Child Bilingualism or Familial Acculturation? 'New' Directions in Measuring Acculturation

David A. Cort

CCPR-058-07

December 2007

California Center for Population Research
On-Line Working Paper Series

Child Bilingualism or Familial Acculturation?
'New' Directions in Measuring Acculturation

David A. Cort[1]
Department of Sociology
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

[1] Direct all correspondence to David A. Cort, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (dcort@soc.umass.edu). The author thanks Roger Waldinger, Robert D. Mare, Min Zhou, Andrew Fuligni, Marjorie Orrelana, and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

Abstract

Over the past fifteen years, the bilingualism or language acculturation of the 'new' second generation has received increasing attention in the literature. Child bilingualism is viewed as an intervening variable in the relationship between immigrant background factors and the future socioeconomic assimilation of second generation children. Missing from this conversation though is the possibility that language acculturation is not a process occurring only among immigrant children; it can occur among families. I fill this gap by first providing a conceptual framework for understanding how acculturation can occur among families and then producing a blueprint for measuring familial acculturation. I then determine which child and parental factors affect familial acculturation. Three results surface from multivariate analyses. First, by far, parental skills and resources, as well as child tenure in the U.S. are the strongest and most consistent determinants of familial acculturation. Second, there is no evidence that the process of familial acculturation differs by sex. Third, parental modes of incorporation do not moderate the effects of parental skills and resources. Together, these findings and the measurement blueprint presented encourage further consideration of how familial acculturation within immigrant families contributes to the entire process of second generation socioeconomic assimilation.

Key Words: Acculturation, bilingualism, assimilation, second generation

Child Bilingualism or Familial Acculturation?
'New' Directions in Measuring Acculturation

Introduction

After many decades of nearly stagnant immigration, the U.S. Congress, in 1965, passed the Hart-Celler Act, which drastically changed the character of in-migration to this country. The new law looked favorably on immigrants whose skills were in need and on those who desired to reunite with family members that were already in this country lawfully. While the volume of this immigration stream is not distinctive when compared to that of the past, its characteristics are quite distinctive. In comparison to their compatriots in the last immigration wave, today's immigrants are more diverse with respect to their racial/ethnic backgrounds (Perlmann & Waldinger 1998; Waldinger 2001) and their socioeconomic status (Alba & Nee 1997; 2003).

Given the distinctive nature of this migration flow, a small but growing literature (see Portes & Zhou 1993; Portes & Rumbaut 1996) seeks to ascertain how second generation immigrants, the children of today's new entrants, acquire the linguistic and cultural tools (hereafter called acculturation) necessary to adapt to the new society and how acculturation, in turn, helps them socioeconomically assimilate. Viewed in such a manner, linguistic and cultural acculturation are important intervening variables in the relationship between immigrant background characteristics and the socioeconomic attainment of second generation immigrant children. That being said, past work (see Espenshade & Fu 1997; Oropesa & Landale 1997) has focused almost exclusively on language acculturation because of the difficulty in operationalising the cultural dimension of this construct. This sustained attention on the influence of individual characteristics on immigrants' bilingualism culminated in the collection of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey (CILS), the best data available for studying the relationship between language acculturation and future assimilation outcomes of second generation immigrants. Using these data, Portes and Rumbaut (2001), in their seminal publication *Legacies*, argue that bilingualism is a key mechanism through which immigrant children socioeconomically assimilate into American society.

While this may indeed be true, I posit that this work, as well as past literature that focuses on bilingualism, omits an important alternative possibility.

While immigrant children can certainly use bilingualism to aid in their own socioeconomic attainment, it is also possible that language acculturation is a process that involves families, and not just children, as suggested by Portes & Rumbaut (2001). Therefore, the rate at which immigrant parents and children linguistically acculturate *together* can provide valuable clues concerning how immigrant families utilise language to aid their children in assimilating into the American socioeconomic structure. Such a framework changes the focus from how the bilingualism of immigrant *children* contributes to the future socioeconomic attainment of children to how language acculturation among immigrant *families* determines the socioeconomic assimilation of the second generation.

Examining the linguistic acculturation of immigrant families is important because scholarship in the field of developmental psychology (see Steinberg 1988, 1990) agrees that the family is a place where many of the important lessons concerning how to make it in society at large takes place. Immigrant families then, are not exempt from this process. Indeed, a growing literature provides evidence that immigrant families work together to develop strategies that help them make it in their new society (Fuligni 2001; Reese 2002; Tseng & Fuligni 2000).

Even though shining a lens on the linguistic acculturation of immigrant families is a worthwhile endeavor, measuring acculturation as a familial process has not received serious attention in the empirical literature. This is a non-trivial omission, for it is a crucial first step in determining how acculturation contributes to the future assimilation of immigrant children. Without a rigorously developed measure of language acculturation, analyses that focus on how this construct contributes to the future assimilation of immigrant children are likely to suffer from measurement error and model misspecification.

To fill this void, I advance an argument for measuring acculturation as a *familial* process. However, before doing this, I ground this argument within the tenets of segmented assimilation, for that theoretical framework contains a detailed and specific discussion of how language acculturation is

connected to second generation socioeconomic assimilation. I provide such an explanation and review of the segmented assimilation model in the pages that immediately follow. Then, I discuss, in conceptual terms, how the original discussion of acculturation that appears in the segmented assimilation model can be refined by a focus on familial language acculturation. I then provide a blueprint for measuring familial acculturation and conduct analyses of its determinants.

Background and Theory

Over the years, the assimilation literature (see Alba & Nee 2001) has characterised immigrants' potential for adaptation in largely optimistic terms. For example, the straight-line assimilation model predicts that with time, and depending on the characteristics of the first generation, second generation immigrants should join the middle-class and achieve more favorable socioeconomic outcomes than their parents. Conversely, supporters of segmented assimilation theory are more pessimistic. They argue that the socioeconomic outcomes of some immigrant children will not be as favorable as straight-line theory suggests. Indeed, downward assimilation into the underclass is a very real possibility for a non-trivial proportion of them.

The theory is born out of certain interpretations of the economic and social contexts of reception that greet new immigrants when they come to the U.S. Proponents argue that these contexts are quite different than contexts encountered at the end of the 1800s. With respect to economic contexts, the literature first suggests that today's immigrants enter the U.S. at a time when there is an increasing tendency for the economy to reward workers who have technological skills and tertiary education more highly than blue-collar workers. Consequentially, the former group earns more and sees more job mobility than the latter (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1984) and, while there are still some blue-collar jobs available to newly arrived immigrants, they generally pay less than white-collar jobs and there are now fewer of them available (Mishel and Bernstein 1992).

Second, the manufacturing economy of yesteryear allowed, within a fairly short time, modest steps from the 'bottom rung' of the socioeconomic ladder to a more modest lifestyle that was able to

support a family. By contrast, today's immigrants enter an economy that is increasingly resembling an 'hourglass economy' – many good jobs at the top of the occupational distribution, many bad jobs at the bottom, and a vanishing pool of employment opportunities in the middle. Thus, positive socioeconomic advancement is by no means guaranteed.

Third, poverty has become highly concentrated in inner-cities in which many immigrants converge upon entry into the U.S. More importantly, with the contraction of the manufacturing sector of the economy, many stable middle-class jobs have been transplanted to the suburbs, along with a crucial stock of middle class residents (see Wilson 1996 for an elaboration on this idea). As a result, immigrants may be unable to utilise the job networks that they may need to acquire stable jobs to support their families.

Social contexts of reception provide yet another layer of pessimism. As is well known, a large proportion of immigrants were, at the turn of the 20th century, from southern Europe. Near the beginning of this migration stream, many of these immigrant groups were considered ethnic minorities and treated as such, enduring mistreatment and discrimination within the larger social structure. However, over time, the definition of who was considered 'white' changed, allowing southern and eastern Europeans to count themselves as white (see Ignatiev 1995 for an elaboration of this idea). Conversely, today's immigrants are not as fortunate. Many of them come from countries where a non-trivial proportion of residents have darker skin, making it impossible to look like whites. Thus, because recent immigrants reside in a society that has not been cured of its racist inclinations, they face the same obstacles to socioeconomic mobility that native-born African Americans face such as residential segregation (Massey and Denton 1993) and the consequences of isolation in inner-city communities (Wilson 1996).

Given these social and economic contexts of reception facing today's immigrants, segmented assimilation theorists argue that four factors determine the direction of socioeconomic assimilation for today's second generation immigrants. They include (1) the context of reception of the immigrant first generation (i.e. first and second generation modes of incorporation and background factors); (2) the pace

and type of acculturation that occurs between parents and children; (3) the cultural and economic barriers that confront the second generation in their quest for successful adaptation and (4) the family and community resources for confronting these barriers.

Specifically, the theory states that parental (first generation) and second generation background factors such as parental socioeconomic status, the social reception that the first and second generation receive from their host environment (i.e. more commonly called modes of incorporation), and first and second generation family structure, all affect different types or patterns of language acculturation of the second generation. In turn, different types of acculturation, along with background factors, modes of incorporation, and family structure, affect the type and direction of assimilation (as measured by variables such as educational attainment) for the second generation *through* external obstacles (or their social and economic contexts of reception) such as the amount of racial discrimination experienced by the second generation, the types of labor markets that they encounter, and the messages they receive from the sub-cultures within the inner cities. Portes & Zhou (1993) and Portes & Rumbaut (1996) describe the interweaving of all of these relationships as the entire process of assimilation.

Two points surface from discussion. First, after the second generation starts the acculturation process, eventual assimilation depends on contexts of reception that immigrants face such as racial discrimination, bifurcated labor markets, and inner-city subcultures. Second, although individual and structural factors do determine whether or not second generation immigrants will acculturate, it is acculturation that in turn determines the future well-being of immigrant children. This point is noteworthy because it establishes that acculturation is an important *intervening variable* in the process of assimilation. However, there is considerable disagreement in the literature concerning whether acculturation additively or non-additively determines the future assimilation outcomes of immigrant children (see Xie & Greenman 2001 for support of this interpretation).

Putting aside this empirical disagreement for the time being, it is important to now highlight a serious void in the literature. Little attention has been paid to measuring acculturation as it was originally

conceptualised by Portes & Rumbaut (1996) in *Immigrant America*. While in that text, these authors provide a typology that suggests ways of measuring acculturation, their empirical analyses of acculturation in *Legacies* (Portes & Rumbaut 2001) do not follow their theoretical guidelines. Specifically, while Portes & Rumbaut (1996) argue for thinking about acculturation as occurring between immigrant parents and children, their measures of acculturation in *Legacies* leave out this crucial intergenerational dimension. Therefore, I offer a conceptual framework for thinking about familial acculturation and suggest a method of measuring the concept.

Intergenerational Acculturation – A Conceptual Framework

Language Consonance and Dissonance

In the assimilation literature, culture is an important component of the adaptation process. Sadly, immigration theorists who care about acculturation have lacked a clear theory of culture. Many construct culture as an entity, or something that is 'obtained' and able to be contrasted with American mainstream culture (see Reese 2002 for support of this idea). However, cultural anthropologists have long argued that culture is a process rather than an entity (Kottak and Colson 1994) and is constantly changing and reproducing itself (Keesing 1994). Because of the lack of theoretical attention given to culture by immigration scholars and the insistence by anthropologists that culture is a process, those specifically interested in studying acculturation were forced to clarify the specific meaning of culture.

To that end, Zhou (1997) suggests that individual and structural factors are intertwined with 'immigrant culture' and group characteristics to determine the eventual fates of immigrant children. Here, immigrant culture is defined as the way of life, values, predispositions, ideas, languages, and beliefs that all immigrants bring with them upon arrival[1]. To adapt to a new lifestyle and to be accepted by the members of the receiving society, immigrant families must make use of norms, values, and English, tools that will help them make it in American society. These tools are either brought with them at immigration or picked up along the way in their new environments. Families use the cultural and language tools that best fit with the norms and values of the host society (Matute-Bianchi 1986).

Often, immigrant parents determine for their young children which tools to best utilise. Moreover, in an effort to pass on certain family values and traditions, parents decide what host culture values and norms are beneficial to keep and what values are better left unused. Many encourage their children to learn English quickly so that they can do well in school and help their parents negotiate their new environments effectively (Fillmore 1991). For example, immigrant children are often used as translators for their parents, facilitating their participation in legal, educational, and medical domains (Orellana, Dorner, and Pulido 2003; Orellana, Reynolds, and Meza; 2003. The negotiation between parents and children about the usage of acculturative tools is really a type of family dynamic that occurs in all families (Collins 1989). However, because immigrant families face added pressures to learn host culture norms and values, three parts of these dynamics are more important to them.

First, because of the increasing sense of child autonomy, individuality, and self-fulfillment in the United States, the ways in which parents used to interact with their children in the sending country may be different from interaction styles in the receiving country. Moreover, the expectations in parental-child interactions that were present at the time of the parents' childhood are no longer in force today. Therefore, parental-child interaction styles are likely to have changed over time and place.

Second, parents learn more slowly than their children. When new immigrants come to a new country, children may be the ones who have the ability to pick up the cultural norms faster than their parents. Thus, parents may have to rely on their children much more than they would have if they were in the home country (Orellana, Dorner, and Pulido 2003; Orellana, Reynolds, and Meza 2003). Thus, in the words of Portes & Rumbaut (1996: 239-40), 'children become, in a very real sense, their parents' parents.'

Third, as children get older, there may be constant negotiations between parents and children concerning which sending country traditions and values should be left unused and which should be used to aid in the assimilation process. For immigrants in tight-knit communities, parents and children actively negotiate the strategies that will best help children succeed. These strategies often involve selectively

using the values of the host society that best help children get ahead (Gibson 1988). This type of parental-child strategizing occurs in a new environment where parents may not have as much control over their children as they did in the host society.

For immigrant families, these three characteristics may well lead to different rates of acculturation between parents and children. Some families may pick up acculturative tools at the same pace, while others may acquire them at different paces[2]. Portes & Rumbaut (1996) bring an important innovation to the literature by conceptualizing the differences in the rate of acculturation between immigrant parents and children in terms of consonance and dissonance. On the one hand, they argue that *generational*[3] *consonance* occurs when parents and children have the same level of understanding of English. On the other hand, *generational dissonance* occurs when parents and children do not have the same level of English competence. Either parents are more linguistically acculturated (an admittedly rare occurrence) or children are more linguistically acculturated.

Acculturation in Families – A 'New' Approach

While this innovation is instrumental in enhancing our understanding of how different rates of acculturation occur, I believe three non-trivial elaborations to this conceptual framework will make it possible to think about acculturation as a familial construct. First, crucial to the aforementioned formulation is the possibility that generational consonance (i.e. when parents and children have the same level of English competence) has two outcomes. On the one hand, parents and children can both have a high rate of language competence. I term this *consonant acceptance*. On the other hand, parents and children can both have a low rate of language competence. This, I call *consonant rejection*, formally called consonant resistance to acculturation in the literature (see Portes & Rumbaut 1996). Consonant acceptance and consonant rejection can be thought of as opposite forms or types of generational consonance.

Second, and perhaps most importantly for this paper, constructing measures of consonant acceptance, consonant rejection, and generational dissonance requires knowledge of the level of English

competence of second generation immigrants (i.e. the immigrant children) as well as the level of English competence of their parents, the first generation. That is, *both* pieces of information are necessary to turn the abstract concepts of consonant acceptance, consonant rejection, and generational dissonance into concrete variables. This innovation is missing from the measures of language acculturation or bilingualism that Portes & Rumbaut (2001) use in their empirical analyses contained in *Legacies*. Therefore, in addition to under-developing the theoretical concepts of language acculturation, Portes & Rumbaut (2001) have failed to measure the indicators of these concepts using language information from immigrant parents and their children.

In essence then, generational consonance is really another way of discussing the *similarity* in the rate of acculturation between immigrant parents and children while generational dissonance can symbolise the *dissimilarity* in the rate of acculturation. Across immigrant groups, there are likely to be non-trivial differences in acculturation rates because immigrants come to this country with different amounts of human capital, economic capital, and familial resources that are likely to increase or reduce differences in the rates at which families acculturate. While that may indeed be true, what is most important for this discussion is a realization that acculturation is something that occurs *between* parents and children[4]. Knowledge of the extent of familial differences in acculturation will likely provide clues concerning which immigrant families are at risk for assimilating into the middle-class and which families are at risk for assimilating into the underclass.[5]

Third, after specifying a unique and interesting conceptual definition of generational dissonance in *Immigrant America*, Portes & Rumbaut, in *Legacies*, advance a unique argument about how dissonance is connected to child outcomes. In doing so, they switch their conceptualization and operationalisation of dissonance. Specifically, in *Immigrant America*, they conceptualise generational dissonance as representing generational differences in the rate of acculturation, as explicated above. However, in *Legacies*, they measure this concept using variables that assess the amount of conflict that can occur between parents and children. They argue that because parents are steeped in foreign norms and values

and their children have grown up in a society that is much different to the ones in which parents were socialized, communication between parents and children can become compromised or impaired. Parents will have difficulties communicating their desires, norms, and values to their children while children will have difficulty communicating with their parents about what it takes to fit in at school and elsewhere. As a result of these communication difficulties, parental-child conflict (or what they call dissonance) is likely to result (see Galambos and Almeida 1992; Offer 1969 for a discussion of parental-child conflict in general). In essence, when parents and children experience a non-trivial amount of conflict, parents lose their ability to monitor what happens to their children in the socioeconomic hierarchy.

While this argument has received quite a bit of attention and comment in the recent literature, I believe that by measuring dissonance using the amount of parental-child conflict that exists in immigrant families, Portes & Rumbaut have conflated generational dissonance as they conceptualised it in *Immigrant America* with its possible consequence, parental-child conflict, the variable they use to measure dissonance in *Legacies*. More importantly, I believe that the communication difficulties that Portes and Rumbaut discuss have not been directly measured in their empirical analyses. Given that these difficulties are theorised to produce the conflict that is an important part of their framework, this deficiency is troubling.

One possible way to begin to think about measuring this potential for communication difficulties between immigrant parents and children is to ask the following question: when would communication between parents and children be most likely? Portes & Rumbaut (2001) provide a possible clue when they point out, in Table 1, that dissonant acculturation and role reversal result when parental understanding of *English* is low and child understanding of the *foreign language* is low. Conversely, I argue that these are exactly the conditions that are likely to produce parental-child communication difficulties, or miscommunication, not dissonant acculturation. If parents cannot adequately communicate their norms, values, and wishes to their children in English (the language that has become the primary means of communication for children), and children have difficulties understanding these values in their parents'

mother tongue, then miscommunication is likely. While these situations may not occur very often, I posit that they can produce communication difficulties, which can in turn lead to the parental-child conflict that Portes & Rumbaut correctly deem to be very important. It is worth stressing that the communication difficulties that I discuss above are really a type of acculturation, while parental-child conflict is a consequence of this type of acculturation. In addition, differences in the rate of acculturation between parents and children discussed above can also produce conflict.

Table 1: Generational Language Knowledge and Types of Acculturation

To sum up, generational language acculturation can be viewed in three ways. First, parents and children can, on the one hand, both have a high level of competence of English. I call this possibility *consonant language acceptance*. On the other hand, parents and children can both have a low level of competence of the English language. This I term *consonant language rejection*. I consider both of these concepts to be opposite forms of the same concept, consonant acculturation. Second, there can be parental-child differences in the rate of language acculturation. This is a type of language dissonance. Third, it is possible that parents may have difficulty communicating their desires, norms, and values to their children while children will have difficulty communicating with their parents about what it takes to fit in at school and elsewhere. The potential for this situation can be called familial miscommunication. Importantly, all of these possibilities represent different facets of immigrant family dynamics. While bilingualism has become the main method for measuring language acculturation, it is perhaps helpful to begin thinking about how different facets of immigrant family dynamics can inform our understanding about how immigrant children are likely to assimilate socioeconomically into American society. While such a framework has been suggested in the past, work here advances a critical elaboration on an old perspective.

Research Questions

In their book *Legacies*, Portes & Rumbaut focus on the determinants of language loss, or bilingualism. Here, I focus attention on the determinants of language acculturation rates, language

dissonance, and parental-child miscommunication within immigrant families. While they refer to the language loss and the bilingualism of children as acculturation, I consider the variables that I will construct to be measures of acculturation that more closely mirror the theoretical literature. Thus, the following discussion is meant to show how those variables could be constructed. I argue that this exercise is the most important part of this paper.

Using their measures of bilingualism, Portes and Rumbaut spend a great deal of time discussing its determinants. I follow that blueprint in analyses that follow. Therefore, subsequent multivariate analyses attempt to ascertain whether the determinants of language acculturation behave in theoretically expected ways across multiple types of acculturation.

Finally, Portes & Rumbaut (1996) argue that when parental resources are plentiful and when parents are able to take advantage of certain modes of incorporation, consonant acculturation (or consonant acceptance in this case) is most likely. Conversely, when parents do not have substantial resources at their disposal and when they are unable to take advantage of certain types of modes of incorporation, dissonant acculturation or consonant rejection should result. Thus, they expect that interactions between parental resources and modes of incorporation should be important when estimating models of acculturation. In subsequent analyses, I attempt to verify that claim.

To address each of these concerns, I propose two simple research questions. First, how do factors related to second generation background factors (i.e. nationality status, sex, family structure, and race), parental skills and resources (such as socioeconomic status, years of experience in the United States), parental control and social cohesion, as well as parental modes of incorporation combine to determine multiple types of familial acculturation? Second, do the effects of background factors, family structure, and parental resources depend on the level or types of modes of incorporation that immigrant parents have at their disposal?

Data & Variables

The data come from Waves I & II of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS). The CILS is a longitudinal survey designed to study the adaptation processes of the immigrant second generation. Two samples (the first in 1992 and the second in 1995) of middle school students were drawn in 49 schools in the San Diego and Miami metropolitan areas. These cities were selected because they represented two of the areas with heavy populations of new immigrants from different parts of the world. Because middle schools represent a critical component of the sampling frame, the data are considered clustered within schools. Even though I am not using school-level variables in subsequent analyses, I employ robust standard error corrections in all analyses to correct for this clustering.

At time 2 of the survey, Portes & Rumbaut (2001) also surveyed one parent or guardian of the child in the survey, making it possible to create measures of generational acculturation. Because parents had to be interviewed in their homes and in their own language, the cost of conducting parental interviews for all children in the sample was prohibitive. Thus, only about 50% of the child sample contains a corresponding parental interview, creating a non-trivial amount of missing information for the parental data. In addition, because the limited funding for the parental interviews was only received at the time of the follow-up child questionnaire, the parental data only contain information at time 2 of the survey.

The lack of parental interviews posed a serious hurdle for the present analyses because the dependent variables rely on the presence of complete child *and* parental information for their construction. Moreover, the most crucial independent variables are parental characteristics. To circumvent this problem, I decided to use the information for children whose parents were given a parental interview. This essentially eliminates just under half of the sample of children. However, the alternatives would involve the multiple imputation of parental characteristics and language acculturation. While these imputation methods are becoming more popular in the social sciences, I decided that it would be safer to make inferences about families that have complete information instead of making assumptions about parents' language use that is imputed.

In total, the original CILS sample contains 5,272 baseline child respondents, 4,281 of which were re-interviewed three years later. Of these 4,281 child respondents, 294 children had English as their mother tongue because they were born in the English speaking. I remove them from the sample because it made little sense to talk about the language acculturation of a population whose mother tongue was English[6]. In addition, I delete 103 respondents who could not be neatly classified into homogenous nationality groups large enough to form their own separate categories. These first two deletions result in a sample of 3,884. From this number, I remove 1,760 children whose parents did not receive a parental interview, leaving an analytical sample of 2,124 child records.

Dependent Variables

I focus my attention on language acculturation. Again, it is important to emphasise that langue acculturation is an intervening variable in the overall assimilation process. Hence, the analyses here are concerned with the relationships in the first part of the assimilation process: the relationship between child and parental background characteristics and familial acculturation.

Familial Acculturation Rates

Knowledge of the English language is the foundation variable I use to measure language acculturation rates. In Wave I of the CILS (collected in 1992), children, but not parents are asked about their ability to speak, read, write, and understand English. In Wave II (collected in 1995), parents and children were asked the same questions. Each of these questions is measured on a 4-point Likert scale where 1 represents speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English 'not at all' and 4 represents speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English 'very well.'

To begin, I sum all four English competence variables (i.e. ability to speak, read, write, & understand English) to create an index (range 4 – 16) of English competence. I do this separately for parents and children, resulting in two separate indexes measuring English language competence. Importantly, while the distribution of competence for parents is fairly symmetrical, most kids report having a very high level of competence in English. This reality poses a potential problem because the

proper creation of consonant acculturation variables requires me to determine the point on the respective indexes where parents and children *both* have high levels of English competence (consonant acceptance) or where parents and children *both* had low levels of English competence (consonant rejection).

To circumvent this problem, I group each of the indexes into four-category variables, with 1 representing *very low comprehension*, 2 representing *moderately low comprehension*, 3 representing *moderately high comprehension*, and 4 representing *very high comprehension*. I do this because the underlying variables that comprise the index are four-category variables. I then cross-tabulate grouped parental and child English competence. Keep in mind that the conceptual definition of consonant acceptance is when parents and children are at high levels of English competence, while consonant rejection applies to the situation when parents and children are at low levels of English competence. Results indicate that 634 children in the sample fit the former definition, while very few fit the latter. Thus, I do not have enough children in the sample to create a category for consonant rejection. However, I argue that it is theoretically possible and should be considered in future analyses. With the cross-tabulation as a guide, I consider children and parents to express *consonant acceptance* if both have *very high* English competence. This yields a dummy variable, with 1 representing parents and children who are *very high* and 0 representing otherwise.

Language Dissonance

I create an index of absolute language dissonance between parents and children using a different method than the one described above. This index is simply the absolute value of the difference between the child and parental competence variables. Conceptually, if children have a zero (0) on this scale, they are at parity with their parents with respect to English competence. If they have values *greater than zero*, their English competence is different to their parent. For now then, one should not be concerned with whether children are more competent than parents or if parents are more competent than children. What's important is the *absolute difference* in the rate of acculturation that occurs between parents and children. Possible scores on this index range from zero (parents and children are at parity) to twelve.

Parental-child Miscommunication

To simulate the potential for parents and children to experience communication difficulties, I must first make two preliminary conceptual assumptions that should be verifiable with data. I assume that parents understand their own mother tongue at a high rate or level and also assume that children understand English at a non-trivial level. The first assumption cannot be directly verified with the data because they do not contain any information about parental foreign language competence. However, I believe it's safe to assume that, especially for parents who did not come to the United States at young ages, they still understand their mother tongue. Fortunately, the second assumption is directly verifiable with the data.

If these two assumptions are indeed true, then parents and children are most likely to have difficulties communicating with each other when parents' understanding of English is low and child understanding of the parental mother tongue is low. That is, when *both* of these conditions are met, then it is likely that parents will have difficulty communicating their desires, norms, and values to their children while children will have difficulty communicating with their parents about what it takes to fit in at school and elsewhere.

To create this variable, I first compute an index of foreign language competence for children (i.e. ability to speak, read, write, & understand the mother tongue). For parents, I utilise the index of English language computed previously. Second, as with the previous indexes, I group the foreign language index for children into four categories. Third, I produce a cross-tabulation of child foreign language competence by parental English competence. Finally, I create a dummy variable for parental-child miscommunication, where 1 represents situations where children have *very low or moderately low* use of the foreign language and parents have *very low or moderately low* use of the English language. Zero (0) represents all other situations[7].

<u>Independent Variables</u>

I separate my independent variables into four conceptual groups. I measure child background factors and family structure, parental modes of incorporation, parental skills and resources, the level of parental control over children's behavior as well as the amount of social cohesion existing in immigrants' communities.

Child Background Factors & Family Structure

All of the variables measuring child background factors and family structure are measured in 1992, Time 1 of the survey. Nationality status of second generation immigrant children is measured by a set of dummy variables indicating the country of origin of the child's mother. When the mother is not interviewed or is missing, I make use of the paternal place of birth. When parental information is completely missing, I use the place of birth that was provided by the child[8]. I also include the sex and race of the child respondent. For racial status, I group all respondents that are not white into a non-white category, distinguishing them from those who are white. I do this because segmented assimilation theory suggests that second generation children who are visible minorities will have vastly different outcomes than those who are white.

I include two variables that measure family structure in the models. The first is an indicator variable that measures whether or not children have two parents in the household. I also include a variable that measures the number of siblings that are living in the child's household. Both of these variables have been used extensively in past work as measures of family structure. I include two variables measuring children's citizenship status and length of tenure in the United States. Citizenship is a dummy variable, with 1 representing those who are citizens, and 0 representing all others. Length of tenure in the U.S. is originally an ordinal variable. I create dummy variables for each category of stay, using children who are in the county for the least time as the omitted category

Parental Skills & Resources

With the exception of pre-migration parental occupational status, all of the parental skills and resources variables that were considered for use come from the parental survey which was administered at

time 2, but not at time 1. Within the survey, I originally considered three candidate covariates that measure parental socioeconomic status. They include parental family income, years of completed education, and current occupational prestige.[9] Because parental income and current occupational status had a non-trivial probability of changing between 1992 and 1995 and because any SES effects on acculturation outcomes may result from the pre-migration class status of parents, I decide not to use current parental income and occupational prestige in my analyses. Instead, I use years of completed education, which is not as likely to undergo substantial changes between 1992 and 1995, and pre-migration occupational status. Education was originally a continuous variable and I leave it in its original form. In Pre-migration occupational status is originally measured using Treiman prestige scores. Sadly, many parents were not working prior to migrating or did not report an occupation, creating a non-trivial amount of missing data. Thus, I transform the prestige scores into quintiles and include the missing information as a dummy variable.

I measure parental experience in the U.S. using three variables. In the parental survey, parents are asked their ages and the year they migrated to the United States. Using this information along with the date of the interview, I create a variable measuring the number of years parents have been in the U.S. In addition, I also create an indicator variable measuring whether or not the parent or guardian was a child (under the age of 13) at the time of migration. Finally, I include an indicator variable that measures whether or not the child has at least one native-born parent in the home, which I consider to be an indicator of the presence of a parent who has some knowledge of how to make it in the United States.

Modes of Incorporation

Modes of incorporation are the specific social contexts that greet first or second generation immigrants upon arrival in the United States. I include three measures of modes in subsequent analyses. Importantly, although I measure the modes with questions from parental questionnaire (time 2), all of these questions query parents about the situations they encountered *at the time of immigration*, minimizing the endogeneity of modes of incorporation and acculturation.

First, in the parental survey, parents are asked about the number of friends and relatives they had at the time of migration. I create an index of the number of friends and family by adding together the two indicators. Second, I create and include in the analyses a variable that measures whether or not parents had access to economic assistance when they arrived in the United States. Third I include an indicator for whether or not the supervisor or coworkers of the parents' first job were of the same national background. I argue that this variable is really a measure of the extent to which parents have help from supervisors and co-workers from within their own communities when they first come to America[10].

Parental Control and Social Cohesion

I include a set of covariates in my analyses that measure the extent to which parents have control over their children's activities and the extent to which they have the ability to monitor and control what their children do, which I conceptualise as social cohesion. A large literature in developmental psychology argues that parental control and social cohesion are related to several child well-being indicators and to the likelihood of shedding the norms and values of the sending country (see Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco 2001 for an extensive discussion of this literature). Via exploratory factor analysis, I construct a composite index that measures the level of neighborhood input in raising children and the level of social cohesion in the community. Candidate items for these scales are taken from the parental questionnaire. I also include a variable that measures whether parents know the children with whom their kids associate. And finally, I include two composite indexes of the level of control parents have over the television viewing of their children and their overall education.

Results

Univariate & Bivariate Analyses

Table 2 provides means and standard deviations for all independent and dependent variables used in the analyses. Of particular interest is the distribution of acculturation measures. Preliminary results indicate that about 30% of immigrant families express consonant acceptance of English. More importantly, the potential for miscommunication between parents and children is quite trivial. On average,

only 8% of families experience this phenomenon. Thus, univariate analyses appear to indicate that although consonant acceptance and miscommunication do occur within immigrant families, they are not exactly widespread.

Insert Table 2 about here

Preliminary Multivariate Analyses

To begin my examination of the determinants of familial language acculturation, I first conduct a set of preliminary multivariate analyses intended to ascertain whether the general pattern of results presented by Portes & Rumbaut (2001) would be obtained even when using the limited sample I utilise in my analyses. In essence, I try to rule out the possibility that the results I discuss below are driven not by my construction of the measures of language acculturation, but by the fact that my sample is different from that sample used by Portes & Rumbaut. In Table 3, I present the parameter estimates for four logistic regression models of second generation bilingualism that contain, to the best of my ability, the independent variables shown in Chapter 6 (Table 6.6) of Legacies[11]. Model 1 contains individual-level covariates, while Model 2 contains the variables in Model 1 plus controls for school-level characteristics.

Insert Table 3 about here

Results from Model 2 suggest that by and large, the overall pattern of the effects of the independent variables is the same across samples. For example, across the two samples, the coefficients for sex are significant and in the direction detected by Portes & Rumbaut. Two exceptions do however surface between the Portes-Rumbaut model and my own. First, they show that early academic achievement (i.e. grade point average) significantly affects the likelihood of children experiencing bilingualism. However, if the model were to be re-fitted using my sample, that result would be non-significant. Second, respondents' age is not a significant determinant in their sample, but achieves marginal significance in mine.

Upon closer examination of Table 3, it becomes obvious that the model reported in Legacies contains significant parameter estimates for the three school-level variables present in Model 2. However,

no such statistical significance surfaces in the model I estimate. I suspect that this finding surfaces because the Portes-Rumbaut model contains no corrections in the standard errors for the fact that children are clustered within schools. To correct for this clustering, I re-fit all models and include robust standard errors. Results are presented in Table 4. In total, the majority of the significant effects for school level variables disappear, and the overall pattern of the results mirrors those presented in *Legacies*.

Insert Table 4 about here

In summary, despite the two exceptions noted above, I argue that the weight of the evidence appears to show that there is consistency between my trimmed sample and the one used by Portes & Rumbaut. That is, I am reasonably confident that despite the fact that I am forced to delete so many observations, the sample that I use is similar enough to the original authors to make firm conclusions about the dependent variables I construct.

Multivariate Analyses

In Table 5, I present the results of three models of familial acculturation. Again, all models contain the same covariates. Models of consonant acculturation and parental-child miscommunication make use of logistic regression techniques, while OLS techniques are used for the model of language dissonance[12]. Four theoretically noteworthy sets of results surface from the multivariate analyses.

Insert Table 5 about here

First, parameter estimates from logistic and OLS regressions of familial language acculturation indicate that across two of the three dependent variables, covariates measuring parental skills and resources as well as child citizenship are the strongest and most conceptually consistent determinants of familial acculturation, providing a clear answer to the first research question. For example, parental human capital is statistically significant and in the expected conceptual direction. By and large, immigrant children whose parents have more of this resources at their disposal are more likely to learn English at the same rate as their parents, less likely to experience some potential for miscommunication with their

parents, and are less different than their parents in the rate of acculturation (i.e. experience less language dissonance).

The effects of parental education are worth explaining for emphasis. Net of all other characteristics, a one year increase in parental human capital increases the odds of consonant acceptance of language by 46 per cent ($exp^{.38} - 1$) and decreases the odds of familial miscommunication by 16 percent ($1 - exp^{-.17}$). In addition a one unit increase in parental human capital decreases the level dissonance by almost half (-.41) a scale unit. Results also suggest that child citizenship is strongly associated with consonant acceptance and language dissonance. The coefficients indicate that the odds of consonant acceptance for children who are citizens are 57 per cent greater than those who are non-citizens. In addition, children who are citizens are about half a point lower on the dissonance index than their counterparts who do not have citizenship.

The second noteworthy finding suggests that contrary to the result reported by Portes & Rumbaut (2001), when familial acculturation is examined instead of child bilingualism, males and females do not differ with respect to their language acculturation outcomes. This is an important finding because it casts doubt on the claim that immigrant females have some sort of acculturative advantage over their male counterparts. Thus, although they may indeed have higher rates of bilingualism, relative to males, females appear to be just as likely to acquire English skills as the same rate as their parents and experience the potential for familial miscommunication. They also do not differ with respect to the level of familial dissonance experienced in the family.

Together, these two sets of results present the literature with a first glimpse of the most important determinants of familial acculturation. While past scholarship paints a portrait of the importance of Latin American origin, sex, and the length of U.S. residence, results here suggest that parental skills and resources are much more important than these factors. In fact, I find that child gender has absolutely no effect on familial acculturation; boys and girls have the same rates of acculturation and experience the same level of miscommunication with their parents.

The third set of findings paint a very theoretically counter-intuitive portrait of the effects of modes of incorporation on familial acculturation. I find that net of other covariates, when parents have had economic assistance from some type of government agency, the likelihood of miscommunication is *more* likely. Furthermore, those who have received such assistance experience *more* language dissonance than those who have not received the assistance. Thus, this mode of incorporation does not decrease miscommunication, but increases it; it does not reduce the level of dissonance, but increases it.

These findings are surprising, given the importance of the modes of incorporation in the literature. Indeed, these factors are arguably one of the most important in the segmented model. However, even though they are surprising on the surface, the results can be explained. Extended bivariate analyses (not shown here) indicate that parents who required aid from the government at arrival have on average significantly poorer English ability than their counterparts who did not require such aid. That fact combined with the very good English competence of kids overall make it no surprise that prior educational assistance from the government is associated with higher levels of miscommunication and language dissonance.

Fourth, in an attempt to determine if there are interaction effects between parental skills and resources and modes of incorporation, I fit several non-additive models of familial acculturation. Such models help to determine whether there is any evidence that modes of incorporation significantly alter the effects of parental skills and resources that were detected in additive models and discussed above. The results (also not shown here) indicate that none of the interaction terms reached statistical significance and none provide significantly better model fits than the simpler models displayed in Table 5. The lack of a significant pattern of interaction effects is particularly important because it suggests that the strong effects of parental skills and resources do not depend on the modes of incorporation of immigrant families[13].

This lack of statistical significance for the non-additive results is a very important finding. A significant portion of the theoretical discussion in *Immigrant America* was focused on the ability of

modes of incorporation experienced by first generation immigrants to countermand the negative effects of a lack of financial resources on language acculturation. Using the best available measures of modes of incorporation, I am unable to detect such an interaction effect, even though it is hypothesised to be important. This essentially means that parental resources are so powerful an asset to immigrant families that their effects are unable to be modified by modes of incorporation.

To sum up, the preliminary and main multivariate evidence presented above provide to the literature a revised portrait of language acculturation among immigrant families. I argue that it is time to begin thinking about acculturation as a process that occurs in families. This process is determined by parental skills and resources, child citizenship in the U.S., and parental modes of incorporation. Put differently, these three factors increase our understanding of how families pick up English skills together, and whether or not parents and children have problems communicating with each other.

Discussion

This paper was motivated by a lack of attention in the literature to theory-driven construction of acculturation, a potentially important intervening variable in the process of assimilation. As a result of that deficiency in the literature, no work to my knowledge has investigated the factors that determine familial acculturation. Thus, I spend much more time in the paper discussing the measurement of acculturation than I do the determinants of the concept because I believe that the former task is a more substantive contribution to the literature than the latter.

Indeed, analysts have not measured acculturation rates with information from parental and child language ability, as past theoretical work has suggested is needed. Therefore, the measures that I construct here are not theoretically 'new,' but are indeed methodologically distinctive. Moreover, no work to my knowledge has examined the potential for miscommunication between the first and second generation. These voids in the literature essentially mean that there has been a paucity of research focusing on the determinants of *familial* acculturation. Therefore, while Portes & Rumbaut (2001) advance a convincing argument that the language loss of children contributes to dissonance, their measures of acculturation only

contain information from immigrant children instead of information from parents *and* children. This prevents them from validating their theoretical claims.

I believe that my method of measuring acculturation more closely adheres to the important theoretical groundwork laid down by Portes & Rumbaut (1996) than the acculturation measures produced in Portes & Rumbaut (2001). This is an important claim, for it essentially means that the measurement method suggested above may have a greater chance of reducing measurement error and model misspecification in future analyses that use acculturation variables as critical covariates. Thus, while Portes & Rumbaut show strong effects of various variables on bilingualism and argue that these results provide evidence of the presence of language acculturation in the second generation, I contend that their models *do not* establish evidence of the language acculturation that occurs in *immigrant families*. For such evidence to surface, their measures of acculturation ought to include information on the language use or loss of the first *and* second generation.

More importantly, there exists a fundamental difference between my conceptualization of how combinations of parental English competence and child foreign language competence produce acculturation and the Portes-Rumbaut conceptualization of the same family characteristics. Again, a reproduction of their conceptualization of acculturation appears in Table 1. Here, they argue that when parents' understanding of English is low and child understanding of the foreign language is low, dissonant acculturation, role reversal, or parental-child conflict results. However, I believe that when these particular combinations of language characteristics are found in immigrant families, *miscommunication* is likely, not dissonance. Thus, I suggest that by arguing that low English competence of parents and low foreign language competence of children produces dissonance or parental-child conflict, Portes & Rumbaut have conflated familial dissonance with its possible consequence: parental child conflict. The combination of these factors does not produce dissonance, but the potential for miscommunication between parents and children. It is more likely that miscommunication produces parental-child conflict.

In addition to thinking about how parental knowledge of English and child knowledge of the foreign language combine to produce the potential for miscommunication, I suggest above that it is parental and child competence in English that produces the acculturation types that Portes & Rumbaut (1996) theorise in *Immigrant America*. I display this point in Table 6. Here, I show that different combinations of parental and child English competence produce consonant acceptance, consonant rejection, and dissonance. Such a characterization is not new, for it appears in *Immigrant America*. What is new is the actual usage of this typology to produce measures of acculturation types.

Insert Table 6 about here

Importantly, I also show in Table 6 that when parents *do not* have the same level of English competence, that situation produces the elusive concept of dissonance. Specifically, I believe that dissonance exists within or between the extremes of combinations of generational understanding of English, when parental and child competence in English is *dissimilar*. Notice that that the diagonals of the Table 6 contain the conceptual definitions of consonant acculturation. On the off-diagonals of the table are what I consider to be the differences in the rate of generational acculturation or more simply, generational dissonance. In addition, it is important to again stress that *combinations* of parental and child understanding of English are what produce acculturation, not simply the level of childhood understanding of English.

Beyond a focus on the measurement and conceptualization of acculturation, I follow Portes & Rumbaut (2001) by analyzing the determinants of acculturation. While they focus on the language loss of children, I shine an analytical lens of the acculturation of families. Thus I change the original question posed by Portes & Rumbaut. Instead of asking ‘what makes a bilingual’, I ask ‘what factors determine acculturation in families’?

In their results, Portes and Rumbaut report that ‘children of two-foreign-born parents who have remained together [i.e. children who come from an intact family] and speak their language at home are more likely to be fluent bilinguals’ (Portes & Rumbaut 2001: 143). My results paint a more vivid portrait

of the factors that determine familial acculturation and the potential for communication difficulties in families. I find that parental experience in the United States, parental socioeconomic resources, and the citizenship status of children combine to affect all types and dimensions of acculturation. Put differently, immigrant children who are citizens of the U.S., whose parents are educated and have experience in the U.S. are more likely to understand English at the same level as their parents. They are also experience less language dissonance in their families. Importantly, contrary to their findings, I report no effect of sex. Males and females do not have differing rates of acculturation.

My findings are particularly difficult to compare with those reported by Portes & Rumbaut (2001) for two reasons. First, their analyses were focused on second generation bilingualism while I focus on acculturation as a familial process. Second, I use parental characteristics to help explain the process of familial acculturation, while they use child information. Together, these differences across analyses make comparison of results rather difficult. Nevertheless, my work provides valuable insights that add useful information to the results already reported by Portes & Rumbaut. While they report in their book that children receive a substantial benefit in their acculturation outcomes from foreign-born parents, my work demonstrates that an added benefit comes from having parents who are highly educated and have experience in the U.S. Indeed, while having at least one native-born parent does increase the likelihood that parents and children will have a high level of competence in English, the level of education and experience of *parents* matter just as much, and perhaps more. Thus, in addition to the Portes-Rumbaut focus on the benefits foreign-born parentage, I find that children also benefit if their parents have more tangible resources such as human capital. The findings reported here demonstrate the importance of explaining a familial process with covariates that measure characteristics of families, not just children.

The results pertaining to the effects of parental resources are important for theoretical reasons as well. As stated previously, straight-line assimilation models posit that the more time parents spend in the U.S. and the more parental resources they have, the more likely their children are to acculturate. In addition, Alba & Nee (2001) point out that since the host society has been increasingly likely to provide

equal treatment to its new entrants, factors that measure the type of aid immigrants receive from the government or from their co-ethnic counterparts should have negligible effects on acculturation outcomes. Results reported above suggest that the economic assistance that parents receive from the government *increases* the potential for parental-child miscommunication and *increases* the level of overall language dissonance between parents and children. While I believe that these results most likely occur because parents who have to receive such aid are most likely to also have poorer English skills, this most certainly cannot explain the entire finding. I suggest further research on this very point because it is so anomalous and contrary to theoretical expectations.

Finally, an important suggestion in the literature is that when immigrant families have sufficient levels of social capital and are able to reside in communities where their co-ethnics can help monitor their children, the negative effects of having fewer human and economic capital resources are diminished. Results reported here suggest that measures of modes of incorporation and the amount of aid parents receive at migration do not interfere with the effects of parental resources. Thus, the additive effects of parental resources are much more important than any non-additive influences. Thus, the evidence thus far does not appear to support the interpretation that social capital or community resources diminish or countermand the effects of parental resources on familial acculturation.

While I am reasonably confident that the results presented above make valuable contributions to the existing literature, I also believe that many deficiencies in the data prevent me from making firmer conclusions. First, most of the measures for parental resources were not measured at Time 1. This essentially means that I am unable to establish clear temporal ordering, which complicates my ability to make causal conclusions. This is most unfortunate, given the empirical and theoretical importance of these variables as determinants of familial acculturation. Scholars who take up this line of work should do everything possible to ensure that SES is measured at the time of immigration, or at least before acculturation occurs.

Third, I make a strong case that generational acculturation should be considered in the literature. That is, the acculturative process is not necessarily individual, but familial. If this is indeed a possibility, then future work ought to consider how the relationships between all members of the family contribute to this process. Thus, it would be very interesting to consider interactions between the number of siblings and other important covariates contribute to the familial acculturative process. I found no such interaction effects in analyses reported here. However, since these data are regional, these results may have been muted. Future work could utilise other sources of data to ascertain whether such relationships exist in a wider context.

Finally, analysts interested in this work ought to use measures of acculturation to determine how these factors, conceptualised and measured as a familial process, affect the future well-being of immigrant children. At the heart of segmented assimilation theory is the expectation that interactions between immigrant social context and acculturation types produce different types of assimilation outcomes. Determining whether this is indeed the case may help shed light on whether or not the decisions that immigrant families make concerning the English language and American culture affect the future destinies of children.

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks to the Andrew Mellon Foundation for providing dissertation funding during the writing phase of this project. The author also acknowledges the long term support of Roger Waldinger, Robert D. Mare, Min Zhou, Andrew Fuligni, Marjorie Orellana, and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. Responsibility for the results reported herein is that of the author alone.

Biography

David A. Cort is assistant professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts-Amherst. His broad research interests include areas such as international migration, social stratification, and quantitative methods. Specifically, he studies the role of language acculturation and documentation status as mechanisms in the socioeconomic assimilation of second generation immigrants.

Notes

1. Theorists outside of immigration also have various definitions of culture. However, they all appear to agree that culture involves some combination of values, norms, traditions, and ideas.

2. Admittedly, there may be other reasons (such as the socializing effects of schools and peer pressure from friends) why differential rates of acculturation among families can occur. I just offer three to serve as examples.

3. The term ‘generational’ refers to interactions between parents and children.

4. Here I argue strongly that acculturation occurs between parents and children. However, this argument does not rule out the possibility that intragenerational (i.e. occurring between older and younger siblings) acculturation is possible.

5. Missing from the conversation is a discussion of selective acculturation. I focus on solely consonance and dissonance because the literature suggests that measures of selective acculturation should include families’ immersion into co-ethnic communities. Given that I believe that this immersion requires more conceptual unpacking and because I do not have community-level indicators in Miami, I decide to leave that issue for another time.

6. This characteristic could ostensibly apply to children from the Philippines because many of them have a healthy command of English upon arrival. However, analyses revealed that a non-trivial proportion of these children also report using their mother tongue. Therefore, while the vast majority of them will appear in the consonant acceptance category, they still have the potential for experiencing miscommunication. Therefore, I decide to leave them in the analyses.

7. In focusing part of my attention on the likelihood of familial miscommunication, I must acknowledge that even if I detect such a probability, it is likely that what I measure in the form of a variable is some consequence of a process that has occurred in the past. Parents and children may have undergone some process that resulted in the miscommunication that I detect. Currently, there exist no variables to correct for parts of the process that occurred prior to the miscommunication. Hence, the results I report are speculative.

8. When examining group effects in multivariate models, I children of Cuban descent are the omitted category. While it is possible to separate private and public school Cubans and omit private school Cubans, I decided against it because they come from homes that are so much better off socioeconomically from other groups, making comparisons misleading and unhelpful. Moreover, omitting public school Cubans created cell-size issues with some of the dependent variables. I decide to control for public-private school attendance, but refrain from showing it in multivariate models because it was non-significant.

9. The original authors of the survey transformed the occupational groupings into Treiman prestige scores (Treiman 1977; Ganzeboom & Treiman 1996).

10. Scale construction techniques and model specifications, are contained in the technical appendix.

11. For to the best of my ability, I measure the variables just as they appear in *Legacies*. However, in my own analyses, the measurement of covariates follows the framework I described earlier. I also shade specific coefficients in my models that are substantively different from those estimated by Portes & Rumbaut.

12. Within the table, coefficients that are lightly bolded indicate statistically significant effects that are of substantive or conceptual importance. However, there are some that are not bolded, but still significant.

13. Although several coefficients for group membership reach significance, I refrain from discussing them at this point. Group membership effects tell a conceptual story that merits more explanation than can be given in this limited space.

References

Alba, Richard D. and Victor Nee. 1997. 'Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration.' *International Migration Review* 31: 826-74.

----------. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Espenshade, Thomas J. and Haishan Fu. 1997. 'An Analysis of English-language Proficiency Among U.S. Immigrants.' *American Sociological Review* 62: 288-305.

Fillmore, Lily Wong. 1991. 'When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First.' *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6: 323-46.

Fuligni, Andrew. 2001. 'A Comparative Longitudinal Approach to Acculturation among Children from Immigrant Families.' *Harvard Educational Review*, 71: 566-78.

Galambos, Nancy L. and David. M. Almeida. 1992. 'Does Parent-Adolescent Conflict Increase in Early Adolescence?' *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54: 737-47.

Ganzeboom, Harry B. G. and Donald Treiman. 1996. 'Internationally Comparable Measures of Occupational Status for the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations.' *Social Science Research* 25: 201-239.

Gibson, Margaret. 1989. *Accommodation Without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge.

Keesing, Roger. 1994. 'Theories of Culture Revisited.' Pp. 301-09 in *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, edited by New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kottak, Contrad and Elizabeth Colson. 1994. 'Multilevel Linkages: Longitudinal and Comparative Studies.' Pp. 396-410 in *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matute-Bianchi, Maria Euginia. 1986. 'Ethnic Identities and Patterns of School Success and Failure among Mexican-Descent and Japanese-American Students in a California High School: And Ethnographic Analysis.' *American Journal of Education* 95: 233-55.

Mishel, Lawrence and Jared Bernstein. 1992. *The State of Working America: 1992 – 1993.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Offer, Judith L. 1969. *The Psychological World of the Teenager*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich, Lisa Dorner, and Lucila Pulido. 2003. 'Immigrant Youth's Work as Family Interpreters.' *Social Problems* 50: 505-24.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich, Jennifer Reynolds, Lisa Dorner, and Maria Meza. 2003. 'In Other Words: Translating or 'Para-Phrasing' as a Family Literary Practice in Immigrant Households.' *Reading Research Quarterly* 38: 12-34.

Oropesa, R. Salvador and Nancy Landale. 1997. 'In Search of the New Second Generation: Strategies for Identifying Second Generation Children and Understanding their Language Acquisition.' *Sociological Perspectives* 40: 429-55.

Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger. 1998. 'Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present – A Reconsideration.' *International Migration Review* 31: 893-922.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. 'The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants.' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530: 74-96.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

----------. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of The Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Reese, Leslie. 2002. 'Parental Strategies in Contrasting Cultural Settings: Families in Mexico and 'El Norte'.' *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 33: 30-59.

Steinberg, Laurence. 1988. 'Reciprocal Relation Between Parent-Child Distance and Pubertal Maturation.' *Developmental Psychology* 24: 122-28.

----------. 1990. 'Autonomy, Conflict, and Harmony in the Family Relationship.' Pp. 255-76 in *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suarez-Orozco, Carola and Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco. 1995. *Transformations: Migration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

----------. 2001. *Children of Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Treiman, Donald. 1977. *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Tseng, Vivian and Andrew Fuligni. 2000. 'Parent-Adolescent Language Use and Relationships Among Immigrant Families with East Asian, Filipino, and Latin American Backgrounds.' *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62: 465-76.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1984. *Census of the Population, 1980: Detailed Characteristics*

of the Populations: U.S. Summary. PC80-1D1-A. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Waldinger, Roger. 2001. *Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wilson, William Julius. 1994. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Xie, Yu and Emily Greenman. 2005. 'Testing Segmented Assimilation Theory: Evidence from the Add Health Study.' Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Population Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Zhou, Min. 1997. 'Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation.' *International Migration Review* 31: 975-1008.

Technical Appendix

Model Specifications

Because two of the three dependent variables are dichotomous, I make use of binary logistic regression to model the effects of the independent variables on those dependent variables. Moreover, each child in the sample is clustered within a particular school, so I make statistical corrections to the standard errors to account for this clustering.

For a binary response model, I use the following model for π_{ij} and explanatory variables X_{ij} and Y_{ij} . The formal model is written as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Y = \pi_{ij} \\
&\pi \sim Binomial(n_{ij}, \mu) \\
&\pi_{ij} = \log istic(\alpha + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \beta_2 Y_{ij} + \beta_3 X_{ij} Y_{ij} + u_{oj})
\end{aligned}
\qquad \text{Eq. (1.1)}
$$

The equation simply states that the log odds (logit) of the dependent variable is modeled as a function of a vector of individual-level child characteristics X_{ij} , parental characteristics Y_{ij} , and interactions $X_{ij}Y_{ij}$ between the two. Importantly, the subscripts indicate that child i is clustered within school j.

When I model the amount of acculturative rate differences, I make use of an Ordinary Least Square Regression (OLS) model. For a continuous response model Y with an explanatory variable x , the formal model is written as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Y = Y_{ij} \\
&Y_{ij} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \beta_2 Y_{ij} + \beta_3 X_{ij} Y_{ij} + e_{ij}
\end{aligned}
\qquad \text{Eq. (1.2)}
$$

This equation states that the acculturative rate difference Y_{ij} can be modeled as a function of a vector of individual-level child characteristics X_{ij} , parental characteristics Y_{ij} , interactions $X_{ij}Y_{ij}$ between the two, and an error term e_{ij} . Again, the subscripts indicate that child i is clustered within school j.

Index Construction Techniques

Several of the independent variables used in the analyses are composite indexes, constructed from multiple single-item indicators. In all, I create four multiple-item indexes via exploratory factor analyses. I use this technique to determine which single-item indicators had high factor loadings, or were correlated along one or more conceptual dimensions. Before performing the factor analyses, I make sure that all items for each concept are coded in a conceptually similar direction. Below, I outline the candidate items that comprised each independent variable concept.

Level of Neighborhood Input

The level of neighborhood impact is a variable that is meant to measure how much influence the community in which the parent currently lives has on the children within its borders. Candidate items for this concept, asked of parents at Time 2 of the survey, include the following:

Do you think the people your neighborhood would intervene (do something) in the following situations?

1. If there was a fight in front of your house and someone was being beaten?
2. If someone were trying to sell drugs to one of your children in plain sight?
3. If your kids were getting into trouble?

Each of the candidate items is scored on a 4-point Likert scale, with 1 representing *very unlikely* and 4 representing *very likely*. One dominant factor emerges, with an accompanying Chronbach's alpha of .906.

General Neighborhood Cohesion

The level of social cohesion in the neighborhood of current parental residence is a variabe that measures the extent to which parents and neighbors can monitor and control what their children do. Candidate items for this concept include the following:

The following statements are about the people who live in your neighborhood. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. There are a lot of adults around that my children can look up to.
2. My neighbors have similar views about how to raise children.
3. I can count on people in the neighborhood to let me know about opportunities for my kids.

Each of these candidate items is scored on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 representing *strongly disagree*, and 5 representing *strongly agree*. As in the previous case, a single dominant factor emerges, with a corresponding alpha of .793.

Parental TV/Educational Control

Finally, the level of parental control of television viewing and education is a more specific type of social cohesion that takes place within families, not neighborhoods. Again, these two variables measure the amount of parental control over the television viewing habits and education of their children. Candidate items are as follows:

Are there family rules about any of the following activities?

1. What program he/she may watch?
2. How early or late he/she may watch television?
3. How many hours he/she may watch television overall?

Are there family rules for your child about any of the following activities?

1. Maintaining a certain grade point average?
2. Doing homework?
3. Doing household chores?

Each of the candidate items is dichotomous, with 0 representing *no*, and 1 representing *yes*. After several rounds of analyses, two dominant factors emerge. Because of this, I decide form two separate indexes. The first, I conceptualise as the level of parental control over TV viewing, and the second, the level of parental control over education. The corresponding alpha coefficients are .86 and .60 respectively. Finally, on all of the indexes included in the analyses, higher values represent more neighborhood input, social cohesion, and parental control.

Table 1. Generational Language Knowledge and Types of Acculturation

		Children's Knowledge of Parental Language		
		None	Limited	Fluent
Parental Knowledge of English	None	Dissonant Acculturation & Role Reversal	Partial Dissonant Acculturation	Selective Acculturation
	Limited	Partial Dissonant Acculturation	Partial Consonant Acculturation	Selective Acculturation
	Fluent	Consonant Acculturation	Consonant Acculturation	Selective Acculturation

Adapted from Portes & Rumbaut (2001)

Table 2. Means and Proportions. CILS, Selected Sample (N = 2,124)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Means	Standard Deviation
Dependent Variables[**]				
Consonant Acceptance of English	0	1	.30	---
Language Dissonance	0	12	3.93	3.19
Miscommunication Potential	0	1	.084	---
Background Factors & Family Structure				
Laos/Hmong	0	1	.081	---
Cubans	0	1	.16	
Vietnam	0	1	.11	---
Mexico	0	1	.16	---
Nicaraguan	0	1	.08	---
Other Latinos/as	0	1	.11	---
Sub-Saharan Africa	0	1	.04	---
Asia[1]	0	1	.04	---
Philippines	0	1	.17	---
Other Southeast Asia[2]	0	1	.04	---
Non-Whites	0	1	.88	---
Males	0	1	.51	---
Intact Family	0	1	.73	---
Number of Siblings	0	8	1.96	1.53
Citizen of U.S.	0	1	.56	---
Born in U.S.	0	1	.40	---
10 or More Years in U.S.	0	1	.29	---
5 – 9 Years in U.S.	0	1	.23	---
Less Than 5 Years in U.S.	0	1	.07	---
Parental Skills & Resources				
Education[**]	0	20	12.45	3.44
1st Pre-Migration Prestige Quintile[**]	0	1	.10	---
2nd Pre-Migration Prestige Quintile[**]	0	1	.12	---
3rd Pre-Migration Prestige Quintile[**]	0	1	.08	---
4th Pre-Migration Prestige Quintile[**]	0	1	.09	---
5th Pre-Migration Prestige Quintile[**]	0	1	.09	---
Missing Prestige Information[**]	0	1	.50	---
Years of U.S. Experience[**]	1	51	18.33	8.17
Child Migrant[**]	0	1	.06	---
At Least 1 Parent Native Born	0	1	.09	---

Note: All variables measured at Time 1 from child questionnaire, except where noted.
** Measured at Time 2, parental questionnaire.

[1] Includes children from mainland China, Taiwan, and Japan.
[2] Includes children from Burma, Cambodia, and Malaysia.

Table 2. Con't. Means and Proportions.

Modes of Incorporation[**]				
Economic Assistance at U.S. Arrival	0	1	.30	---
Co-Ethnic Supervisor or Coworker at U.S. Arrival	0	1	.25	---
Number of Family & Friends at U.S. Arrival	0	170	43.99	49.25
Parental Control & Social Cohesion[**]				
Neighborhood Input	3	12	8.72	2.66
Social Cohesion	3	15	10.23	2.50
Know Kid's Parents	0	1	.73	---
Level of TV Viewing Control	0	3	1.84	1.28
Level of Educational Control	0	3	2.64	.71

Note: All variables measured at Time 1 from child questionnaire, except where noted.
** Measured at Time 2, parental questionnaire.

Table 3. Effect Parameters for Logistic Regression Models Predicting Child Bilingualism

Variables	P&R – Model 1		Cort – Model 1		P&R – Model 2		Cort – Model 2	
	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.
Sex (1=male)	-.38**	.08	-.27**	.11	-.42**	.08	-.34**	.12
Age	-.001	.05	-.14*	.07	-.002	.05	-.14*	.07
Latino Origin	1.96**	.09	2.50**	.15	1.61**	.11	2.42**	.19
Length US Residence[1]	-.03	.04	.01	.06	-.02	.04	.04	.06
US-Born Parent[2]	-.73**	.13	-.65**	.22	-.61**	.14	-.56**	.22
Foreign Home Lang.[3]	.06	.08	.06	.12	.10	.08	.06	.12
# of Foreign Friends	.32**	.07	.35**	.11	.25**	.07	.29**	.11
Grade Point Average	.12**	.05	.09	.07	.13**	.05	.08	.07
Parental SES	.21**	.05	.22**	.08	.14**	.05	.18*	.08
Pct. Latino in School	---		---		.004**	.001	.005	.003
Pct. Asian in School	---		---		-.01*	.003	.007	.005
Pvt. Bilingual Sch.	---		---		.44**	.19	.42	.24
Intercept	-3.17**	.72	-1.80	1.07	-2.95**	.72	-1.99	1.10
Sample Size	4,280		2,124		4,280		2,124	

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

[1] 1 = less than 5; 2 = 5 to 9; 3 = 10 or more; 4 = all life, native born

[2] Children of one foreign-born and one US-born parent

[3] Use of foreign home language 'always' or 'often' in families with both biological parents present

Table 4. Effect Parameters for Clustered Logistic Regression Models Predicting Child Bilingualism

Variables	P&R – Model 1		Cort – Model 1		P&R – Model 2		Cort – Model 2	
	Coeff.	R.S.E.	Coeff.	R.S.E.	Coeff.	R.S.E.	Coeff.	R.S.E.
Sex (1=male)	-.38**	.10	-.27**	.12	-.42**	.09	-.34**	.12
Age	-.001	.04	-.14*	.05	-.002	.04	-.14**	.05
Latino Origin	1.96**	.17	2.50**	.19	1.61**	.23	2.42**	.29
Length US Residence[1]	-.03	.08	.01	.08	-.02	.07	.04	.09
US-Born Parent[2]	-.73**	.11	-.65**	.19	-.61**	.13	-.56**	.22
Foreign Home Lang.[3]	.06	.09	.06	.12	.10	.09	.06	.11
# of Foreign Friends	.32**	.08	.35**	.09	.25**	.10	.29**	.10
Grade Point Average	.12**	.05	.09	.06	.13**	.04	.08	.06
Parental SES	.21**	.06	.22**	.09	.14**	.06	.18*	.08
Pct. Latino in School	---		---		.004	.003	.005	.003
Pct. Asian in School	---		---		-.008	.005	.007	.006
Pvt. Bilingual Sch.	---		---		.44*	.19	.42**	.14
Intercept	-3.17**	.63	-1.80*	.84	-2.95**	.62	-1.99*	.97
Sample Size	4,280		2,124		4,280		2,124	

* p < .05
** p < .01

[1] 1 = less than 5; 2 = 5 to 9; 3 = 10 or more; 4 = all life, native born

[2] Children of one foreign-born and one US-born parent

[3] Use of foreign home language ‘always’ or ‘often’ in families with both biological parents present

Table 5. Effect Parameters for Logistic and OLS Models Predicting Language Acculturation (N=2,124)

Variables	Consonant Acceptance		Language Dissonance		Miscommunication Potential	
	Coeff.	R.S.E.	Coeff.	R.S.E.	Coeff.	R.S.E.
Background Factors & Family Structure						
Laos/Hmong[1]	-.53	.53	-.69	.42	2.96**	.64
Vietnam	-1.24*	.62	-.88*	.39	2.78**	.60
Mexico	-.61**	.25	.37	.23	.76	.64
Nicaraguan	-.25	.38	.26	.40	1.38*	.67
Other Latinos/as	-.53**	.19	.001	.21	1.67*	.80
Sub-Saharan Africa	.56	.31	-.12	.30	2.84**	.74
Asia[2]	-1.03**	.34	.07	.32	3.06**	.64
Philippines	.82**	.21	-1.64**	.21	-.58	1.30
Other Southeast Asia[3]	-.47	.71	.30	.52	3.02**	.67
Race (1=nonwhite)	-.01	.17	.10	.21	.10	.54
Sex (1=males)	-.13	.09	-.07	.08	.18	.18
Intact Family	-.21	.12	.18	.14	-.002	.18
Number of Sibs	-.12**	.04	.03	.03	.02	.04
U.S. Citizen	.45**	.18	-.51**	.16	.04	.30
U.S. Born[4]	-.05	.33	1.63**	.22	.72	.57
> 10 Yrs in U.S.	-.03	.36	1.81**	.19	.92**	.33
5 – 9 Yrs in U.S.	-.09	.30	1.58**	.19	.61	.37
Parental Skills & Resources						
2nd Prestige Quintile	.30	.34	.04	.29	.05	.40
3rd Prestige Quintile	.47	.24	.18	.26	-.09	.57
4th Prestige Quintile	-.09	.25	.44	.25	-.03	.42
5th Prestige Quintile	-.07	.28	.46	.26	-.30	.53
Missing Prestige	.28	.29	.25	.22	.24	.26
Education	.38**	.03	-.41**	.03	-.17**	.03
Experience	.06**	.01	-.07**	.01	.001	.02
Child Migrant	.97**	.25	-1.22**	.28	---	
1 N.B. Parent	.50**	.19	-.46	.24	-.41	.62
Parental Control & Social Cohesion						
Neigh. Input	-.06	.03	.05	.030	-.01	.03
Social Cohesion	.004	.03	.04	.03	.03	.04
Know Child's Friends	.13	.18	-.04	.15	-.12	.22
TV Control	.05	.04	-.10**	.04	-.16	.08
Educational Control	-.16	.10	.03	.05	.001	.10
Modes of Incorporation						
Economic Assistance	-.42	.23	.41*	.20	.68**	.28
Co-ethnic Super. Coworker	-.08	.16	.17	.16	.56	.24
# of Family/Friends	.002	.001	-.004	.001	-.003	.002
Intercept	-6.54**	.72	8.48**	.62	-3.75**	1.01
Estimation Procedure	Logistic		OLS		Logistic	
R-Square	---		.400		---	

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

[1] Reference is Cuban children.
[2] Includes children from mainland China, Taiwan, and Japan.
[3] Includes children from Burma, Cambodia, and Malaysia.
[4] Reference is 'in U.S. less than 5 years'

Table 6. Generational English Knowledge and Types of Acculturation

		Children's Knowledge of English		
		None	Limited	Fluent
Parental Knowledge of English	None	Consonant Rejection	Partial Dissonance	Extreme Dissonance
	Limited	Partial Dissonance	Partial Consonant Reject/Accept	Partial Dissonance
	Fluent	Extreme Dissonance	Partial Dissonance	Consonant Acceptance