Hyphenated Americans? Fluidity in Ethnic Identification among the 1.5 and Second Generation

Abstract

How does the ethnic self-identification among children of immigrants relate to their socioeconomic trajectories? Logistic regression is employed to determine correlates of adolescents' initial self-labels (American, hyphenated American, racial, or foreign nationality) and changes in identification over a decade. Change in self-identification is widespread, particularly among boys and youth of lower socioeconomic status. The proportion 'American' declines dramatically from age 14 to 18, with the exception of European- and Canadian-origin youth. Regression results show that youth who use racial terms obtain less education, earn less, and have higher risk of arrest than those who use hyphenated or foreign nationality labels. Calling oneself 'American' at age 14 is also associated with lower socioeconomic attainment at age 24. The results suggest that stronger attachment to one's parents' or own national origins is associated with greater socioeconomic attainment by early adulthood.

Introduction

The study of immigrant assimilation in the United States is currently the subject of a spirited debate: does the pattern of intergenerational social mobility and incorporation of earlier immigrant waves apply today? One useful approach to answering this question is to follow Gordon's (1964) division of the assimilation process into cultural and structural dimensions. The former refers to individual-level behaviors and preferences, while the latter refers mainly to socioeconomic dimensions of integration. Echoing the sentiments of onlookers a century ago, some scholars and commentators have suggested that assimilation is not taking place for immigrants who have arrived since the 1965 immigration reform (e.g. Krikorian 2008, Huntington 2004). There is evidence of rapid cultural assimilation among the 'new second generation' (Kasinitz *et al*., 2008), but also of persistent socioeconomic disadvantage for second and later generations, at least among Mexican Americans (Telles and Ortiz 2008). The lack of consensus on this question points to a need for research regarding the relationship between the processes of cultural and socioeconomic assimilation (for an overview, see Portes and Rivas 2011).

An important dimension of immigrant assimilation from a culturalist perspective is self-identification as a member of the host country. This study examines the relationship between adolescents' ethnic self-identification and their socioeconomic positions in young adulthood for children of immigrants growing up in the 1990s. Rather than assume that the shift towards identifying as 'American' occurs in parallel with upward socioeconomic mobility, I attempt to untangle these two processes. The contributions to the existing literature are twofold. First, unlike the bulk of sociological research, this study uses longitudinal data that allows for variance in ethnic identification over the life course. Second, by analyzing the relationship between ethnic

self-identification in adolescence and socioeconomic measures in young adulthood, I present evidence suggesting that the choice of ethnic self-identification is predictive of the socioeconomic trajectories of the new second generation. If ethnic identification depends on experiential context and is related to social mobility and economic success, then the context in which the second generation grows up can shape their integration via identity-formation processes. This paper thus provides a motivation for the theoretical utility of treating ethnicity as context-dependent rather than fixed. Therefore, the paper aims to extend what is currently known about both cultural and structural assimilation processes among children of immigrants growing up in the contemporary United States.

Classical and segmented assimilation theory

With respect to structural or socioeconomic integration, this study is positioned at the center of the current debate over the degree to which the second and following generations—descendants of recent (post-1965) immigrants to the United States—have integrated or will integrate into the American mainstream. Post-industrial economic restructuring may have closed doors to economic advancement that were available to the European immigrants who arrived a century ago; in the intervening decades low-skilled work has shifted from manufacturing to low-paying, less stable service sector employment (Sassen 1998, Morris and Western 1999). Two competing theories, classical acculturation theory and segmented assimilation theory, are contrasted in order to provide a framework of interpretation for this study.

The recent interpretation of classical or 'straight-line' assimilation theory posits a 'new melting pot' in which time spent in the United States, both at the individual or generational level, is associated with greater preference for American customs, higher rates of English fluency, and

stronger identification as American (Alba and Nee 2003). In a recent study of second generation youth in New York, Kasinitz *et al.* (2008) found evidence for rapid acculturation and even a 'second generation advantage' from the combination of familiarity with American ways and access to immigrant networks. In contrast, the 'second generation decline' hypothesis questions whether old patterns of intergenerational upward mobility apply to more recent immigrants and their children (Gans 1992). Similarly, the 'segmented assimilation' hypothesis portrays a divided process in which children of highly educated immigrants enter the middle class with relative ease while children of low-skilled, often non-white labor migrants face high barriers to social mobility and may instead experience downward assimilation (Portes and Zhou 1993). Among Mexican Americans, who currently comprise the largest immigrant-origin group in the United States, studies of social mobility and acculturation provide mixed evidence. Telles and Ortiz (2008) find that English fluency rises rapidly but that educational attainment stalls after the second generation; on the other hand, in terms of labor market attachment Waldinger and Feliciano (2004) find that second-generation Mexican-American men had outcomes similar to those of native-born white men and better than those of native-born black and Puerto Rican men.

The lack of scholarly agreement suggests that we ought not expect individual immigrants or groups to proceed towards mainstream incorporation at the same rate—or even towards the same end-point, an argument also put forth by DeWind and Kasinitz (1997). The vital question is then: what conditions facilitate integration and opportunities for, at a minimum, maintenance of a decent quality of life? In this study I look to the self-reports of identity based on the expectation that ethnic self-identification indicates how individuals perceive, interpret and respond to the their life experiences. These adaptation strategies, I argue, bear on individuals' chances of economic success and social integration.

Ethnic identification

Ethnic self-identification is known to be both fluid and context-dependent: social psychologists have shown that responses depend on the individual's stage in the life course and on the context in which the respondent is asked (e.g. Phinney 1989; Turner 1988 and 1994). The strength of connection with an ethnic group develops in stages during adolescence (Oyserman *et al*. 2003; Oyserman 2008). In terms of context, youth of multiracial parentage have been found to be more likely to report multiracial identity in school than when at home (Harris and Sim 2002; Brown *et al*. 2006). Despite the contingent nature of such responses, ethnic identification is linked to a wide array of outcomes including self-esteem, academic aspirations and achievement, criminal misbehavior and political engagement. This demonstrates the importance of understanding ethnic identification for a wide variety of policy reasons.

In terms of sociological theory the context-dependent nature of ethnoracial categorization has been widely recognized (Loveman 1999; Snipp 2003; Frank and Akresh 2010). Widespread reclassifications across racial boundaries, illustrating historical changes in the definitions of racial categories, have been documented in Puerto Rico (Loveman and Muniz 2007), Brazil (Carvalho *et al.* 2004) and among American Indians in the United States (Eschbach *et al*. 1998). Some scholars have argued that the influx of immigrants from Latin America and Asia, which has increased diversity in the U.S. population (Frank *et al.* 2010), may mean the destabilization and restructuring of the American conception of race (Lee and Bean 2004; Hitlin *et al*. 2007; Frank *et al.* 2010). Here I follow the example of theorists who have proposed collapsing race, ethnicity and nationality into one object of analysis (Eriksen 2002; Brubaker *et al.* 2004; Brubaker 2009). This is in line with the view that ethnic identity is an instrument deployed by individuals when they believe it is to their advantage (Wimmer 2008). Ethnic identification can be thought to

5

reflect the confluence of individual experiences and macro-level processes such as political salience of ethnic boundaries and degree of social closure along ethnic lines (*ibid*). I apply this view to the individual responses to a question about ethnic identification, which I interpret as personal reactions to external circumstances, such as experiences of discrimination or perceived opportunities.

Self-reported ethnic labels reflect how children of immigrants see themselves within both the local and the broader U.S. sociopolitical context. Exposure to the U.S., measured by nativity or duration of residence and parental nativity, are well-established determinants of ethnic identification for the 1.5 and second generations (e.g. Rumbaut 1994, Espiritu and Wolf 2001). Other aspects of the context of reception also affect ethnic identification: for Mexican immigrant descendents, darker skin color and experience of discrimination are associated with higher likelihood of retaining Mexican as opposed to American identification (Ono 2002; Golash-Boza 2006). These represent important an dimension of acculturation processes in that they directly represent the understandings that those individuals have of their group memberships. It is important to recognize the distinction made by Brubaker and Cooper (2000) between respondents' self-understandings and self-identifications; yet self-identification can still be an informative indicator of individuals' adaptation strategies.

People behave differently when collective identities are made salient, and identifying oneself as a member of a certain group can allow individuals to gain access to political, cultural, or social privileges (Hogg 2003). Indeed, the possibility to mobilize politically is thought to be one of the main drivers of the formation of ethnic groups (Nagel 1994; Diehl and Schnell 2006). Self-identifications are also associated with individuals' socioeconomic trajectories, which suggests that they reflect adaptive strategies taken on in response to perceived opportunities and barriers to

success. In an attempt to enhance the understanding of ethnoracial identification as a process rather than a permanent trait, this study makes use of longitudinal data to capture the dynamic nature of self-identification in terms of the stability and correlates of different types of identification.

The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study is unusual in that it allows respondents to fill in a written response rather than check boxes to indicate their ethnic identification. Their responses have been categorized into four types of ethnic self-identities: American, foreign nationality, racial[1], and hyphenated nationality (e.g. Vietnamese-American). These account for all but five percent of the answers given (Rumbaut and Portes 2001). I propose a typology of categories, dividing them based on the national origin(s) indicated, and the type of group affiliation they indicate. As illustrated in Figure 1, the 'American' and racial labels (such as Hispanic, Latino, Black, White, or Asian) are categorized as designating U.S. origin, whereas the labels that name a specific non-U.S. nation, whether in conjunction with American or alone, are categorized as 'foreign origin'. This difference can be considered a dimension of identificational assimilation or acculturation. Whereas the former labels are rooted in U.S. experience, the latter make reference to one's own or one's parents' life experiences in another country. In the second dimension, affiliation type is split into national and ethnic, where the latter includes racial and hyphenated national labels. This distinction is rooted in the difference between identification based on citizenship or nativity and that which is inherited, i.e. that is retained across generations. This typology facilitates prediction about how labels relate to youths' adaptive strategies.

---

[1] Here the term 'racial' includes Asian, Hispanic, Black, White, and variants of these. Hispanic could properly be termed a panethnic, rather than a racial, term. However, given the fact that the term's origin is the U.S. Census and that the Census Bureau is considering a change to include Hispanic in the race question, I have opted to call all of these 'racial' terms.

Designated origin(s)		**Affiliation type**	
		National	*Ethnic*
	US-origin only	American	Racial
	Foreign origin	Foreign nationality	Hyphenated nationality

Figure 1. Typology of ethnic self-identification in two dimensions: origin (rows) and affiliation type (columns).

Adaptation strategies

In terms of how well children of immigrants fare in the United States, previous studies have found differences in adult socioeconomic outcomes associated with different ethnic self-labels. The theory of selective acculturation suggests that youth who maintain ties to their parents' communities and cultural origins while gaining fluency in American norms are best positioned for social and economic success (Portes and Rumbaut 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). This theory is supported by evidence that 'thin' racial-ethnic identity, in which one feels little attachment to an ethnic group, is associated with lower academic achievement than either 'bridging' or thick in-group identity (Altschul *et al.* 2008). Higher self-esteem and academic aspirations are also associated with hyphenated identification in both Spain (Portes *et al.* 2011) and the United States (Portes and Macleod 1996; Morning 2001; Feliciano 2009). Youth who report attachment to both host and origin cultures have achieved the greatest emotional well-being and socioeconomic success. These findings contradict the expectations of straight-line assimilation, wherein greater acceptance of American identity and behaviors occurs alongside upward socioeconomic mobility.

Another possible trajectory for second generation immigrants is racialization, in which recent immigrants of some origins may become identified, and identify, with racial labels. The implied long-term outcome of this is downward assimilation, with the expectation that these groups would become trapped in multigenerational struggles against disadvantage similar to those of

impoverished and socially isolated African-Americans in inner city environments (e.g. Marrow 2003; Telles and Ortiz 2009; Massey and Sánchez 2010). This hypothesis is related to the theory of segmented assimilation in that it implies bifurcated assimilation trajectories depending on class origins, geographic location of residence, and appearance. Youth who have been exposed to extreme disadvantage, lack of opportunity or discrimination from the receiving society may therefore reject the mainstream, perceiving themselves as having been rejected (Diehl and Schnell 2006; Portes and Rivas 2011). This hypothesis has been termed 'reactive ethnicity', and is expected to be associated with poor adult socioeconomic outcomes, as subscribers to such identities are expected not to be motivated to do well academically. Although racial identity is oriented towards the United States rather than the nationality of origin, based on racialization theory I predict that use of such self-labels when young is correlated with lower educational attainment and poorer socioeconomic outcomes later in life. Foreign national identification, too, may indicate that the individual does not see him- or herself as being to join mainstream American society and could result in lowered educational and occupational aspirations, leading towards downward assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

To test whether identificational assimilation is occurring as predicted by classical assimilation theory, I test whether exposure to the United States is accompanied by greater likelihood of 'American' identification over time (H1). Exposure to American culture is measured by generation (nativity and parental nativity), and duration of stay in the U.S. for the 1.5 generation. The second hypothesis predicts that stability of identity will vary across identity types, because each reflects a different adaptive strategy with respect to the development of a coherent, solidified identity. Because American and national origin identities are the most polarized options among the multiple ways of self-identifying that I examine, I expect that as they grow older and accrue

different kinds of experiences, individuals will face challenges to either of these identities from various members of their social lives. Thus, the identification types most resistant to change are those that partially reflect the juxtaposition of foreign parental origins and the American context in which the second generation grows up: hyphenated and racial. These labels also more closely reflect the meaning of ethnic identification in the United States, and thus may be reinforced as legitimate responses to the question as respondents age. Finally, the third second hypothesis reflects the predictions of selective acculturation and reactive ethnicity concepts.

Hypotheses

The first part of the analysis addresses the questions: how do 1.5 and second generation youth in the United States self-identify, and what determines changes in their ethnic self-identification during late adolescence? I analyze whether identification shifts are random or are associated with other individual-level characteristics. I then examine whether these self-reported labels are informative about individuals' socioeconomic trajectories. Below are a set of hypotheses regarding correlates of change and relationships between identification change and socioeconomic outcomes in early adulthood.

1. Greater exposure to American culture is associated with greater likelihood of U.S.-origin identification, i.e. racial and 'American' labels, relative to foreign-origin identification.
2. The level and determinants of stability in identification vary across types, with national identification being less stable than ethnic identification.
3. Hyphenated self-identification is associated with better socioeconomic outcomes and racial self-identification is associated with lower attainment.

Data and Methods

The data used in this paper come from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), which took place over the period 1992 to 2003 in the metropolitan areas of Miami/Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, and San Diego, California. Because this survey has been described in detail elsewhere (e.g. Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Rumbaut 2006), I only briefly discuss the descriptive statistics of the sample and the methodology of the original project. Of the total sample (n = 5,262), respondents were included if data was available for all three survey waves. Descriptive statistics for the subsample used in these analyses are presented in Table 1.

[Table 1 about here]

The CILS panel followed youth with at least one foreign-born parent from early adolescence to young adulthood. Students were first surveyed in 1992-1993 (hereafter T1) when they were attending eighth or ninth grade in schools selected in the Miami/Fort Lauderdale and San Diego public school districts. Two bilingual private schools in Miami were also included. The survey was designed to target fourteen-year-olds, reflecting the mean age of children of Asian and Latin American immigrants in the United States in the 1990 census. This age precedes the majority of school drop-out, preventing socioeconomic bias in sampling to some degree. Students were selected to participate if they attended one of 49 schools in these two cities and had at least one foreign-born parent, for a total sample size of 5,262. The initial sample was approximately evenly split between males and females and between the foreign- and native-born (i.e. the 1.5 and second generations; see Rumbaut 2004). Both immigrant-heavy schools and those of native-born concentration were included to obtain information about assimilation processes in a variety of settings. The two sites, south Florida and southern California, were chosen for their importance as

immigrant-receiving ports for the major sending regions of the world. Miami receives immigrants primarily from the Caribbean, South and Central America, while San Diego is an important point of entry and settlement for immigrants from Southeast Asia, especially the Philippines, from Mexico and other Central American nations.

Follow-up surveys were conducted in 1995-96 (T2), when respondents were 18 years old, and 2001-03 (T3), when respondents were 24 years old on average. Out of the original sample, 4,436 individuals or 84.3% were re-interviewed in the second phase. In the third phase, since many respondents had moved away from their family homes, it was necessary to conduct surveys principally by mail; 3,613 individuals were respondents in all three survey waves, or a 68.7% response rate (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Of these, a total of 2,974 had complete data available for all three waves, of whom 2,512 were included after removing the individuals who reported 'other' identification types. Due to item missingness, 2.2% of the data were removed because the missing items (grade point average, age, and parental socioeconomic status) were needed to generate propensity score weights. Because of concerns about non-random survey attrition, I use probability weights via propensity score matching to preserve the representativeness of the original survey (see Appendix).

The main outcome variable in the first section of this study is self-reported identification, collected as a handwritten response to the following question: "How do you identify, that is, what do you call yourself?" This was followed by a list of examples. In the first survey, examples were given including American, Cuban, Cuban-American, and Hispanic. In each survey wave, the question included at least one example from the four categories that I term identity types: American, nationality of origin, hyphenated-American, and racial (corresponding to the examples

above, respectively). Responses which did not fit into these four mutually exclusive categories, approximately five percent in each survey wave, are excluded from the analysis.

The approach of this analysis involves two main components. First, I examine predictors of stable identity and of changes in identity over all survey waves, using propensity score weights to correct for survey attrition bias. This involves analyzing choice of self-identification at age fourteen; stability of each self-identification type over survey waves; and choice of self-identification type in subsequent survey waves (i.e. change in self-identification). In the second stage, I examine the relationship between self-identification type in adolescence and socioeconomic outcomes in young adulthood. In this section, the type of self-identification is treated as an independent variable measured at T1 and T2, and outcomes are taken from the final survey wave at T3. The methods used in each stage are presented in greater depth in the remainder of this section.

Modeling stability of ethnic identification

I run logistic regression on the odds of a stable identity type over all three survey waves, with controls for T1 identification and other sociodemographic characteristics. Important control variables are nativity, parental nativity, duration of stay in the U.S., English language skill and foreign language skill. Additional controls are age, sex, city of residence, household composition, grade point average, parental socioeconomic status, and a dummy for whether the school attended was 60% or more black and/or Hispanic. Household composition is operationalized with a dummy variable for whether or not the respondent lived with both biological parents. Parental socioeconomic status is operationalized using a standardized scale that combines both parents' occupational prestige and educational attainment. Grade point average is measured on a 4.0 scale. English and other language ability are both calculated as the average of four items on ability to

speak, listen, read and write in the language, each of which is self-rated from 1 ("not at all") to 4 ("very well"). The internal consistency of items included in these indices is measured by Cronbach's alpha, which gives values of 0.92 for English skill and 0.87 for other language skill. Duration of stay in the U.S. is operationalized as an ordinal variable containing the following categories: all my life; ten years or more; five to nine years; less than five years. Finally, the regression equations include propensity score weights to account for non-response attrition.

The logistic regression on identity stability is repeated for each T1 identification type to test whether the aggregate model covariates of stability are associated with stability for each group. Multilevel models showed that school fixed effects were statistically significant according to a likelihood ratio test, but, due to the limitations of sample size, this modeling strategy forced the exclusion of other covariates of theoretical interest. Therefore I have retained single-level models, having ascertained that coefficients of interest did not change considerably in magnitude or significance when school fixed effects were included (results not shown).

Modeling outcomes in young adulthood

In order to understand the socioeconomic and contextual roles in shaping change in identification over adolescence and young adulthood, I employ multinomial regression where identification type at T2 and T3 are the outcomes, and previous identification type (T1 and T2, respectively) are the key independent variables. The abovementioned variables are also included as controls. This analysis reveals associations between various sociodemographic traits and change among different identification types over time, and to examine whether those factors are the same in mid-adolescence and in young adulthood. If identity shifts appear to be structured rather than random, this indicates that these changes in self-labeling reflect the interaction of environment

The dramatic trend in the identification data is the decline in plain-American identification. This decline is driven by U.S.-born individuals: one in five reports the label at T1, compared with just one in twenty at T2 and T3. This shift away from American identification is observed mainly among youth of Latin American and Caribbean origins, from 14.7% to 3%. Since relatively few Asian-origin youth (3.9%) report American identity at T1, little change is observed in this group. The only group with a *higher* share reporting American identity at older ages is the combined European and Canadian-origin group (n = 35), for whom the proportion reporting American identity rises from 40% in wave one to 62.8% in wave three. This is suggestive of a segmented or racialized process of assimilation in which white-appearing students are more accepted as Americans, but it cannot be considered conclusive since the number of observations is small (and because we cannot be certain that respondents from Canada and Europe are of 'white' appearance).

The spike in national-origin identification at T2 relative to T1 and T3 is driven primarily by respondents of Vietnamese and Filipino origin in San Diego, but also occurs for Nicaraguan and Haitian-origin respondents in Miami. For example, among the nearly 500 respondents of Filipino origin, one third report Filipino identity at T1, 60% do so at T2, and one third at T3. The increase in national origin identification at T2 is stronger for the foreign-born but is also present among U.S.-born individuals. One possible impetus for the rise in national origin identification could be the political turmoil surrounding California Proposition 187, a 1994 ballot initiative proposition aimed at curtailing access to public services for undocumented immigrants (Suárez-Orozco 1996). The fact that the pattern is apparent in the South Florida sample might argue against this, and it may simply reflect changes in life course and adolescent development. On the other hand,

it is possible that older adolescents in Miami would have been aware of the California controversy and have reacted to it as well.

To test which what are associated with change in ethnic identification, I predict the probability of stable identification over all three survey waves using logistic regression. The overall predicted probability of retaining the same label is 0.23, but this differs by identification type: for those who self-identify as American it is 0.03, versus 0.24 for hyphenated, 0.28 for racial and 0.29 for national origin labels. This instability particular to the American label is illustrated by simple unweighted frequencies of identification type for each wave (Table 2a).

[Tables 2a - 2c here]

The first step in identifying patterns in self-reported ethnic identification is to test for the significance of association with sociodemographic covariates. Females are far less likely than males to call themselves American: their odds of reporting the label are one third the male respondents' odds, given identical values of other observed (Table 3). This is consistent with previous research that finds females more likely to report bicultural identity, but differs from Feliciano's finding of no gender difference in reporting American identification relative to hyphenated identification (2009).

Parental and own nativity are associated with identification in a way consistent with straight-line acculturation: individuals born in the U.S. have four to ten times lower risk of self-identifying with labels other than American, relative to the to foreign-born individuals. Those with one parent born in the U.S. have higher relative risk of self-identifying as American relative to hyphenated or foreign nationality, but parental nativity does not change the relative risk of racial and American identification. Interestingly, self-assessed English skills are negatively correlated

with relative risk of self-identifying with a racial label, whereas skill in a language other than English is positively associated with that category type. This could reflect a stronger identification with a racialized outsider status among those with poorer fluency in English, or it may be an effect of differential familiarity with the meaning of the terms among young respondents.

[Table 3 here]

As noted above, American identification is far less stable category than hyphenated identification, which in turn is less stable than foreign nationality or racial identification. These results contradict classical acculturation theory and provide partial support for the third hypothesis, which predicts that national identification is less stable than ethnic identification. I find that American national identification is the outlier and that the stability of other identification types is fairly similar. That American identification is least likely to persist and that very few respondents switch to that label is strong evidence against the predictions of straight-line identificational assimilation.

To test whether predictors of stability differ among identification-types, I run regressions separately for each group (Table 4). There are important differences in terms of correlates of stability among these groups. Among individuals who report 'American' identity at wave one, greater skill in a foreign language is associated with lower odds of continuing to identify as American. This suggests that, for youth who have not become English-monolingual, there are greater barriers to continued self-perception as American. The odds of continuing to identify oneself as American are nearly eleven times higher for females than for males, but females are less likely to identify as American alone in the first place. Age at T1 is strongly associated with

stability. Given the process proposed by social psychologists of ethnic identity development, proceeding from unexamined beliefs through exploration to eventual security in ethnic identity (Phinney *et al.* 2001), it is not surprising that older youth are more likely to identify consistently over time, although this effect is only significant among American and racial-identified youth.

Among those who report a hyphenated identification at T1, nearly 30% do so in both subsequent surveys as well. Foreign-born respondents are much less likely to continue to report hyphenated identity than U.S.-born students, and students with higher middle-school GPAs have higher odds of retaining this hyphenated identity than those with poorer academic achievement. Attending a majority-minority school at T1 nearly doubles the odds of continuing to use a hyphenated label later in life. There are other context-related differences as well: racial identity is more stable in Miami, whereas national origin identification is more stable in San Diego. This may be due to differences in the national-origin composition of the groups in these cities, as well as to differences in the political climate.

[Table 4 here]

To test whether these findings were driven by patterns specific to certain national origins, separate regressions were run for respondents of the most common national origins in the sample: Cuba, Mexico, and the Philippines. Many of the overall patterns are driven at least in part by members of certain national-origin groups. For example, the gender and nativity differences in stability of identification occur among Cubans, but these factors are not statistically associated with stability among Filipinos or Mexicans. The association between identificational stability and parental nativity, on the other hand, is strong for Filipinos but not for Cubans or Mexicans (see Appendix, Table 5).

Shifts in ethnic self-identification

Given that self identification changes for so many youths across survey waves, what patterns can be discovered in these shifts? In order to map characteristics associated with identity change from one type to another, I predict identification type at T2 and T3 using previous identification as an independent variable of interest. The regression results are presented in Table 6. Racial identification is 'stickiest': odds ratios for reporting same identification type as in the prior survey are 3.4, 3.2 and 5.9 for American, national origin and racial respectively. Those who called themselves racial at T1 prefer national to hyphenated labels at T2, whereas those who used a national origin label at T1 switch to racial labels more often than hyphenated labels. The revision of self-labeling among those who considered themselves American is usually in favor of a racial label. In other words, 'Americans' at age 14 often consider themselves racial minorities at age 18, while some who used racial terms at age 14 have shifted to foreign nationality by age 18.

Several other factors are also significant in terms of predicting second-wave identity change (Table 6). Parent and own nativity affect changes in identification in ways that would be predicted by straight-line assimilation theory: having a U.S.-born parent doubles the odds of changing to American identity relative to hyphenated identity, and respondent and parental American nativity decrease the odds of shifting to national origin identity by 78% and 66% respectively. Also consistent with straight-line acculturation, those who had been in the U.S. a short time relative to others had higher odds of reporting national origin as well as or racial identity at T2.

[Table 6 here]

The predictors of T3 identity type are substantively similar to those at T2. In terms of switching from one category to another the only important difference is that between ages 18 and 24, those who claimed racial identity at 18 have three times the odds of endorsing 'American' identity, relative to the odds of endorsing hyphenated identity. However, American identity still represents a very small proportion of all respondents in the third wave (3.9% versus 43.5% for hyphenated identity). Parental nativity is associated with much higher odds of American identity and somewhat higher odds of racial identification relative to hyphenated, controlling for previous identification. Several other factors emerge that were not present in the mid-adolescent period. Higher GPA is associated with lower odds of reporting racial identity relative to hyphenated identity, and higher parental SES (at T2) is associated with lower odds of reporting national origin.

There is substantial evidence that reevaluation of ethnic identification takes place during adolescence for young second generation immigrants in the San Diego and Miami/Fort Lauderdale metropolitan areas. There is also evidence suggesting that immigrant generation and longer duration of residence are associated with greater affinity to racial identity. The American category, on the other hand, declines in importance for this population over the period. Second generation youth to realize that American is either an insufficient or improper response to the question, "How do you identify, or what do you call yourself?" In the following section I relates these findings to more concrete socioeconomic outcomes measured in adulthood: educational attainment, occupational prestige, earnings, and contact with the criminal justice system.

Outcomes in young adulthood: education, labor market, and criminal justice system contact

In a model predicting the probability of having completed a college degree including a dummy variable for stability of ethnic identification, identification at T1, and an interaction between the two, I find that individuals whose identification is stable have 36% higher odds of obtaining a bachelor's degree than those whose identification changes (Table 7). Furthermore, those who consistently identify as American have one forth the odds of college completion relative to those who endorse hyphenated identity at T1. Individuals who consistently endorse racial identities also have lower chances of obtaining a Bachelor's degree, although the effect is not as strong as for the American-identified respondents. This strongly supports the selective acculturation hypothesis and is consistent with other studies that show a correlation between bridging identities and high academic achievement. Both English and other language skills are correlated with higher odds of college completion, while duration of residence in the United States is inversely to the odds of college completion. This last finding could be a result of lower intergenerational conflict (acculturative dissonance), or to shorter exposure to discrimination that could lead to formation of 'reactive identities' that invert mainstream definitions of success.

[Table 7 here]

With respect to occupational success, an ordinary least squares regression model of occupational prestige shows no differences on average across identification types, controlling for other sociodemographic characteristics (results not shown). This is most likely a result of the fact that educational attainment is highly correlated with the Treiman prestige score; it is associated with monotonically increasing prestige scores ($p < 0.001$ for education beyond high school). Any identity-related differences would therefore be mediated by educational attainment. A test of the

relationship between adolescent identification and labor market outcomes is presented in Table 8, where monthly earnings are used as an admittedly imperfect proxy for labor market success. There are significant differences in average monthly earnings according to self-reported ethnic identity at wave one: those who report racial identity at the first wave earn on average $336 less per month than those who report hyphenated identification, while those who identify as American in early adolescence earn $225 less (mean earnings in the sample is $1250 per month). These earnings differentials are roughly equivalent to the gender penalty: women earn on average $354 less than men per month. English language skill and university degrees have the expected large positive association with income. Statistically significant wage penalties are found for youth of Jamaican, Honduran, and Chinese origin even after controlling for sociodemographic characteristics, while those with Hong Kong origins earn significantly more. However, the number of cases for each is quite small (n = 54, 21, 22 and 12, respectively) so these results can be considered illustrative but not conclusive. The income differentials nevertheless serve as a reminder of how divergent the trajectories can be for members of the new second generation.

[Table 8 here]

An additional dimension of incorporation into U.S. society is contact with the criminal justice system; I model the probability of having been arrested (Table 9) or spent time in prison (not shown) in the five years preceding the third survey wave. There is no association between ethnic identification type and odds of incarceration, although the number of cases of imprisonment is small (n = 88). There are however significant differences in the odds of arrest among groups with different ethnic identification. Identification with a national origin at age 14 is associated with 64% higher odds of arrest than hyphenated identification. Also, consistent racial identification is strongly associated with risk of later imprisonment: those who report a racial identity in all three

waves have double the odds of arrest relative to the hyphenated identity group. This finding holds true even when national origins are accounted for in the model. Earlier findings Le and Stock

[Table 9 here]

Discussion

Ethnic self-identification is both malleable and meaningful in terms of the adaptive trajectories of children of immigrants during their youth. The marked shift away from self-identification as 'American' over the course of adolescence contradicts the popular narrative of a straightforward, linear pattern of cultural and structural assimilation, at least among youth who live in immigrant-dense metropolitan areas like Miami/Fort Lauderdale and San Diego. Classical acculturation as measured by identification with host-country nationality occurs intergenerationally (between the 1.5 and second generation), but not over the individual life course.

Hyphenated self-identification is associated with higher educational attainment and earnings than either American or racial self-identification, but there is no advantage over a plain foreign national identity. Young people who self-identify with racial terms, on the other hand, have lower educational attainment, lower average earnings and higher risk of arrest. The split in terms of successful adaptive strategies is associated not with type of identity (national or ethnic) but with origins: those who use self-labels that highlight the parental origins, whether alone or in combination with American, have better educational and occupational outcomes than those who use U.S.-origin terms alone. This evidence supports selective acculturation theory.

The results are also suggestive of a racialization process for some youths. Racial and panethnic labels originating in United States categorization practices are adopted by some members of the

second generation– specifically, by those who show the strongest signs of downward assimilation. They have on average lower rates of college completion, lower earnings and higher risk of arrest. Although the mechanism of causality is not easy to establish, the temporal relationship of adolescent identification and later life conditions suggest a link between young peoples' perceptions of their social context, the barriers they face to integration, and their measurable young adult life outcomes. The use of broad racial terms by some members of this group is likely to increase among subsequent generations, who are further removed from national origin-specific knowledge, community, and cultural practice.

One possible concern about the data used in this study is whether young adolescents understand the ethnic self-identification question in the same way that adults do. Ethnographic evidence suggests that this may be an issue: in a study similar to CILS in which ninth graders were asked to indicate their racial or ethnic identity, "… most of the Haitian students had little or even no idea of the concept of racial or ethnic identity… " (Stepick *et al*. 2001, p. 251). Yet the statistical associations between adolescent self-identification and adult outcomes demonstrates that these labels reflect the lived experience of adolescent respondents. Indeed, learning to interpret a question about ethnic identity is itself a part of the parallel processes of adolescent development and acculturation that these young people undergo.

A second possible limitation to this study is that it assumes that there is an equivalent distinction between identification types across national-origin groups. National origin-specific ethnographies in Rumbaut and Portes' *Ethnicities* (2001) look deeper into the experiences of the principal groups included in CILS. There are, of course, major differences in experiences related to identity for these groups (see also Rumbaut 1994). In this paper, though, it is necessary to make an

assumption of equivalence among broad, panethnic labels such as Hispanic and Asian, even though they are associated with very different stereotypes.

In terms of extending the findings presented here, one important result worth of further research is the role of geographic context. The Miami/Ft. Lauderdale and San Diego school systems are both important entry points for recent immigrants, yet there are city-level differences in ethnic identification: respondents in San Diego are more likely than Miami respondents to use hyphenated and foreign national labels—that is, those associated with the best adult socioeconomic outcomes. Given what is known about the role of local context in shaping identities, it would be useful to compare ethnic identification at a lower level than the metropolitan area in future research. Ethnographic evidence from the Nicaraguan community suggests that in Miami, identifying as Hispanic is a way to symbolically identify oneself with the Cuban mainstream (Fernandez-Kelly and Curran, 2001). Waters reports that West Indian immigrants who grow up in poor inner-city areas more likely to identify with black Americans, whereas those growing up in middle class integrated neighborhoods are more likely to assert West Indian specific ethnic identities (2001). Greater attention to context of assimilation is a promising route to clarification of the link between identificational assimilation and socioeconomic outcomes.

Conclusions

This study addresses the formation and dynamics of ethnic identity among children of immigrants in the U.S. and the links between second generation youths' perceptions of their ethnic identities to their adult socioeconomic outcomes. The labels youths choose indicate their adaptive responses to perceived acceptance, opportunity, or barriers to full participation in social and civic

life. The native-born reception of the second generation in the United States may set an example for other societies, notably in Europe, whose tenure as immigrant destinations is more limited.

In the past century of assimilation research focus shifted from acculturation (Park and Burgess 1921; Warner and Srole 1945) to socioeconomic measures (Alba and Nee 2003). In this study I argue that cultural and structural dimensions of assimilation are intertwined: social acceptance of second generation youth is a key factor in their opportunities for socioeconomic success and political engagement. Integration involves not just educational and labor market performance but also language, practices, identity and belonging; thus, the study of self-identification among children of immigrants can allow for the return of a cultural perspective on integration, as advocated by scholars such as Thomson and Crul (2007).

By examining the dynamics of ethnic self-identification among children of immigrants in the United States we gain insight into the strategies that members of this group—who represent a growing share of the population—adopt as they come of age in the U.S. and draw conclusions about their place and futures as members of the American nation. We also come closer to a treatment of ethnic and racial groupings that takes account of the contextual, flexible nature of these social phenomena.

It is important to discover which environmental and relational factors lead to identification with one type of ethnic label versus another. This study makes it clear that self-identification with various terms of ethnicity do not reflect permanent, fixed traits but vary with time and in reaction to experience. The causes of racialization and the long-term impact of that process, in particular, are important areas for future research, since it is likely that future descendents of recent immigrants will be increasingly likely to identify in ways that reflect their U.S. origins.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study subsample. All statistics refer to the average characteristics of respondents in the first survey wave (1992-93).

Individual characteristics	
Age (years)	14.1
Female (%)	54.7
U.S. born (%)	52.8
U.S. born parent (%)	11.1
Citizen (%)	69.8
Academic and language performance	
English skill (1-4 scale)	3.8
Other language skill (1-4 scale)	2.7
Grade point average (4.0 scale)	2.7
Residential and school characteristics	
Two bio. parents in household (%)	71.8
Attends private school (%)	4.5
Attends > 60% nonwhite school (%)	43.1
Resides in Miami (%)	48.8
Resides in San Diego (%)	47.5
Resides in Ft. Lauderdale (%)	3.4
Number of observations	2512

Table 2a. Percentage of respondents reporting each form of ethnic self-identification, by survey wave. Source: CILS.

	American	Hyphenated	National origin	Racial
Wave 1 (1992-93)	12.0	43.9	28.2	14.0
Wave 2 (1995-96)	3.3	34.2	34.8	27.7
Wave 3 (2001-03)	3.5	44.2	26.2	26.1

Table 2b. Transition matrix for ethnic self-identification type at wave 1 (1992-93, *rows*) and wave 2 (1995-96, *columns*). Source: CILS.

		Wave 2 identification (%)			
		American	Hyphenated	National origin	Racial
Wave 1 identification	American	13.7	39.1	7.4	39.8
	Hyphenated	2.6	48.1	28.8	20.6
	National origin	1.1	19.4	59.4	20.1
	Racial	0.6	14.6	33.4	51.4

Table 2c. Transition matrix for ethnic self-identification at wave 2 (1995-96, *rows*) and wave 3 (2001-03, *columns*). Source: CILS.

		Wave 3 identification (%)			
		American	Hyphenated	National origin	Racial
Wave 2 identification	American	29.5	32.1	3.9	34.6
	Hyphenated	3.2	63.5	15.2	18.1
	National origin	1.2	37.9	47.4	13.5
	Racial	4.1	27.7	15.3	52.9

Table 3. Relative risk ratios for ethnic self-identification at T1. Reference category is American.
Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	Hyphenated *vs. American*	National origin *vs. American*	Racial *vs. American*
Individual characteristics			
Female	2.86 ***	2.90 ***	3.08 ***
Age	1.03	0.92	0.85
US born	0.27 ***	*** 0.10	0.20 ***
US born parent	0.53 **	0.29 ***	1.10
Citizen	0.59	0.30 **	0.33 *
Academic and language performance			
English	0.82	0.65	0.46 *
Other language	1.32 ***	1.56 ***	2.41 ***
GPA	1.07	0.95	0.81
Residential and school characteristics			
Parental SES	1.18	1.25	0.98
Two-parent home	1.02	1.05	0.89
Private school	1.85	0.36	0.47
School > 60% nonwhite	0.62	0.25 ***	0.36 **
School % subs. lunch	1.02 ***	1.02 ***	1.02 ***
Urban school	0.98	0.72	0.94
City: Ref = Miami			
Ft. Lauderdale	1.86	2.81 *	1.58
San Diego	9.81 ***	7.73 ***	3.98 ***

Table 4. Odds ratios for covariates of stability in ethnic self-identification over three survey waves, modeled for entire sample and separately for each type of T1 self-identification. Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	All	Hyphenated	National Origin	Racial
Individual characteristics				
Female	1.28 ***	1.42 **	1.07	1.29
Age	1.03	1.03	0.86	1.46 **
US born	1.37 *	3.67 ***	0.36 ***	1.54
US born parent	1.63 ***	1.51 *	1.01	1.69
Duration: Ref = since birth				
In US > 10 yrs	1.15	1.99 **	0.96	0.98
In US 5-9 yrs	0.91	0.54 *	1.12	0.56
In US < 5 yrs	0.96	1.68	0.56	1.44
Academic and language performance				
English skill	0.96	0.83	0.92	1.29
Other lang. skill	0.95	1.03	0.99	1.02
GPA	1.06	1.13	1.02	0.87
Residential and school characteristics				
Parental SES	1.09	1.10	0.96	1.40 *
Two-parent hh	1.03	1.11	1.24	0.73
Private school	2.14 ***	2.79 ***	4.35	0.42
School > 60% nonwhite		1.63 *	1.23	1.01
% subs. lunch		1.00	1.00	1.00
Urban school		0.95	0.84	1.38
City: Ref = Miami				
Ft. Lauderdale	0.78	0.35 *	1.41	1.10
San Diego	1.04	1.73	2.38 **	0.37 *
Identity type: Ref = Hyphenated				
American (T1)	0.11 ***			
Nat. origin (T1)	1.32 **			
Racial (T1)	1.39 **			
(Intercept)	0.23	0.06 *	3.44	0 **

Table 5. Logistic regressions results: odds ratios for stability of identification among the largest national-origin groups in sample: Cuba (n = 622), Philippines (n = 494), Mexico (n = 342). Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	Cuba	Mexico	Philippines
Identification at T1: Ref = Hyphenated			
American	0.04 ***	0.00	0.11 **
National	0.62 *	1.12	1.60 **
Racial	0.67	0.34 ***	0.08 **
Individual characteristics			
Female	1.49 **	1.29	0.95
Age	0.93	1.28 *	0.90
US born	3.60 **	0.87	1.05
US-born parent	0.74	1.36	7.81 ***
Duration: Ref = since birth			
In US > 10 yrs	3.64 **	0.88	1.14
In US 5-9 yrs	1.58	1.63	0.79
In US < 5 yrs	1.00	0.50	0.70
Academic and language performance			
English skill	0.72	0.62 *	0.50 *
Other lang. skill	1.08	1.19	1.02
GPA	1.16	0.85	1.57 ***
Residential and school characteristics			
Parental SES	1.05	1.31	1.48 *
Two-parent hh	1.09	0.86	1.01
School > 60% nonwhite	0.97	1.91	1.10
City: Ref = Miami			
Ft. Lauderdale	0.00	6E+06	0.11
San Diego	1E+07	9E+06	5.3E+05
(Intercept)	0.98	0.00	0.00

Table 6. Multinomial regression on ethnic self-identification at T2 and T3, controlling for previous identification. Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	Identity at wave 2			Identity at wave 3		
	Hyphenated	National	Racial	Hyphenated	National	Racial
Prior Identification: Ref = Hyphenated						
American	0.26 ***	0.17 ***	0.64	0.09 ***	0.05 ***	0.30 **
National	0.74	2.35	1.41	0.75	2.69 *	0.94
Racial	1.58	5.32 *	9.69 **	0.29 ***	0.58	1.45
Individual characteristics						
Female	1.02	1.01	1.00	1.43	1.20	1.40
Age	0.78	0.77	0.88	1.27	1.19	1.29
US born	0.67	0.23 **	0.66	0.50	0.24 **	0.31 *
US born parent	0.55 *	0.23 ***	0.52 *	0.28 ***	0.21 ***	0.69
Citizen	0.12	0.06 *	0.09 *	1.43	1.12	1.05
Academic and language performance						
English skill	1.06	0.95	0.75	0.91	1.11	0.81
Other lang. skill	1.30 *	1.22	1.35 **	1.06	1.05	1.29 *
GPA	0.98	0.90	0.92	1.11	1.02	0.96
Residential and school characteristics						
Parental SES	1.08	1.34	1.01	0.74	0.62 *	0.73
Two-parent hh	1.12	1.23	1.16	1.65	1.75 *	1.43
Private school	7.05 **	1.64	1.92	1.03	0.91	0.51

(Table 6 cont.)

City: Ref = Miami						
Ft. Lauderdale	0.50	0.75	0.64	0.24 **	0.53	0.50
San Diego	4.59 ***	11.17 ***	1.82	1.82	1.69	0.60
(intercept)	1442.98 *	4011.47 *	922.07 *	0.72	0.62	0.61

Table 7. Odds ratios on college completion by average age 24, controlling for ethnic identification type in first survey wave and stability of ethnic identification over subsequent survey waves. Note that all national origins are included in this model (reference is Colombia) but are omitted from this table for ease of interpretation. Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	Exp(B)
Prior identification: Ref = Hyphenated	
American	1.01
National origin	0.96
Racial	0.74
Stable * American	0.26 *
Stable * Hyphenated	1.36 *
Stable * National origin	0.63
Stable * Racial	0.41 **
Individual characteristics	
Female	1.01
Age	0.90
US born	1.96 **
US-born parent	0.76
Citizen	1.15
Academic and language performance	
English skill	1.75 ***
Other lang. skill	1.17 **
GPA	5.08 ***
Residential and school characteristics	
Parental SES	1.95 ***
Two-parent hh	1.23
School < 60% nonwhite	0.77
% subsidized lunch	0.99 *
Duration: Ref =since birth	
Resident 10+ yrs	1.71 *
Resident 5-9 yrs	2.21 **
Resident < 5 yrs	3.08 *

(Table 7 cont.)

City: Ref = Miami	
Ft. Lauderdale	0.74
San Diego	0.41 *
(Intercept)	0.00 ***

Table 8. Ordinary least squares estimation of monthly earnings at wave three (mean age 24). National origins were included in the model (ref. Colombia) but are not shown. Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	B
Prior identification (Ref = Hyphenated)	
American	-224.74
National origin	12.62
Racial	-335.73 *
Stable * American	-225.01
Stable * Hyphenated	-219.03
Stable * National	34.00
Stable * Racial	160.81
Individual characteristics	
Female	-354.26 ***
Age	101.42 *
US born	0.0797
US born parent	58.95
Citizen	-66.02
Academic and language performance	
English skill	258.78 **
Other language skill	-6.25
GPA	15.25
Residential and school characteristics	
Parental SES	88.18
Two-parent hh	-70.55
School > 60% nonwhite	30.08
% subsidized lunch	1.21

(Table 8 cont.)

Educational attainment ref - HS graduate	
< HS graduate	-278.22
1-2 years post-HS	122.78
2-year degree	304.23 *
3+ years college	-256.66 *
College graduate	450.29 ***
Some postgrad	-7.63
Master's degree	425.07
Professional deg.	3017.28 **
Other	-266.26
City: Ref = Miami	
Ft. Lauderdale	-18.15
San Diego	-171.56
(Intercept)	51.21

Table 9. Odds ratios of arrest in the five years preceding the third survey wave completion by average age 24, controlling for ethnic identification type in first survey wave and stability of ethnic identification over subsequent survey waves. National origins are included in this model (reference is Colombia) but not shown. Significance: *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

	Exp(B)
Prior Identification: Ref = Hyphenated	
American	0.64
National origin	1.64 *
Racial	1.18
Stable * American	1.45
Stable * Hyphen.	0.72
Stable * National	0.80
Stable * Racial	2.27 *
Individual characteristics	
Female	0.18 ***
Age	0.96
US born	1.65
US born parent	1.06
Citizen	0.90
Academic and language performance	
English skill	1.35
Other language skill	0.92
GPA	0.83 *
Residential and school characteristics	
Parental SES	1.03
Two-parent hh	0.53 ***
School > 60% nonwhite	1.47
% subsidized lunch	0.99 *

(Table 9 cont.)

Duration: Ref = since birth		
Resident 10+ yrs	1.26	
Resident 5-9 yrs	0.90	
Resident < 5 yrs	0.00	
Educational attainment: Ref = H.S.		
< High school	1.34	
1-2 years post-HS	0.69	*
2-year degree	0.35	***
3+ years college	0.63	*
College graduate	0.49	**
Some grad school	0.16	*
Master's degree	0.40	
Professional degree	0.00	
Other	0.43	
City: Ref = Miami		
Ft. Lauderdale	0.58	
San Diego	1.55	
(Intercept)	0.16	

References

Alba, Richard D. and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altschul, Inna, Daphna Oyserman, and Deborah Bybee. 2008. "Racial-Ethnic Self-Schemas and Segmented Assimilation: Identity and the Academic Achievement of Hispanic Youth." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 71(3):302 –320.

Brown, J. Scott, Steven Hitlin, and Glen H Elder Jr. 2006. "The Greater Complexity of Lived Race: An Extension of Harris and Sim." *Social Science Quarterly* 87(2):411–431.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2009. "Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:21–42.

---------- and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity'." *Theory and Society* 29(1):1–47.

----------, Mara Loveman, and Peter Stamatov. 2004. "Ethnicity as cognition." *Theory and Society* 33:31–64.

Carvalho, José Alberto Magno de, Charles H. Wood, and Flávia Cristina Drumond Andrade. 2004. "Estimating the stability of census-based racial/ethnic classifications: The case of Brazil." *Population Studies* 58(3):331–343.

DeWind, Josh, and Philip Kasinitz. 1997. "Everything old is new again? Processes and theories of immigrant incorporation." *International Migration Review* 31(4):1096–1111.

Diehl, Claudia, and Rainer Schnell. 2006. "'Reactive Ethnicity' or 'Assimilation'? Statements, Arguments, and First Empirical Evidence for Labor Migrants in Germany." *International Migration Review* 40(4):786–816.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2002. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.

Eschbach, Karl, Khalil Supple, and C. Matthew Snipp. 1998. "Changes in Racial Identification and the Educational Attainment of American Indians, 1970-1990." *Demography* 35(1):35.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2009. "Education and Ethnic Identity Formation among Children of Latin American and Caribbean Immigrants." *Sociological Perspectives* 52(2):135–158.

Fernández-Kelly, Patricia, and Sarah R Curran. 2001. "Nicaraguans: Voices Lost, Voices Found." Pp. 127–155 in *Ethnicities: children of immigrants in America*, edited by Rubén G. Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Frank, Reanne, Ilana Redstone Akresh, and Bo Lu. 2010. "Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order." *American Sociological Review* 75(3):378 –401.

Gans, Herbert J. 1992. "Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2):173–192.

Gibson, Margaret A. 1997. "Complicating the Immigrant/Involuntary Minority Typology." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 28(3):431–454.

Gil-White, Francisco J. 2001. "Are Ethnic Groups Biological 'Species' to the Human Brain? Essentialism in Our Cognition of Some Social Categories." *Current Anthropology* 42(4):515–553.

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2006. "Dropping the Hyphen? Becoming Latino(a)-American through Racialized Assimilation." *Social Forces* 85(1):27–55.

Gordon, Milton. 1961. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality." *Daedalus* 90(2):263–285.

Harris, David R., and Jeremiah Joseph Sim. 2002. "Who Is Multiracial? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):614–627.

Hitlin, Steven, J. Scott Brown, and Glen H. Elder. 2007. "Measuring Latinos: Racial vs. Ethnic Classification and Self-Understandings." *Social Forces* 86(2):587–611.

Hogg, Michael A. 2003. "Social Identity." Pp. 462–479 in *Handbook of self and identity*, edited by Mark R. Leary and June P. Tangney. New York: Guilford Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. "The Hispanic Challenge." *Foreign Policy*, March 1 Retrieved June 19, 2012 (http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/03/01/the_hispanic_challenge).

Kasinitz, Philip *et al*. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Krikorian, Mark. 2008. *The New Case Against Immigration: Both Legal and Illegal*. Penguin.

Lee, Jennifer, and Frank D. Bean. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:221–242.

Loveman, Mara. 1999. "Is 'Race' Essential?" *American Sociological Review* 64(6):891–898.

---------- and Jeronimo O. Muniz. 2007. "How Puerto Rico Became White: Boundary Dynamics and Intercensus Racial Reclassification." *American Sociological Review* 72(6):915 –939.

Marrow, Helen. 2003. "To be or not to be (Hispanic or Latino)." *Ethnicities* 3(4):427 –464.

Martin, John Levi, and King-To Yeung. 2003. "The Use of the Conceptual Category of Race in American Sociology, 1937–99." *Sociological Forum* 18(4):521–543.

Massey, Douglas S., and Magaly Sánchez. 2010. *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-Immigrant Times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Morning, Ann. 2001. "The Racial Self-identification of South Asians in the United States." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27:61–79.

Morris, Martina, and Bruce Western. 1999. "Inequality in Earnings at the Close of the Twentieth Century." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:623–657.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41(1):152–176.

Ono, Hiromi. 2002. "Assimilation, Ethnic Competition, and Ethnic Identities of U.S.-Born Persons of Mexican Origin." *International Migration Review* 36(3):726–745.

Oyserman, Daphna. 2008. "Racial-Ethnic Self-Schemas: Multidimensional Identity-Based Motivation." *Journal of Research in Personality* 42(5):1186–1198.

----------, Markus Kemmelmeier, Stephanie Fryberg, Hezi Brosh, and Tamera Hart-Johnson. 2003. "Racial-Ethnic Self-Schemas." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66:333.

Painter, Nell Irvin. 2010. *The History of White People*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Park, Robert Ezra, and Ernest Watson Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Phinney, Jean S, Gabriel Horenczyk, Karmela Liebkind, and Paul Vedder. 2001. "Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Wel-Being: An Interactional Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues* 57(3):493–510.

----------. 1989. "Stages of Ethnic Identity Development in Minority Group Adolescents." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 9(1-2):34 –49.

Portes, Alejandro, and Dag MacLeod. 1996. "What shall I call myself? Hispanic identity formation in the second generation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19:523–547.

---------- and Alejandro Rivas. 2011. "The Adaptation of Migrant Children." *The Future of Children* 21(1):219–246.

---------- and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---------- and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: the Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

----------, Erik Vickstrom, and Rosa Aparicio. 2011. "Coming of age in Spain: the self-identification, beliefs and self-esteem of the second generation." *The British Journal of Sociology* 62(3):387–417.

---------- and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74–96.

Ridgeway, Greg, et al. 2012. "Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups: A tutorial for the twang package." RAND. Online 2012-02-28: http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/twang/vignettes/twang.pdf

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1994. "The Crucible within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation among Children of Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 28(4):748–794.

----------. 2004. "Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States1." *International Migration Review* 38(3):1160–1205.

---------- and Alejandro Portes. 2001. *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.

Snipp, C. Matthew. 2003. "Racial Measurement in the American Census: Past Practices and Implications for the Future." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:563–588.

Stepick, Alex, Carol Dutton Stepick, Emmanuel Eugene, Deborah Teed, and Yves Labissiere. 2001. "Shifting Identities and Intergenerational Conflict: Growing up Haitian in Miami."

Pp. 229–266 in *Ethnicities: children of immigrants in America*, edited by Rubén G. Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M. 1996. "California Dreaming: Proposition 187 and the Cultural Psychology of Racial and Ethnic Exclusion." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 27(2):151–167.

Tajfel, Henri. 2010. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Telles, Edward E., and Vilma Ortiz. 2009. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Thomson, Mark, and Maurice Crul. 2007. "The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33:1025–1041.

Treiman, Donald J. 1976. "A Standard Occupational Prestige Scale for Use with Historical Data." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 7(2):283–304.

Turner, John C. 1988. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

----------, Penelope J. Oakes, S. Alexander Haslam, and Craig McGarty. 1994. "Self and Collective: Cognition and Social Context." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(5):454 –463.

Turner, Stephen P. 1994. *The Social Theory of Practices: Tradition, Tacit Knowledge, and Presuppositions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vaquera, Elizabeth, and Grace Kao. 2006. "The Implications of Choosing 'No Race' on the Salience of Hispanic Identity: How Racial and Ethnic Backgrounds Intersect among Hispanic Adolescents." *The Sociological Quarterly* 47(3):375–396.

Waldinger, Roger, and Cynthia Feliciano. 2004. "Will the new second generation experience 'downward assimilation'? Segmented assimilation re-assessed." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(3):376–402.

Warner, William Lloyd, and Leo Srole. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4):970–1022.

Appendix

Propensity Score Weights

To account for bias introduced by non-random survey attrition, I first test whether there are differences in respondent trait means among those present in all survey waves versus those with missing response. Then, to adjust for selective survey attrition, I generate propensity score weights via a three-step iterative process. The first step is to regress the survey non-response dummy on covariates using logistic regression. The second step involves matching respondents with non-respondents on the basis of the estimated propensity scores. The third step is to verify that matching has balanced the response and non-response groups. This proceeds iteratively in such a way that the propensity score model becomes more complex with each step, allowing the model greater flexibility. The results presented in Table A indicate significant differences between those missing and present in terms of age, sex, grade point average, parental socioeconomic status, and knowledge of English at survey wave one.

Table A. Covariate means at wave one (1992-93) for respondents present in all waves and for respondents with missing data at wave two or three.

	Present	Missing	t statistic
GPA	2.72	2.25	-18.9
SES	0.02	-0.19	-10.1
English score	3.76	3.63	-9.2
Age	14.13	14.37	9.6
Sex (% female)	54.71	46.48	-5.8
US Born (%)	52.82	45.51	-5.2

To generate the propensity score weights I relied on the 'Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups' package developed for use in R software (Ridgeway *et al*. 2011). This package implements a lasso (least absolute subset selection and shrinkage operator) method to estimate coefficients. The procedure maximizes the logistic log-likelihood but includes a penalty

based on the absolute magnitude of the coefficients (equation 1). This method gives allows for interactions and non-linear effects of the independent variables (*ibid*.). When covariates are correlated, the model produces more stable estimates with information from all the included covariates, rather than producing larger covariate estimates relying more heavily on fewer covariates.

$$l\beta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i \beta' x_i - \log(1 + e^{(\beta' x_i)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{J} |\beta_j| \quad (1)$$

The propensity score weights can be evaluated by comparing the distribution of average features in the weighted response and non-response groups. The process of iteration continues until the balance between groups meets a certain threshold, e.g. average effect size difference across covariates. The resulting weights accorded greatest influence to respondents' GPA, followed by parental SES, an index of skill in English, age, sex, and nativity.