

Rumbaut, Rubin

**Working Paper**

## Achievement and ambition among children of immigrants in Southern California

Working Paper, No. 215

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

*Suggested Citation:* Rumbaut, Rubin (1997) : Achievement and ambition among children of immigrants in Southern California, Working Paper, No. 215, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/79205>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

Achievement and Ambition among Children of Immigrants  
in Southern California

by

Rubén G. Rumbaut\*

Working Paper No. 215

November 1997

Presented at the symposium on the second generation, sponsored by The Jerome Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, October 23-25, 1997.

\*The Russell Sage Foundation and Department of Sociology, Michigan State University

This paper is a revision of a report submitted in June 1997 to the Board of Trustees of the Russell Sage Foundation.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction: The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS)	1
Immigrants and Their Types in San Diego: The Longitudinal Sample and the Local Setting	2
Children of Immigrants: A Portrait	5
Socioeconomic Status and Neighborhood Contexts	6
Family Structure and the Quality of Family Relationships	7
Patterns of Achievement: GPAs, Dropouts, Suspensions, Homework, TV, and School Contexts	9
Patterns of Ambition: Educational and Occupational Aspirations, Expectations, and Values	12
Language Shifts: English Proficiency and Preference	14
Ethnic Identity Shifts and Perceptions of Discrimination	15
Psychological Well-Being: Patterns and Predictors of Self-Esteem and Depression	17
Predictors of Achievement and Ambition: A Summary	19
References	22
Technical Appendix: Composition and Reliability of Scales	24

### Tables of Data:

- Table 1.* Re-Interview Rates and Sociodemographic Characteristics
- Table 2.* Family Socioeconomic Status and Neighborhood Characteristics
- Table 3.* Family Structure and Quality of Family Relationships
- Table 4.* School Performance, School Work, and School Contexts
- Table 5.* Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Values
- Table 6.* Language Preference and Proficiency and Ethnic Self-Identity
- Table 7.* Discrimination and Perceptions of American Society
- Table 8.* Self-Esteem and Depression
- Table 9.* Predictors of Educational Achievement and Aspirations
- Table 10.* T2 Student and Parent Interview Rates, by Selected T1 Variables
- Table 11.* Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios of Student and Parent Interviews at T2

## Achievement and Ambition Among Children of Immigrants in Southern California

Rubén G. Rumbaut

This report summarizes the latest results of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), a multifaceted investigation of the educational performance and social, cultural and psychological adaptation of children of immigrants, the “new second generation” (cf. Portes, 1996) now growing up in American cities. Since late 1991, the study has followed the progress of a large sample of teenage youths representing over 70 nationalities in two key areas of immigrant settlement in the United States: Southern California (San Diego) and South Florida (Miami and Fort Lauderdale).<sup>1</sup> The original survey, conducted in Spring 1992 (“T1”), interviewed over 5,200 students enrolled in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades in schools of the San Diego Unified School District (N=2,420), and of the Dade and Broward County Unified School Districts (N=2,843). The sample was drawn in the junior high grades, a level at which dropout rates are still relatively rare, to avoid the potential bias of differential dropout rates between ethnic groups at the senior high school level. For purposes of the study, students were eligible to enter the sample if they were U.S.-born but had at least one immigrant (foreign-born) parent, or if they themselves were foreign-born and had come to the U.S. at an early age (most before age ten).

Three years after the original survey, in 1995-96 (“T2”), a second survey of the same group of children of immigrants was conducted—this time supplemented by in-depth interviews with a stratified sample of their parents as well—using survey questionnaires especially developed for longitudinal and comparative analyses. The purpose of this follow-up effort was to add a temporal dimension to the study and ascertain changes over time in the family situation, school achievement, educational and occupational aspirations, language use and preferences, ethnic identities, experiences and expectations of discrimination, and social and psychological adaptation of these youths. By this time the children, who were originally interviewed in junior high when most were 14 or 15 years old (the mean age at T1 was 14.2), had reached the final year of senior high school and were making their passages to adulthood, firming up plans for their future as well as their outlooks on the surrounding society. This paper describes the initial results of that latest survey, focusing on changes observed over time (from T1 to T2) among the youths in the San Diego area.

These children of immigrants represent the most consequential and lasting legacy of the new mass immigration to the United States. While the rapid growth of international migration to the United States over the last few decades has led to a mushrooming research literature and an intensified public debate about the new immigrants and their impact on American society, less noticed has been the fact that all the while a new generation of Americans raised in immigrant families has been coming of age. Over time, its members will decisively shape the character of their ethnic communities and their success or failure. Indeed, the long-term effects of contemporary immigration will hinge more on the trajectories of these youths than on the fate of their parents.

---

<sup>1</sup> The CILS project involves the latest collaboration of the two principal investigators, Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut. The original survey in the San Diego area, directed by Professor Rumbaut, was carried out with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. A parallel survey in South Florida, led by Professor Portes, was supported by the Spencer Foundation and the National Science Foundation. The follow-up survey (1995-96) was again supported by the Mellon and Spencer Foundations for the two respective sites, and by a major research grant to the joint project from the Russell Sage Foundation. For some of the published results of the original survey on a variety of themes, see Fernández-Kelly and Schauffler, 1994; Pérez, 1994; Portes, 1995, 1996; Portes and MacLeod, 1996; Portes and Rumbaut, 1996, chapter 7; Portes and Schauffler, 1996; Rumbaut, 1994a, 1995, 1997.

The size of this youthful population—including both immigrant children and U.S.-born children of immigrants—has already surpassed the prior record set by the offspring of European immigrants earlier in this century. Among children under 18 years of age, the 1990 census counted nearly 6 million U.S.-born children living with immigrant parents, and another 2 million foreign-born children ages 0-17, combining to form a “new second generation” of some 8 million children as of that time (see Oropesa and Landale, 1997). By 1996, the immigrant population of the U.S. increased even faster—from 20 to 25 million—with the number of children of immigrants growing commensurately. Furthermore, while one third of the immigrant population of the U.S. resided in California, over 40% of under-18 children of immigrants lived in California. Hence the size and concentration of this emerging population, added to its diverse national and socioeconomic origins and forms of adaptation, makes its evolution extraordinarily important.

### **Immigrants and Their Types in San Diego: The Longitudinal Sample and the Local Setting**

Reflecting the diverse patterns of recent immigration into Southern California, the principal nationalities represented in the San Diego sample are Mexican, Filipino, Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, and smaller groups of other children of immigrants from Asia (mostly Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Korean) and Latin America. These groups are representative of some of the principal types of immigrants in California today and in contemporary American society (cf. Portes and Rumbaut, 1996). Thus:

(1) Mexicans constitute by far the largest legal and illegal immigrant population in both California and the U.S.—indeed, they form part of the largest, longest, and most sustained labor migration in the contemporary world—and San Diego, situated along the Mexican border, has long been a major area of settlement. The 1990 census showed that among adults over 25, Mexican immigrants had the lowest educational levels of any major U.S. ethnic group, native or foreign-born (see Rumbaut, 1994b).

(2) Since the 1960s, the Filipinos have formed the second largest immigrant population in the country, and they are the largest Asian-origin immigrant group in California and in the U.S. Many have come as professionals (nurses most conspicuously) and through military connections (especially the U.S. Navy, making San Diego with its huge Navy base a primary area of settlement). The 1990 census showed that Filipino immigrants as a whole have the lowest poverty rate of any sizable ethnic group in the U.S.

(3) Since the end of the Indochina War in 1975, refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos have formed the largest refugee population both in California and in the U.S. The 1990 census found the highest poverty and welfare dependency rates in the country among Laotians and Cambodians. Comparative research on the mental health of Indochinese refugees and other ethnic groups has also found the highest levels of depressive symptomatology and post-traumatic stress disorder among the adult survivors of the “killing fields” of Cambodia—raising questions as well about the psychological well-being of their children in the U.S. (see Rumbaut, 1991a, 1991b, 1996; Vega and Rumbaut, 1991).

Remarkably, although the 25 million immigrants in the U.S. in 1996 came from over 140 different countries, fully 35% came from only three: Mexico, the Philippines, and Vietnam (cf. Hansen and Faber, 1997). More remarkable still, by 1996 these three nationalities accounted for the majority (55%) of the 8.1 million foreign-born population of California. And fully 90% of our San Diego sample consisted of children of parents who hailed from Mexico, the Philippines, and Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia—representing distinct groups of immigrant laborers, professionals and refugees with sharply contrasting migration histories and contexts of exit and of reception.

The survey of 1995-96 in San Diego succeeded in re-interviewing 85.2 percent of the baseline sample of 2,420 students, for a total of 2,063. Students who had moved, transferred or dropped out of school during the intervening years had been followed throughout, and even the majority of dropouts were located and re-interviewed. It was because of the difficulty in tracking these harder-to-locate cases that the data collection period extended into 1996. With some exceptions--based on the tendency of higher-status youth from intact families who owned their home in San Diego at T1 to be better represented in the second survey--the population interviewed at both points in time is largely the same. In fact, Indochinese students from the poorest families in the survey (the smaller-sized Cambodian, Lao and Hmong groups) had re-interview rates above 90%, as did the high-SES "Other Asians" (Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Korean), and no nationality had re-interview rates below 80%. In addition, there was practically no difference by gender or nativity (foreign-born vs. U.S.-born) in the final T2 sample. As during the baseline survey, this data collection effort for the most part took place during repeated visits to schools with the cooperation of the San Diego City Schools, including administrators, principals, teachers and staff.

In addition, in San Diego a total of 1,318 parental interviews were completed—representing 54.5% of the 2,420 students originally surveyed at T1. However, more realistically, this number computes into a parent interview rate of 63.1%, if we use as the denominator the actual number of students contacted and surveyed at T2 (2,063) plus the 27 parents who were interviewed even though we were unable to interview their children at T2 (including cases of runaways, youths in detention facilities or jail, and absentees).

The following are the final T2 student re-interview rates, the percent of parent interviews completed (as a fraction of the number of T1 student interviews), and the parent interview rate (as a fraction of the actual number of families contacted T2, as described above):

<u>Demographic Characteristics</u>	<u>Total T1 Sample</u>	<u>% T2 Students Re-Interviewed</u>	<u>% Parent Interview</u>	<u>Parental Interview Rate (% per above)</u>
Female	1211	86	54	62
Male	1209	85	55	64
Foreign-born	1358	84	59	69
U.S.-born	1062	87	49	56
Filipino	808	89	46	52
Mexican	727	80	45	56
Vietnamese	361	84	69	81
Lao	154	93	93	95
Cambodian	94	94	90	94
Hmong	53	94	87	90
Others	223	83	42	63
TOTAL	2420	85.2	54.5	63.1

A more complete set of tables reporting T2 student and parental interview rates for the San Diego sample, broken down by a wide set of variables—family structure and socioeconomic status, neighborhood poverty rates, dropout and active/inactive status, T1 GPA—as well as two logistic regressions predicting the odds of a student or parent being interviewed at T2—are appended at the conclusion of this report.

Finally, it may be useful here to provide a brief description of the larger San Diego population. To highlight key differences between the communities where the study took place, a socioeconomic profile of the City of San Diego—the jurisdiction covered by the San Diego Unified School District—is sketched below, compared to the same 1990 census data for the metropolitan area of Miami-Hialeah (covered by the Dade County Unified School District in South Florida, where most of the parallel survey was carried out; a small sample was also surveyed in adjacent Broward County). For side-by-side comparisons, profiles of the populations of the City of Los Angeles, the state of California, and the United States are also provided.

**San Diego City, Los Angeles City, California, Metropolitan Miami, and the United States: 1990**

	<u>City of San Diego</u>	<u>City of Los Angeles</u>	<u>California</u>	<u>Metro Miami (Dade Co.)</u>	<u>United States</u>
Population, 1990 Census	1,110,549	3,485,398	29,760,021	1,914,689	248,709,873
% non-Hispanic White	58.8	37.5	57.4	30.1	75.8
% Hispanic	20.1	39.3	25.4	49.2	8.8
% Black	9.3	13.9	7.4	20.7	12.0
% Asian	11.8	9.8	9.6	1.3	2.9
% Foreign-born	20.9	38.4	21.7	45.4	7.9
% non-English speakers	29.2	49.9	31.5	57.6	13.8
% High School graduates	82.3	67.0	76.2	65.0	75.2
% College degree	29.8	23.0	23.4	18.8	20.3
% Unemployment rate	6.2	8.4	6.6	7.7	6.3
% Professionals, managers	32.5	27.3	28.6	24.6	26.4
% Laborers, fabricators	8.8	15.9	12.8	13.6	14.9
% Poverty rate (persons)	13.4	18.9	12.5	18.0	13.1
% Poverty rate (families)	9.7	14.9	9.3	14.2	10.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, United States: Social and Economic Characteristics, 1990 CP-2-1 (November 1993).

San Diego's school district is the nation's 8<sup>th</sup> largest, with 133,000 students enrolled K-12, drawn from the city's (1990) population of 1.1 million, the 6<sup>th</sup> largest city in the U.S. While the city of Miami (1990 population: 358,458) is much smaller than San Diego, the Dade County Unified school district is the 4<sup>th</sup> largest in the country, since it draws from the much larger metropolitan Miami-Hialeah-area. The socioeconomic profiles above characterize the populations whose children are enrolled in the two main school districts from which the children of immigrants samples were drawn. Compared to other large cities and school districts in the country—New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit, San Francisco, Miami—San Diego's is comparatively a more affluent, better educated, still primarily native non-Hispanic white population, with a 4-to-1 ratio of professionals to laborers in its labor force, in contrast to a ratio of about 2-to-1 in California and less than 2:1 for Los Angeles or the Miami metropolitan area. Nearly half (45%) of the Miami area's population was foreign-born in 1990—tops in the U.S. among metropolitan areas—compared to 22% of San Diego's, and only 8% for the U.S. as a whole; and in metro Miami Hispanics—mostly of Cuban and other Latin American origin—comprise

about half (49%) of its total population, compared to a one-fifth share (20%) in San Diego—where they are overwhelmingly of Mexican origin. San Diego's Asian-origin population (12%)—composed preponderantly of Filipinos and Southeast Asians—is well above the equivalent proportion of the U.S. population (3%) as a whole and even of the populations of California and Los Angeles.

### **Children of Immigrants: A Portrait**

Basic demographic characteristics of the longitudinal sample of 2,063 (those youths interviewed in both surveys) are provided in [Table 1](#), including their birthplace, year of birth, year of arrival in the U.S., and U.S. citizenship status at T1 and T2, broken down by the national origin of their parents, and gender. Some points merit highlighting. The sample overall is about evenly balanced between foreign-born (55%) and U.S.-born children of immigrants (45%)—that is, respectively and more precisely, between the “1.5 generation” and the “second generation.”<sup>2</sup> However, most of the Mexicans (61%) and Filipinos (57%) were born in the U.S., reflecting long-established migration histories, while the Indochinese groups, a legacy of the U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam and its spread into Cambodia and Laos, are all overwhelmingly foreign-born and recent arrivals (and hence a much smaller proportion of them are U.S. citizens, although an increase in naturalizations is evident for all groups between T1 and T2). Put differently, the majority of the Indochinese in the sample are “1.5ers,” while the majority of the Mexicans and Filipinos are second-generation youths—differences which refer not just to nativity differentials but fundamentally distinct socio-developmental contexts of incorporation.

---

<sup>2</sup> It may be useful to note for the record the origin of the concept of the “one-and-a-half” generation (or “1.5” generation, decimal-style). I coined the term in a 1969 thesis about the adaptation of Cuban-born youth who had come to the U.S. at a young age, but after starting school in Cuba (after age 5) and before the onset of puberty and adolescence (by about age 12). The idea was inspired by a passing reference well into Thomas and Znaniecki's classic work, *The Polish Peasant In Europe and America* (1958: 1776), to what those authors called a “half-second generation” (a phrase which they then do not use again in the entire 5-volume work). I found their usage awkward and reversed the term to “one and a half” for clarity's sake. But while those authors did not describe what they had in mind, to me it was a key distinction to make. The literature, when describing the “first” generation, typically has in mind a fully formed adult, socialized elsewhere, who moves to a new sociocultural environment; and when describing the “second” generation what is referred to are U.S.-born and U.S.-socialized children of immigrants. Nowhere in either of those two terms is the experience of a youth “in between” generations accurately captured, or begins to appreciate the radically different socio-developmental contexts involved at the time of immigration. The “1.5” concept intends to grasp this “in-between-ness”—between two worlds, two sociocultural environments of neither of which are they fully part of, occupying an altogether different psycho-historical actuality (in Erik Erikson's sense). It is the marginal, in-between character of the generational location in sociohistorical time and space that gets to the essence of the concept, which I later elaborated as I read especially the work of Karl Mannheim on generations and Erik Erikson on identity. In the 1970s, I used the concept again in the context of studies I did of Cuban families in exile and of generational differences within those families; then in the 1980s in the context of studies of Southeast Asian refugee families. [For a recent application of the term to refugee adults and children as “protagonists” and “deuteragonists” in the migration experience, see my “The Agony of Exile” (Rumbaut, 1991a); a more literary application of the idea is in Gustavo Perez-Firmat's aptly titled book, *Life on the Hyphen* (1994).] In the 1990s I have explored the idea further through a three-type classification, distinguishing among three fundamentally and developmentally different age groups of immigrant children (under 18), depending on their age at immigration/arrival at the place of destination: (1) pre-school children ages 0-5, largely socialized here, whose experience and adaptive outcomes are most similar to the “true” second generation of U.S.-born children of immigrant parents, and whom I have tentatively labeled (for lack of a better term) the “1.75” generation; (2) school-age pre-adolescent children ages 6-12, the “1.5” generation; and (3) adolescent children ages 13-17, whose experience and adaptive outcomes are closer to the “true” first generation of immigrant adults, and whom I have labeled accordingly the “1.25” generation. For an empirical test of this classification, see Oropesa and Landale (1997). The concept has over time entered into popular use—and popular misuse, since it is often applied in blanket fashion without a clue of its theoretical underpinnings (developmental, generational, psychohistorical, sociological).



## TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The 16% of the Vietnamese who were born in the U.S. comprise a salient and historically important exception, as will become clearer in what follows: they are largely the children of the comparatively elite “first wave” of South Vietnamese who were evacuated as Saigon fell in April 1975 (over 80% of the youths in the sample were born in 1977 or 1978, and none were born before 1975). They differ in crucial respects from all the other Vietnamese in the sample.

Too often analysts who rely on nativity and ethnicity data, such as that available through the decennial census, tend to conceive of ethnicity as a fixed quality or constant (e.g., “Mexican,” “Vietnamese”) and of nativity as a sort of “continuous” variable (i.e., as a proxy for generation or time in the U.S.), and to assume that differences between foreign-born and U.S.-born co-ethnics reflect processes of change (typically of assimilation) over time or generation. But the confounding of period and cohort effects can loom large, missing the import of class and other differences between heterogeneous “waves” and “vintages” of immigrants from the same country in different historical contexts (as the example of the 1975 Vietnamese exiles illustrates). It can also miss the crucial import of intermarriage among non-compatriots, as the data on parental nativity suggests (see the bottom panel of Table 1).

For instance, in our sample, only about three-fourths of the parents were co-nationals (the other fourth consisted of mothers and fathers who were not born in the same country—representing over 50 nationalities overall); and in 14% of the cases one parent was U.S.-born (ranging from virtually none of the Indochinese, to one sixth of the Mexicans and Filipinos, and nearly one third of the “Others”). Thus, far from being a fixed characteristic, the very assignment of national origin to the children in our sample became fluid and problematic in a substantial proportion of cases. In such cases where the parents were not co-nationals, the mother’s nationality determined the child’s national origin classification, except where the mother was U.S.-born, in which case the father’s nationality was determinative (for an explanation and elaboration on this methodological problem, see Rumbaut, 1994a).

Substantive results of the adaptive trajectories of these children of immigrants from approximately the beginning (T1) to the end (T2) of high school—as sketched in Tables 2-8 which follow—cover their family’s economic situation, school achievement and effort, educational and occupational aspirations, language proficiency and preference, ethnic self-identities, perceptions of discrimination and of American society, and indicators of psychological well-being such as self-esteem and depressive symptoms. In the final section, the crucial question of the T1 determinants of these children of immigrants’ educational achievement as of T2 (GPAs, dropouts, suspensions) and of their educational aspirations is examined in more detail (as presented in Table 9).

### **Socioeconomic Status and Neighborhood Contexts**

The modest family origins of many of these children, the highly educated backgrounds of others, and the gradual improvement of their economic situation over time, are described in Table 2. Only a tiny proportion of Mexican and Indochinese fathers and mothers (with the signal exception of the U.S.-born Vietnamese, who as noted are the children of the first wave of 1975 refugees) have college degrees, well below the 1990 U.S. norm of 20% for adults 25 and over. By contrast, 43% of Filipino mothers have college degrees, well above national norms. The contrast is made even sharper by looking at the proportion of parents with less than a high school education—that is, less than what their children have now already achieved: most of the more recently arrived foreign-born children from Mexico, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia have fathers and mothers who never completed secondary-level schooling.

Mexican fathers and mothers, however, have high rates of labor force participation (both above national norms), whereas the Indochinese refugees have very low rates, indicative of their eligibility for and use of public assistance (again with the notable exception of the U.S.-born Vietnamese).

#### TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Home-ownership is a telling indicator of socioeconomic advancement and spatial stability. About half of the total sample lived in families who owned their homes in 1992 (T1); three years later (T2) that proportion had edged up to 55%. But there is a huge gap between groups by nativity and nationality. At T1, only a third of foreign-born children (in more recently immigrated families) lived in homes owned by their parents, compared to two-thirds of native-born children (in longer-resident families, by definition); by T2 the respective figures were 41% vs. 73%. By nationality, the socioeconomic gap is far wider, ranging at T2 from a low of 4% among Hmong families from Laos and 8% among the Cambodians to 89% among native-born Filipinos. On the other hand, one indicator of life change that was appraised positively by most of the youths was moving to a new home: 45% of the foreign-born had moved to another home after T1, compared to 28% of the native-born children.

These homes are located in neighborhoods that range from the poorest in San Diego (particularly for Mexican, Cambodian and Laotian immigrant families) to upper-middle-class suburbs, as suggested by the 1990 census tract data in Table 2. Still, for the sample as a whole at T1, their neighborhoods were located in census tracts with a poverty rate of 34% on average, much higher than the 1990 rates for the city of San Diego (13.4%) and the U.S.(13.1%). They are also located in areas with above-average proportions of immigrants (30% foreign-born, vs. 20% for the city overall), and with below-average proportions of white residents who speak English only.

The children, nonetheless, are optimistic about their families' economic progress. Asked in 1992 whether they believed their family's economic situation was better (or much better), the same, or worse (or much worse) than it had been three years before, 54% said it was better, compared to 10% who felt it had worsened. Asked the same question in 1995-96, 40% believed it had improved, while 16% said it had worsened. Perceptions of downward mobility are significantly associated with depressive symptoms, as will be seen in a later section on psychological well-being outcomes.

#### **Family Structure and the Quality of Family Relationships**

Family and school are the central interpersonal contexts shaping the experience of these youths as they make their passages to adulthood. Table 3 presents data on the size and composition of their family-households, and a variety of indicators of the quality of parent-child relationships. At both T1 and T2, family structure emerged as a key determinant of educational performance outcomes—as well as of self-esteem and depression. The presence of both natural parents at home is significantly and strongly associated with positive outcomes over time. Indeed, an intact family was a principal predictor of the probability that a student was re-interviewed at T2: while the overall re-interview rate was a solid 85.2%, the re-interview rate for students living in intact families at T1 was over 90%, compared to 75% for students living in step-families or in single-parent homes at T1.

#### TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Over time in the U.S., for every nationality, the size of their households decreases (as the economic need to pool resources with extended family members, such as grandparents and uncles and aunts, lessens). But there is also evidence, as Table 3 shows, that the proportion of intact families with both natural parents at home also decreases slightly, mainly as a result of marital separation or divorce. The

sharpest declines were seen among the Hmong and the Cambodians (in the latter case involving a greater proportion of death of a parent between T1 and T2 than for any other group). In general, the higher the socioeconomic status of these groups, the larger the proportion of intact families. The highest proportions (around 85%) of such stable family structures were noted among U.S.-born Vietnamese and Filipino children, and the lowest (around 60%) for the Mexican families, a figure matched by T2 by the Hmong and the Cambodians.

However, in addition to the importance of family structure is the question of the quality of familial relationships—that is, of the cohesiveness of families, and of the degree of parent-child conflict—and of their effects, net of structural factors. Nearly three-fourths of the youths in San Diego sample lived in intact families (74% at T1, 72% at T2), but within these families there is significant variance in the level of cohesiveness and conflict among family members. Indeed, growing up in immigrant families is often marked by wide linguistic and other acculturative gaps between parents and children that can exacerbate intergenerational conflicts, cause the children to feel embarrassed rather than proud of their parents as they try to fit in with native peers, and even lead to role reversals, as children assume adult roles prematurely by dint of circumstance. An indication of the importance of the quality of such relationships was suggested in an earlier multivariate analysis of cross-sectional results at T1 (Rumbaut, 1994a), which found that our measure of parent-child conflict emerged as the single strongest determinant—much more so than an intact family structure—of both self-esteem and depression. The same parent-child conflict index had a more significant and stronger (negative) effect on educational achievement (GPA) and aspirations than the weaker (positive) effect of an intact family structure (see Rumbaut, 1997a). We will return to these analyses in the final section of the paper.

Table 3 presents data on *family cohesion* (a 3-item measure used at T2, scaled 1 to 5, as detailed in the technical appendix), *familism* (a 3-item scale, identified through factor analysis and used at T1 and T2, measuring a deeply ingrained sense of collective obligation to the family), *parent-child conflict* (a 3-item scale also identified through factor analysis and used at T1 and T2), and the proportion of children who indicated *embarrassment* about their parents at both T1 and T2. (The composition and reliability of these scales are specified in the technical appendix attached.)

By these measures, the families of Mexico-born youths emerge here as the most cohesive and familistic as well as characterized by relatively low and actually decreasing parent-child conflict over time, as measured by these scales, while those of U.S.-born Mexican youths have only average scores in cohesion and conflict—a result suggestive of significant generational differences. Mexican-origin children, however, regardless of nativity, were significantly less likely to report embarrassment about their parents than any other nationality in the sample. By contrast, levels of parent-child conflict were otherwise significantly higher among the foreign-born than the U.S.-born generally, and by nationality such conflict was highest for the Filipino and the Indochinese groups.

The Hmong, who experience the greatest *contextual dissonance* between the world of their parents (the majority of whom are preliterate highlanders, with the Hmong language being but an oral tradition until missionaries in Laos developed a written notation for it in the 1950s) and the Southern California world in which they are growing up, are caught in a quandary: they were the most apt to express embarrassment about and conflict with their parents at both T1 and T2, despite exhibiting high cohesion and familism scores at the same time. Familism scores are generally higher for the foreign-born than the U.S.-born in this sample, and tend to decline over time in the U.S., suggesting a growing acculturation to the individualistic values of American society.

## Patterns of Achievement: GPAs, Dropouts, Suspensions, Homework, TV, and School Contexts

An important reason for following this sample of students over time was to find out about their educational performance, their likelihood of dropping out of school before graduation, and the main determinants of these outcomes. One key question was whether the level of attainment exhibited by these children of immigrants matched, exceeded, or fell below the grade 9-12 average for the San Diego school district overall (the nation's 8<sup>th</sup> largest). A fairly precise comparison of official GPAs and dropout rates is possible, since the school system is the same source of information for both measures and both populations. Academic grade point averages (the percent of students with GPAs below 2.0 and above 3.0), broken down by grade level (9-12), for all schools district-wide in San Diego in 1993-94, were compared against the GPAs earned in grades 9-12 in those schools by the entire original T1 sample of 2,420 children of immigrants during 1992-95. *The results, presented below, showed that at every grade level the children of immigrants outperform the district norms, although the gap narrows over time and grade level.* For example, only 29% of all 9<sup>th</sup> graders in the district had GPAs above 3.0 (top students with As and Bs in their academic classes), compared to a much higher 44% of the 9<sup>th</sup> graders from immigrant families; and while 36% of 9<sup>th</sup> graders district-wide had low GPAs under 2.0 (less than a C on average), only half as many (18%) of the children of immigrants performed as poorly. Those differentials decline over time by grade level, so that the advantage by the 12<sup>th</sup> grade is reduced to a few percentage points in favor of the children-of-immigrants.

Grade	<u>San Diego City Schools, 1994<sup>3</sup></u>		<u>Children of Immigrants, 1992-95</u>	
	GPAs (%)		GPAs (%)	
	<u>Below 2.0</u>	<u>Above 3.0</u>	<u>Below 2.0</u>	<u>Above 3.0</u>
9	36	29	18	44
10	36	31	23	40
11	29	34	25	41
12	14	46	12	50

Part of that narrowing of the GPA gap may be due to the fact that a greater proportion of students district-wide drop out of school than do the youth from immigrant families. As the following breakdown by ethnicity shows, the multi-year dropout rate for grades 9-12 in the San Diego schools was 16.2 percent, nearly triple the rate of 5.7% for the entire original sample of children of immigrants--that is, of the 2,420 students who were originally interviewed in 1992 in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades, only 5.7% were officially determined to have dropped out of school at any point by 1996.<sup>4</sup> That dropout rate is significantly lower than the dropout rates for preponderantly native non-Hispanic white (10.5%) and black (17.8%) high school students. Among the students from immigrant families, the highest dropout rate (8.5%) was that for "Hispanic" (mostly Mexican-origin) students, but even that rate was noticeably lower than the district norm, and slightly lower than the rate for non-Hispanic whites.

<sup>3</sup> Unweighted academic Grade Point Averages, where A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0. "Below 2.0" are students with less than a C average in their courses, while "above 3.0" students average A's and B's. District-wide data on 1993-94 GPAs and dropout rates are drawn from published reports of the Planning, Assessment and Accountability Division of San Diego City Schools (1995).

<sup>4</sup> Ethnicity as classified by the San Diego City Schools. Some of these ethnic categories combine students regardless of nativity, national origin, or generation in the U.S. Thus, the groups in the children of immigrants sample have been aggregated here equivalently for comparative purposes. The multi-year dropout rate for grades 9-12 measures the percentage of students in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade who drop out of school before they finish high school.

**Multi-year (Grades 9-12) Dropout Rates, San Diego City Schools, by Ethnicity and Gender**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Filipino</u>	<u>Indochinese</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
All Students (Grades 9-12):	10.5	17.8	26.5	5.8	12.2	9.7	17.1	15.4	16.2
Children of Immigrants:	**	**	8.5	4.5	4.0	4.8	5.9	5.6	5.7

Shifting the focus now to the T2 longitudinal sample, [Table 4](#) describes the school performance of these youths from immigrant families in more detail over time, broken down by nativity and nationality, as well as data on the level of effort invested (comparing daily hours spent doing homework vs. watching TV), and on a range of characteristics of their school contexts. In terms of national origin, there are major differences seen in all indicators of school performance. The highest GPAs are earned by Vietnamese and especially the “Other Asian” (Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Indian) students, although the Vietnamese have average dropout rates relative to other nationalities in the sample as well as an above-average number of school suspensions (mostly for fighting and disruption/defiance). The lowest dropout rates were evidenced by the Lao and the Hmong—the two ethnic groups from Laos—while the Cambodians had the lowest number of school suspensions. The Filipinos performed above average on all of these outcome measures. The Mexicans, on the other hand, evidenced significantly lower GPAs and higher rates of dropping out and of being suspended from school than any other group in the sample—although it bears recalling the above-mentioned finding that they still showed a lower multi-year dropout rate than that for the district as a whole and for mostly native non-Hispanic white and black students in the school system

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

These results are remarkable enough in view of the relatively low socioeconomic status of a substantial proportion of the immigrant families. They become all the more remarkable in the context of other school data displayed in [Table 4](#). At T1, over a quarter (28.7%) of the sample were classified as LEP [Limited English Proficient] students by the schools, ranging from virtually none of the native-born Filipinos to around two-thirds of the foreign-born Mexican, Cambodian and Hmong students. That classification is supported by nationally standardized ASAT (Abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test) scores measuring English reading skills: the sample as a whole scored just below the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally, and the foreign-born groups with the highest proportion of LEP students scored in the bottom quartile nationally. That language handicap reflects their relatively recent arrival as non-native-English speakers; a language other than English is spoken in the homes of nearly all of these students (96% at T2), although, as will be shown below, their fluency in the parental language tends to atrophy over time, while their ability in and preference for English increases. On the other hand, as would be expected, all groups do better in math computation than English reading tests (for an earlier district-wide study, see Rumbaut and Ima, 1988). At T1, their ASAT math achievement test scores placed the sample as a whole at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally, with some students achieving extraordinarily high scores (notably the U.S.-born Vietnamese and “Other Asian” [Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Korean] students, placing most of them in the top quartile nationally). In fact, a disproportionate number of those U.S.-born students were classified as *gifted* by the schools, as shown in [Table 4](#).

One key reason for these students’ above-average academic GPAs, despite significant socioeconomic and linguistic handicaps, is shown in the middle panel of [Table 4](#). They work for it. At both T1 and T2, these students reported spending an average of over 2 hours per day on homework, with the foreign-born

students compensating for language and other handicaps by significantly outworking their U.S.-born peers. From the end of junior high at T1, to the end of senior high at T2, the level of effort put into school work increased across all nationalities. The sole exception in this regard were the Hmong, who at T1 posted the highest average number of daily homework hours (2.9), but decreased to 2.6 hours at T2 (still above the sample average); not surprisingly, that drop in effort was matched by the drop in their GPAs from 2.92 (at T1) to 2.63 (at T2), the main drop in GPA among all the groups in the sample. GPA, more so than achievement test scores, is a measure of school performance that reflects the level effort invested in it by the student and rewarded by the teacher. Overall, the children of immigrants generally maintained their level of GPA attainment from T1 (2.80) to T2 (2.77).

In multivariate analyses at T1, the number of daily homework hours emerged as the strongest single predictor of higher GPAs, while the number of hours spent watching television daily was significantly associated with lower GPAs (see Rumbaut, 1995, 1997). By T2, the data show that students who had dedicated more hours to school work in junior high did significantly better in terms of educational achievement three years later. Conversely, students who spent a large number of hours in front of the television by age 14 were more prone to perform poorly in subsequent years. The negative effect of television on children's academic performance is confirmed by these findings--although the effect, while still significantly negative, becomes weaker. Table 4 shows that for all groups without exception, the average amount of time in front of the TV declined from the early-to-mid-adolescent years at T1, to the end of high school and adolescence at T2, as the students matured, got drivers' licenses and part-time jobs. Still, taken together these results suggest that, even among student from low socioeconomic backgrounds, those with ambition and work discipline were more prone to get ahead educationally.

What other factors were found to be most predictive of children of immigrants' educational achievement and aspirations? A preliminary analysis (to be elaborated upon at the end of this paper) suggests that falling behind in school or getting ahead is largely determined by the same set of factors. Children who come from intact families with both natural parents present at home do much better—that is, they have higher GPAs, lower dropout rates and suspensions, and higher aspirations. This is even more so the case in more cohesive families with lower levels of parent-child conflict.

Similarly, youths who come from high status families also have a distinct advantage. Those whose mothers and fathers have a college education perform much better in terms of achieving high grades and remaining in school without disciplinary action taken against them, than do those whose parents have lesser levels of education. These same patterns are evident for other indicators of socioeconomic status, such as home-ownership and neighborhood poverty rates. Students who remain in school and achieve higher grades with fewer suspensions tend to attend suburban schools in higher-status areas of the city. It is scarcely surprising that a more cohesive and resourceful home environment leads to higher educational achievement. Rather, in this respect, children of immigrants are no different from the native-born.

While gender makes only a small difference in terms of remaining in school, it strongly affects grades and suspensions, with females exhibiting superior performance compared to male students, as well as an edge in educational aspirations—although at the same time, females exhibited significantly lower self-esteem and higher depression than males at both T1 and T2. Indeed, this gender paradox parallels a larger achievement paradox among immigrant students: the more recently arrived foreign-born students tend to earn higher GPAs and devote more effort to their schooling than their U.S.-born co-ethnic peers, yet the newcomers too exhibit lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms. What both females and recent immigrants share in common is a relatively more devalued and disparaged status in the stratification system of their social worlds, with concomitant psychological effects.

For all of them, however, hard work and a clear sense of future goals pay off handsomely. High occupational goals in early adolescence (which are detailed in the next section) are closely associated with remaining in school and with better educational performance. So, notably, is the influence of peers: the worst educational outcomes by far were associated with having close friends who themselves had dropped out of school or had no plans for college, while conversely, the best outcomes were attained by students whose circle of friends consisted of largely college-bound peers.

The bottom panel in Table 4 now shifts the focus to specific events and circumstances in the school attended by the respondent. The items listed were factor analyzed and found to make up three factors (which were subsequently combined to produce three indices): (1) an index of perceived *school safety*—including the presence of gangs at the school, the frequency of interracial or interethnic fights, appraisals of the level of disruptions by others experienced at the school, and whether the respondent felt safe at school; (2) an index of *stressful school events* occurring to the respondent in the current year—including one or more instances of getting into a physical fight, being threatened, being offered drugs, and having personal property stolen while at school; and (3) a measure of *teaching quality and fairness*—appraisals of whether the teachers are interested and the teaching is good, and of the fairness of grading and discipline. Despite very high reports of disruptions, gang presence and interethnic fights at school (about 50% reported these), not feeling safe at school (25% did not feel safe), and a high incidence of stressful events (from thefts to threats), almost nine-tenths (87%) gave high marks to their teachers, in part another way of underscoring the value they place on education. [As an aside here, it turns out that these indices of contextual factors have significant effects in multivariate analyses of self-esteem and depressive symptoms at T2.]

### **Patterns of Ambition: Educational and Occupational Aspirations, Expectations, and Values**

San Diego's children of immigrants are ambitious and their goals—both their aspirations and their expectations—remain stable over time, as evidenced by the results shown in [Table 5](#). When they were early teenagers, 61% *aspired* to advanced degrees and another 26% would not be satisfied with less than a college degree. Three years later, as the high school years came to a close, these proportions stayed the same—62% now aspired to earn advanced degrees and 26% aspired to graduate from college—showing the stability over time of these aspirations. The students were also asked for a “realistic” assessment of their chances of achieving those aspirations. At T1, 35% “realistically” *expected* to earn advanced degrees and another 39% would not be satisfied with less than a college degree. At T2, these proportions actually edged up slightly—37% now “realistically” expected to earn advanced degrees and another 41% expected to graduate from college—again showing the resilience over time of these more realistic expectations. The proportion of those who, based on a realistic assessment, believed that they would not reach as far as a college degree dropped from 26% at T1 to 22% at T2. Given the modest family origins and material resources of many of these children, their ambitions and even realistic expectations may be quite disproportionate with what many will be able to achieve in the end. In part, their optimism may be triggered by their appraisal of the economic progress of their families (as seen above in Table 2) and by their own efforts so far (as suggested by the results in Table 4).

#### **TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE**

Ambition clearly matters. The research literature shows that high expectations are necessary for subsequent achievement. However, there are significant variations both among immigrant communities and in the social context that would make attainment of their expectations possible. While most of these youths aim high, the loftiest goals are found among the Filipinos, Vietnamese, and “Other Asians,” with about half of them (whether foreign-born or native-born) believing that they will achieve a post-graduate degree—percentages that *increased* over time. The least ambitious expectations are seen among the

Mexicans, Cambodians and Laotians—who are also the groups whose expectations *decreased* over time. Thus, there are major differences in aspirations by family socioeconomic status, and this gap appears to widen over time. Children from better off families have predictably higher and more secure plans for the future. The correlations between parental socioeconomic status variables and children's educational goals and expectations are positive and highly significant.

*Indeed, even more ambitious than these children are their own parents.* As Table 5 shows, asked what their parents' expectations were for their educational futures, the students felt that their parents expected them to achieve at a much higher level than the students themselves aspired to. Indeed, for many immigrants that is precisely the purpose of bringing their children to the United States. For example, at T2, while 37% of the students expected to attain an advanced degree, 60% of their parents did so; and while 22% of the children expected to stop short of a college degree, only 9% of the parents held such a low expectation. Parental expectations are significantly correlated with students' school performance.

In sharp contrast to the perceived parental pressure to achieve are the plans of the students' close *friends*—and here again the types of peer groups in which the students are embedded vary in part by family socioeconomic status. Children from higher status families, growing up in neighborhoods where residents have low poverty rates and high levels of education, are also much less likely to have friends who have dropped out of high school, who have no college plans, or who plan to skip college and get a full-time job after high school. Conversely, most of the friends of these advantaged youths also intend to attend 4-year colleges or universities. The sharpest contrast in these friendship networks is seen between the U.S.-born Vietnamese (57% of whom report that most of their friends intend to attend 4-year colleges or universities, while virtually none have friends who dropped out of school) and the Mexican students (only a quarter of whom have friends who plan on attending 4-year colleges, a third have friends who plan to get a job after high school, and about 8% have close friends who had already dropped out of school). These social circles can exercise a powerful influence in either reinforcing or undercutting children's high aspirations and confidence in reaching them.

Table 5 also reports results at T1 and T2 of the children of immigrants' occupational aspirations. The proportion aspiring to upper white-collar professions increased from 70% of the total sample at T1 to 74% at T2. Such goals increased for every group, by nativity and nationality, except for U.S.-born youth of Mexican parents, for whom a slight decline was registered (from 64% to 60%). For the overall sample, the proportion of native-born children of immigrants who reported such aspirations remained identical (73%) from junior high to the end of senior high, while such aspirations increased for foreign-born youth from two-thirds of them at T1 to three-fourths at T2. In general, as in the case with educational aspirations, the stability and resilience of these occupational aspirations over time is underscored by these latest data. And as with educational goals, higher status families encourage loftier occupational goals in their children. By and large, children of immigrants imitate their native peers in preferring careers perceived as the most prestigious and remunerative.

The professions of choice at T1 (not shown in Table 5) were physician (22%), engineer (14%), business executive/manager (10%), lawyer (8%), and computer programmer (7%). In the T2 survey three years later, the top three choices are again physician (20%), engineer (15%), and business executive/manager (14%), followed now by nurse/physical therapist (13%) and professor/teacher (9%). By T2 the choice of law as a career fell to ninth place, below clerical/sales (5%), while computer programmer remained the choice of 7% of the sample. In the most popular career choices there were noticeable differences by nationality at both T1 and T2. By the latest survey, almost a third of the Vietnamese (30%) aspired to become physicians—up from 24% in 1992—and another 18% aspired to business management—up from 12% in the first survey. Among the Filipinos, the proportion planning to



become doctors declined over this time from 28% to 23%, while the choice of a nursing career more than doubled from 9% to 22% (the career modeled by many of their mothers). Among the Mexicans and the other Indochinese groups, occupational plans became more realistic, with the proportions planning to become doctors and lawyers declining significantly by T2, while more modest professions increased in popularity. Still, notably, by T2 the Mexicans ranked above all other groups in their aspiration to become lawyers.

Finally, as shown in the bottom panel of Table 5, the children of immigrants in this sample almost universally value the importance of a good education. Out of a variety of choices given in the T2 survey, 90% ranked a good education as “very important” (more than any other value), and another 81% deemed becoming an expert in one’s field “very important,” while only half as many (45%) equally valued “having lots of money.”

### **Language Shifts: English Proficiency and Preference**

Language preference is a key index of cultural assimilation. Over 90% of these children of immigrants report speaking a language other than English at home, mostly with their parents. But as seen in Table 6, at T1 two-thirds of the total sample (66%) already preferred to speak English instead of their parents’ native tongue, including 56% of the foreign-born youth and 78% of the U.S.-born. Three years later, the proportion had grown significantly to over four fifths (82%), including 72% of the foreign-born and over 90% of the U.S.-born. The most linguistically assimilated in this respect were the Filipinos, among whom 92% of those born in the Philippines (where English is an official language) and 98% of those born in the U.S. preferred English by T2. But even among the most mother-tongue-retentive group—the Mexican-origin youth living in a Spanish-named city on the Mexican border with a large Spanish-speaking immigrant population and a wide range of Spanish-language radio and TV stations—the force of linguistic assimilation was incontrovertible: while at T1 only a third (32%) of the Mexico-born children preferred English, by T2 that preference had doubled to 61%; and while just over half (53%) of the U.S.-born preferred English at T1, that proportion had jumped to four-fifths (79%) three years later.

#### **TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE**

A main reason for this rapid language shift in use and preference has to do with their increasing fluency in English (both spoken and written) relative to their level of fluency in the mother tongue. Respondents were asked to evaluate their ability to speak, understand, read and write in both English and the non-English mother tongue; the response format (identical to the item used in the U.S. census) ranged from “not at all” and “not well” to “well” and “very well.” Over two-thirds of the total sample reported speaking English “very well” (67% at T1, growing to 71% at T2), compared to only about a third who reported an equivalent level of spoken fluency in the non-English language. Naturally, these differentials are much more pronounced among U.S.-born youth, most of whom (87%) spoke English “very well,” while only a fourth of them could speak the parental language “very well.” But even among the foreign born, those who spoke English very well surpassed by 59% to 44% those who spoke the foreign language just as well.

And the differences in reading fluency (not shown in the table for reasons of space) are much sharper still: those who can read English “very well” triple the proportion of those who can read a non-English language very well (68% to 23%). Only the Mexico-born youth maintained by T2 an edge in their reported knowledge of Spanish over English, and even they nonetheless indicated a preference for English. The ability to maintain a sound level of literacy in a language—particularly in languages with entirely different alphabets and rules of syntax and grammar, such as many of the Asian languages

brought by immigrants to California—is nearly impossible to maintain in the absence of schools that teach it, and a community in which it can be regularly practiced.

As a consequence, the bilingualism of these children of immigrants becomes increasingly uneven and unstable. The data in Table 6 vividly underscore the rapidity with which English triumphs and foreign languages atrophy in the United States—even in a border city like San Diego with the busiest international border crossing in the world—as the second generation not only comes to speak, read and write it fluently, but prefers it overwhelmingly over their parents’ native tongue.

This linear pattern of rapid linguistic assimilation is constant across nationalities and socioeconomic levels and suggests that, over time, the use of and fluency in foreign languages will inevitably decline—results which directly rebut nativist alarms about the perpetuation of foreign-language enclaves in immigrant communities. These findings suggest that the linguistic outcomes for the third generation—the grandchildren of the present wave of immigrants—will be no different than what has been the age-old pattern in American immigration history: the grandchildren may learn a few foreign words and phrases as a quaint vestige of their ancestry, but they will most likely grow up speaking English only.

### **Ethnic Identity Shifts and Perceptions of Discrimination**

In both surveys, an identical open-ended question was asked to ascertain the respondent’s ethnic self-identity. The results (and the wording of the question) are presented in the middle panel of Table 6. Four main types of ethnic identities became apparent: (1) a plain “American” identity; (2) a hyphenated-American identity; (3) a national-origin identity (e.g., Mexican, Filipino, Vietnamese); and (4) a pan-ethnic minority identity (e.g., Hispanic, Latino, Chicano, Asian, Black). The way that adolescents see themselves is significant. Self-identities and ethnic loyalties can often influence patterns of behavior and outlook independent of the status of the families or the types of schools that children attend. That significance is confirmed by the students themselves: the overwhelming majority perceive their ethnic identity as “important” to themselves, including two-thirds (66%) who deem it “very important,” as shown in the bottom panel of Table 6. But unlike aspirations, which tend to remain stable over time, or language, which changes in straight-line fashion, ethnic self-identities vary significantly over time—yet not in linear fashion, like an arrow, but in a reactive, dialectical fashion, rather more like a boomerang. The data in Table 6 illustrate that pattern compellingly.

In 1992, almost a third (32%) of the sample identified by national origin; the largest proportion (43%) chose a hyphenated-American identification; a small fraction (3.3%) identified as plain “American;” and 16% selected pan-ethnic minority identities. Whether the youth was born in the U.S. or not made a great deal of difference in the type of identity selected at T1: the foreign-born were three times more likely to identify by national origins (44%) than were the U.S.-born (16%); conversely, the U.S.-born were much more likely to identify as “American” or hyphenated-American than were the foreign-born, and somewhat more likely to identify in pan-ethnic term. Those findings at T1 seemed suggestive of an assimilative trend from one generation to another. But by the T2 survey (conducted in the months after the passage, with 59% of the vote, of Proposition 187 in California in November 1994) the results were quite the opposite from what would have been predicted by a straight-line identificational assimilation perspective.

In 1995, the biggest gainer by far in terms of the self-image of these youths was the foreign nationality identity, increasing from 32% of the sample at T1 to nearly half (48%) now. This shift took place among both the foreign-born and the U.S.-born, as Table 5 shows. This occurred among most but not all national-origin groups, and it was particularly sharp among the youth of Mexican and Filipino descent. Overall, pan-ethnic identities remained at 16% at T2, but that figure conceals a notable decline

among Mexican-origin youth in “Hispanic” and “Chicano” self-identities, and an extremely sharp upswing in the proportion of youths now identifying pan-ethnically as “Asian” or “Asian American,” especially among the smallest groups such as the “Other Asians” (Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Thai) and the Hmong among the Indochinese. The simultaneous rapid decline of both the plain “American” (cut in half to a miniscule 1.6%) and hyphenated-American (dropping from 43% to 30%) self-identities points to the rapid growth of a reactive ethnic consciousness. Furthermore, the measure of the salience or importance that the youths gave to their chosen identities showed that the strongest salience scores were reported for national-origin identities, and the weakest for plain “American” ones, with hyphenates scoring in-between in salience.

Change over time, thus, has been not toward assimilative mainstream identities (with or without a hyphen), but rather a return to and a valorization of the immigrant identity for the largest groups, and toward pan-ethnic identities among the smallest groups, as these youths become increasingly aware of the ethnic and racial categories in which they are classified by mainstream society—and this among a sample of children of immigrants less than 2% of whom self-report racially as “white.”

#### TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

The process of growing ethnic awareness is also evident in the evolution of their perceptions, experiences and expectations of race and ethnic discrimination. These are detailed in the top panel of Table 7. Reported experiences of discrimination against themselves increased from 64% to 69% of the sample in the last survey. Virtually every group reported more such experiences of rejection or unfair treatment against themselves as they grew older, with the Hmong registering the sharpest increase (to 82%), but about two-thirds of every other nationality in San Diego uniformly reported such experiences.

Racial and ethnic prejudice are the main factors driving such negative experiences. Among those suffering discrimination, their own race or nationality are the overwhelming forces perceived to account for that unfair treatment. Furthermore, such experiences of discrimination tend to be associated over time with the development of a distinctly more pessimistic stance about their chances to reduce discriminatory treatment on meritocratic grounds through higher educational achievement. As Table 7 shows, in both surveys the students were asked to agree or disagree with the statement, “No matter how much education I get, people will still discriminate against me.” In 1992, 37% of the total sample agreed with that gloomy assessment; by 1995-96, the proportion agreeing had grown to 41%. Such expectations of external discrimination on ascribed rather than achieved grounds—and thus of perceived danger and threatening circumstances beyond one’s control—were found in an multivariate analysis of the original survey data to be significant predictors of depressive symptomatology (see Rumbaut, 1994a). That finding is now confirmed again three years later.

Perhaps because of their awareness of racial discrimination and ethnic inequality (see Table 7 for specific results), these youths are not ready to endorse all aspects of American society. Asked how often they prefer “American ways,” an identical minority of 41% in both surveys reported that they did so most of the time. Instead the majority of children of immigrants take a selective stance, preferring American ways only some of the time. Nonetheless, it is important to emphasize as well that despite their growing awareness of the realities of American racism and intolerance, most continue to affirm a sanguine belief in the promise of equal opportunity through educational achievement—including nearly 60% in the latest survey who disagreed with the statement that people will discriminate against them regardless of educational merit. Even more tellingly, 63% of these youths agreed in the original survey that “there is no better country to live in than the United States,” and that endorsement grew to 71% three years later. Majorities of every nationality, regardless of whether they were foreign-born or U.S.-born, agreed with that appraisal, ranging from nearly 60% among the Mexicans and Cambodians to a high of 85% among

the U.S.-born children of the 1975 Vietnamese refugees, whose families generally experienced a supportive and welcoming context of reception through a historic resettlement program organized by the U.S. government.

### **Psychological Well-Being: Patterns and Predictors of Self-Esteem and Depression**

In this section we shift our focus to examine two key cognitive and affective dimensions of psychosocial adaptation and well-being: self-esteem and depression, respectively. The measure of global self-esteem used is the 10-item Rosenberg scale. Depressive symptoms are measured with the 4-item Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) subscale. Both are scored on a scale of 1 to 4 as the mean of the items composing the measure (the composition, scoring and reliability of these widely used scales are specified in the technical appendix). To be sure, self-esteem and depression are inversely related (the correlation between the two measures at T1 was  $-.362$ , and at T2 it was  $-.418$ ), but they are determined by distinct sets of factors and are not simply two sides of the same psychological coin, as is clear from the results of multiple regressions. Furthermore, the T1 score on each scale is significantly but only moderately correlated with the T2 score on the same scale three years later ( $.411$  for self-esteem,  $.297$  for depression), suggesting that considerable change occurs over time in the psychological dimensions of well-being tapped by these measures, particularly with regard to depressive symptoms.

#### **TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE**

Table 8 sketches a detailed picture of self-esteem and depression scores at T1 and T2, broken down by gender for a wide range of hypothesized predictors: national origin, nativity, age at arrival, citizenship, socioeconomic status, family structure and parent-child conflict, English proficiency and preference, aspirations, ethnic self-identity, and experiences and expectations of discrimination. These results portray the differing social patterning of these measures of psychological well-being: some of the predictor variables (e.g., parent-child conflict) show clear and significant linear relationships with both well-being outcomes, while others are significantly associated with one but not the other (e.g., U.S. citizenship, parent's education, and English preference are significantly associated with self-esteem but not with depression, while being discriminated against is much more strongly linked with depression than with self-esteem). These data are presented separately by gender because of the very significant differences that are found between males and females on both measures: females report significantly lower self-esteem and higher levels of depressive symptoms, a finding consistent with other studies of adolescents and adults among both immigrants and natives and among both majority and minority populations. As spelled out in Table 8, for both males and females in this sample there is a statistically significant if moderate increase over time in self-esteem (from T1 to T2), while for both males and females their slightly higher scores in depressive symptoms by T2 are not significantly different. Still, a multiple regression analysis of each of these two dependent variables—self-esteem and depression as of T2, when these youths were nearing the end of adolescence and high school—shows that they are shaped by a largely different set of determinants.

First, as had been found earlier with the T1 data, gender remains one of the most significant predictors of both well-being measures even after controlling for a score of other variables. Significantly lower self-esteem, and even higher levels of depressive symptoms, are observed for females in this sample (even though, as noted earlier, females significantly outperform males in educational achievement outcomes such as GPAs and suspensions, and they also exhibit higher educational aspirations). *Age at arrival* washes out of the self-esteem equation, but remains significantly associated with depression: the more recently arrived the immigrant (and the older age at time of arrival), the higher the depression score, net of other factors. That finding is consistent with T1 results as well, and with the expectations of theories of acculturative stress among immigrants. And among national origin groups, the Filipinos and

Vietnamese are significantly linked to lower self-esteem. This again confirms the T1 finding that among all the different nationalities, only the Filipinos and Vietnamese reflect statistically significantly lower self-esteem scores, net of other factors, raising questions about possible psychosocial vulnerabilities and dynamics among these two groups of children of immigrants, not captured by our data, that may be linked to a diminished sense of self-worth. The findings are all the more intriguing in view of recent reports by the Centers for Disease Control, based on surveys in San Diego and elsewhere, that found Filipinos in San Diego schools as reporting the highest levels of suicidal ideation and attempts of any major ethnic group, despite the comparative socioeconomic advantages of that population. Those findings have also been supported by a separate study by Wolf (1997) of Filipino youth in two California sites. No other nationalities showed significant associations with either dependent variable in other models tested.

Second, intra-family factors have very significant effects on both dependent variables, particularly the measure of parent-child conflict which, as in T1, emerges as one of the principal predictors of emotional well-being in these populations. By contrast, family structure washes out of the self-esteem equation, and retains a weak though still significant protective effect against depressive symptoms. A stronger effect is seen for the measure of family cohesion. Perceptions of downward economic mobility in the family's situation is very significantly associated with depression (as had also been seen at T1), but not self-esteem. Family contexts clearly if varying shape psychological outcomes among these youths.

Third, several of the hypothesized extra-family factors that wash out of the self-esteem equation retain significant net effects on depressive symptoms—notably *expectations of discrimination* (underscoring the point made earlier about the effects of perceived discrimination on psychological well-being), as well as stressful school events experienced, and the decision of most close friends not to go to college (but instead to drop out or get a job). *These variables appear generally to have in common the experience of perceived danger and lack of control over threatening life events—characteristics that have been specifically associated with depressive symptomatology.* Interestingly, the proportion of English-only speakers in the neighborhood—an indicator of contextual dissonance—emerges as a significant predictor of *both* lower self-esteem and higher depression. The finding lends support to theoretical predictions, following Rosenberg (1979), that self-esteem should be lower in contexts where social dissimilarity is greater, along with exposure to negative stereotypes and reflected appraisals about one's group of origin.

By contrast, a very different set of predictors having to do with personal competence in role performance—educational achievement and aspirations and achieving a command of English—all had strong and significant effects on self-esteem, especially English proficiency (underscoring again the psychological importance of language competency for immigrant youth), but all of them washed out as predictors of depressive symptoms.

In all of these respects, it becomes clear that self-esteem and depressive symptoms are measures of different cognitive and affective dimensions of psychological well-being, subject to a different set of determinants, which throw additional light on the adaptational challenges that children of immigrants confront in their passages to adulthood in American contexts. In some respects, such as the effects of gender, the patterns are quite similar to what one would expect to find with a sample of non-immigrant, non-minority youth. But in others—particularly with respect to issues of non-native language competency, contextual dissonance, foreign birth and recency of arrival, entry into minority status and experiences and expectations of discrimination—the children of immigrants face acculturative stressors along with the potential for accompanying intergenerational conflict over these within the family that significantly add to the developmental challenges of adolescence.

## Predictors of Achievement and Ambition: A Summary

Despite these added challenges—or perhaps because of them—the overall picture that emerges from our study is one of noteworthy achievement and resilient ambition. Whether that can be sustained as these youths make their entry into the world of work and careers, as they form new families of their own, and as they seek to carve out a meaningful place in the years ahead in the society of which they are the newest members, remain as of yet unanswered questions.

However, the available longitudinal data affords an opportunity to examine the effect of independent variables measured at T1 when they were in junior high, upon selected outcomes by the end of senior high at T2 three years later. This final section returns to the crucial question raised earlier about the determinants of children of immigrants' educational achievement and aspirations. For our purposes here, the temporal ordering of these variables is unambiguous. The presentation of results is organized in a series of sequential tables (together comprising Table 9), based on three different indicators of educational outcomes reported by the school system: *the latest GPA achieved, having dropped out of school at any point since T1, and the number of school suspensions meted out for serious disciplinary infractions*. In addition, a measure of educational aspirations is also examined as an outcome for the purpose of this analysis. This set of tables show the values of each of these outcomes of interest as of 1995-96 for selected predictors measured for the most part three years earlier in 1992. These latter include nationality, gender, intact families, parent-child conflict, mother's and father's education, home ownership, the poverty rate of the neighborhood (census tract) of residence at T1, attending an inner-city or suburban school at T1, school classification as a gifted and as a LEP or FEP student, language preference, nativity, homework hours per day at T1 (and T2), TV-watching hours per day at T1 (and T2), ethnic self-identity at T1, self-esteem score at T1, friends' college plans, and the respondents' own specific college plans. The tables also examine the association of these predictors with parents' aspirations for their children.

The pattern revealed by these results, as noted earlier, is that falling behind in school or getting ahead is largely determined by the same set of factors. In addition to the national origin and gender differences in achievement previously noted, the data in Table 9 clearly show that children who come from intact families with both natural parents present at home do much better—that is, they have higher GPAs, lower dropout rates and suspensions, and higher aspirations. This is even more pronounced in families (even intact families) with lower levels of parent-child conflict. The greater the stability of the family, both structurally *and* emotionally (in terms of the quality of parent-child interactions), the greater the educational achievement and aspirations—and, in addition, the higher the self-esteem and the lower the level of depressive symptoms. To illustrate, consider the following breakdown of relevant outcomes:

<u>Family Type</u> (at T1)	<u>GPA</u> <u>at T2</u>	<u>% Dropped</u> <u>out by T2</u>	<u>N of school</u> <u>Suspensions</u>	<u>Self-esteem</u> <u>score, T2</u>	<u>Depression</u> <u>score, T2</u>
<u>Intact family:</u>					
<u>Low</u> conflict	2.86	2.70	0.21	3.43	1.51
<u>Med.</u> conflict	2.80	3.34	0.34	3.23	1.77
<u>High</u> conflict	2.30	3.45	0.46	2.86	2.06
<u>Non-intact family:</u>					
<u>Low</u> conflict	2.73	4.79	0.32	3.40	1.62
<u>Med.</u> conflict	2.56	6.43	0.34	3.11	1.90
<u>High</u> conflict	2.30	10.00	0.78	2.96	2.08

The table above depicts the combined effects of family structure (intact vs. not) *and* of varying levels of parent-child conflict at T1 upon five selected outcomes at T2: GPAs, dropouts, school suspensions, self-esteem, and depression. Overall, low-conflict intact families have the best outcomes across the board, while high-conflict non-intact families fare worst (notably in high dropout and suspension rates), although high-conflict families yield equally poor GPAs, self-esteem and depression scores regardless of parental structure.

Similarly, children of immigrants who come from higher socioeconomic status families also have a distinct advantage. Those whose mothers and fathers have a college education perform much better in terms of achieving high grades without disciplinary action taken against them, and in aspiring to advanced degrees, than do those whose parents have lesser levels of education. Remaining in school is more sensitive to the mother's level of education than the father's (partly a function of the fact of father absence in a sizable proportion of these families). These same patterns are clearly evident for other indicators of socioeconomic status, such as home-ownership and neighborhood poverty rates. Students who remain in school and who achieve higher grades with fewer suspensions tend to attend suburban schools in higher-status areas of the city.

In short, it comes as no surprise that a more cohesive, stable, and socioeconomically resourceful home environment leads to higher educational achievement—and in this respect, children of immigrants are no different from the native-born. The question then becomes what factors other than intra-family contexts influence who gets ahead. The rest of the results in these tables suggest an initial answer based on two main types of causal factors: individual characteristics of the children themselves, and contextual characteristics, especially those involving their networks of friends.

Earlier it was noted that while gender makes but a small difference in terms of remaining in school, it strongly affects grades and suspensions, with females exhibiting superior performance compared to male students in these areas, as well as an edge in educational aspirations. We suggested earlier in this connection what might be called the challenge-and-response parallel between two “paradoxes:” a “gender paradox” and an “achievement paradox,” wherein comparatively lower-status roles in the pecking order of the youths’ social worlds (females, recent immigrants) are associated both with higher educational achievement and aspirations on the one hand, and lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms on the other. Similar patterns have recently been reported for immigrant youth in Norway (Laughlo, 1997). Fruitful reformulations of adaptive processes among children of immigrants may well be stimulated and advanced through the systematic analysis of such seeming “paradoxes” (cf. Rumbaut, 1997b).

Still, for both male and female children of immigrants, work discipline and a clear sense of future goals pay off handsomely in achievement dividends. The data show that students who dedicated more hours to school work in junior high (as well as subsequently) did significantly better in terms of educational achievement three years later—a clear illustration of the positive long-term effects of the early inculcation of disciplined work habits. Conversely, students who spent a large number of hours in front of the television by age 14 were more prone to perform poorly in subsequent years. The generally negative effect of television on children's academic performance is illustrated by these findings.

Also, high educational and occupational goals and values in early adolescence are themselves closely associated with remaining in school and with better educational performance. A multiple linear regression analysis of academic GPAs at T2 found that high “realistic” educational aspirations at T1 were strongly and positively associated with high GPAs at T2 net of other factors. In addition, the higher were the parents’ achievement expectations as perceived by their children, the higher were the students’ GPAs. Taken together, these results demonstrate that, even among student from low socioeconomic

backgrounds, those with ambition and work discipline early on were more prone to get ahead educationally.

Subjective factors also shaped performance outcomes. Pan-ethnic self-identities (e.g., Chicano, Latino) selected by age 14 or 15 in junior high were linked three years later with lower GPAs, higher dropout and suspension rates, and lower aspirations (but *not* with lower self-esteem or higher depression scores). No such effects were observed for any of the other types of ethnic self-identities at T1. And the self-esteem score measured at T1 remained significantly associated with all of these outcomes across the board: the lower the self-esteem score at T1, the worse the school performance three years later. On the other hand, students who had been classified as LEP (Limited English Proficient) by the schools at T1 remained significantly associated with lower academic achievement by T2 in a multiple regression analysis. And school contexts and experiences also play a part. A multiple linear regression analysis of academic GPAs at T2 found that one measure of the quality of school contexts--the school stress events index (described earlier in Table 4)--had significant negative net effects on GPA: the higher the school stress events index score, the lower the GPA.

Finally, and even more significant in its effects, is the influence of peers: the worst outcomes by far were associated with having close friends who themselves had dropped out of school or had no plans for college, while conversely, the best outcomes were attained by students whose circle of friends consisted of largely college-bound peers. Indeed, in a multivariate analysis, the index of friends with no college plans had the most significant and strongest negative effect on GPA.

We are currently analyzing these data to seek to disentangle the effects of ethno-national background on performance from those of family socioeconomic status, peer groups, school and neighborhood contexts, and the individual characteristics and drive of each student. In this regard, your comments and suggestions in this conference will be most welcome.



## REFERENCES

- Fernández-Kelly, M. P., and R. Schauffler. 1994. "Divided Fates: Immigrant Children in a Restructured U.S. Economy." International Migration Review, 28, 4: 662-689.
- Hansen, K. A., and C. S. Faber. 1997. "The Foreign Born Population: 1996." Current Population Reports, P20-494. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Kann, L., *et al.* 1995. "Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance—United States, 1993." Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 44 (SS-1): 1-56.
- Lauglo, J. 1997. "The Adaptation of Immigrant Youth to School in Norway." Paper prepared for the Nordic Sociology Conference, Copenhagen, June 13-15.
- Oropesa, R. S., and N. S. Landale. 1997. "In Search of the New Second Generation: Alternative Strategies for Identifying Second Generation Children and Understanding Their Acquisition of English." Sociological Perspectives, 40, 3: 427-455. [Special issue on "Immigration and Incorporation," edited by R. G. Rumbaut and C. F. Hohm.]
- Pérez, L. 1994. "The Households of Children of Immigrants in South Florida: An Exploratory Study of Extended Family Arrangements." International Migration Review, 28, 4: 736-747.
- Pérez Firmat, G. 1994. Life on the Hyphen: The Cuban-American Way. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Portes, A. 1995. "Children of Immigrants: Segmented Assimilation and Its Determinants." In A. Portes, ed., The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship, pp. 248-279. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A., ed. 1996. The New Second Generation. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A., and D. MacLeod. 1996. "Educational Progress of Children of Immigrants: The Roles of Class, Ethnicity, and School Context." Sociology of Education, 69: 255-275.
- Portes, A., and R. G. Rumbaut. 1996. Immigrant America: A Portrait. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., and R. Schauffler. 1996. "Language Acquisition and Loss Among Children of Immigrants." In S. Pedraza and R. G. Rumbaut, eds., Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America, pp. 432-443. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rosenberg, M. 1979. Conceiving the Self. New York: Basic Books.
- Rumbaut, R. G. 1991a. "The Agony of Exile: A Study of Indochinese Refugee Adults and Children." In F. L. Ahearn and J. L. Athey, eds., Refugee Children: Theory, Research, and Services, pp. 53-91. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1991b. "Migration, Adaptation, and Mental Health: The Experience of Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States." In H. Adelman, ed., Refugee Policy: Canada and the United States, pp. 381-424. Toronto: York Lanes Press.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1994a. "The Crucible Within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation Among Children of Immigrants." International Migration Review, 28, 4: 748-794.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1994b. "Origins and Destinies: Immigration to the United States Since World War II." Sociological Forum, 9, 4: 583-621.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1995. "The New Californians: Comparative Research Findings on the Educational Progress of Immigrant Children." In R. G. Rumbaut and W. Cornelius, eds., California's Immigrant Children: Theory, Research, and Implications for Educational Policy, pp. 17-70. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

R. G. Rumbaut. 1996. "A Legacy of War: Refugees from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia." In S. Pedraza and R. G. Rumbaut, eds., Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America, pp. 315-333. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1997a. "Ties That Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States." In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, and N. S. Landale, eds., Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants, pp. 3-46. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rumbaut, R. G. 1997b. "Paradoxes (and Orthodoxies) of Assimilation." Sociological Perspectives, 40, 3: 483-511. [Special issue on "Immigration and Incorporation," edited by R. G. Rumbaut and C. F. Hohm.]

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.

Thomas, W.I., and F. Znaniecki. 1958. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, Vol. 2. New York: Dover. [Originally published in five volumes, 1918-1920.]

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1993. 1990 Census of Population, United States: Social and Economic Characteristics, 1990 CP-2-1 (November). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Vega, W. A., and R. G. Rumbaut. 1991. "Ethnic Minorities and Mental Health." Annual Review of Sociology, 17: 351-383.

Wolf, D. 1997. "Family Secrets: Transnational Struggles Among Children of Filipino Immigrants." Sociological Perspectives, 40, 3: 457-482. [Special issue on "Immigration and Incorporation," edited by R. G. Rumbaut and C. F. Hohm.]

Zhou, M. 1997. "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." Annual Review of Sociology, 23: 63-95.

# TECHNICAL APPENDIX.

## Composition and Reliability of Selected Scales, and Scoring of Items, at T1 and T2

(San Diego Longitudinal Sample, N=2,063)

Scale and Scoring	Cronbach's Alpha		Items and Measures
	T1	T2	
Rosenberg Self-Esteem (10 items: scored 1 to 4)	.81	.82	<p>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>].</p> <p>1=Disagree a lot, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree a lot</p>
CES-D Depression (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.74	.77	<p>[<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.</p> <p>1=Rarely, 2=Some of the time (1 or 2 days a week),  3=Occasionally (3 or 4 days), 4=Most of the time (5 to 7 days)</p>
Familism Scale (3 items: scored 1 to 4)	.60	.62	<p>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.</p> <p>1=Disagree a lot, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Agree a lot</p>
Family Cohesion Scale (3 items: scored 1 to 5) (T2)	--	.84	<p>Family members like to spend free time with each other.  Family members feel very close to each other.  Family togetherness is very important.</p> <p>1=Never, 2=Once in a while, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always</p>
Parent-Child Conflict (3 items: scored 1 to 4)	.58	.63	<p>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.</p>
(4th item added at T2:)	--	.72	<p>My parents and I often argue because we don't share the same goals.  1=Not true at all, 2=Not very true, 3=Partly true, 4=Very true</p>
Educational Aspirations (2 items: scored 1 to 5)	.80	.83	<p>What is highest level of education you would like to achieve?  And <i>realistically</i> speaking, what is the highest level of education that you think you will get?</p> <p>1=Less than high school, 2=High school, 3=Some college, 4=Finish college, 5=Finish a graduate degree</p>
English Proficiency Index (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.94	.93	<p>How well do you (speak, understand, read, write) English?  1=Not at all, 2=Not well, 3=Well, 4=Very well</p>
Foreign Language Index (4 items: scored 1 to 4)	.96	.92	<p>How well do you (speak, understand, read, write) [Foreign lang.]?  1=Not at all, 2=Not well, 3=Well, 4=Very well</p>

Table 1.

**Re-Interview Rates and Sociodemographic Characteristics of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
by National Origin of their Parents and Gender of the Children**

Characteristics <sup>a</sup>	<u>Mexico</u>	<u>Philippines</u>	<u>Vietnam</u>	<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>Others<sup>c</sup></u>	<u>GENDER</u>		
					<u>Lao</u>	<u>Hmong</u>		Female	Male	TOTAL
N of Sample, <b>T1</b> (1992)	727	808	361	94	154	53	223	1,211	1,209	2,420
N of Sample, <b>T2 (1995-96)</b>	578	716	302	88	143	50	186	<b>1,040</b>	1,023	2,063
% Re-interviewed at T2	80.0	88.6	83.7	93.6	92.9	94.3	83.4	85.9	84.6	85.2
<u>Nativity of Children:</u>										
% Foreign-born	38.8	43.4	84.4	97.7	95.8	94.0	47.3	55.3	56.0	55.6
% U.S.-born	61.2	56.6	15.6	2.3	4.2	6.0	52.7	44.7	44.0	44.4
<u>Year of Birth:</u>										
% 1975-76	18.1	17.0	23.5	22.7	36.3	12.0	17.2	16.2	23.3	19.8
% 1977	45.3	51.5	42.4	44.3	41.3	52.0	45.7	47.7	46.1	46.9
% 1978	36.6	31.5	34.1	33.0	22.4	36.0	37.1	36.1	30.6	33.3
<u>Year of U.S. Arrival:</u>										
% Born in U.S.	61.2	56.6	15.6	2.3	4.2	6.0	52.7	44.7	44.0	44.4
% 1976-79	10.2	10.3	20.9	11.4	20.3	22.0	9.1	13.2	12.3	12.7
% 1980-84	10.2	15.1	35.8	62.5	46.9	46.0	17.2	21.5	22.3	21.9
% <b>1985-90</b>	18.3	18.0	27.8	23.9	28.7	26.0	21.0	20.6	21.4	21.0
<u>U.S. Citizenship:</u>										
% Citizen at <b>T1</b> (1992)	69.2	78.6	32.5	6.8	16.8	8.0	68.8	59.0	59.5	59.3
% Citizen at T2 (1995)	73.4	85.6	46.4	11.4	23.8	12.0	73.7	66.1	66.2	66.1
<u>Nativity of Parents:<sup>b</sup></u>										
Parents are co-nationals	73.7	79.5	89.7	80.7	95.1	90.0	58.6	78.6	79.2	78.9
One parent born in U.S.	17.8	16.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.2	14.2	13.8	14.0

<sup>a</sup> The data are from the longitudinal sample of 2,063 respondents surveyed in 1992 (**T1**) and again in **1995-96 (T2)**. When originally interviewed in Spring 1992, **all** respondents were enrolled in the 8th or 9th grades in the San Diego City Schools; eligible respondents had to have at least one parent who was foreign-born.

<sup>b</sup> When the parents were not co-nationals (i.e., not born in the same country), the mother's nationality determined the child's national origin classification, except where the mother was U.S.-born. Over 50 different nationalities (countries of birth of fathers and mothers) were represented in the sample overall.

<sup>c</sup> "Others" include smaller immigrant **groups** from Asia (Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Thai) and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

Table 2.  
**Family Socioeconomic Status and Neighborhood Characteristics of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
 by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity <sup>a</sup>	Time														
		<u>Mexico</u>		<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Vietnam</u>		<u>Cambodia<sup>b</sup></u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>All Others</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>		
		FB	US	FB	US	FB	US	FB	FB	FB	FB	US	FB	US	TOTAL
<u>Socioeconomic Status:</u>															
<i>Father:</i>															
% College graduate	T1	7.1	6.5	37.0	23.5	11.0	36.2	4.5	11.2	2.0	35.2	39.8	18.1	19.3	18.7
% Less than high school	T1	76.3	59.9	16.4	15.1	66.3	31.9	77.3	65.7	86.0	31.8	12.2	53.7	33.6	44.8
% In the labor force	T1	79.9	81.4	86.2	79.8	51.4	89.4	22.7	32.9	20.0	76.1	83.7	62.3	81.1	70.6
% In the labor force	T2	74.1	78.2	81.0	85.9	62.4	93.6	35.2	40.6	34.0	79.5	91.8	74.5	83.8	73.0
<i>Mother:</i>															
% College graduate	T1	2.7	4.5	37.9	43.0	5.9	25.5	4.5	4.2	0	25.0	24.5	14.7	24.9	19.2
% Less than high school	T1	82.6	66.9	22.5	17.5	71.4	48.9	85.2	76.2	98.0	35.2	18.4	60.5	38.8	50.9
% In the labor force	T1	58.0	55.4	84.2	90.6	36.9	72.3	12.5	25.2	12.0	64.8	76.3	51.5	74.0	61.5
% In the labor force	T2	63.4	66.1	84.9	89.1	43.1	74.5	15.9	31.5	10.0	68.2	85.7	55.0	79.0	65.6
<i>Home:</i>															
% Family owns home	T1	18.3	44.1	65.3	86.4	28.6	70.2	11.4	25.2	2.0	44.3	80.6	34.8	68.0	49.5
% Family owns home	T2	27.5	52.8	74.2	88.8	28.6	74.5	8.0	36.6	4.0	54.0	81.6	41.1	72.7	55.1
% Moved to new home	T2	52.7	32.0	37.9	25.4	45.7	25.5	43.7	44.4	50.0	47.7	20.4	44.9	27.8	37.3
<u>Family's Economic Situation</u> (since 3 yrs ago):															
% Better	T1	56.5	56.4	56.7	46.9	58.4	55.6	45.9	56.6	54.0	52.3	56.1	55.8	52.1	54.1
% Worse	T1	9.4	9.4	5.9	11.7	9.2	11.1	15.3	7.0	2.0	11.6	14.3	8.4	11.0	9.6
% Better	T2	44.8	42.3	49.2	38.6	39.4	19.1	22.1	38.7	30.6	45.5	30.6	41.8	38.2	40.2
% Worse	T2	14.8	14.8	13.5	22.4	14.2	25.5	12.8	14.1	12.2	19.3	15.3	14.3	18.8	16.3
<u>Neighborhood Profile:</u> <sup>c</sup> (1990 census tract data)															
% Below poverty line	T1	55.5	47.4	16.9	16.4	35.2	21.1	57.7	51.2	44.4	29.8	22.8	37.7	29.6	34.0
% Foreign-born	T1	34.0	31.3	29.4	29.6	28.4	23.4	33.1	34.0	34.7	21.1	21.8	30.5	29.1	29.9
% White	T1	39.3	42.7	46.3	45.9	56.3	66.3	42.7	34.3	50.2	65.7	67.7	47.1	48.1	47.5
% Speak English only	T1	48.0	51.3	61.3	61.0	61.0	70.3	51.1	48.8	51.5	70.3	71.4	56.7	58.8	57.6

<sup>a</sup> Nativity: FB = foreign-born; US = U.S.-born.

<sup>b</sup> No separate columns for US-born youths from Cambodia and Laos are included in the tables because there were only a handful of such cases in the sample.

<sup>c</sup> Social and economic characteristics of the neighborhood (census tract) where respondent lived at the time of the T1 (1992) survey; data are drawn from the 1990 census.

Table 3.  
**Family Structure and Quality of Family Relationships of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
 by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time														
		<u>Mexico</u>		<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Vietnam</u>		<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>All Others</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
		FB	US	FB	US	FB	US	FB	Lao	Hmong	FB	US	FB	US	
<b><u>Family-Household:</u></b>															
Family-household size	T1	5.1	4.5	4.8	4.3	5.4	5.0	5.5	5.6	6.9	3.8	3.3	5.2	4.3	4.8
	T2	4.5	4.1	4.4	3.9	5.1	4.6	4.9	5.2	5.6	3.4	3.1	4.7	3.9	4.4
% Intact family (both natural parents at home)	T1	62.1	65.5	75.9	85.4	74.9	87.2	70.5	75.5	76.0	61.4	71.4	71.3	76.4	73.5
	T2	58.0	60.7	73.3	84.4	74.5	85.1	62.5	78.3	60.0	64.8	73.5	69.3	73.9	71.3
% Step family	T1	14.7	10.7	12.2	5.4	5.1	2.1	5.7	5.6	4.0	11.4	12.2	9.5	8.0	8.8
	T2	12.5	9.6	11.6	4.0	5.1	2.1	3.4	6.3	4.0	8.0	9.2	8.4	6.8	7.7
% Single parent, other	T1	23.2	23.7	11.9	9.1	20.0	10.6	23.9	18.9	20.0	27.3	16.3	19.3	15.6	17.6
	T2	29.5	29.7	15.1	11.6	20.4	12.8	34.1	15.4	36.0	27.3	17.3	22.4	19.3	21.0
% Grandparents at home	T1	6.7	8.5	27.3	22.7	14.5	6.4	13.6	20.3	12.0	14.8	11.2	17.1	15.0	16.1
	T2	3.6	6.8	22.8	15.1	14.1	6.4	10.2	18.2	4.0	10.2	8.2	13.9	10.6	12.5
% Uncles/aunts at home	T1	11.2	8.2	15.4	10.6	16.1	23.4	12.5	10.5	8.0	9.1	4.1	13.1	9.7	11.6
	T2	4.9	5.4	11.9	7.7	14.5	12.8	13.6	9.1	2.0	1.1	3.1	9.8	6.4	8.3
<b><u>Family Relationships:<sup>a</sup></u></b>															
Family cohesion (1-5)	T2	3.92	3.58	3.61	3.50	3.43	3.24	3.45	3.55	3.79	3.71	3.48	3.63	3.51	3.58
Familism scale (1-4)	T1	2.21	1.97	1.88	1.84	2.17	1.80	2.11	2.17	2.16	2.04	1.65	2.08	1.87	1.99
	T2	2.01	1.82	1.86	1.78	2.17	2.01	2.01	2.22	2.13	1.96	1.63	2.04	1.80	1.93
Parent-child conflict (1-4)	T1	1.67	1.69	1.78	1.72	1.84	1.78	1.94	1.78	1.97	1.70	1.59	1.78	1.70	1.75
	T2	1.57	1.66	1.86	1.74	1.86	1.88	1.96	1.85	2.10	1.73	1.57	1.81	1.70	1.76
% Embarrassed by parent	T1	6.7	8.2	20.6	16.5	22.4	42.6	33.0	19.6	34.0	26.1	26.5	20.2	15.6	18.2
	T2	10.3	6.2	16.7	17.0	19.2	12.8	22.7	16.8	34.0	20.5	15.3	17.2	12.8	15.3

<sup>a</sup> See the technical appendix for the composition and reliability of these scales. Family cohesion was measured by a 3-item scale scored from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The 3-item familism scale is scored 1 (disagree a lot) to 4 (agree a lot). The parent-child conflict scale also consists of 3 items, scored 1 (not true at all) to 4 (very true). The data reported in the table are mean scores for these three scales.

**Table 4.**  
**School Performance, School Work, and School Contexts of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,**  
**by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time															
		<u>Mexico</u>		<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Vietnam</u>		<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>All Others</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>		TOTAL	
		FB	US	FB	US	FB	US	FB	Lao FB	Hmong FB	FB	US	FB	US		
<u>School Performance:</u>																
Academic GPA <sup>a</sup>	T1	2.37	2.25	3.02	2.98	3.05	3.21	2.75	2.89	2.92	3.06	3.11	2.87	2.72	2.80	
	T2	2.32	2.31	2.86	2.95	3.05	3.14	2.58	2.89	2.63	3.16	3.24	2.80	2.73	2.77	
Reading: national %ile <sup>b</sup>	T1	22.3	29.0	50.2	54.0	33.3	63.4	14.0	22.6	15.8	44.2	69.9	33.4	46.3	39.5	
Math: national %ile <sup>c</sup>	T1	28.5	33.5	57.9	62.3	57.4	70.6	35.8	42.6	30.6	56.9	69.2	47.5	51.9	49.6	
% Classified as LEP <sup>d</sup>	T1	62.5	26.8	13.8	0.5	45.1	4.3	70.1	49.0	66.0	34.1	1.0	42.5	11.4	28.7	
% Classified as Gifted <sup>e</sup>	T1	4.9	6.5	19.3	24.4	11.8	38.3	1.1	5.6	0.0	21.6	45.9	11.2	20.2	15.2	
% Dropped out since T1 <sup>f</sup>	T2	5.4	6.5	2.3	2.7	3.1	2.1	3.4	2.8	4.0	3.4	2.0	3.4	4.0	3.7	
% Suspended since T1 <sup>g</sup>	T2	22.8	24.3	11.9	12.1	21.2	10.6	17.0	13.3	18.0	18.2	12.2	17.2	16.9	17.1	
<u>Homework and TV:</u>																
Homework hours daily	T1	1.73	1.66	2.57	2.33	2.55	2.58	2.27	2.36	2.86	2.33	2.32	2.36	2.08	2.23	
	T2	2.05	1.88	2.79	2.61	2.89	2.89	2.44	2.47	2.58	2.85	2.65	2.61	2.34	2.49	
TV-watching hours daily	T1	2.80	3.02	3.21	3.09	2.64	2.41	2.72	2.63	2.40	2.53	2.60	2.81	2.98	2.88	
	T2	2.20	2.39	2.51	2.37	2.18	2.20	2.26	2.25	1.96	2.39	1.80	2.29	2.31	2.30	
<u>School Contexts:</u>																
<i>School Safety (% agree):</i>	T2															
% Many gangs in school		36.9	38.7	56.6	53.1	51.0	46.8	60.2	62.7	77.6	36.0	41.2	51.9	46.0	49.3	
% Frequent ethnic fights		44.1	44.3	46.6	44.0	54.9	66.0	67.0	72.1	77.5	45.9	36.1	53.8	44.8	49.8	
% Disruptions by others		45.9	45.7	55.3	54.3	58.8	46.8	54.0	64.1	67.3	57.5	43.3	55.8	49.7	53.1	
% Don't feel safe here		24.9	26.3	23.8	22.5	21.7	25.5	25.0	30.8	46.9	26.7	18.6	25.5	24.0	24.8	
<i>School Events (this year):</i>	T2															
% Had property stolen		36.8	37.4	48.2	41.7	45.1	55.3	42.0	49.0	38.0	50.6	35.1	44.5	40.3	42.6	
% Was offered drugs		20.3	33.4	24.4	31.3	13.3	36.2	10.2	16.8	10.0	21.8	28.9	18.3	32.1	24.4	
% Was threatened		18.1	13.4	21.6	17.6	16.1	23.4	21.6	19.6	22.0	14.9	16.5	18.9	16.3	17.7	
% Got in physical fight		20.3	16.1	15.8	9.7	17.6	10.9	17.0	21.8	12.0	11.6	10.3	17.2	12.7	15.2	
<i>School Teaching (agree):</i>	T2															
% Teaching is good		90.1	85.5	85.9	88.6	85.4	85.1	86.4	92.3	87.8	83.9	80.4	87.4	86.3	86.9	
% Teachers are interested		86.4	80.7	83.0	82.5	77.4	78.7	85.2	81.7	64.6	79.1	79.4	81.7	80.8	81.3	
% Grading is fair		74.4	72.8	74.9	72.5	70.6	66.0	71.6	76.9	65.3	79.1	74.2	73.9	72.3	73.2	
% Discipline is fair		76.8	73.2	78.1	73.3	72.3	74.5	70.1	75.9	72.9	75.9	74.2	75.5	73.2	74.5	

[Table 4, continued]

- a Cumulative academic grade point average (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0), weighted for advanced placement and honors courses (for which A=5, B=4, C=3).
- b National percentile rank based on the English reading vocabulary and comprehension subtest of the Abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test.
- c National percentile rank based on the mathematics subtest of the Abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test.
- d LEP: "Limited English Proficient" student, as officially classified by the school system, based partly on standardized English proficiency tests.
- e Gifted: official school classification, based on standardized tests and other evaluations.
- f A dropout, as officially defined by the California State Department of Education, is any student in grades 7 through 12 who left school before graduation or attainment of its legal equivalent (e.g., GED) and did not return to school or another educational program by mid-October of the following year, as evidenced by a transcript request or other reliable documentation. The rates indicated are the percent of students who dropped out at any time between Spring 1992 and Spring 1996.
- g Percent suspended from school for any reason at least once between 1991 and 1995. Suspending a student from school for one or more days is, except for expulsion, the most severe official reaction to student disciplinary infractions. Most (nearly 80%) of the suspensions in the San Diego school district are meted out for physical injury (fights, threats, attempts) and disruption/defiance; others include property damage, tobacco/alcohol/drugs, and weapons infractions. Suspensions rise sharply in the 7th grade, peaking in the 8th grade and dropping steadily until the 12th grade, and male students are suspended far more often than females (district-wide, the male to female suspension ratio was 3:1 in 1993-94, a ten-year low). The average suspension in grades 9-12 is approximately 2.5 days.



Table 5.  
**Educational and Occupational Aspirations, Expectations, and Values of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time															
		<u>Mexico</u>		<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Vietnam</u>		<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>All Others</u>					
		FB	u s	FB	u s	FB	u s	FB	<u>Lao</u> FB	<u>Hmong</u> FB	FB	US	FB	u s	TOTAL	
<b><u>Educational Aspirations:</u></b>																
% Advanced degree	T1	53.8	48.4	75.8	71.1	55.2	89.4	54.0	42.9	40.0	65.9	75.3	59.0	63.6	61.1	
	T2	48.7	47.5	72.7	70.7	64.3	87.2	51.1	50.3	54.0	68.2	72.2	60.7	62.5	61.5	
% College degree	T1	22.0	28.9	19.4	32.1	6.4	44.7	33.3	32.1	26.0	28.4	23.7	26.4	25.1	25.8	
	T2	26.3	31.6	21.9	26.3	10.6	42.6	34.1	28.7	30.0	23.9	21.6	25.9	25.7	25.8	
% Less than college	T1	24.2	22.7	12.7	4.3	23.1	8.5	12.6	25.0	34.0	5.7	1.0	14.6	11.3	13.1	
	T2	25.0	20.9	9.4	2.1	15.3	6.4	14.8	21.0	16.0	8.0	6.2	13.4	11.8	12.7	
<b><u>Educational Expectations:<sup>a</sup></u></b>																
% Advanced degree	T1	33.0	28.0	40.8	40.2	37.3	46.8	23.9	20.3	12.0	50.0	49.0	34.2	36.6	35.3	
	T-2	25.9	23.2	46.9	43.2	46.3	51.1	21.6	21.7	6.0	56.8	61.2	36.8	37.5	37.1	
% College degree	T1	30.4	35.6	42.4	43.2	39.6	44.7	40.9	33.6	30.0	35.2	42.9	37.2	40.2	38.5	
	T2	31.3	44.4	38.6	43.5	38.4	42.6	47.7	47.6	62.0	30.7	26.5	39.2	42.1	40.5	
% Less than college	T1	36.6	36.4	16.7	16.5	23.1	8.5	35.2	46.2	58.0	14.8	8.2	28.6	23.2	26.2	
	T2	42.9	32.5	14.5	13.3	15.3	6.4	30.7	30.8	32.0	12.5	12.2	24.0	20.4	22.4	
<b><u>Parents' Aspirations:<sup>b</sup></u></b>																
% Advanced degree	T2	57.1	47.2	65.3	63.5	62.7	78.7	58.0	56.6	48.0	64.8	66.3	60.5	58.5	59.6	
% College degree	T2	27.2	36.7	31.2	32.1	26.7	21.3	33.0	28.7	36.0	31.8	32.7	29.7	33.1	31.2	
% Less than college	T2	15.6	16.1	3.5	4.4	10.6	0.0	9.1	14.7	16.0	3.4	1.0	9.8	8.4	9.2	
<b><u>Occupational Aspirations:</u></b>																
% Upper white collar job	T1	61.2	63.6	74.9	80.7	67.8	76.6	69.3	62.9	50.0	70.5	76.5	67.2	73.4	70.0	
	T2	66.1	59.6	82.0	83.7	76.1	80.9	76.1	73.4	58.0	78.4	76.5	74.8	73.3	74.2	
<b><u>Plans of Most Friends:<sup>c</sup></u></b>																
% Dropped out of school	T2	6.7	8.3	1.9	1.7	3.6	0.0	3.4	3.5	4.0	6.9	3.1	4.0	4.3	4.1	
% No college plans	T2	11.4	11.6	4.8	4.5	5.5	6.4	11.5	6.4	4.0	8.0	6.1	7.0	7.7	7.3	
% Get a job after H.S.	T2	33.5	32.2	32.2	26.3	15.5	19.1	25.3	25.4	16.0	16.1	17.5	25.6	27.2	26.3	
% go to 2-year college	T2	25.9	24.9	31.4	27.4	18.3	23.4	38.6	24.6	30.0	20.7	11.3	26.4	24.4	25.5	
% go to 4-year university	T2	26.2	26.7	50.5	54.0	47.4	57.4	45.5	42.3	36.0	51.7	55.1	43.6	43.2	43.4	

[Table 5 continues]

Table 5 (continued)

**Educational and Occupational Aspirations, Expectations, and Values of Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time														
		<u>Mexico</u>		<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Vietnam</u>		<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Laos</u>		<u>All Others</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>		TOTAL
		FB	u s	FB	u s	FB	US	FB	Lao FB	Hmong FB	FB	u s	FB	u s	
<u>Values:</u>															
% "Very Important" to:															
Get a good education	<b>T2</b>	<b>90.2</b>	87.6	94.9	92.3	87.8	89.4	92.0	86.6	80.0	93.1	86.7	<b>90.5</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>90.1</b>
Able to find steady work	<b>T2</b>	86.0	89.5	91.6	90.3	81.4	87.0	85.2	90.9	86.0	83.0	89.7	<b>86.9</b>	<b>89.6</b>	88.1
Become expert in field	<b>T2</b>	78.3	81.2	86.2	82.0	78.0	87.0	78.4	78.9	74.0	77.3	77.6	80.2	81.3	80.7
Have strong friendships	<b>T2</b>	66.5	67.8	86.8	81.1	69.0	80.9	69.3	75.4	69.4	80.7	75.5	75.0	75.4	75.1
Have lots of money	<b>T2</b>	35.9	41.4	46.6	47.5	47.1	38.3	48.9	58.0	52.0	42.0	44.9	46.1	44.3	45.3
Have children	<b>T2</b>	43.9	42.7	55.0	48.6	34.5	55.3	28.4	35.7	48.0	52.3	50.0	43.5	46.7	44.9

**a** Responses to the question, "And *realistically* speaking, what is the highest level of education that you think you will get?"

**b** Responses to the question, "What is the highest level of education that your parents want you to get?"

**c** The question asked "How many of your friends have . . .?" Data above show the applicable responses pertaining to "many or most friends" of the respondent.

Table 6.  
Language Preference and Proficiency and Ethnic Self-Identity Among Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time															
		Mexico		Philippines		Vietnam		Cambodia	Laos		All Others					
		FB	US	FB	US	FB	US	FB	Lao FB	Hmong FB	FB	US	FB	US	FB	US
<u>English Language:</u>																
% Prefers English	T1	32.1	52.8	81.4	95.8	43.9	91.5	67.0	51.7	66.0	55.7	92.9	56.1	78.4	66.0	
	T2	62.5	78.2	92.6	98.0	69.0	91.5	85.2	74.1	58.0	72.7	99.0	75.8	89.8	82.0	
% Speaks it "very well"	T1	38.5	74.1	75.2	94.3	45.9	95.7	48.9	44.1	22.0	59.8	93.9	52.2	86.2	67.3	
	T2	48.2	77.7	83.3	93.6	47.8	89.4	50.0	49.0	30.0	70.5	93.9	58.5	87.0	71.2	
<u>Non-English Language:</u>																
% Speaks it "very well"	T1	74.0	44.8	23.2	2.0	41.3	10.6	33.3	42.0	50.0	49.4	11.2	43.4	20.3	33.1	
	T2	78.1	49.9	23.0	3.6	38.7	4.3	33.3	40.6	44.0	50.6	18.2	43.7	25.7	36.3	
<u>Ethnic Self-Identity:<sup>a</sup></u>																
% "American"	T1	0.0	2.8	0.3	5.2	2.4	8.5	2.3	0.7	4.0	3.4	18.4	1.3	5.8	3.3	
	T2	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	3.4	9.2	0.6	2.7	1.6	
% Hyphenated-American	T1	14.7	40.4	50.8	66.2	43.9	70.2	46.6	28.7	26.0	18.2	38.8	35.8	53.0	43.4	
	T2	12.1	39.3	21.9	48.4	28.2	51.1	30.7	19.6	12.0	9.1	25.5	20.2	42.4	30.1	
% National origin	T1	33.5	8.2	41.8	21.5	45.9	19.1	40.9	61.5	62.0	44.3	11.2	44.3	15.7	31.6	
	T2	67.9	26.3	72.7	42.5	56.1	36.2	48.9	67.1	48.0	18.2	11.2	60.7	32.3	48.1	
% Racial/panethnic	T1	51.3	44.9	3.5	1.2	0.4	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.0	22.7	17.3	13.2	19.8	16.1	
	T2	18.8	27.7	0.6	2.0	14.5	8.5	20.5	11.2	38.0	58.0	40.8	15.8	16.8	16.2	
% Mixed ethnicity, other	T1	0.4	3.7	3.5	5.9	7.5	2.1	9.1	7.0	6.0	11.4	14.3	5.4	5.7	5.5	
	T2	1.3	4.8	3.9	5.2	1.2	2.1	0.0	1.4	2.0	11.4	13.3	2.7	5.7	4.0	
<u>Ethnic Identity Salience:<sup>b</sup></u>																
"How important is this identity to you?"	T2															
% "Very important"		73.2	65.5	75.5	65.2	58.9	61.7	57.5	58.2	78.0	60.2	53.1	67.1	63.6	65.5	
% "Somewhat important"		18.8	25.1	21.0	26.2	26.1	29.8	29.9	30.5	11.3	22.7	29.2	23.4	26.2	24.6	
% "Not important"		8.0	9.4	3.5	8.6	15.0	8.5	12.6	14.0	8.0	17.0	17.7	9.5	10.2	9.8	

- <sup>a</sup> Responses to the open-ended survey question: "How do you identify, that is, what do you call yourself?" "Hispanic," "Chicano," "Latino," "Black," and "Asian" are classified as racial or panethnic identities; a "Hmong" ethnic identity is included under "national origin;" "Cuban-Mexican" or "Chinese-Thai" under "mixed" identities.
- <sup>b</sup> A follow-up question asked "How important is this identity to you, that is what you call yourself?" The highest salience scores were found among those identifying by national origin; the lowest among those identifying as "American;" in-between were the salience scores for hyphenated-American and racial/panethnic identities.

Table 8.  
Self-Esteem and Depression Among Male and Female Children of Immigrants:<sup>a</sup>  
Patterns of Psychological Well-Being and Change Over Time, 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)

Correlates <sup>b</sup> of Psychological Well-Being	SELF-ESTEEM						DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS					
	Male		Female		TOTAL		Male		Female		TOTAL	
	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	3.23	3.33	3.17	3.26	3.20	3.29	1.54	1.57	1.75	1.79	1.65	1.68
<b>National Origin:</b>					***	***					NS	*
Mexican	3.19	3.38	3.17	3.33	3.18	3.36	1.56	1.52	1.76	1.76	1.66	1.64
Filipino	3.33	3.37	3.20	3.27	3.26	3.32	1.52	1.59	1.81	1.86	1.66	1.72
Vietnamese	3.10	3.17	3.10	3.12	3.10	3.15	1.62	1.62	1.70	1.76	1.66	1.69
Cambodian	3.21	3.35	2.96	3.07	3.06	3.18	1.57	1.53	1.73	1.69	1.66	1.63
Lao	3.03	3.17	3.08	3.18	3.06	3.17	1.52	1.57	1.64	1.57	1.58	1.57
Hmong	3.01	3.24	2.97	3.09	2.99	3.17	1.56	1.61	1.80	1.94	1.66	1.76
Others	3.45	3.41	3.38	3.41	3.41	3.41	1.39	1.62	1.72	1.86	1.57	1.75
<b>Nativity:</b>					***	***					NS	NS
Foreign-born	3.16	3.29	3.11	3.21	3.13	3.25	1.56	1.59	1.76	1.79	1.66	1.69
U.S.-born	3.33	3.38	3.24	3.33	3.28	3.35	1.51	1.55	1.75	1.79	1.63	1.67
<b>Age at Arrival:</b>					***	***					*	NS
All life in U.S.	3.33	3.38	3.24	3.33	3.28	3.35	1.51	1.55	1.75	1.79	1.63	1.67
0-5 years old	3.21	3.32	3.20	3.29	3.21	3.31	1.53	1.58	1.72	1.77	1.63	1.68
6-11 years old	3.19	3.27	3.08	3.14	3.13	3.20	1.54	1.59	1.76	1.78	1.66	1.69
12-15 years old	2.93	3.20	2.87	3.09	2.91	3.15	1.69	1.61	1.88	1.93	1.77	1.75
<b>U.S. Citizenship:</b>					***	***					NS	NS
Citizen	3.33	3.37	3.24	3.31	3.28	3.34	1.52	1.56	1.74	1.78	1.63	1.67
Not a citizen	3.10	3.24	3.06	3.16	3.08	3.20	1.57	1.60	1.78	1.82	1.68	1.71
<b>Mother's Education:</b>					***	***					NS	NS
College graduate	3.35	3.35	3.24	3.25	3.29	3.30	1.47	1.63	1.76	1.85	1.61	1.74
High school graduate	3.33	3.41	3.23	3.34	3.28	3.38	1.53	1.57	1.73	1.76	1.63	1.66
Less than high school	3.13	3.27	3.11	3.22	3.12	3.24	1.57	1.55	1.77	1.79	1.67	1.67
<b>Father's Occupation:</b>					***	***					**	NS
White collar	3.35	3.36	3.24	3.31	3.29	3.33	1.51	1.59	1.62	1.77	1.59	1.68
Blue collar	3.25	3.36	3.18	3.31	3.09	3.33	1.50	1.54	1.78	1.76	1.64	1.65
Not in labor force	3.10	3.24	3.09	3.15	3.09	3.19	1.63	1.61	1.78	1.82	1.71	1.72
<b>Family Economic Status:</b>					NS	**					***	***
Better than 3 years ago	3.24	3.38	3.18	3.30	3.21	3.35	1.51	1.49	1.73	1.76	1.62	1.62
Same as 3 years ago	3.24	3.30	3.17	3.23	3.20	3.27	1.52	1.58	1.74	1.75	1.64	1.67
Worse than 3 yrs ago	3.17	3.25	3.11	3.25	3.14	3.25	1.83	1.81	1.85	1.94	1.84	1.88

[Table 8 continues]

Table 7.  
**Discrimination and Perceptions of American Society Among Children of Immigrants in San Diego, California,  
by Nativity of the Children and National Origin of their Parents, in 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Characteristics by National Origin and Nativity	Time															
		Mexico		Philippines		Vietnam		Cambodia	Laos		All Others					
		FB	US	FB	US	FB	US	FB	Lao	Hmong	FB	US	FB	US	FB	US
<u>Discrimination:</u> <sup>a</sup>																
% Has experienced being discriminated against	T1	62.5	63.8	60.8	66.2	65.5	70.2	61.4	71.3	56.0	64.8	58.2	63.7	64.5	64.0	
	T2	68.8	64.4	69.1	68.9	71.8	70.2	65.9	74.8	82.0	60.2	63.3	69.9	66.8	68.5	
% Expects discrimination regardless of merit	T1	33.5	35.6	35.0	41.0	33.3	40.4	38.6	46.2	40.0	29.5	32.7	35.8	37.9	36.7	
	T2	39.3	38.4	43.7	44.2	36.9	40.4	39.8	43.4	50.0	42.0	31.6	40.9	40.7	40.8	
<i>Perceives discrimination:</i>																
% ...by white Americans	T1	22	27	22	28	19	32	20	16	14	30	29	21	28	24	
	T2	33	35	29	34	35	43	22	32	32	31	22	31	34	32	
% ...by black Americans	T1	16	21	16	24	21	19	26	21	8	17	12	18	21	20	
	T2	23	21	23	26	26	26	25	31	20	16	22	24	24	24	
<u>Perceptions of U.S.:</u> <sup>b</sup>																
% "Agree" that there is:																
Racial discrimination in economic opportunities	T1	72.9	81.8	81.5	83.9	81.6	89.4	73.6	86.0	75.5	82.0	91.8	79.6	84.2	81.7	
	T2	83.0	89.8	88.7	86.5	87.0	89.4	82.8	89.4	92.0	90.8	89.8	87.1	88.4	87.7	
Much conflict between racial and ethnic groups	T1	74.2	81.9	82.5	86.6	78.7	83.0	82.6	84.1	70.8	83.3	89.7	79.7	85.0	82.1	
	T2	81.6	87.8	85.5	88.3	85.9	91.5	83.7	88.6	90.0	90.9	87.8	85.7	88.1	86.8	
Equal opportunity for nonwhites to get ahead	T1	49.8	51.0	55.9	55.6	47.8	42.6	48.9	54.2	62.5	44.2	51.0	51.3	53.0	52.0	
	T2	56.7	52.1	51.1	56.1	56.1	55.3	57.5	62.0	62.0	48.3	50.0	55.4	53.8	54.7	
Americans feel superior to foreigners	T1	74.5	79.6	67.8	72.6	71.5	76.6	57.5	73.8	72.0	74.4	70.4	70.4	75.4	72.6	
	T2	78.1	83.5	76.2	81.6	81.4	91.5	83.7	82.1	82.0	74.7	78.4	79.0	82.6	80.6	
American way of life weakens the family	T1	44.4	43.0	39.2	36.3	54.1	44.7	42.5	50.7	42.9	46.4	41.1	45.7	40.1	43.2	
	T2	54.7	54.7	54.5	51.1	65.0	53.2	53.5	61.7	61.2	54.0	46.4	57.9	52.3	55.4	
No better country to live in than the U.S.	T1	49.3	60.7	58.0	68.2	69.5	61.7	67.8	70.4	66.0	65.1	59.8	62.0	64.0	62.9	
	T2	58.3	67.3	72.3	78.5	78.0	85.1	59.8	71.4	72.0	62.1	71.4	69.0	73.7	71.1	
% Prefers American ways most of the time	T1	18.9	31.0	46.1	58.6	34.5	65.2	31.8	26.8	50.0	43.0	68.4	34.7	49.1	41.1	
	T2	19.5	25.4	48.2	58.0	34.3	57.4	43.2	33.6	46.0	35.6	63.9	36.1	46.1	40.5	

<sup>a</sup> Responses to the open-ended question, "Have you ever felt discriminated against?" If yes, "by whom and what do you think was the reason?" A separate item asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "No matter how much education I get, people will still discriminate against me." Data above show percent who agreed.

<sup>b</sup> Identical statements were asked at T1 and T2, scaled from "Agree a lot," "Agree a little," to "Disagree a little," "Disagree a lot." The "agree" choices are summed here.

Table 8 (continued)

**Self-Esteem and Depression Among Male and Female Children of Immigrants:<sup>a</sup>**  
**Patterns of Psychological Well-Being and Change Over Time, 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Correlates <sup>b</sup> of Psychological Well-Being	SELF-ESTEEM						DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS					
	Male		Female		TOTAL		Male		Female		TOTAL	
	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>
<u>Family Structure:</u>					***	**					***	***
Both natural parents	3.27	3.34	3.18	3.29	3.23	3.31	1.50	1.54	1.71	1.76	1.60	1.65
Two-parent stepfamily	3.19	3.38	3.21	3.23	3.20	3.31	1.67	1.54	1.90	1.83	1.78	1.68
Single-parent family	3.10	3.26	3.08	3.19	3.09	3.22	1.66	1.72	1.85	1.88	1.76	1.81
<u>Parent-Child Conflict:</u>					***	***					***	***
Low conflict	3.36	3.45	3.28	3.39	3.32	3.42	1.43	1.43	1.61	1.64	1.52	1.53
Medium conflict	3.10	3.18	3.03	3.13	3.06	3.15	1.67	1.78	1.94	1.95	1.81	1.87
High conflict	2.70	2.91	2.80	2.84	2.75	2.87	2.03	2.03	2.30	2.21	2.16	2.13
<u>Embarrassed of Parents:</u>					***	***					***	*
No	3.27	3.34	3.20	3.28	3.24	3.31	1.51	1.56	1.72	1.78	1.62	1.67
Yes	3.09	3.24	2.98	3.13	3.04	3.19	1.66	1.65	1.93	1.86	1.78	1.75
<u>English Proficiency:</u>					***	***					**	NS
Speaks it "very well"	3.36	3.41	3.26	3.35	3.31	3.38	1.51	1.57	1.73	1.80	1.62	1.69
Speaks it "well"	3.02	3.15	2.99	3.05	3.00	3.11	1.59	1.59	1.78	1.77	1.68	1.67
Speaks it "not well"	2.81	2.95	2.79	2.78	2.80	2.86	1.67	1.59	1.92	1.82	1.79	1.70
<u>English Preference:</u>					***	***					NS	NS
Prefers English	3.30	3.37	3.20	3.28	3.25	3.32	1.52	1.55	1.74	1.80	1.63	1.68
Prefers other language	3.10	3.15	3.10	3.17	3.10	3.16	1.58	1.66	1.78	1.73	1.68	1.69
<u>Educational Aspirations:</u>					***	***					**	NS
Advanced degree	3.34	3.51	3.30	3.37	3.32	3.43	1.48	1.50	1.68	1.77	1.60	1.66
College degree	3.27	3.30	3.11	3.24	3.20	3.27	1.51	1.57	1.79	1.80	1.64	1.68
Less than college degree	3.08	3.14	3.00	3.05	3.05	3.11	1.63	1.66	1.84	1.83	1.72	1.73
<u>Occupational Aspirations:</u>					*	*					NS	NS
High-status profession	3.29	3.35	3.19	3.28	3.23	3.31	1.53	1.58	1.75	1.77	1.65	1.68
Middle-status job	3.23	3.30	3.10	3.18	3.17	3.25	1.52	1.52	1.70	1.89	1.60	1.68
Low-status job	3.15	3.27	3.16	3.14	3.15	3.23	1.57	1.57	2.00	1.90	1.66	1.68

[Table 8 continues]

Table 8 (continued)

**Self-Esteem and Depression Among Male and Female Children of Immigrants:<sup>a</sup>  
Patterns of Psychological Well-Being and Change Over Time, 1992 (T1) and 1995 (T2)**

Correlates <sup>b</sup> of Psychological Well-Being	SELF-ESTEEM						DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS					
	Male		Female		TOTAL		Male		Female		TOTAL	
	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1 <sup>c</sup>	T2 <sup>c</sup>
<u>Ethnic Self-Identity:</u>					NS	NS					***	*
"American"	3.36	3.48	3.54	3.08	3.42	3.33	1.48	1.50	1.57	2.08	1.51	1.72
Hyphenated-American	3.29	3.38	3.19	3.32	3.24	3.35	1.52	1.56	1.76	1.75	1.64	1.66
National origin	3.13	3.28	3.10	3.23	3.12	3.26	1.59	1.58	1.76	1.80	1.68	1.69
Racial/panethnic	3.25	3.39	3.16	3.23	3.20	3.30	1.51	1.52	1.74	1.76	1.63	1.66
Mixed identity, other	3.26	3.23	3.23	3.40	3.24	3.32	1.54	1.85	1.73	1.97	1.63	1.91
<u>Experienced Discrimination:</u>					***	NS					***	***
Has been discriminated against by others	3.22	3.31	3.12	3.25	3.17	3.28	1.59	1.63	1.84	1.83	1.72	1.73
Has <i>not</i> been...	3.27	3.36	3.25	3.27	3.26	3.31	1.45	1.44	1.60	1.72	1.52	1.59
<u>Expected Discrimination:</u>					**	***					***	***
Will be discriminated against despite merit	3.19	3.27	3.13	3.20	3.16	3.24	1.64	1.68	1.83	1.89	1.73	1.77
Will <i>not</i> be...	3.26	3.38	3.19	3.29	3.22	3.33	1.47	1.48	1.71	1.74	1.60	1.62

<sup>a</sup> Measured by the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1-4), and the 4-item CES-D Depression Subscale (1-4). See appendix for the items composing the two scales, and their scoring. The longitudinal sample of 2,063 is split evenly between males (1,023) and females (1,040).

<sup>b</sup> All variables as measured at T1 and T2, reflecting changes over time, except constants such as gender, national origin, generation, age at arrival, parents' education, and parents' ethnicity; i.e., psychological well-being outcomes at T1 reported in this table are associated with predictor variables (such as family structure and English proficiency) measured at T1, and T2 outcomes with variables measured at T2.

<sup>c</sup> Statistical significance of differences in group mean scores: \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , NS = not significantly different.

**TABLE 9. Children of Immigrants in San Diego, N=2,420****T1 (1992) Predictors of T2 (1995) Educational Achievement and Aspirations**

Mean

Ethnic Groups	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Mexican	2.2403	8.80	.50	.24	.51
Filipino	2.8625	3.96	.23	.45	.64
Vietnamese	3.0224	5.54	.40	.47	.65
Cambodian	2.5488	4.26	.17	.22	.58
Lao	2.8493	3.90	.23	.22	.57
Hmong	2.6464	3.77	.19	6.00E-02	.48
Asian, Other	3.3646	4.48	.23	.63	.66
Latin, Other	2.7422	5.62	.40	.52	.64
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Gender	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Female	2.9082	5.62	.16	.43	.67
Male	2.5021	5.87	.53	.31	.52
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Both natural parents at home, T1	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
no	2.5434	9.17	.44	.32	.56
yes	2.7749	4.26	.30	.39	.61
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Parent-child conflict, T1	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
LO conflict	2.7690	4.95	.28	.41	.61
MED conflict	2.6618	6.78	.40	.32	.56
HI conflict	2.4091	6.98	.58	.28	.63
Total	2.7100	5.67	.34	.37	.60



Mean

Mother's education	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Less than high school	2.5624	6.68	.41	.28	.54
HS grad or some college	2.7749	5.17	.32	.43	.60
College grad	3.0087	3.93	.18	.53	.73
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Father's education	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Less than high school	2.5397	6.42	.41	.25	.55
HS grad or some college	2.7862	4.55	.31	.43	.61
College grad	2.9618	6.44	.23	.54	.69
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Own home, T1	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Not own	2.5491	7.44	.40	.30	.54
Own	2.8868	3.76	.28	.45	.65
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Poverty rate of T1 neighborhood (1990 census)	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Under 15%	2.8956	2.64	.35	.46	.63
15% to 50%	2.7242	7.13	.32	.41	.63
Over 50%	2.4752	7.46	.37	.22	.51
Total	2.7046	5.76	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Inner city school, T1 (0=suburb)	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
no	2.8218	4.37	.32	.44	.63
yes	2.5330	7.77	.38	.27	.54
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Student classified as gifted, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
no	2.5886	6.32	.38	.33	.57
yes	3.4027	2.31	.12	.60	.73
Total	2.7055	5.75	.34	.37	.60

Mean

School-assigned language status, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
LEP	2.4643	8.31	.42	.23	.52
FEP	2.8295	4.35	.30	.41	.64
English Only	2.7643	5.32	.32	.48	.59
Total	2.7055	5.75	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Prefers to speak English, T1	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
no	2.5529	7.21	.42	.29	.52
yes	2.7890	4.94	.30	.41	.63
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Aspired to advanced degree, T1 (realistic)	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
0	2.5402	5.97	.41	.24	.51
1	3.0207	5.30	.21	.61	.75
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Nativity	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
US-born	2.6627	5.41	.36	.37	.58
Foreign-born	2.7378	6.00	.33	.37	.61
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Homework hours per day, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
< 1 hour	2.2741	8.27	.58	.20	.43
1-2 hours	2.6167	6.09	.32	.33	.59
2-3 hours	2.8888	4.28	.27	.42	.64
> 4 hours	3.0269	4.39	.25	.50	.68
Total	2.7108	5.68	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Homework hours per day, 1995	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
< 1 hour	2.2656	5.17	.51	.16	.42
1-2 hours	2.6102	4.27	.36	.28	.55
2-3 hours	2.7845	3.42	.22	.37	.61
> 4 hours	3.1397	2.71	.20	.55	.71
Total	2.7710	3.69	.30	.37	.60

Mean

TV-watching hours per day, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
< 2 hours	2.7983	6.21	.38	.43	.63
2-4 hours	2.7297	5.17	.27	.37	.59
> 4 hours	2.5635	5.61	.39	.30	.56
Total	2.7116	5.65	.34	.37	.60

Mean

TV-watching hours per day, 1995	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
< 2 hours	2.8224	3.72	.28	.40	.60
2-4 hours	2.7314	3.91	.27	.36	.59
> 4 hours	2.6671	3.12	.45	.28	.58
Total	2.7688	3.69	.30	.37	.60

Mean

Type of ethnic self-identity, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
American	2.8249	3.61	.23	.54	.63
Hyphenated-American	2.8125	4.70	.26	.40	.61
National origin	2.7844	6.01	.33	.38	.62
Racial/panethnic	2.2552	7.99	.57	.26	.52
Mixed/other	2.7426	6.52	.43	.32	.54
Total	2.7051	5.74	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Self-esteem score, 1992	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Low (< 3.0)	2.4816	8.27	.42	.27	.55
Med (3-3.5)	2.7741	4.50	.30	.39	.60
High (> 3.5)	2.8897	4.11	.28	.47	.65
Total	2.7078	5.67	.34	.37	.60

Mean

Friends dropped out of school	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
None	2.9128	2.72	.20	.44	.62
Some	2.6206	4.17	.41	.29	.58
Most	2.1758	10.59	.65	.15	.44
Total	2.7696	3.61	.30	.37	.60

Mean

Friends have no college plans	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
None	3.0119	2.80	.18	.47	.64
Some	2.6194	4.05	.37	.31	.57
Most	2.4603	6.00	.53	.23	.59
Total	2.7724	3.67	.30	.37	.60

Mean

Friends will go to work full-time	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
None	3.2269	2.79	.12	.53	.67
Some	2.7118	3.81	.31	.36	.58
Most	2.5194	3.91	.43	.27	.58
Total	2.7696	3.62	.30	.37	.60

Mean

Friends will go to 2-year college	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
None	2.9562	3.46	.32	.42	.62
Some	2.8092	3.65	.30	.38	.58
Most	2.6128	3.45	.30	.32	.63
Total	2.7757	3.58	.30	.37	.60

Mean

Friends will go to 4-year college	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
None	2.2170	7.60	.58	.13	.37
Some	2.6606	3.64	.36	.29	.55
Most	3.0065	2.70	.19	.51	.69
Total	2.7737	3.56	.30	.37	.60

Mean

College wants to attend	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Local community college	2.3878	6.11	.43	.17	.39
SDSU	2.7131	1.97	.31	.35	.61
UCSD	3.1895	1.87	.15	.56	.75
Other, California	3.1363	2.59	.17	.57	.73
Other, not California	3.0213	4.48	.33	.54	.66
Vocational, military	2.6188	2.33	.70	.30	.49
No plans, DK	2.4418	5.57	.36	.20	.50
Total	2.7683	3.68	.30	.37	.60

Mean

College will attend (realistically)	Academic GPA, T2 (latest)	Percent dropped out since T1	N of school suspensions since T1	Aspire to advanced degree, T2 (realistic)	Parents aspire to advanced degree, T2
Local community college	2.5057	3.92	.37	.19	.50
SDSU	2.9023	2.06	.17	.44	.68
UCSD	3.4630	2.35	.14	.71	.76
Other, California	3.3707	3.01	.10	.72	.72
Other, not California	3.0618	1.82	.45	.58	.73
Vocational, military	2.6060	.00	.63	.30	.57
No plans, DK	2.5165	5.38	.40	.27	.54
Total	2.7683	3.68	.30	.37	.60

**TABLE 10. T2 Student Re-interview and Parent Interview Rates, by Selected T1 Variables**

**San Diego, Children of Immigrants Sample (N=2,420)**

Mean

Gender	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Female	.86	.54	.62
Male	.85	.55	.64
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Ethnic groups	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Mexican	.80	.45	.56
Filipino	.89	.46	.52
Vietnamese	.84	.69	.81
Cambodian	.94	.90	.94
Lao	.93	.93	.95
Hmong	.94	.87	.90
Others	.83	.42	.50
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Nativity	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
US-born	.87	.49	.56
Foreign-born	.84	.59	.69
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Family structure, T1	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Both natural parents	.90	.59	.65
Stepfamily	.75	.44	.57
Single parent, other	.74	.44	.58
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

School-assigned language status, 1992	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
LEP	.81	.59	.72
FEP	.90	.56	.62
English Only	.80	.43	.53
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Active or inactive, 1993	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Inactive	.42	.23	.51
Active	.90	.58	.64
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Active or inactive, 1995	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Inactive	.41	.25	.55
Active	.97	.62	.64
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Dropped out since T1	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
no	.87	.56	.63
yes	.55	.34	.56
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

GPA, T1 (1992)	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
< 2.0	.74	.46	.60
2.0-2.5	.81	.51	.62
2.5-3.0	.86	.52	.60
3.0-3.5	.90	.57	.64
3.5-3.75	.90	.62	.68
> 3.75	.95	.66	.69
Total	.85	.54	.63



Mean

Homeowner, T1	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Not own	.80	.54	.67
Own	.91	.55	.59
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Father's education	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
< 12 yrs	.84	.59	.69
H.S. grad or some college	.86	.49	.57
College graduate	.89	.55	.61
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Mother's education	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
< 12 yrs	.83	.58	.69
H.S. grad or some college	.86	.48	.56
College graduate	.92	.54	.59
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Poverty rate of T1 neighborhood	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
Under 15%	.88	.52	.59
15% to 50%	.86	.53	.60
Over 50%	.82	.59	.71
Total	.85	.54	.63

Mean

Inner city school, T1 (0=suburb)	Re-interviewed at T2	Parent interview done, T2	Parent interview rate, T2
no	.88	.51	.58
yes	.82	.60	.71
Total	.85	.54	.63

TABLE 11.

ODDS OF STUDENT BEING RE-INTERVIEWED AT T2 IN SAN DIEGO

Total number of cases: 2420 (Unweighted)  
 Number rejected because of missing data: 10  
 Number of cases included in the analysis: 2410

Dependent Variable: IW95 = Student re-interviewed at T2 (1=yes, 0=no)

Beginning Block Number 0. Initial Log Likelihood Function

-2 Log Likelihood 2011.2547

\* Constant is included in the model.

## Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. DROPOUT@ Dropped out since T1  
 SUSPEND@ N of school suspensions since T1  
 ACTIVE95 Active or inactive, 1995  
 AGE Age at T1  
 GPA Academic GPA, T1 (1992)  
 V18 Gender (1=male, 0=female)  
 NATURPAR Both natural parents at home, T1  
 INERCITY Inner city school, T1 (0=suburb)  
 KPOVERTY Poverty rate of neighborhood at T1  
 LEP LEP status at T1  
 GENERAT2 Nativity  
 FATHEDUC Father's education  
 MOTHEDUC Mother's education  
 OWNHOME Homeowner, T1  
 VIETNAM Vietnamese  
 INDOCHIN Cambodian or Laotian  
 FILIPINO Filipino  
 MEXICO Mexican

Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because  
 Log Likelihood decreased by less than .01 percent.

-2 Log Likelihood 1105.896  
 Goodness of Fit 2307.528  
 Cox & Snell - R<sup>2</sup> .313  
 Nagelkerke - R<sup>2</sup> .313

	Chi-Square	df	Significance
Model	905.358	18	.0000
Block	905.358	18	.0000
Step	905.358	18	.0000

## Classification Table for IW95

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted				Percent Correct	
		no	yes				
		n	I	y			
Observed		+-----+-----+					
no	n	I	225	I	129	I	63.56%
		+-----+-----+					
yes	y	I	96	I	1960	I	95.33%
		+-----+-----+					
Overall						90.66%	

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp (B)
DROPOUT@	-.2418	.2410	1.0061	1	.3158	.0000	.7852
SUSPEND@	-.2148	.0772	7.7299	1	.0054	-.0534	.8067
ACTIVE95	3.7282	.1757	450.3924	1	.0000	.4722	41.6038
AGE	.0001	.0939	.0000	1	.9990	.0000	1.0001
GPA	.3874	.1043	13.7858	1	.0002	.0766	1.4731
V18	.1900	.1679	1.2801	1	.2579	.0000	1.2092
NATURPAR	.3660	.1653	4.9045	1	.0268	.0380	1.4420
INERCITY	-.2740	.2131	1.6528	1	.1986	.0000	.7603
KPOVERTY	-.5313	.4247	1.5648	1	.2110	.0000	.5878
LEP	.0060	.1949	.0010	1	.9753	.0000	1.0061
GENERAT2	-.1116	.1895	.3469	1	.5559	.0000	.8944
FATHEDUC	.0291	.0656	.1972	1	.6570	.0000	1.0296
MOTHEDUC	.0632	.0637	.9838	1	.3213	.0000	1.0652
OWNHOME	.7056	.1972	12.8063	1	.0003	.0733	2.0251
VIETNAM	-.0507	.3427	.0219	1	.8824	.0000	.9506
INDOCHIN	1.9619	.4127	22.6026	1	.0000	.1012	7.1128
FILIPINO	-.0458	.3068	.0223	1	.8814	.0000	.9553
MEXICO	.5223	.3173	2.7091	1	.0998	.0188	1.6860
Constant	-2.0616	1.4656	1.9787	1	.1595		

[illegible]

Page 2

# ODDS OF PARENT BEING INTERVIEWED AT T2 IN SAN DIEGO

Total number of cases: 2420 (Unweighted)  
 Number rejected because of missing data: 10  
 Number of cases included in the analysis: 2410

Dependent Variable: PQ95 = Parent interview done, T2 (1=yes, 0=no)

Beginning Block Number 0. Initial Log Likelihood Function

-2 Log Likelihood 3321.9419

\* Constant is included in the model.

## Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. DROPOUT@ Dropped out since T1  
 SUSPEND@ N of school suspensions since T1  
 ACTIVE95 Active or inactive, 1995 (1=active)  
 AGE Age at T1  
 GPA Academic GPA, T1 (1992)  
 V18 Gender (1=male, 0=female)  
 NATURPAR Both natural parents at home, T1  
 INERCITY Inner city school, T1 (0=suburb)  
 KPOVERTY Poverty rate of neighborhood at T1  
 LEP LEP status at T1  
 GENERAT2 Nativity  
 FATHEDUC Father's education  
 MOTHEDUC Mother's education  
 OWNHOME Homeowner, T1  
 VIETNAM Vietnamese  
 INDOCHIN Cambodian or Laotian  
 FILIPINO Filipino  
 MEXICO Mexican

Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because  
 Log Likelihood decreased by less than .01 percent.

-2 Log Likelihood 2753.927  
 Goodness of Fit 2454.480  
 Cox & Snell - R<sup>2</sup> .210  
 Nagelkerke - R<sup>2</sup> .210

	Chi-Square	df	Significance
Model	568.015	18	.0000
Block	568.015	18	.0000
Step	568.015	18	.0000

## Classification Table for PQ95

The Cut Value is .50

		Predicted				Percent Correct
		no		yes		
		n	I	y		
Observed		+-----+-----+				
no	n	I	611	I	487	55.65%
		+-----+-----+				
yes	y	I	260	I	1052	80.18%
		+-----+-----+				
		Overall				69.00%

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp (B)
DROPOUT@	-.0841	.2170	.1503	1	.6983	.0000	.9193
SUSPEND@	-.1202	.0545	4.8581	1	.0275	-.0293	.8868
ACTIVE95	1.6334	.1329	150.9559	1	.0000	.2118	5.1213
AGE	-.1364	.0576	5.6091	1	.0179	-.0330	.8725
GPA	.1408	.0641	4.8194	1	.0281	.0291	1.1512
V18	.2118	.0973	4.7411	1	.0294	.0287	1.2359
NATURPAR	.3163	.1067	8.7909	1	.0030	.0452	1.3720
INERCITY	.1125	.1345	.6992	1	.4031	.0000	1.1190
KPOVERTY	-.0580	.2668	.0473	1	.8279	.0000	.9436
LEP	.0730	.1247	.3425	1	.5584	.0000	1.0757
GENERAT2	.0075	.1073	.0049	1	.9439	.0000	1.0076
FATHEDUC	.0088	.0372	.0557	1	.8134	.0000	1.0088
MOTHEduc	.0341	.0369	.8567	1	.3547	.0000	1.0347
OWNHOME	.2985	.1151	6.7274	1	.0095	.0377	1.3478
VIETNAM	1.3211	.2028	42.4197	1	.0000	.1103	3.7475
INDOCHIN	3.0797	.2802	120.8429	1	.0000	.1891	21.7525
FILIPINO	.0559	.1680	1.1108	1	.7392	.0000	1.0575
MEXICO	.5052	.1917	6.9441	1	.0084	.0386	1.6573
Constant	-.8476	.8972	.8925	1	.3448		

[illegible]

Page 2