

EDITED BY
SOFÍA ESPINOZA ÁLVAREZ AND
MARTIN GUEVARA URBINA

IMMIGRATION AND THE LAW



Race, Citizenship, and Social Control



THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA PRESS

TUCSON

The University of Arizona Press
www.uapress.arizona.edu

© 2018 by The Arizona Board of Regents
All rights reserved. Published 2018.

ISBN-13: 978-0-8165-3762-4 (paper)

Cover design by Lisa Force

We thank the Empower Global Foundation for partially funding this book. Without its vital and generous support, these efforts would not be possible.

Agradecemos a la Fundación Empower Global por patrocinar parcialmente este libro. Sin su apoyo vital y generoso, este proyecto no sería posible.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Álvarez, Sofía Espinoza, editor. | Urbina, Martín G. (Martín Guevara), 1972–

Title: Immigration and the law : race, citizenship, and social control / edited by Sofía Espinoza Álvarez and Martín Guevara Urbina.

Description: Tucson : The University of Arizona Press, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017035689 | ISBN 9780816537624 (pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Emigration and immigration law—Social aspects—United States. | United States—Emigration and immigration—Government policy. | Immigration enforcement—United States.

Classification: LCC KF4819 .I47135 2018 | DDC 342.7308/2—dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017035689>

Printed in the United States of America

Ⓢ This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Chapter 7

CHALLENGES TO INTEGRATION

The Children of Immigrants and Direct and Indirect Experiences with the Law

LEO R. CHÁVEZ

What we need to do is to have a sensible approach to immigration. It needs to be open. It needs to be non-dogmatic and non-bigoted. We need to be firm but reasonable in the way we deal with the problem of illegal immigration. And we need to try to get as many of our immigrants who want to do so to become citizens as quickly as possible so that the American people will all see that this is a part of the process of American history, which is a good one for our country.

—BILL CLINTON

ON JUNE 16, 2015, Donald Trump officially began his campaign for president by declaring, “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.” Donald Trump’s incendiary and disparaging comments about Mexican immigrants when he declared his candidacy renewed a long-simmering, often vitriolic, debate over the costs and benefits of immigration (Chavez 2001, 2013a). It may be easy for scholars to dismiss Trump’s hyperbolic statement. After all, scholars have long noted that immigrants commit less crime than citizens (Dowling and India 2013; Kubrin, Zatz, and Martinez 2012; Rumbaut 2009a; Rumbaut and Ewing 2007; Sohoni and Sohoni 2013). However, crime and experiences with the judicial/legal system may have important consequences for the children of immigrants well beyond Trump’s inflammatory rhetoric.

This chapter examines how direct and indirect experiences with the legal system, especially immigration law, neighborhood crime, and experiences of arrest and incarceration, may influence two key indicators of how the children of immigrants are

integrating into U.S. society: years of schooling and personal income. In addition, integration is influenced by how one perceives being welcomed by the larger society, that is, by one's sense of belonging. So perceptions of prejudice and discrimination are also part of how the children of immigrants view their social environment. To examine these issues, this chapter relies on survey data collected on the adult children of Chinese, Filipino, Guatemalan, Korean, Mexican, Salvadoran, Taiwanese, and Vietnamese immigrants in the greater Los Angeles area.

Understanding what is meant here by "integration" and "belonging" is crucial. Integration, assimilation, acculturation, hybridization (blending), and joining the "mainstream" are terms used to capture the changes taking place among immigrants, their descendants, and other members of their communities and the nation (Alba and Nee 2003; Chávez 2006; Hirschman 2013). Specifically, integration implies that people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds are brought together into unrestricted and equal association ("to become integrated"). How well this process is working among the adult children of immigrants is examined in relation to education and income.

Several factors influence integration, not the least of which is immigration status (Gonzales and Chávez 2012; Massey and Pren 2012). Because undocumented children grow up steeped in U.S. culture, their illegality poses fundamental dilemmas. They must often make critical life decisions within the constraints created by their status. Catarina, who was twenty-one years old when interviewed (by author), was brought from Mexico to the United States at age eight. She explained the anxiety she felt trying to decide if going to college was a possibility for her.

You become depressed, you become very depressed. You work so hard and now what? You start questioning yourself. Is it worth it? Was it worth it? And what now? You have two options. Either you take the college route because education is education, and I'm learning and I like what I'm learning, and I'm going to continue to learn. Or you take the other route, where you just say, that's it. I'm just going to start working. It wasn't worth it. My mom or my dad, or my neighbor, was right. Why am I still going to school if I am not going to be able to continue with my education? So two paths, you have to decide which one to take.

Catarina's comments reflect the depth of her anguish at her uncertain future as an undocumented child of immigrants. Ultimately, she decided to attend the University of California.

This discussion suggests that the integration of the children of immigrants must not be viewed as an either/or situation, integrated or not integrated. Rather, integration is a process that is affected by myriad factors, as we shall explore. U.S. immigration law plays a major role in the lives of immigrant families (Abrego 2011, 2014; Dreby

2012; Menjivar and Abrego 2012; Motomura 2014). An examination of ninety years of census data resulted in the conclusion that immigration law has been the most important factor shaping family structure, even more than race and ethnicity (Gratton, Gutmann, and Skop 2007). Immigration law constructs not only legal immigration but undocumented or unauthorized immigration status, the “illegal alien” (Ngai 2004). Immigration laws change over time and even the status of illegality is not fixed, as laws exist for regularizing an unauthorized status, though they have become much more restrictive over time. President Obama’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy, which allows undocumented immigrants brought as children, the 1.5 generation, to request a grant of relief from the Department of Homeland Security, is an example of the flexible nature of immigration status (Chávez 2013b; Gonzales and Terriquez 2013). The U.S. Congress could pass immigration reform that would also provide further, broader avenues for regularization, as it did in 1986 with the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). The IRCA resulted in 70 percent of the nation’s undocumented immigrants between 1986 and 1988 moving into a legal status, typically legal permanent residency (Yoshikawa and Kholoptseva 2013). The point here is that we must not consider illegality as the only factor affecting attachment to U.S. society, nor should it be the focus of policy on the social and cultural integration of immigrants and their children (Jones-Correa and Graauw 2013). At the same time, we must not minimize the effect that regularizing the status of undocumented 1.5-generation children of immigrants would have on their integration (Massey 2013). Finally, parents who enter the country as unauthorized migrants may also bequeath their children a legacy of obstacles to their social integration (Bean et al. 2013; Coutin 2013; Motomura 2006).

Clearly, integration involves sentiments of belonging, the emotional attachments immigrants and their children express about where they live and where they feel at home, which, in turn, are related to cultural identity (Massey and Sánchez R. 2010). For the children of immigrants, a sense of belonging and cultural identity are not something they are born with, nor something they acquire whole, fixed, and set for life (Vasquez 2011). As Stuart Hall (1990, 221) has observed about cultural identity: “It is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact . . . we should think, instead, of identity as a ‘production,’ which is never complete, always in process.” This is similar for a sense of belonging, which is also always in a process of becoming a more or less positive sentiment.

Growing up in the United States pulls the children of immigrants toward a shared history with the larger society. This is an *e pluribus unum* sense of belonging, that one is part of a nation consisting of “one people” that transcends immigrant origins. However, other less harmonizing experiences influence sentiments of belonging. The

United States is a complex society, with many areas of difference: cultural beliefs and practices, economic disparities, educational attainment, and language are among the many differences that affect how the children of immigrants see themselves in relation to the larger society. Despite all the similarities that draw people in a society together, “there are also critical points of deep and significant *difference* which constitute ‘what we really are’; or rather—since history has intervened—‘what we have become’” (Hall 1990, 225).

Catarina’s story exemplifies tensions in integrating and a sense of belonging that can sometimes arise among the children of immigrants.

I think if you have obstacles to integrating, one, they don’t want you to integrate. Obviously, they have the obstacles for you not to integrate, so you get to the point where you know what, I don’t want to integrate, whether you will eventually want me to integrate for any reason, I am no longer willing to integrate. . . . After September 11, I felt American. And it’s amazing because regardless of political inequalities, I think of my life and what would it have been if I had not been here. And here I am. There are obstacles, but it’s better. It’s better here even with the inequalities. I guess it’s human nature. We just want something better.

Catarina’s observations reflect her sense of belonging, which in turn can have implications for integration. As Nira Yuval-Davis (2006, 197) has observed, “Belonging is about emotional attachment, about feeling ‘at home’ and . . . about feeling ‘safe.’” Home consists of both a sentiment and a set of social relationships, such as having family nearby, and a sense of safety and of the quality of life in one’s neighborhood. For the children of undocumented immigrants, the neighborhood offers experiences outside the family, which may reduce or sharpen the effects of their parents’, or even their own, immigration status. In this regard, Hirokazu Yoshikawa and Jenya Kholoptseva (2013, 8) have observed that “how children experience a parent’s unauthorized status may differ—that is, any negative effects may be mitigated or exacerbated—depending on historical, policy, neighborhood, and network contexts.”

Home is more than an idea or cognitive construct. One’s home is also a material place, part of a neighborhood that can offer relative safety or can be beset with crime, gangs, and drugs. According to anthropologist E. N. Anderson (2005, 66), “Humans must feel safe and secure, above all.” Broadening the idea of home to include the neighborhood raises the issue not just of safety but of relations with police and the legal system. In particular, the children of immigrants may experience arrests and incarcerations as part of their lived experiences (Armenta 2016; Light and Iceland 2016; Martinez 2016). As part of immigrant families, these young people have directly or indirectly experienced the increasing criminalization of immigrants and the growth

of private immigrant detention centers, what Karen Manges Douglas and Rogelio Sáenz (2013) have characterized as the “immigration-industrial complex” (Rosas 2012; Urbina and Álvarez 2017). Further, it has become increasingly clear that arrest and incarceration experiences can have significant consequences for both individuals and society (Abrego and Menjivar 2012; Lerman 2013; Urbina 2018; Urbina and Álvarez 2017).

The experiences of adult children in relation to neighborhood crime, arrests and incarcerations, and perceptions of prejudice and discrimination will be further examined after presenting the study’s methods of data collection, where logistic regression analyses will examine the relative influence of these factors on the dependent variables of education and income.

RESEARCH METHODS FOR THE CURRENT STUDY

PARTICIPANTS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Data examined here come from the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey that was supported by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation (Bean et al. 2006; Rumbaut, Massey, and Bean 2006).¹ Conducted in 2004, the study targeted the young-adult children of immigrants from large immigrant groups in the five-county metropolitan Los Angeles area (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura). Immigrants, or the foreign-born, accounted for 26.9 percent of California’s population in 2013, surpassing New York (22.3 percent), Texas (16.5 percent), Florida (19.4 percent), and Illinois (14 percent) (Migration Policy Institute 2015a). The five counties in the study had about 5,510,900 immigrants in 2013, accounting for about 13.7 percent of the nation’s immigrants (Migration Policy Institute 2015a). Latinos were 51.6 percent of California’s immigrant population in 2013, and Asian Americans accounted for 32 percent (Migration Policy Institute 2015b).

Data was collected using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system to gather information from 2,820 persons aged twenty to forty who had at least one immigrant parent from China (both mainland and Taiwan), El Salvador, Guatemala, Korea, Mexico, the Philippines, or Vietnam.² The study was designed to be a random probability sample of persons residing in households with telephones in the greater Los Angeles area.³ Because of the centrality of the Mexican-origin group to the immigrant experience in Los Angeles, we oversampled the Mexican-origin population. The study’s sample also included 1,860 individuals who are not considered here, including

U.S. whites, African Americans, other Latin Americans than those mentioned above, other Asians, and Middle Easterners. The surveys were administered between April 2004 and October 2004.⁴ For the purposes of sample design, eligible adult immigrants were defined as “1.5 generation” if they came to the United States to live before the age of fifteen; as “2nd generation” if they were born in the United States and had at least one parent who was foreign-born; and as “3rd+ generation” if they and their parents were U.S.-born but had one or more foreign-born grandparents (3rd+ generation not included in this analysis).

TABLE 7.1. Characteristics of Adult Children of Latin American and Asian Immigrants in the Study

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 843/% | 376/% | 1,219/% | 400/% | 399/% | 401/% | 401/% | 1,601/% |
| Gender (Male) | 49.3 | 49.7 | 49.5 | 56.5 | 49.6 | 50.1 | 49.1 | 51.3 |
| Age (30+) | 39.0 | 30.9 | 36.5 | 39.0 | 37.6 | 33.9 | 35.4 | 36.5 |
| Schooling 13+ Years | 47.8 | 63.0 | 52.5*** | 94.3 | 91.5 | 90.5 | 88.3 | 91.1 |
| Personal Income \$30,000+ | 32.4 | 29.2 | 31.4*** | 53.3 | 49.1 | 35.9 | 42.0 | 45.0 |
| Prefers English at Home Now | 54.7 | 51.6 | 53.7*** | 53.0 | 63.2 | 52.1 | 86.8 | 64.3 |
| GENERATION | | | | | | | | |
| 1.5 Generation | 34.4 | 47.3 | 38.4 | 54.8 | 64.9 | 70.6 | 46.6 | 59.0 |
| 2nd Generation | 65.6 | 52.7 | 61.6*** | 45.3 | 36.1 | 29.4 | 53.4 | 41.0 |
| Married/ Cohabiting | 51.1 | 40.7 | 47.9*** | 29.3 | 33.1 | 27.7 | 39.7 | 32.4 |

TABLE 7.1. *continued*

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN | GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|---|---------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| 5+ Relatives Live Nearby | 69.1 | 66.7 | 68.4** | 68.4** | 49.4 | 49.2 | 59.5 | 68.2 | 56.6 |
| Medical Insurance Through Work | 54.9 | 58.1 | 55.9 | 58.2 | 58.2 | 50.4 | 51.5 | 59.8 | 55.0 |
| Medical Insurance, Private or Government | 70.5 | 72.1 | 71.0*** | 59.5 | 53.4 | 67.1 | 62.3 | 60.6 | |
| Belongs to 1 or More Community Organizations | 15.2 | 13.3 | 14.6** | 23.6 | 18.9 | 17.2 | 18.3 | 19.5 | |
| Ethnicity Important | 60.9 | 63.0 | 61.6*** | 41.4 | 53.4 | 46.3 | 54.7 | 48.9 | |

All Latinos compared to all Asian Americans: significance (X^2) for cross tabulations: .05, **.01, ***.001.

Source: Rumbaut et al. 2004; N = 2,820.

Table 7.1 summarizes the characteristics of the adult children of immigrants who participated in the study. The respondents were about evenly distributed in terms of gender, and there was no difference among the groups in age breakdown. However, there were significant differences between the children of Latino and Asian immigrants. Asians were more likely to have one or more years of schooling beyond high school, and higher incomes. However, Filipinos preferred English. The children of Chinese/Taiwanese, Korean, and Vietnamese immigrants were similar to the children of Latino immigrants in their English preference. Asian Americans were also more likely than Latinos to belong to one or more community organizations. Latinos were more likely second generation; that is, U.S.-born Latinos and Asian American respondents were in the 1.5 generation, defined here as migrating when under fifteen years of age. Latinos were also more likely to be married or cohabiting

than Asian American respondents, to have medical insurance, and to feel ethnicity was important.

A majority of both Latinos and Asian Americans preferred to speak English at home. However, the vast majority of the respondents grew up in a home where a non-English language was spoken, not surprising given that over three hundred languages are spoken in the United States, a testament to the adage that we are a "nation of immigrants" (Ryan 2013, 4). According to the U.S. Census, in 2011, in the Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Orange County area, 54 percent spoke a non-English language at home (Ryan 2013, 13). Despite this linguistic diversity, the same census study found that 75.1 percent of California's population spoke English very well (55.7 percent) or well (19.4 percent). Non-English language use among the children of immigrants in the greater Los Angeles area is on the wane, a pattern found nationally as well (Taylor and Cohn 2013). While individuals may be becoming more English-dominant, immigrants continue to come to the United States, replenishing linguistic diversity and ethnic endurance (Jimenez 2009).

FACTORS INFLUENCING INTEGRATION

IMMIGRATION LAW

Immigration law determines the conditions under which people migrate to the United States. Migrants who enter with an authorized status of some type typically do so with a permanent resident visa, tourist visa, student visa, temporary work permit of various sorts, or asylum status (or request for asylee status). Thus, for this study immigration status was assessed through a series of questions. Respondents were asked where they were born and if they were U.S. citizens. If foreign-born, they were asked if they were a permanent legal resident when they first came to the United States. If no, we then asked if any of the following applied to their immigration status at the time: refugee status, temporary work visa, or border-crossing card. The default category consisted of those without authorization to be in the United States. The respondents were asked similar questions about their mother's and father's migration history, and similar questions were asked about the respondents' and their parents' immigration status at the time of the interview.

Table 7.2 presents the immigration status at time of entry to the United States and at the time of the interview for the children of immigrants who themselves were immigrants, the 1.5-generation respondents, and all the respondents' parents. The 1.5-generation children of Latin American immigrants (45.5 percent) were more likely than the Asian

TABLE 7.2. Immigration Status at Time of Entry and at Time of Interview, Respondent and Parents

| | MEXICAN | | SALVADORAN | | GUATEMALAN | | CHINESE/TAIWANESE | | KOREAN | | VIETNAMESE | | FILIPINO | |
|---|---------|------|------------|------|------------|------|-------------------|------|--------|------|------------|------|----------|------|
| | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND | 1.5 | 2ND |
| Respondent Unauthorized Entry to United States | 51.4 | NA | 36.0 | NA | 13.7 | NA | 8.6 | NA | 3.5 | NA | 11.2 | NA | 1.5 | 2ND |
| Respondent Unauthorized at Interview | 19.0 | NA | 8.4 | NA | 0.9 | NA | 1.6 | NA | 0 | NA | 1.1 | NA | 1.1 | NA |
| Mother Unauthorized Entry to United States | 46.2 | 26.0 | 47.2 | 40.9 | 10.5 | 16.0 | 8.6 | 18.1 | 2.8 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 18.2 | 10.2 | 18.2 |
| Father Unauthorized Entry to United States | 41.4 | 29.7 | 31.5 | 41.4 | 6.8 | 17.7 | 5.9 | 13.9 | 3.9 | 11.0 | 6.4 | 17.3 | 6.4 | 17.3 |
| Mother or Father Unauthorized at Entry to United States | 59.3*** | 40.5 | 54.5 | 51.0 | 11.9** | 22.1 | 10.2** | 22.9 | 4.2** | 12.7 | 12.8** | 26.2 | 12.8** | 26.2 |
| Mother or Father Unauthorized at Interview | 12.1 | 3.4 | 7.3 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.9 |

Significance (X₂) for 1.5 vs. 2nd generation: * >.05, ** >.01, *** >.001.

American 1.5-generation respondents (8.8 percent) to have entered the United States without authorization ($X_2 = <.001$). However, 13.7 percent of Chinese/Taiwanese and 11.2 percent of Filipinos entered without authorization. Very few of the Asian American respondents (0.8 percent) were still unauthorized at the time of the interview, but 15 percent of the Latino respondents were unauthorized at the time of the interview ($X_2 = <.001$).

The mothers (36.3 percent) and fathers (34.5 percent) of Latinos were more likely to have entered the United States without authorization than the mothers (11.1 percent) and fathers (9.7 percent) of Asian American respondents ($X_2 = <.001$). However, as table 7.2 indicates, the second-generation Asian American respondents had significantly higher proportions of parents who entered the United States without authorization compared to their 1.5-generation counterparts. Having at least one parent who entered the country without authorization reached 26 percent among Filipino second-generation respondents, and above 20 percent for Chinese/Taiwanese and Korean respondents. Few of the Latino respondents' parents (6.1 percent) and even fewer of the Asian American parents (1.2 percent) were unauthorized at the time of the interview ($X_2 = <.001$). The important question here is, what legacy does unauthorized status at time of entry have for the integration of the children of immigrants into U.S. society?

LIFE AND CRIME IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

The children of immigrants grow up in families that are mobile. While some may stay in one place after migrating, others make strategic decisions to move for opportunities and safety. As Catarina (introduced above) said, "I see that throughout the years, as my parents' economic situation got better, we moved into, not better neighborhoods at least into a better home. We started off like living in an apartment with my uncles, the typical big family thing where you really have no privacy. And then my father decided to try it on his own and start his own business, so we started moving. Now, he's paying the mortgage of the house we're living in. So my neighborhood at this point is, it's a nice neighborhood."

However, Catarina made clear that the neighborhood her family now lives in is "completely different" from the one she grew up in after coming to the United States, declaring: "I know there was like the drug problem. We moved into the apartments, you could see, like, people, alcohol abuse, everything. Kids were on the streets. So just the atmosphere was completely different. It's not that far [from where I live now], but yet, that area is still the same. Visibly noticeable kinds of problems."

Like Catarina, many of the children of immigrants grew up in neighborhoods where drugs, gang activity, and other criminal activity were problems. As table 7.3 indicates, drugs were somewhat of a problem or a big problem in the neighborhoods for almost half of the Mexican and Salvadoran-Guatemalan children of immigrants,

TABLE 7.3. Neighborhood Crime

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 843/% | 376/% | 1,219/% | 400/% | 399/% | 401/% | 401/% | 1,601/% |
| DRUGS IN NEIGHBORHOOD GREW UP IN: | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 55.0 | 53.5 | 54.6*** | 86.3 | 82.2 | 74.8 | 74.6 | 79.5 |
| Somewhat of a Problem | 22.8 | 22.6 | 22.7 | 10.6 | 13.6 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 15.1 |
| Big Problem | 22.2 | 23.9 | 22.7 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 5.4 |
| GANGS IN NEIGHBORHOOD GREW UP IN: | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 39.2 | 32.7 | 37.2*** | 70.8 | 71.4 | 54.1 | 59.4 | 63.9 |
| Somewhat of a Problem | 29.7 | 33.2 | 30.8 | 24.3 | 23.8 | 34.3 | 28.4 | 27.7 |
| Big Problem | 31.0 | 34.0 | 32.0 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 8.4 |
| OTHER CRIME PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD GREW UP IN: | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 46.3 | 40.1 | 44.4*** | 68.4 | 73.0 | 52.3 | 61.6 | 63.8 |
| Somewhat of a Problem | 31.1 | 37.9 | 33.2 | 27.6 | 21.9 | 39.6 | 32.2 | 30.3 |
| Big Problem | 22.6 | 22.0 | 22.4 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 5.8 |

Significance (X^2) for Latino by Asian American comparison: * >.05, ** >.01, *** >.001.

but for only about 20 percent of the children of Asian immigrants, a significant difference. However, about one in four of the Vietnamese and Salvadorans grew up in neighborhoods where drugs posed somewhat of or a big problem. Among the children of Mexican immigrants there was a significant difference between the 1.5 generation (more likely) and second generation on this issue of drugs being a big or somewhat of a problem in their neighborhoods when growing up ($X^2 = <.01$). The second-gener-

ation Vietnamese were significantly more likely than the 1.5 generation to have grown up in neighborhoods where drugs were somewhat of or a big problem ($X^2 = <.01$).

Gang activity was somewhat of or a big problem for both Latinos (62.8 percent) and Asian Americans (36.1 percent), although the difference was significant. About similar proportions of all groups, however, said gangs were somewhat of a problem. Once again, the children of Vietnamese (45.9 percent) and Filipino (40.1 percent) immigrants were more likely than children of Chinese/Taiwanese (29.2 percent) and Korean (28.6 percent) immigrants to indicate that gangs were somewhat of a big problem in the neighborhood where they grew up. Only the 1.5-generation children of Mexican immigrants (more likely) were significantly different from their second-generation counterparts ($X^2 = <.01$).

Neighborhoods could also have a problem with other types of criminal activity. A majority (55.6 percent) of the Latino groups indicated that other criminal activity was a big or somewhat of a problem, compared to 36.2 percent of the children of Asian immigrants, although higher among Vietnamese (47.7 percent). Only among the Filipinos was there a significant difference between the 1.5 generation (less likely) and second generation in terms of other criminal activity being somewhat of or a big problem ($X^2 = <.01$).

TABLE 7.4. Number of Neighborhood Crime Problems

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|--|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 843/% | 376/% | 1,219/% | 400/% | 399/% | 401/% | 401/% | 1,601/% |
| NEIGHBOR- HOOD GREW UP IN HAD: | | | | | | | | |
| No Crime Problems | 31.0 | 25.3 | 29.2*** | 57.3 | 58.9 | 39.7 | 45.1 | 50.2 |
| One Problem (Drugs, Gangs, Other Crime) | 15.7 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 20.5 | 19.5 | 22.4 | 23.2 | 21.4 |
| Two Problems (Drugs, Gangs, Other Crime) | 17.2 | 20.2 | 18.1 | 13.0 | 11.0 | 18.5 | 14.2 | 14.2 |

TABLE 7.4. *continued*

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|--|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| Three Problems (Drugs, Gangs, Other Crime) | 36.2 | 38.8 | 37.0 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 19.5 | 17.5 | 14.2 |
| One or More Crime-Related Problems | 69.0 | 74.7 | 70.6*** | 47.2 | 41.1 | 60.3 | 54.9 | 49.6 |

Significance (X^2) for Latino by Asian American comparison: * $>.05$, ** $>.01$, *** $>.001$.

While many of the children of immigrants grew up with one or more of these problems (gangs, drugs, or other criminal activities), Latinos (70.6 percent) were significantly more likely to have done so compared to Asian Americans (49.6 percent), as illustrated in table 7.4. However, almost half of Chinese/Taiwanese (47.2 percent) and a majority of Filipinos (54.9 percent) and Vietnamese (60.3 percent) grew up in neighborhoods with crime problems. The question here is, to what extent do these experiences growing up in neighborhoods with crime predict social integration?

ARRESTS AND INCARCERATIONS

Neighborhood conditions and perceptions of discrimination have material consequences for the lives of the children of immigrants. This is especially true when considering relations with the police and legal system. The issue of crime is especially complicated for the 1.5-generation unauthorized children of immigrants, for whom just being in the United States may be seen as a "criminal" activity. When undocumented 1.5ers try to work or even just engage in everyday activities that most citizens and legal residents take for granted, their illegality becomes an issue. As Lupita explains:

I didn't want to break the law, but everything you do is illegal because you are illegal. Everything you do will be illegal. Otherwise you can't live. But I am still afraid. I don't want to jeopardize anything. I mean, I guess I am just ashamed. I looked [for work] in most restaurants and they would be like, "Why do you want to work for us if you have a

B.A.? So, I am going to have to lie and I am going to have to tell them that I just dropped out of high school. But eventually they are going, it is going to come out, I know it. The people [working] at those places, like the cooks and the cashiers, they are either really young people, and I feel really old, like what am I doing there if they are all like 16, 17 years old. The others are like señoras who are 35 and have little kids; they dropped out of school, but because they have little kids they are still working at the restaurant. Thinking about that, it makes me feel so fucking stupid. And like the factories, too, because they ask me, “*Que estas haciendo aqui?* [“What are you doing here?”] You can speak English. You graduated from high school. You can work anywhere.” They don’t stop bugging me. (Qtd. in Gonzales and Chavez 2012, 264)

While Lupita’s status may raise questions about what she is legally able to do (work, for example), arrest and incarceration experiences are more clear-cut. As table 7.5 indicates, many of the interviewees or their family members had been arrested and/or incarcerated (reform school, detention center, jail, or prison). While the proportions

TABLE 7.5. Arrest/Incarceration

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 843/% | 376/% | 1,219/% | 400/% | 399/% | 401/% | 401/% | 1,601/% |
| Self-Arrested | 16.0 | 17.3 | 16.4*** | 4.8 | 9.0 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 6.6 |
| Self or Family Ever Arrested | 34.0 | 31.4 | 33.2*** | 8.8 | 16.5 | 13.7 | 16.7 | 13.9 |
| Self Ever Incarcerated: in Reform School, Detention Center, Jail, Prison | 9.8 | 8.5 | 9.4*** | 1.8 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 3.0 |
| Self or Family Member Ever Incarcerated: in Reform School, Detention Center, Jail, Prison | 25.0 | 21.8 | 24.0*** | 5.0 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 9.6 |
| Self-Arrested or Incarcerated | 16.8 | 17.8 | 17.1*** | 4.8 | 9.5 | 5.2 | 8.2 | 6.9 |
| Self or Family Arrested or Incarcerated | 36.3 | 34.0 | 35.6*** | 9.8 | 18.3 | 16.0 | 17.7 | 15.4 |

Significance (X^2) for 1.5 vs. 2nd generation: * >.05, ** >.01, *** >.001.

vary among the groups, Latinos were significantly more likely than Asian Americans to either personally have been arrested or incarcerated or to have had family members arrested or incarcerated. However, arrest and incarceration rates among Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, and those in the *Other* category indicate that problems with the criminal justice system are an important area of concern for them as well. When arrest and incarceration rates for the interviewee and/or other family members are combined, Filipinos, Koreans, and Vietnamese often have direct or indirect experiences with the criminal justice system. Lastly, second-generation interviewees were significantly more likely than the 1.5 generation to have been arrested only among the children of Mexican ($X^2 < .01$) and Salvadoran-Guatemalan ($X^2 < .05$) immigrants. To what extent the experiences of arrest and incarceration predict social integration will also be examined in logistic regression analysis.

PERCEPTIONS OF PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION

There was no statistical difference between Latinos and Asian Americans in response to the question about having experienced prejudice or discrimination because of their ethnicity or race in the year previous to the interview. About a third of all interviewees in each of the groups indicated they had experienced prejudice or discrimination because of their race or ethnicity in the past year, with no significant difference between Latinos and Asian Americans, as illustrated in table 7.6. Koreans were most likely (39.1 percent) of all the groups to believe they had been the victim of prejudice or discrimination. Although the second generation was generally more likely to feel themselves to be the recipient of prejudiced or discriminatory behavior, there was only a significant generational difference among the Filipino ($X^2 < .05$) and Vietnamese children of immigrants ($X^2 < .01$).

Latinos (25 percent) were more likely than Asian American children of immigrants (11.3 percent) to feel they had experienced prejudice or discriminatory treatment from the police ($X^2 < .001$). However, many Vietnamese also indicated negative treatment by police (17.2 percent). Mexicans (43.8 percent) and Salvadoran-Guatemalans (45.2 percent), in particular, cited the workplace or looking for work as sites where they encountered prejudice. Although Latinos differed significantly from Asian American children of immigrants ($X^2 < .001$), many of the Vietnamese (37.1 percent) and Filipinos (35.6 percent) also indicated problems of prejudice related to work.

Housing discrimination was also cited more by Latinos than Asian American children of immigrants ($X^2 < .001$). Asian Americans were significantly more likely than Latinos to indicate that they had experienced prejudice or discrimination in "other" situations. However, a majority of all groups felt they had been victims of

TABLE 7.6. Prejudice/Discrimination

| | MEXICAN | SALVADORAN- GUATEMALAN | ALL LATINOS | CHINESE/ TAIWANESE | KOREAN | VIETNAMESE | FILIPINO | ALL ASIAN AMERICANS |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------------------|
| | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 843/% | 376/% | 1,219/% | 400/% | 399/% | 401/% | 401/% | 1,601/% |
| Felt Prejudice or Discrimination Because of Ethnicity or Race in Past Year | 32.5 | 33.5 | 32.8 | 29.3 | 39.1 | 37.7 | 32.9 | 34.7 |
| EXPERIENCED PREJUDICE OR DISCRIMINATION (MULTIPLE RESPONSES RECORDED): | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = | N = |
| | 274/% | 126/% | 400/% | 117/% | 156/% | 151/% | 132/% | 556/% |
| From Police | 26.3 | 22.2 | 25.0*** | 3.4 | 10.3 | 17.2 | 12.9 | 11.4 |
| At Work or Looking for Work | 43.8 | 45.2 | 44.4*** | 22.2 | 19.9 | 37.1 | 35.6 | 28.8 |
| Looking for House/ Apartment | 15.0 | 11.9 | 14.0*** | 4.3 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.0 |
| Other Setting | 63.5 | 73.8 | 66.8*** | 82.9 | 84.6 | 73.5 | 72.7 | 78.4 |
| DISCRIMINATED BY: | | | | | | | | |
| White | 74.8 | 73.0 | 74.3 | 70.8 | 76.8 | 65.2 | 71.2 | 70.9 |
| African American | 12.4 | 15.9 | 13.5* | 6.8 | 11.5 | 7.3 | 9.8 | 9.0 |
| Asian American | 7.3 | 4.0 | 6.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 13.6 | 6.1 |
| Latino | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.8** | 17.1 | 9.0 | 22.5 | 18.9 | 16.7 |

Significance (X^2): * >.05, ** >.01, *** >.001.

prejudice or discrimination in some other setting. Sometimes it could be a feeling of being unwelcomed or viewed as out-of-place. Catarina provides an example of being made to feel she was intruding into an event she attended—not by staff at the Orange County Performing Arts Center, but by some other attendees: “They looked at me like I didn’t belong. Even if you are dressed up you are still Mexican. You still don’t belong. They look at you from top to bottom and they don’t stop looking at

you. This is an experience I had in high school, because we had to go see a play. There was this couple with a little girl, they were white, and they just kept looking at us, like saying what you are doing here.”

Catarina also related an experience she recently had at Starbucks:

And I just had an experience at Starbucks this week. I went in and I ordered a coffee and something went wrong with the name the girl wrote down, and I said, “I’m sorry this is not what I asked for.” She turns her head and she doesn’t even answer, and I said, “Excuse me.” And she goes, “I’m not even talking to you.” And I said, “Oh, I’m sorry.” And I looked at her, and she went on talking with her co-worker discussing whatever had happened with the coffee. And she goes, “Are you gonna want this or not?” And I’m like, “Excuse me,” and she goes, “Do you want me to switch the cup?” And I just said it’s okay. And she then starts screaming at me, and I thought, if I had been white would she have done this to me? And it’s interesting because they serve Mexicans, you know.

We asked respondents from whom they received discriminatory treatment. A majority in all groups who had experienced prejudice or discrimination attributed it to whites (non-Latinos), as reported in table 7.6. However, prejudice or discriminatory behavior was also attributed, but much less frequently, to other ethnic/racial groups. Although Latinos were significantly more likely than Asian American children of immigrants to cite African Americans as the source of discriminatory behavior ($X^2 < .05$), Koreans (11.5 percent) and Filipino (9.8 percent) were close to the proportion of Mexicans (12.4 percent) citing African Americans. Asian Americans generally were not cited as often as the source of prejudice or discriminatory behavior. Interestingly, however, Filipinos (13.6 percent) were the most likely to cite other Asians as discriminators. The children of Mexican immigrants (7.3 percent) cited Asian Americans more frequently than Salvadoran-Guatemalans and the other Asian American groups besides Filipinos.

Latinos were also cited as the source of prejudice and discriminatory behavior. Reportedly, there was a significant difference between Latinos, 8.8 percent, and Asian American children of immigrants, 16.7 percent ($X^2 = < .01$). More than one-fifth (22.5 percent) of the Vietnamese, and many of the Filipinos (18.9 percent) and Chinese-Taiwanese (17.1 percent), also cited Latinos. However, it should be noted that Mexicans (8.8 percent) and Salvadorans (8.7 percent) also cited Latinos more often than either group cited Asian Americans for prejudiced behavior. Once again, Catarina provides an incident where she felt she was treated unfairly by a Latino: “It’s interesting because [discrimination] happens with like my own people. I walked into the shoe store [at a major mall], and there is this sales representative, and he doesn’t approach me. Nothing. And I’m looking there and this lady, white lady, comes in, and he’s already right there helping her. I was like okay.”

Isela, who was twenty-two at the time the author interviewed her, was brought to the United States without authorization at age nine. She felt classmates, teachers, and random people had treated her unfairly at various times in her life. She related two experiences, one as a child in Las Vegas and the other after 9/11:

One time we were in Vegas with my family and we were walking, and our first time in Vegas, we were little kids. I was probably eleven, so we were, you know, walking around, in front of my parents, kinda laughing. And there was a man walking a dog, and we were like, oh look at the cute dog, and the man said, "Go back to your country!" And you know, we were like, oh my God. We had never experienced that before. People, the way people look at me certain times, especially after 9/11. People thought I was Middle Eastern, so at the mall I get a lot of stares, and it frustrates me.

Situating prejudice and discrimination within a broader context, we analyzed additional factors (below), while trying to better understand a focal question: To what extent do perceptions of prejudice and discrimination predict social integration?

LANGUAGE USE

Other factors that influence social integration are language use and a sense of belonging. Language use is an important indicator of cultural integration, ethnic resilience, economic mobility, and educational attainment (Portes and Schauffler 1996; Rumbaut 2009b; Urbina and Wright 2016). Use of English also indicates acculturation, a process that the children of immigrants can find stressful and anxiety provoking as they attempt to "fit in" to American culture (Guendelman, Cheryan, and Monin 2011). Language use, then, is about more than the facility to communicate. It carries with it much larger political significance for issues of cultural identity and ethnic persistence, as well as integration into the life of the nation. The politics over language, then, is a politics over belonging. According to Nira Yuval-Davis (2006, 207): "Much of the contemporary debates on the politics of belonging surround that question of who 'belongs' and who does not, and what are the minimum common grounds—in terms of origin, culture and normative behavior—that are required to signify belonging." Catarina pointed out that bilingualism has definite benefits and she would try to ensure her children could speak Spanish, declaring, "One is the culture thing. If you know Spanish and if you're Mexican, or that's your cultural background, you have to teach [children] some culture. It's essential for their identity, self-identity, self-esteem, and two languages, especially here, let's say in the United States, and in California, Spanish and English, that's plus." Despite the benefits, the generation after Catarina's will probably prefer to speak English in even higher proportions.

A SENSE OF BELONGING

Almost all (94.6 percent) of the children of immigrants in our study indicated that the United States feels most like home, even when compared to their parents' home country.⁵ For those in the 1.5 generation, who spent a few years in their country of origin, there is more ambivalence, a sense of home in both places. For example, Catarina, who was twenty-one when interviewed and was brought from Mexico to the United States when she was eight, explained her sense of home and how she felt about her local community:

Like home, I would have to say probably the U.S. at this point. Although there's this holding on of your native country, and I think just by the fact that I went to school there for a while, and my grandparents were there, and some of my childhood was there, it's still my home as well. But I guess at this point most of my life I've been here. . . . If I define [it as,] Do I feel part of my community, like my neighborhood and everything, yes because, although I don't participate in events that they do hold, my entire neighborhood is kind of close together. I think they all help each other when there's need and everything. Like for example, when someone dies and they need to raise funds, in different events.

Catarina's comments suggest the importance of community engagement for a sense of belonging, a factor that we will explore below.

Clearly, immigration law can influence a sense of belonging. For example, Lupita, twenty-seven at the time of the interview, excelled academically in high school and was heavily involved in extracurricular activities. She completed a BA at a University of California campus and would someday like to get a PhD or law degree. At the time of the interview, however, she was working and trying to survive as an undocumented immigrant. Lupita spoke of how her life is constrained because of her unauthorized status:

I know I can do so much more, but I can't because I can't live wherever. I can't choose where I live. I can't choose where I work. And the worst thing is that I can't choose my friends. In high school I was able to do that. I can't anymore. I can't hang out with my friends anymore. I can't even hang out with my high school friends anymore and that hurts a lot. Yeah, they want to do grown-up stuff. I can't do anything that is eighteen and over. I can't do anything. I can only hang out where little kids hang out. I can't hang out with them. I can't travel with them. I can't go out to dinner with them. I can't go to Vegas with them. If I want to go to a bar, I don't even have a drink. If they want to go to San Diego, if they want to go visit museums down there, if they want to go to Sea World,

I can't go with them. I can't go to Los Angeles. I can't go to any clubs in L.A. (Qtd. in Gonzalez and Chavez 2012, 264)

As these comments indicate (her cry to be understood, be heard, and a call for help), a sense of belonging is influenced by social relationships with family, friends, and the community. A belief that one's ethnic identity is important may also contribute to a sense of belonging, which may influence, positively or negatively, social integration (Barth 1982; Stepick and Stepick 2010).

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSES

To further delineate and statistically quantify the influence of these various factors on social integration, we now utilize a more advanced statistical technique (logistic regression analyses), using education and income as dependent variables. Before presenting our findings, though, we define our dependent variables: individual characteristics; experiences with crime, law, and discrimination; belonging and community; and analysis.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Years of schooling was dichotomized: 0 = 12 years or less; 1 = 13 years or more. Personal yearly income was dichotomized using the sample median: 0 = <\$30,000; 1 = \$30,000 or more. Individual characteristics include gender with the values 0 = female; 1 = male, and age: 0 = 30 or younger; 1 = 31 or older. Language preference was dichotomized as prefers to speak English at home: 0 = No; 1 = Yes. Those indicating they preferred both English and another language were categorized as 0. Generation in the United States included the 1.5 generation (defined as coming to United States under fifteen years of age) and the second generation, those born in the United States with an immigrant parent. The generation variable was dichotomized: 0 = 1.5 generation; 1 = 2nd generation. Marital status was dichotomized: 0 = single, divorced, or widowed; 1 = married or living together. Medical insurance through work is an indicator of integration labor force integration, with "better" jobs providing medical insurance (Liebig 2008); and the variable was dichotomized as 0 = No medical insurance through work; 1 = Yes, medical insurance through work.

EXPERIENCES WITH CRIME, LAW, AND DISCRIMINATION

Having experienced prejudice or discrimination in the past year was dichotomized: 0 = No; 1 = Yes. Having grown up in a neighborhood characterized with problems related to drug use, gang activity, or other types of crime problems was dichot-

omized: 0 = Yes; 1 = No; and if the respondent or immediate family member had been arrested and/or incarcerated was dichotomized: 0 = Yes; 1 = No. Immigration status was assessed through a series of questions. We asked where the respondents were born and if the respondent was a U.S. citizen. If foreign-born, they were asked if they were a permanent legal resident when they first came to the United States. If no, we then asked if any of the following applied to their immigration status at the time: refugee status, temporary work visa, or border-crossing card. The default category consisted of those without authorization to be in the United States. The respondents were asked similar questions about their mother's and father's migration history. The immigration-related variables in the analysis are: respondent entered the United States without authorization (0 = No; 1 = Yes), and mother and/or father entered the United States unauthorized (0 = No; 1 = Yes). The first variable compares those with an unauthorized immigration status when migrating to the United States to respondents who were authorized when coming to the United States or who were U.S.-born citizens since birth. When included in the logistic regression, it indicates if that status at entry predicts self-rated health—similar to the comparison of respondents who had at least one unauthorized immigrant parent versus those whose parents were authorized immigrants or citizens.

BELONGING AND COMMUNITY

A sense of belonging was assessed through a belief that ethnicity is important: 0 = No; 1 = Yes; and having relatives living nearby, dichotomized as 0 = 0 to 4 relatives living nearby; 1 = 5 or more relatives living nearby. Children of immigrants were assigned values of 0 = Latin American parents; 1 = Asian immigrant parents. Respondents' community engagement was assessed broadly. Respondents were asked: Do you belong to any community organizations, work-related organizations, sports teams, or other nonreligious organizations? Community organizations could include ethnic or nonethnic defined groups. Community engagement was dichotomized: 0 = zero participation; 1 = participating in one or more community organization.

ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (PASW 21). Variables were analyzed using frequencies (means, medians), cross-tabulations (chi-square tests), and logistical regression (odds ratios and confidence intervals). Logistic regression analysis provides the odds ratio, which indicates the odds of the 1 value, of a dichotomous variable with 0 and 1 values, predicting the dependent variable, hold-

ing other variables in the model constant. Cases with missing values were excluded from the analyses.⁶ Three logistic regression models were used to estimate the odds ratios (OR) for each of the two dependent variables (years of schooling and personal income). Model 1 included only the Latino respondents, Model 2 included only the Asian American respondents, and Model 3 included both Latino and Asian American respondents.

TABLE 7.7. Logistic Regression Analysis of Years of Schooling (1 = 13 or More Years; 0 = 12 Years or Less), Latino and Asian American 1.5- and 2nd-Generation Children of Immigrants in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area

| PREDICTORS | MODEL 1: LATINOS | | MODEL 2: ASIAN AMERICANS | | MODEL 3: ALL | |
|--|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI |
| INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS | | | | | | |
| Gender: 1 = Male; 0 = Female | 0.61*** | 0.46–0.80 | 0.71 | 0.47–1.07 | 0.66*** | 0.53–0.84 |
| Age: 1 = 30+; 0 = Under 30 | 1.08 | 0.79–1.47 | 0.89 | 0.53–1.52 | 1.04 | 0.79–1.35 |
| Yearly Income: 1 = \$30,000+; 0 = <\$30,000 | 2.43*** | 1.74–3.38 | 4.09*** | 2.38–7.02 | 2.92*** | 2.20–3.86 |
| Prefers to Speak English at Home: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.40* | 1.06–1.85 | 1.36 | 0.88–2.11 | 1.33* | 1.05–1.67 |
| Marital Status: 1 = Married/Cohabit; 0 = Single | 0.51*** | 0.38–0.68 | 0.56* | 0.34–0.94 | 0.53*** | 0.41–0.68 |
| Medical Insurance Through Work: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.52** | 1.14–2.03 | 0.72 | 0.46–1.11 | 1.20 | 0.95–1.53 |
| Generation: 1 = 2nd Generation; 0 = 1.5 Generation | 1.73 | 0.87–3.45 | 1.74 | 0.29–1.88 | 1.29 | 0.75–2.22 |
| CRIME, LAW, DISCRIMINATION | | | | | | |
| Problem Neighborhood: 1 = No; 0 = Yes | 0.97 | 0.72–1.31 | 1.81** | 1.18–2.78 | 1.20 | 0.94–1.53 |

TABLE 7.7. *continued*

| PREDICTORS | MODEL 1: LATINOS | | MODEL 2: ASIAN AMERICANS | | MODEL 3: ALL | |
|---|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Self or Family Member Arrested and/or Jail: 1 = No; 0 = Yes | 1.53** | 1.15– 2.04 | 2.39*** | 1.52– 3.77 | 1.72*** | 1.35– 2.20 |
| Respondent Unauthorized when Entered the United States: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 0.80 | 0.51– 1.26 | 0.66 | 0.27– 1.62 | 0.74 | 0.50– 1.08 |
| Mother and/or Father Unauthorized when Entered the United States: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.31 | 0.99– 1.74 | 0.98 | 0.53– 1.83 | 1.24 | 0.96– 1.60 |
| Prejudice or Discrimination: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.62** | 1.21– 2.18 | 0.94 | 0.62–1.4 | 1.37* | 1.07– 1.74 |
| BELONGING AND COMMUNITY | | | | | | |
| Ethnicity Important: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.04 | 0.79– 1.38 | 1.08 | 0.72– 1.61 | 1.08 | 0.86– 1.35 |
| Five or More Relatives Live Nearby: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.19 | 0.89– 1.60 | 1.09 | 0.72– 1.64 | 1.16 | 0.92– 1.47 |
| Belongs to One or More Community Organizations: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.90** | 1.28– 2.83 | 1.54 | 0.87– 2.71 | 1.77** | 1.27– 2.45 |
| Ethnicity: 1 = Asian American; 0 = Latino | | | | | 7.07*** | 5.38– 9.31 |
| X2 | | 133.31*** | | 71.67*** | | 692.61*** |
| DF | | 15 | | 15 | | 16 |

Significance: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Source: Rumbaut et al. 2004.

Model 1: N in analysis = 1,028; missing cases 191.

Model 2: N in analysis = 1,348; missing cases 253.

Model 3: N in analysis = 2,376; missing cases 444.

FINDINGS FOR THE CURRENT STUDY

Table 7.7 displays the findings from three models for the dependent variable years of schooling. The children of Asian immigrants were seven times more likely than the children of Latin American immigrants to have had thirteen or more years of education. However, both groups had similar predictors of fewer and more years of schooling, especially relations with the law. Male children of Latin American immigrants were significantly less likely than Latinas to have had thirteen or more years of schooling, a pattern that follows national trends (U.S. Census Bureau 2011). Gender was not significant for the children of Asian immigrants, although gender was significant in Model 3, with all respondents in the analysis. In all three models, married respondents or those living with a partner were significantly less likely to have had thirteen or more years of education, perhaps due to the additional responsibilities that accompany family formation.

Among Latino respondents, preferring to speak English at home significantly predicted being in the higher education category, but not so for Asian Americans. However, English preference was significant in Model 3. Also among Latinos, having medical insurance through work, an indicator of better jobs, was also significantly correlated with more years of education. More years of schooling is significantly correlated with higher personal incomes among Latinos, Asian Americans, and all respondents. Among Latinos, those with more education were almost two-and-a-half times more likely to earn more than \$30,000 a year. Among Asian Americans, those with more schooling were four times as likely as those with less schooling to be in the higher personal income category.

Experiences with the law also predicted years of schooling. Latinos who had never personally been arrested nor had a family member who had been arrested and/or incarcerated were 53 percent more likely to have had thirteen or more years of schooling compared to respondents who did have negative experiences with the criminal justice system. Among Asian Americans, those without arrest and/or incarceration experiences were 2.39 times as likely to be in the higher years of schooling category than those with negative experiences with the criminal justice system. The predictability of arrests and incarcerations for schooling is significant when all respondents are included in the analysis (Model 3). Asian Americans growing up in a neighborhood without crime problems were 81 percent more likely to have thirteen or more years of education than those who did experience neighborhoods with crime when growing up. Among Latinos, perceived experiences of prejudice and discrimination were positively associated with more years of education. The variable perceptions of prejudice and/or discrimination were significant in Model 3 as well. Respondents' and parents' immigration statuses when coming to the United States were not significant

predictors of years of schooling. Also, the respondents' beliefs about the importance of ethnic identity and having five or more relatives living nearby were not significant factors in this study. However, Latinos who participated in at least one community organization were 90 percent more likely to have thirteen or more years of education than Latinos who were not community engaged.

TABLE 7.8. Logistic Regression Analysis of Personal Income (0 = <\$30k; 1 = \$30k or More), Latino and Asian American 1.5- and 2nd-Generation Children of Immigrants in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area

| PREDICTORS | MODEL 1: LATINOS | | MODEL 2: ASIAN AMERICANS | | MODEL 3: ALL | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI | ODDS RATIO | 95% CI |
| INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS | | | | | | |
| Gender: 1 = Male; 0 = Female | 1.69** | 1.22-2.36 | 1.16 | 0.88-1.53 | 1.40** | 1.13-1.76 |
| Age: 1 = 30+; 0 = Under 30 | 3.19*** | 2.29-4.45 | 3.81*** | 2.78-5.23 | 3.50*** | 2.79-4.38 |
| Years of Schooling: 1 = 13 or More Years; 0 = 0-12 Years | 2.37*** | 1.70-3.30 | 3.86*** | 2.26-6.59 | 2.83*** | 2.14-3.73 |
| Prefers to Speak English at Home: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.54* | 1.10-2.14 | 1.36* | 1.01-1.84 | 1.41** | 1.14-1.76 |
| Marital Status: 1 = Married/Cohabit; 0 = Single | 1.97*** | 1.43-2.73 | 2.41*** | 1.75-3.32 | 2.26*** | 1.80-2.83 |
| Medical Insurance Through Work: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 5.09*** | 3.59-7.21 | 5.50*** | 4.18-7.24 | 5.29*** | 4.28-6.55 |
| Generation: 1 = 2nd Generation; 0 = 1.5 Generation | 0.91 | 0.41-2.03 | 0.90 | 0.49-1.66 | 0.90 | 0.56-1.44 |
| CRIME, LAW, DISCRIMINATION | | | | | | |
| Problem Neighborhood: 1 = No; 0 = Yes | 1.02 | 0.72-1.46 | 1.44** | 1.10-1.89 | 1.29* | 1.043- 1.60 |
| Self or Family Member Arrested and/or Jail: 1 = No; 0 = Yes | 1.05 | 0.75-1.47 | 1.44 | 0.99-2.10 | 1.18 | 0.92-1.51 |

TABLE 7.8. *continued*

| PREDICTORS | MODEL 1: LATINOS | | MODEL 2: ASIAN AMERICANS | | MODEL 3: ALL | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Respondent Unauthorized when Entered the United States: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 0.56* | 0.32-0.97 | 0.99 | 0.52-1.89 | 0.69 | 0.46-1.03 |
| Mother and/or Father Unauthorized when Entered the United States: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.13 | 0.82-1.57 | 0.86 | 0.53-1.83 | 1.00 | 0.76-1.29 |
| Prejudice or Discrimination: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 0.96 | 0.68-1.35 | 0.94 | 0.57-1.31 | 0.99 | 0.80-1.23 |
| BELONGING AND COMMUNITY | | | | | | |
| Ethnicity Important: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 0.95 | 0.69-1.31 | 1.11 | 0.85-1.46 | 1.05 | 0.86-1.29 |
| Five or More Relatives Live Nearby: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.27 | 0.90-1.81 | 0.95 | 0.72-1.25 | 1.06 | 0.85-1.31 |
| Belongs to One or More Community Organizations: 1 = Yes; 0 = No | 1.67* | 1.10-2.53 | 1.05 | 0.75-1.48 | 1.26 | 0.97-1.64 |
| Ethnicity: 1 = Asian American; 0 = Latino | | | | | 1.63*** | 1.27-2.11 |
| X2 | | 313.69*** | | 547.11*** | | 890.64*** |
| DF | | 15 | | 15 | | 16 |

Significance: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Source: Rumbaut et al. 2004.

Model 1: N in analysis = 1,028; missing cases 191.

Model 2: N in analysis = 1,348; missing cases 253.

Model 3: N in analysis = 2,376; missing cases 444.

Table 7.8 presents the logistic regression analysis on personal income (0 = <\$30,000; 1 = \$30,000 or more) as the dependent variable. The children of Asian immigrants were 63 percent more likely than the children of Latin American immigrants to be in the higher-income category, which, given the imbalance in years of education, is an "interesting" finding. Almost all the respondents' individual characteristics are significant predictors of personal income. Males earn more than females among Latinos;

older respondents earn more than younger ones among all respondents. More years of schooling, being married or living together, and preferring to speak English at home all significantly predicted higher personal income for all respondents. Medical insurance through work, an indicator before the Affordable Care Act of a “better” job, was also significantly associated with higher personal income for all respondents. Asian Americans who did not grow up in neighborhoods with crime were 44 percent more likely to be in the higher personal income category, which was also significant in Model 3, with all respondents. Among Latinos, those who entered the United States without authorization were significantly less likely to be in the higher-income category than those who entered with authorization or were born in the United States. Lastly, among the belonging and community variables, Latinos who belonged to one or more community organizations were 67 percent more likely to be in the upper-income category than their less community-engaged counterparts.

DISCUSSION

As delineated herein, schooling and personal income are two key indicators of social integration. These indicators are not independent factors in that the amount of schooling one receives influences later earnings potential. The findings indicate the negative effect on schooling the children of immigrants experience as a result of arrest or incarceration, affecting either themselves or family members. Early life experiences in neighborhoods with crime can also affect schooling, especially among the children of Asian immigrants. Interestingly, Latinos who perceived themselves as the victims of prejudice or discrimination actually did better in terms of schooling. Either their education made them more aware or sensitive to possible instances of prejudice and discrimination, or they excelled to overcome a sense of social exclusion instilled by such experiences, or, as reported by Martin Guevara Urbina and Claudia Rodriguez Wright in *Latino Access to Higher Education: Ethnic Realities and New Directions for the Twenty-First Century* (2016), they possessed *ganas* (desire/will) to overcome all obstacles to stay in school and graduate, and subsequently obtain a better life.

Importantly, immigration status at time of entry was not a significant predictor of schooling among the participating respondents. The study was conducted after AB 540 was signed into law in California in 2001, allowing undocumented students to pay resident tuition to attend public colleges and universities. Previous to AB 540, unauthorized students had to pay nonresident tuition, much higher than the amount paid by residents, often limiting the years of schooling or forcing attendance at a less costly public university or community college. The finding that parents’ immigration status when coming to the United States was not a significant predictor of years

of schooling may reflect the inclusion of a broad range of community and policing variables, in contrast to other studies that do find a continued effect of immigration status over generations (Bean, Brown, and Bachmeier 2015). Personal income was predicted by many of the respondents' individual characteristics. However, schooling was highly significant, and as these findings suggest, schooling is affected by negative experiences with the criminal justice system. Although being arrested and/or incarcerated was not a significant predictor of personal income, such experiences had an indirect effect through negatively affecting years of schooling. Growing up in crime-ridden neighborhoods had a direct effect on personal earnings among Asian Americans and respondents generally.

Immigration law was a significant factor in earnings for the children of Latin American immigrants. Latinos who entered the country without authorization were significantly less likely to be in the higher-income category. The study was conducted before the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program in 2012. Although undocumented young people could go to college or university at the time of study, they could not work legally, and doing so would jeopardize their chances of obtaining legal resident status. As these findings indicate, this appears to have negatively influenced personal income among these respondents.

CONCLUSION

Evidently, experiences with law and crime play an important role in the social integration of the children of immigrants, though not in the ways indicated in the statement by Donald Trump quoted at the beginning of this chapter. The children of immigrants who had negative experiences with the criminal justice system and who grew up in neighborhoods with drugs, gangs, and other crimes faced significant obstacles to their social integration. They were less likely to continue with their schooling and less likely to experience mobility in their personal earnings. Among the children of Mexican, Salvadoran, and Guatemalan immigrants, if they came to the United States without authorization they experienced additional obstacles to their earnings potential. Working at formal jobs increased the risk of deportation and reduced or even eliminated the possibility of acquiring legal resident status. They would, therefore, face limitations to working in better-paying jobs, such as those that provided medical insurance, which was also a significant predictor of higher personal income.

Broadly, these findings support legislative efforts to regularize the status of the undocumented children of immigrants as a way to improve social integration. Further, these findings underscore the need for interventions to ameliorate community and police relations and to reduce negative experiences with the criminal justice system

among the children of both Asian and Latin American immigrants (see Urbina 2018; Urbina and Álvarez 2015, 2017). Attention to such efforts would improve educational attainment and thus social integration. Finally, immigrants and their children should not be penalized because of the neighborhoods they can afford to live in. All people deserve safe neighborhoods, but the findings here underscore the obstacles that neighborhoods with drugs, gangs, and crime add for the social integration of children of immigrants. While the situation for these children reveals a continued struggle, thousands of immigrant children (undocumented and documented) across the United States are experiencing not only the historical realities detailed herein, but also the current implications and consequences of Trump's anti-immigrant, anti-Mexican, anti-Latino, and anti-minorities movement. The findings presented illustrate the pressing call for action as we strive for understanding, tolerance, social integration, transformation, and unity in a highly multiethnic, multiracial, and multicultural American society.

NOTES

1. Co-principal investigators of the IIMMLA study were Rubén G. Rumbaut, Frank D. Bean, Susan K. Brown, Leo R. Chávez, Louis DeSipio, Jennifer Lee, and Min Zhou.
2. The Field Research Corporation conducted the telephone interviews.
3. Before the start of the interviewing, targeted quotas for the ethnic strata were established for eligible respondents aged twenty to forty years in the five-county area, placing special emphasis on the largest and most significant group—the Mexican-origin population. The IIMMLA also sampled a strategic handful of other large immigrant refugee origin-groups that were expected to be different in their modes of incorporation into U.S. society, including Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, and Vietnamese, along with Salvadorans and Guatemalans taken together. All groups were assigned a separate sampling stratum for 1.5- and 2nd-generation respondents. The final design called for completing approximately 2,800 closed-ended telephone interviews with random samples of eligible 1.5- and 2nd-generation Latino and Asian American respondents. Multiframe sampling procedures were used to improve the chances of finding and interviewing members of targeted populations. The first stage used random digit dialing (RDD) to sample and screen households in the five-county area, and using this approach the IIMMLA was able to complete sample quotas for Mexicans. For the other groups, samples were compiled using RDD until the incidence rates of eligible respondents became prohibitively low. At this point, more specific geographic and race-ethnic sampling frames were used, targeting RDD to households in high-density Asian residential areas and those on lists of Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese surnames. Sixty-one percent of

the completed interviews were derived using solely first-stage RDD sampling, while 39 percent resulted from interviews using the augmented samples. The surveys were administered in English or Spanish using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system. The number of questions asked varied by generation status, yielding an average interview length of thirty-two minutes for those in the 2nd generation and thirty-four minutes for those in the 1.5 generation. Respondents received \$20 for participating in the survey. The response rate for the survey's main questionnaire was 55.6 percent.

4. An important consideration discussed by the study team prior to the launching of the study was the extent to which non-English languages would be required for the telephone survey. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau pertaining to 1.5/2nd- and 3rd+-generation immigrants residing in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, as well as the results of a preliminary pilot test conducted in 2003 for UCI by the Field Research Corporation, indicated that relatively small proportions of the 1.5-, 2nd-, and 3rd+-generation respondents were not fluent in English. Nevertheless, due to the presence of the large Spanish-speaking population, a courtesy Spanish-language version of the questionnaire was prepared and made available to those who requested it. Results from the survey indicated that greater than 90 percent of all eligible Latino adults chose to be interviewed in English.
5. Researchers at the Pew Research Center (Taylor and Cohn 2013, 48) found that 61 percent of U.S.-born children of Hispanics and Asian Americans consider themselves to be "typical Americans," which was double that of the 1.5-generation Hispanics (33 percent) and Asian Americans (30 percent).
6. A correlation matrix with all variables included found that none of the variables were highly enough correlated to be included in the analysis.

REFERENCES

- Abrego, L. 2011. "Legal Consciousness of Undocumented Latinos: Fear and Stigma as Barriers to Claims-Making for First- and 1.5-Generation Immigrants." *Law and Society Review* 45: 337-70.
- . 2014. *Sacrificing Families: Navigating Laws, Labor, and Love Across Borders*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Abrego, L., and C. Menjivar. 2012. "Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 117: 1380-1421.
- Alba, R., and V. Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, E. N. 2005. *Everyone Eats: Understanding Food and Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

- Armenta, A. 2016. "Racializing Crimmigration: Structural Racism, Colorblindness, and the Institutional Production of Immigrant Criminality." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 3: 82–95.
- Barth, F., ed. 1982. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bean, F. D., S. K. Brown, and J. D. Bachmeier. 2015. *Parents Without Papers: The Progress and Pitfalls of Mexican American Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bean, F. D., S. K. Brown, M. Leach, J. Bachmeier, L. R. Chávez, L. DeSipio, R. G. Rumbaut, J. Lee, and M. Zhou. 2006. "How Pathways to Legal Status and Citizenship Relate to Economic Attainment Among the Children of Mexican Immigrants." Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Bean, F. D., S. K. Brown, M. A. Leach, J. D. Bachmeier, and J. V. Hook. 2014. "Unauthorized Mexican Migration and the Socioeconomic Integration of Mexican Americans." In *Diversity and Disparities: America Enters a New Century*, edited by J. R. Logan, 341–74. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chávez, L. R. 2001. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2006. "Culture Change and Cultural Reproduction: Lessons from Research on Transnational Migration." In *Globalization and Change in Fifteen Cultures: Born in One World and Living in Another*, edited by J. Stockard and G. Spindler, 283–303. Belmont, Calif.: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- . 2013a. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 2013b. "Illegality Across Generations: Public Discourse and the Children of Undocumented Immigrants." In *Constructing "Illegality": Critiques, Immigrants' Experiences, and Responses*, edited by C. Menjivar and D. Kanstroom, 84–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coutin, S. 2013. "Place and Presence Within Salvadoran Deportees' Narratives of Removal." *Childhood* 20: 323–36.
- Douglas, K. M., and R. Sáenz. 2013. "The Criminalization of Immigrants and the Immigration-Industrial Complex." *Daedalus* 142: 199–227.
- Dowling, J. A., and J. X. India, eds. 2013. *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Dreby, J. 2012. "The Burden of Deportation on Children in Mexican Immigrant Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74: 829–45.
- Gonzales, R. G., and L. R. Chávez. 2012. "'Awakening to a Nightmare': Objectivity and Illegality in the Lives of Undocumented 1.5 Generation Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Current Anthropology* 53: 255–81.
- Gonzales, R. G., and V. Terriquez. 2013. "How DACA Is Impacting the Lives of Those Who Are Now DACAdmented: Preliminary Findings from the National UnDACAdmented Research

- Project." Immigration Policy Center, Center for the Study of Immigrant Integrant, University of Southern California. <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/how-daca-impacting-lives-those-who-are-now-documented>.
- Gratton, B., M. P. Gutmann, and E. Skop. 2007. "Immigrants, Their Children, and Theories of Assimilation: Family Structure in the United States, 1880–1970." *History of the Family* 12: 203–22.
- Guendelman, M. D., S. Cheryan, and B. Monin. 2011. "Fitting In but Getting Fat: Identity Threat and Dietary Choices Among U.S. Immigrant Groups." *Psychological Science* 22: 959–67.
- Hall, S. 1990. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by J. Rutherford, 222–37. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hirschman, C. 2013. "The Contributions of Immigrants to American Culture." *Daedalus* 142: 26–47.
- Jimenez, T. 2009. *Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jones-Correa, M., and E. de Graauw. 2013. "The Illegality Trap: The Politics of Immigration and the Lens of Illegality." *Daedalus* 142: 185–98.
- Kubrin, C. E., M. S. Zatz, and R. Martinez, eds. 2012. *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lerman, A. E. 2013. *The Modern Prison Paradox: Politics, Punishment, and Social Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liebig, T. 2008. "Labor Market Integration of the Children of Immigrants." The Integration of the European Second Generation Academic Conference. Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Light, M., and J. Iceland. 2016. "The Social Context of Racial Boundary Negotiations: Segregation, Hate Crime, and Hispanic Racial Identification in Metropolitan America." *Sociological Science* 3: 61–84.
- Martinez, R. 2016. "Latina/o Immigrants, Crime, and Justice." In *Latinos and Criminal Justice: An Encyclopedia*, edited by J. L. Morin. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Greenwood.
- Massey, D. 2013. "America's Immigration Policy Fiasco: Learning from Past Mistakes." *Daedalus* 142: 5–15.
- Massey, D., and K. Pren. 2012. "Unintended Consequences of US Immigration Policy: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge from Latin America." *Population and Development Review* 38: 1–29.
- Massey, D., and M. Sánchez R. 2010. *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-immigrant Times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Menjivar, C., and L. Abrego. 2012. "Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 117: 1380–1421.
- Migration Policy Institute. 2015a. "U.S: Immigrant Population by State and County." Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/us-immigrant-population-state-and-county>.

- . 2015b. "State Immigration Data Profiles." Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/state-immigration-data-profiles>.
- Motomura, H. 2014. *Immigration Outside the Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Motomura, H. 2006. *Americans in Waiting: The Lost Story of Immigration and Citizenship in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ngai, M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Portes, A., and R. Schauffler. 1996. "Language Acquisition and Loss Among Children of Immigrants." In *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America*, edited by S. Pedraza and R. Rumbaut, 432–43. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.
- Rosas, G. 2012. *Barrio Libre: Criminalizing States and Delinquent Refusals of the New Frontier*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Rumbaut, R. G. 2009a. "Undocumented Immigration and Rates of Crime and Imprisonment: Popular Myths and Empirical Realities." In *The Role of Local Police: Striking a Balance Between Immigration Enforcement and Civil Liberties*, edited by M. Malina, 119–39. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.
- . 2009b. "A Language Graveyard? The Evolution of Language Competencies, Preferences, and Use Among Young Adult Children of Immigrants." In *The Education of Language Minority Immigrants in the United States*, edited by T. G. Wiley, J. S. Lee, and R. Rumberger, 35–71. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Rumbaut, R. G., and W. Ewing. 2007. *The Myth of Immigrant Criminality and the Paradox of Assimilation: Incarceration Rates Among Native and Foreign-Born Men*. Washington, D.C.: Immigration Policy Center.
- Rumbaut, R. G., D. S. Massey, and F. D. Bean. 2006. "Linguistic Life Expectancies: Immigrant Language Retention in Southern California." *Population and Development Review* 32: 447–60.
- Rumbaut, R. G., F. D. Bean, L. R. Chávez, J. Lee, S. K. Brown, L. DeSipio, and M. Zhou. 2004. *Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA)*. ICPSR22627-v1. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-07-01. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR22627.v1>.
- Ryan, C. 2013. *Language Use in the United States: 2011*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Sohoni, D., and T. W. P. Sohoni. 2013. "Perceptions of Immigrant Criminality: Crime and Social Boundaries." *Sociological Quarterly* 55: 49–71.
- Stepick, A., and C. D. Stepick. 2010. "The Complexities and Confusions of Segmented Assimilation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33: 1149–67.
- Taylor, P., and D. Cohn. 2013. *Second-Generation Americans: A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

- Urbina, M. G., ed. 2018. *Hispanics in the U.S. Criminal Justice System: Ethnicity, Ideology, and Social Control*. 2nd ed. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas.
- Urbina, M. G., and S. E. Álvarez, eds. 2015. *Latino Police Officers in the United States: An Examination of Emerging Trends and Issues*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas.
- . 2017. *Ethnicity and Criminal Justice in the Era of Mass Incarceration: A Critical Reader on the Latino Experience*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas.
- Urbina, M. G., and C. R. Wright. 2016. *Latino Access to Higher Education: Ethnic Realities and New Directions for the Twenty-First Century*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2011. *More Working Women Than Men Have College Degrees*. <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/education/cb11-72.html>.
- Vasquez, J. M. 2011. *Mexican Americans Across Generations: Immigrant Families, Racial Realities*. New York: New York University Press.
- Yoshikawa, H., and J. Kholoptseva, J. 2013. "Unauthorized Immigrant Parents and Their Children's Development: A Summary of the Evidence." Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/COI-Yoshikawa.pdf>.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40: 197–214.