as well as Haiti and the other West Indies groups, significantly increases those odds. Why this is so poses intriguing theoretical and policy questions. National origin indicators are in effect proxies for the complex and diverse histories, social structures and cultures of these immigrant communities, which, while not reducible to the variables employed in this study, nonetheless significantly shape the self-definitions of their youth. To delve into these issues will require extensive comparative-historical and ethnographic research.

Predictors of Hispanic and Chicano Ethnic Identities

Separate logistic regressions (not shown in Table 5) were run for selected subsamples to explore the association of variables with specific types of racial/panethnic self-identities, such as Hispanic and Chicano. These results may be briefly summarized here. For an analysis of the odds of selecting a Hispanic identity, we examined the subsample of 3,033 respondents of Latin American origins. The results show that a Hispanic self-identification

is significantly more likely to be made by females: who are foreign-born, living in the U.S. less than 10 years, whose English is poor but whose Spanish is very good, and who speak in Spanish with their parents and close friends; who are not embarrassed by their parents; and whose parents are not conationals and themselves identify in panethnic terms or as a mixed identity. The smaller-size Latin-origin groups – the Nicaraguans, Colombians, and other Latin Americans (but not Cubans or Mexicans) – are shown to be much more likely to select Hispanic as an ethnic identity.

For an analysis of the odds of selecting a Chicano identity, we focused separately on the subsample of 729 respondents of Mexican origin in San Diego. The results show that a Chicano self-identification is significantly more likely to be made by males, who are U.S. born (the odds are huge, 37 to 1) and whose close friends are also U.S.-born. They are significantly more likely to feel that they have been discriminated against. Moreover, among these 729 teenagers, the lower their academic grade point averages (GPAs) and the lower their educational and occupational aspirations, the greater the odds of their identifying as Chicano. This significant association of flattened aspirations and low educational attainment with a Chicano ethnic identity is not found for any other type of ethnic self-identification in our data set. It supports related findings reported in the literature that link a Chicano self-definition among U.S.-born high school youth with the development of adversarial modes of reaction. These include defensive non-learning strategies in the classroom, anticipation of bleak adult futures, rejection of behaviors defined as acting white, and rejection of school and of teachers, in contrast to the more optimistic outlook and valuation of schooling reported among Mexico-born immigrant youth (De Vos and Suárez-Orozco, 1990; Matute-Bianchi, 1986, 1991; Suárez-Orozco, 1991, 1995; Vigil, 1988).

Predictors of Self-Esteem and Depressive Symptoms

Table 6 shifts our focus to a multiple regression analysis of two key psychological dependent variables: self-esteem (the 10-item Rosenberg scale) and depressive symptoms (CES-D subscale). Both equations examine the effects of several sets of variables hypothesized to influence those cognitive and affective dimensions of psychosocial adaptation: gender, age, and nativity; family socioeconomic status and parent-child relations; English and foreign language proficiency; school attainment; experiences and expectations of discrimination; and ethnic identity and national origins. In both equations, by far the strongest predictor variable associated with lower self-esteem (beta = $-.267$) and higher depression (beta = $.281$) was our measure of parent-child conflict. For that reason, given the importance of such inter-generational conflict in psychosocial adaptation processes among children

of immigrants, the results of a multiple regression analysis to identify the principal correlates of parent-child conflict are presented separately in Table 7.

Gender emerges here as the next strongest predictor of psychological well-being. Significantly lower self-esteem, and especially higher levels of depressive symptomatology, are found among females in this sample, a finding consistent with other studies of adolescents (*see* Rosenberg, 1979:287; Phinney, 1991) as well as of adults among immigrant/nonimmigrant majority and minority populations (*see* Vega and Rumbaut, 1991). Interestingly, lower self-esteem is also associated with being U.S. born (second-generation status), a finding that parallels research in Britain that found that the self-esteem of West Indian girls born in Britain was lower than those born in the West Indies (Cropley, 1983:107–108). That may be related to differing comparative frames of reference between the foreign born and the native born, and to the generational shift from immigrant into ethnic minority status (*cf.* Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995). By contrast a significant though relatively weak effect is seen in the net association between being a recent arrival to the United States and depressive symptoms, a finding consistent with the expectations of theories of acculturative stress among immigrants (Laosa, 1990; Vega and Rumbaut, 1991).

More than the other objective measures of socioeconomic status, the respondents' perception that their family's economic situation compared to five years before had worsened was significantly associated with decreased self-esteem as well as increased depression and parent-child conflict – a result that points to the psychological costs of downward mobility and economic stress for the adolescents in our sample. The unemployment of the father and even more so, the absence of the father from the home are related to higher depression and lower self-esteem. The father's level of education (but not the mother's) is significantly and positively related to self-esteem. Both psychological dependent variables – self-esteem and depression – worsen when the respondent has no one at home or elsewhere to help with school work, when the respondent feels embarrassed by his or her parents, and especially, by the level of parent-child conflict and derogation. Family contexts clearly shape psychological outcomes among these youths; the findings in this regard are unexceptional and in line with conventional theories.

English language competence and educational achievement measures are significantly and positively related to self esteem and psychological well-being. Specifically, the higher the English language proficiency index and the higher the academic GPA, the higher the self-esteem score and the lower the depression score. Knowledge of English in particular showed a very strong positive association with self-esteem, underscoring the psychological importance of linguistic acculturation for children of immigrants in

TABLE 6
PREDICTORS OF SELF-ESTEEM AND DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS AMONG CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS:
RESULTS OF LEAST-SQUARES MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS

	Y=Self-Esteem				Y=Depressive Symptoms			
	B	S.E.	Beta	Sig.	B	S.E.	Beta	Sig.
Gender, Age, and Nativity								
Gender (1=male; 0=female)	.118	.014	.113	^a	-.281	.017	-.222	^a
Age (years)	.022	.008	.035	^b				NS
U.S.-born	-.028	.014	-.027	^c				NS
Foreign-born <10 years in U.S.				NS	.051	.021	.035	^c
Family Socioeconomic Status								
Father's educational level (1-6)	.008	.004	.026	^c				NS
Father not employed				NS	.052	.022	.035	^c
Father absent from home	-.046	.015	-.040	^b	.106	.020	.076	^a
Worse family economic situation	-.026	.008	-.039	^b	.044	.011	.054	^a
Parents								
Parent-child conflict scale (1-4)	-.225	.012	-.267	^a	.288	.015	.281	^a
Embarrassed by parents	-.068	.009	-.097	^a	.042	.011	.050	^b
Parents are main homework help				NS				NS
No one helps with homework	-.031	.016	-.026	^c	.060	.020	.040	^b
Language and Schooling								
English Proficiency Index (1-4)	.210	.017	.193	^a	-.053	.020	-.040	^b
Foreign Language Index (1-4)				NS				NS
Limited-English-Proficient (LEP)	-.150	.023	-.102	^a				NS
Grade point average (GPA)	.057	.008	.098	^a	-.063	.010	-.089	^a
Discrimination								
Been discriminated against				NS	.090	.018	.071	^a
Expects discrimination (1-4)	-.028	.007	-.055	^a	.022	.009	.036	^b
Ethnic Identity, National Origin¹								
Black	.169	.065	.033	^b				NS
Filipino	-.138	.019	-.099	^a				NS
Vietnamese	-.083	.026	-.042	^b				NS
Explained variance			R ² = .281				R ² = .200	

Statistical significance: ^ap < .0001; ^bp < .01; ^cp < .05; NS Not Significant

¹No other self-reported ethnic identities (American, Hyphenated-American, Hispanic, Chicano) or national origin groups had statistically significant effects in these equations.

American social contexts, especially in the schools. Indeed, net of the level of English language proficiency, being labeled and assigned to classes as a Limited English Proficient (LEP) student in school is significantly associated with diminished self-esteem (although not with depressive symptoms). A LEP status is a common designation for non-English-speaking immigrants in public schools, as well as a stigmatized status which typically places them outside the mainstream English-language curriculum and exposes them to teasing and ridicule by other students. By contrast, the foreign language proficiency index score was not significantly associated with either dependent variable. Also, although not shown in Table 6, higher self-esteem is strongly associated with higher educational aspirations.

With cross-sectional data, of course, we cannot here untangle unambiguously the causal dynamics or even the sequence of effects in all of these

associations – particularly with subjective variables such as educational aspirations, but also with objective variables such as GPA. It may be that reciprocal effects are involved (Owens, 1994; Rosenberg, Schooler and Schoenbach, 1989; Faunce, 1984), and we will need to wait to reinterview the sample in 1995 and add a longitudinal dimension to our study in order to more clearly sort out the temporal ordering of variables and effects.

The noxious psychological effects of racial-ethnic discrimination are apparent in the results shown in Table 6. Having been discriminated against elevates depressive symptoms significantly – although interestingly, it does not have a significant effect on self-esteem. However, expected discrimination – *i.e.*, agreeing with the statement that “people will discriminate against me regardless of how far I go with my education” – is significantly associated with both increased depression and decreased self-esteem. With perceived discrimination and the other variables controlled, only one type of ethnic self-identity was significantly associated with self-esteem, and none with depression scores. Specifically, a Black self-identity was positively associated with higher self-esteem, a result suggesting that such a mode of self-identification serves a psychologically protective function (*cf.* Porter and Washington, 1993). No other reported ethnic self-identity showed any significant positive or negative relationship with self-esteem. That finding is in accord with the available research literature (Phinney, 1991; Rosenberg, 1979), and debunks the enduring but erroneous folk wisdom that minority group or lower-SES children *ipso facto* must have lower self-esteem. Indeed, the broad implication is that ethnic self-definitions may be chosen or accepted to the extent that they are protective of the youth’s sense of self-regard in relevant social contexts. Conversely, among national-origin groups, the Vietnamese and especially the Filipinos were the only nationalities still flagged by the data as reflecting statistically significantly lower self-esteem scores, suggesting that in comparison to other groups certain psychosocial vulnerabilities or dynamics among Vietnamese and Filipino children of immigrants not captured here by our data may be linked to a diminished sense of self-worth. All other nationalities, however, washed out of the regression equation analyzing self-esteem outcomes.

Predictors of Parent-Child Conflict

Finally, Table 7 presents the results of a multiple regression analysis predicting parent-child conflict scale scores. We examined a broad array of potential objective and subjective predictors, and will briefly highlight some of the most noteworthy findings. Here again gender is a significant determinant. The daughters of immigrant parents are more likely than sons to be involved in such conflicts and instances of parental derogation – a possible reflection of the clash between restrictive parental standards for behavior,

dating and the like, against the girls' increasing sense of and desire for individuality and independence from parental control in the transition to adulthood (*cf.* Gibson, 1995; Matute-Bianchi, 1991; Rumbaut and Ima, 1988; Waters, forthcoming; Woldemikael, 1989). Net of the other factors controlled for in this analysis, age and U.S. nativity are not significantly related to parent-child conflict. Instead, such conflicts appear more likely to occur among the most recently arrived immigrant families in our sample.

Several objective and subjective features of the family context are particularly associated with frictions in the parent-child relationship. Table 7 suggests that such frictions are more likely to occur in families where the mother is less educated and where the economic situation of the family has perceptively worsened. Parent-child conflict is significantly reduced in families with both natural parents at home and where both parents and siblings are available/relied upon as main sources of help with school work – all of which may be interpreted here not only as indicators of available family resources and social support but also of family cohesion. Conversely, conflict with parents is exacerbated where the youth feels embarrassed by his or her parents and where the youth has no one to seek out for help with school work.

Language and education are central issues in the relationship of immigrant parents and their children which may spark conflict and derogation between them. As Table 7 shows, conflict is significantly increased in cases where the child prefers English and also has a poor command of the parental native language – a recipe for communication problems, as well as posing problems of parental control and authority. In Vietnamese families, to take one example, parents are sometimes infuriated when a teenage son deliberately switches to English, with its egalitarian pronoun “you,” in order to avoid speaking in Vietnamese, which would require the son to use the numerous pronouns through which due deference is paid to the authority of the parents (Rumbaut and Ima, 1988). Conflict with parents is also exacerbated by the greater the number of hours the children spent watching television and the fewer the hours they spent on homework, the lower their academic GPA, and the lower the youths' educational aspirations – variables that paint a fairly vivid picture of the nature of the clashing discourses and competing concerns over which tensions develop in the parent-child relationship.

Lastly, as Table 7 shows, the issue of discrimination is itself associated strongly with parent-child conflict: the more the youth has experienced being discriminated against and the more the youth perceives that “people will discriminate against me regardless of how far I go with my education,” the more conflict there appears to be in the parent-child relationship – perhaps because the implicit outlook that sees discrimination as trumping education contradicts immigrant parents' folk theories of success (Gibson,

TABLE 7
PREDICTORS OF PARENT-CHILD CONFLICT AMONG CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS

Predictor Variables	Y = Parent-Child Conflict			
	B	S.E.	Beta	Sig.
Gender, Age, and Nativity				
Gender (1=male; 0=female)	-.101	.017	-.081	a
Age (years)				NS
U.S.-born				NS
Foreign-born <10 years in U.S.	.059	.021	.041	b
Family Socioeconomic Status				
Mother's educational level (1-6)	-.018	.006	-.049	b
Worse family economic situation	.041	.011	.051	a
Parents				
Both natural parents at home	-.053	.018	-.041	b
Embarrassed by parents	.168	.011	.206	a
Parents are main homework help	-.107	.023	-.078	a
Siblings are main homework help	-.078	.024	-.050	b
No one helps with homework	.088	.023	.060	b
Language and Schooling				
English Proficiency Index (1-4)				NS
Foreign Language Index (1-4)	-.018	.009	-.031	c
Limited-English-Proficient (LEP)	.076	.029	.044	b
Prefers English (1=yes; 0=no)	.083	.021	.060	a
Grade point average (GPA)	-.101	.011	-.148	a
Educational aspirations (1-5)	-.034	.011	-.045	b
Hours per day doing homework	-.016	.007	-.034	b
Hours per day watching TV	.010	.005	.028	c
Discrimination				
Been discriminated against	.121	.018	.097	a
Expects discrimination (1-4)	.101	.009	.167	a
National Origin¹				
Haitian	.112	.048	.032	c
Filipino	.074	.026	.045	b
Vietnamese	.162	.035	.069	a
Laotian and Cambodian	.124	.040	.048	b
Explained variance			R ² = .190	

Statistical significance: ^ap < .0001; ^bp < .01; ^cp < .05; NS Not Significant

¹No other self-reported ethnic identities (American, Hyphenated-American, Hispanic, Chicano, Black) or national origin groups had statistically significant effects in these equations.

1995; Ogbu, 1991). That is, immigrant parents tend to define the situation in instrumental terms (extolling the virtues of hard work and good grades), whereas their children tend to seek to fit in socially and to experience in expressive terms the impact of disparagement within an ethnic minority status.

None of the different ethnic self-identity types, however, had statistically significant associations with parent-child conflict. Only a handful of nationalities were significantly related to such conflicts with parents: the Haitians, the Filipinos, and the Indochinese groups (Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians). The degree of parent-child conflict was shown earlier (in the

bivariate results by nationality) to be more intense among those particular national-origin groups; that remains the case in the multivariate analysis even after controlling for a variety of explanatory factors. It is worth repeating that multivariate results also showed that the Vietnamese and Filipinos were the only nationalities significantly associated with lower self-esteem, even with parent-child conflict controlled, suggesting that psychosocial adaptation processes may be particularly problematic for both parents and children in those ethnic groups.

In any event, these data only begin to suggest a range of issues around which tension, derogation and conflict – the “friction” that Mary Antin refers to at the outset of this article – are produced in the adolescents’ relationship with their immigrant parents, conflicts which in turn affect the children’s self-esteem and psychological well-being, and their social identities.

CONCLUSION

This article has touched on multiple aspects of the psychosocial adaptation of children of the new waves of immigration to the United States, focusing on the formation of ethnic identities during adolescence. Among the many empirical results presented in the preceding analysis, certain findings are especially noteworthy. The data show major differences in patterns of ethnic self-identification among teenage children of immigrants from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean – both between and within groups from diverse national origins – growing up in two distinct corners of the United States. Instead of a uniform assimilative path, we found multiple or segmented paths to identity formation and resolution. Over one-quarter of the youths (27%) identified by national origin; another 40 percent chose a hyphenated-American identity; about one-tenth (11%) identified as unhyphenated Americans and two-tenths (21%) selected racial or panethnic identity labels. Thus, two-thirds of the respondents ethnically self-identified with their own or their parents’ immigrant origins; the remaining one-third reported either assimilative or dissimilative identities that are not connected to those origins but to their American present. Several major patterns emerged from multivariate analyses of a wide range of factors that were theoretically expected to shape the process of ethnic self-identification, and of other aspects of psychosocial adaptation such as self-esteem and depression.

First, ethnic self-identification is a gendered process. Among the adolescents in the sample, gender was a significant predictor of virtually every type of ethnic self-identity chosen, suggesting that issues of gender and ethnic identity may be connected. Girls were much more likely to choose additive or hyphenated identities, as well as a Hispanic panethnic self-label; boys were more likely to choose an unhyphenated national identity (whether

American or national origin), and among those of Mexican descent to identify as Chicano. In addition, gender was a main determinant of psychological well-being outcomes, with girls being much more likely than boys to report lower self-esteem, higher depression, and a greater level of parent-child conflict.

Second, partly in line with expectations drawn from classic assimilation theory, acculturation strongly affects the process of identificational assimilation. Being born in the United States (second generation status) greatly increases the propensity for an assimilative self-definition, as does naturalized U.S. citizenship, and a preference for and fluent use of English with close friends. Conversely, being foreign-born (1.5 generation) and not a U.S. citizen, as well as a preference for and fluency in the parental native language, are associated with an ancestral or national-origin identity. The strength and significance of the effects of acculturative processes on the odds of self-identifying as a hyphenated-American lie between those two poles. In general, the hyphenated identity emerges here less as a qualitatively different mode of ethnic self-definition than as a bridge or middle position along the identificational spectrum between an American national identity and that of origin.⁷ Still, whereas as a rule parental nationality tends to wash out in our models as a predictor of the children's propensity to identify either as American or by national origin, parental nationality has very strong effects on the choice of a hyphenated identity. Children of all Asian-origin nationalities are much more likely to do so, whereas most of those coming from Latin America and the Caribbean are less likely to add the hyphen.

Third, perceptions of discrimination affect the way children define their ethnic identities. Those who have experienced being discriminated against are less likely to identify as American; those who perceive that people will discriminate against them no matter the level of education they may achieve are more likely to remain loyal to a national-origin identity. Such experiences/perceptions of exclusion and rejection on racial-ethnic grounds – on ascribed rather than achieved statuses – undercut the prospect of identificational assimilation into the mainstream. They are also associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms and greater parent-child conflict.

Fourth, the determination of dissimilative racial or panethnic self-identities follows a different logic, having relatively little to do with acculturative processes as such. Location and nationality matter more here. Youths in inner city schools where most students are racial-ethnic minorities are more likely to define themselves in terms of those identities, particularly Black and Chicano, and less likely to identify ancestrally by national origin. Precisely the opposite effect is seen for those attending upper-middle-class

⁷Harold J. Abramson puts it this way: "The hyphenate synthesizes a larger loyalty to America with a historic loyalty to the ethnic past" (1981:156).

private schools. The results support a segmented-assimilation theoretical perspective. Virtually no Asian-origin youth chose the panethnic labels Asian or Asian American. A Black or Black American racial identity was chosen by only 10 percent of the youth from Afro-Caribbean backgrounds, but its use increases among the U.S. born. A Hispanic identity was picked by over 20 percent of those from Spanish-speaking countries, but it declines rapidly among the U.S. born. Children of immigrants in San Diego are much more likely to identify in racial or panethnic minority terms. The Miami area, despite its extraordinarily high proportion of immigrants, turns out to be more conducive to the development of assimilative mainstream identities, an ironic result that may be in part connected to race (the overwhelming proportion of phenotypically white youth in the sample reside in Miami) and to the effects of American racial categories and racism on perceived ethnic identity options.

Fifth, children's psychosocial adaptation is shaped by the family context. The likelihood of identificational assimilation is moderated by parental ethnic socialization, social status, and parent-child relationships. The children's ethnic self-identities strongly tend to mirror the perceptions of their parents' (and especially their mother's) own ethnic self-identities, as if they were reflections in an ethnic looking-glass. Children who feel embarrassed by their parents are significantly more likely to identify assimilatively as unhyphenated Americans, whereas higher-status professional parents are more likely to influence their children to identify by their national origin. Parent-child conflict emerged as the strongest determinant of poorer self-esteem and depressive affect.

"Becoming American" takes different forms, has different meanings, and is reached by different paths. But the process is one in which all children of immigrants are engaged – defining an identity for themselves, *i.e.*, a meaningful place in the society of which they are its newest members. To be sure, the process is complex, conflictual and stressful, and profoundly affects the consciousness of immigrant parents and children alike. The process is also shaped within a much larger historical context of which the participants may be no more conscious than fish are of water, and in an American crucible that has been shaping identities since the origins of the nation. In the final analysis, it is the crucible without that shapes the crucible within.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, H. J.
1981 "Assimilation and Pluralism." In *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Ed. S. Thernstrom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 150–160.
- Alba, R. D.
1990 *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

-
- 1985 *Italian Americans: Into the Twilight of Ethnicity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Antin, M.
1912 *The Promised Land*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bernal, M. E. and G. P. Knight, eds.
1993 *Ethnic Identity: Formation and Transmission Among Hispanics and Other Minorities*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Caplan, N., M. H. Choy, and J. K. Whitmore
1991 *Children of the Boat People: A Study of Educational Success*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Child, I. L.
1943 *Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cropley, A. J.
1983 *The Education of Immigrant Children: A Social-Psychological Introduction*. London: Croom Helm.
- DeVos, G. A. and M. M. Suarez-Orozco
1990 *Status Inequality: The Self in Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Erikson, E. H.
1968 *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
-
- 1950 *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Espiritu, Y. L.
1992 *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fauce, W. A.
1984 "School Achievement, Social Status, and Self-Esteem," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(1):3-14.
-
- 1982 "The Relation of Status to Self-Esteem: Chain Saw Sociology at the Cutting Edge," *Sociological Focus*, 15(3):163-178.
- Foner, N.
1987 "The Jamaicans: Race and Ethnicity Among Migrants in New York City." In *New Immigrants in New York*. Ed., N. Foner. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. 195-217.
- Fordham, S. and J. U. Ogbu
1987 "Black Students' School Success: Coping With the Burden of 'Acting White,'" *Urban Review*, 18(3):176-206.
- Franklin, J. H.
1993 *The Color Line: Legacy for the Twenty-First Century*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Gans, H. J.
1992 "Second Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(2):173-192.
-
- 1979 "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2(1):1-20.
- Gibson, M. A.
1995 "Additive Acculturation as a Strategy for School Improvement." In *California's Immigrant Children: Theory, Research, and Implications for Educational Policy*. Ed. R. Rumbaut and W. A. Cornelius. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California.

-
- 1989 *Accommodation Without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Glazer, N.
1993 "Is Assimilation Dead?," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530:122-136.
- Gleason, P.
1981 "American Identity and Americanization." In *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Ed. S. Thernstrom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 31-58.
- Gordon, M. M.
1964 *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hatcher, R. and B. Troyna
1993 "Racialization and Children." In *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*. Ed. C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow. New York: Routledge. Pp. 109-125.
- Hirschman, C.
1994 "The Meaning of Race and Ethnic Population Projections." Paper presented at 13th Albany Conference on American Diversity, State University of New York at Albany. April 15-16.
- Hurtado, A., P. Gurin and T. Peng
1994 "Social Identities - A Framework for Studying the Adaptations of Immigrants and Ethnics: The Adaptation of Mexicans in the United States," *Social Problems*, 41(1):129-151.
- Laosa, L. M.
1990 "Psychosocial Stress, Coping, and Development of Hispanic Immigrant Children." In *Mental Health of Ethnic Minorities*. Ed. F. C. Serafica *et al.* New York: Praeger. Pp. 38-65.
- Matute-Bianchi, M. E.
1991 "Situational Ethnicity and Patterns of School Performance Among Immigrant and Nonimmigrant Mexican-Descent Students." In *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities*. Ed. M. Gibson and J. U. Ogbu. New York: Garland. Pp. 205-247.
-
- 1986 "Ethnic Identities and Patterns of School Success and Failure among Mexican-Descent and Japanese-American Students in a California High School: An Ethnographic Analysis," *American Journal of Education*, 95(1):233-255.
- MacLeod, J.
1987 *Ain't No Making It: Leveled Aspirations in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Min, P. G., ed.
1995 *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ogbu, J. U.
1991 "Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities in Comparative Perspective." In *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities*. Ed. M. A. Gibson and J. U. Ogbu. New York: Garland. Pp. 3-33.
-
- 1987 "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4):312-334.
-
- 1974 *The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Academic Press.
- Olsen, L.
1988 *Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public Schools*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

- Owens, T. J.
1994 "Two Dimensions of Self-Esteem: Reciprocal Effects of Positive Self-Worth and Self-Deprecation on Adolescent Problems," *American Sociological Review*, 59(3):391-407.
- Phinney, J. S.
1991 "Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem: A Review and Integration," *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2):193-208.
-
- 1990 "Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research," *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3):499-514.
- Porter, J. R. and R. E. Washington
1993 "Minority Identity and Self-Esteem," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19:139-161.
- Portes, A.
1984 "The Rise of Ethnicity: Determinants of Ethnic Perceptions Among Cuban Exiles in Miami," *American Sociological Review*, 49(3):383-397.
- Portes, A. and R. G. Rumbaut
1990 *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. and A. Stepick
1993 *City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou
1993 "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530:74-96.
- Rosenberg, M.
1979 *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books.
-
- 1965 *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M., C. Schooler, and C. Schoenbach
1989 "Self-Esteem and Adolescent Problems: Modeling Reciprocal Effects," *American Sociological Review*, 54:1004-1018.
- Rumbaut, R. D. and R. G. Rumbaut
1976 "The Family in Exile: Cuban Expatriates in the United States," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 133(4):395-399.
- Rumbaut, R. G.
1995 "The New Californians: Comparative Research Findings on the Educational Progress of Immigrant Children." In *California's Immigrant Children: Theory, Research and Implications for Educational Policy*. Ed. R. G. Rumbaut and W. A. Cornelius. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California.
-
- 1994 "Origins and Destinies: Immigration to the United States Since World War II." *Sociological Forum*, 9(4):583-621. December.
-
- 1991 "The Agony of Exile: A Study of Indochinese Refugee Adults and Children." In *Refugee Children: Theory, Research, and Services*. Ed. F. L. Ahearn, Jr. and J. L. Athey. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
-
- 1990 *Immigrant Students in California Public Schools: A Summary of Current Knowledge*. CDS Report No. 11. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University.
- Rumbaut, R. G. and K. Ima
1988 *The Adaptation of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth: A Comparative Study*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement.
- Sanchez, G. J.
1993 *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Suárez-Orozco, M. M.
 1991 "Immigrant Adaptation to Schooling: A Hispanic Case." In *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities*. Ed. M. A. Gibson and J. U. Ogbu. New York: Garland. Pp. 37–61.
-
- 1989 *Central American Refugees and U.S. High Schools: A Psychosocial Study of Motivation and Achievement*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, M. M. and C. Suárez-Orozco
 1995 "The Cultural Patterning of Achievement Motivation: A Comparative Study of Mexican, Mexican Immigrant, and Non-Latino White American Youths in Schools." In *California's Immigrant Children: Theory, Research, and Implications for Educational Policy*. Ed. R. G. Rumbaut and W. A. Cornelius. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California.
- Sung, B. L.
 1987 *The Adjustment Experience of Chinese Immigrant Children in New York City*. Staten Island, NY: Center for Migration Studies.
- Tajfel, H.
 1981 *Human Groups and Social Categories*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, W. I. and F. Znaniecki
 1958 *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America [1918–20]*. Vol. 2. New York: Dover.
- Vega, W. A., et al.
 1993 "Acculturation and Delinquent Behavior Among Cuban American Adolescents: Toward an Empirical Model," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 21(1):351–383.
- Vega, W. A., R. L. Hough, and A. Romero
 1983 "Family Life Patterns of Mexican-Americans." In *The Psychological Development of Minority Group Children*. Ed. G. J. Powell. New York: Bruner/Mazel. Pp. 194–215.
- Vega, W. A. and R. G. Rumbaut
 1991 "Ethnic Minorities and Mental Health," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17:351–383.
- Vigil, J. D.
 1988 *Barrio Gangs: Street Life and Identity in Southern California*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Warner, W. L. and L. Srole
 1945 *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Waters, M. C.
 n.d. "The Intersection of Gender, Race and Ethnicity in Identity Development of Caribbean American Teens." In *Urban Adolescent Girls: Resisting Stereotypes*. Ed. B. Leadbeater and N. Way. New York: New York University Press. In press.
-
- 1990 *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whyte, W. F.
 1955 *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1st ed, 1943.
- Woldemikael, T. M.
 1989 *Becoming Black American: Haitian and American Institutions in Evanston, Illinois*. New York: AMS Press.
- Yinger, J. M.
 1981 "Toward a Theory of Assimilation and Dissimilation," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4(3):249–264.