

**Pyong Gap Min, "A Comparison of Post-1965
and Turn-of-the-Century Immigrants in
Intergenerational Mobility and
Cultural Transmission"**

BETWEEN 1880 AND 1930, approximately 28 million people immigrated to the United States. About half of the immigrants during this mass migration period originated from southern and eastern European countries. While the vast majority of the earlier northwestern European immigrant groups were Protestant, these later immigrants were mostly Catholic or Jewish. Initially, these *non-Protestant*, "new immigrant" groups were considered different races and encountered prejudice, discrimination, and racial violence by native-born Americans of northwestern ancestry. However, as classical assimilation theory predicted, these non-Protestant, white ethnic groups quickly acculturated to the American mainstream and achieved gradual social assimilation and socioeconomic mobility over generations. Although their ancestors were labelled as "inassimilable races," they have been incorporated into the white American mainstream culturally and structurally.

Race!

became
white

National origin discriminatory immigration laws in the early 1920s, the Great Depression, and World War II caused the immigration flow to drop to its nadir in the next four decades beginning in 1930. Yet, the liberalization of immigration laws, the United States government's political and military involvement in many Third World countries, and other factors have accelerated the flow of immigration since 1965, ushering in the second mass migration period in American history. While the majority of immigrants during the first mass migration period were whites who originated in European countries, the vast majority of post-1965 immigrants were drawn from non-European, Third World countries.

An important issue regarding the adaptation of the descendants of these new immigrant groups is whether they will follow the descendants of the earlier white immigrant groups at the turn of the twentieth century. To put the question differently, what will the major differences be between the descendants of earlier white ethnic groups and those of contemporary immigrant groups in patterns of adaptation?

This article intends to compare the descendants of contemporary, Third World immigrants and those of the turn-of-the-century white immigrants in their adaptation patterns. To compare the adaptation patterns systematically, we need to examine the differences in (1) patterns of ethnicity and acculturation and (2) patterns of social mobility separately.

"Inassimilable Races" Have Become White Americans

Table 1.1 provides an overview of historical trends between 1841 and 1996 in immigration size and regions of immigrants' origin, with a focus on the

Table 1.1 Immigration to the U.S. by decade, region, and race, 1841–1996

Decade	Total N (in 1000s)	Region (%)				U.S. totals		
		N.&W. Europe	S.&E. Europe ²	Canada & N.E. ³	Total White	L.A. ¹ & C.I. ⁴	% of Foreign Born	% of White
1841–50	1,713	93.0	0.3	2.4	95.7	1.2	9.7	84.3
1851–60	2,598	93.6	0.8	2.3	96.7	0.6	13.1	85.6
1861–70	2,315	87.8	1.5	6.7	96.0	0.6	14.0	87.1
1871–80	2,812	73.6	7.7	13.6	94.9	0.7	13.3	86.5
1881–90	5,247	72.0	18.2	7.5	97.7	0.7	14.7	87.5
1891–1900	3,688	44.6	51.9	0.1	96.6	1.0	13.6	87.9
1901–10	8,795	21.7	69.9	2.0	93.6	2.1	14.6	88.9
1911–20	5,763	25.3	50.0	12.9	88.2	6.0	13.1	89.7
1921–30	4,107	32.5	27.5	22.2	82.2	14.4	11.5	89.8
1931–40	528	38.7	27.2	20.5	86.4	9.7	8.6	89.8
1941–50	1,035	49.9	10.1	16.6	76.6	17.7	6.9	89.3
1951–60	2,516	38.2	14.5	15.0	67.7	24.6	5.4	88.6
1961–70	3,322	18.3	15.5	12.4	46.2	39.3	4.7	87.6
1971–80	4,493	11.6	10.0	23.8	45.4	40.3	6.2	79.6
1981–90	7,338	4.6	5.2	1.8	11.6	46.8	8.0	75.6
1991–96	6,146	3.3	10.2	1.5	15.0	48.7	9.7	72.0

Notes

1. Latin America.

2. Up to 1910, data for Austria and Hungary were tabulated together by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In this table, the data for these two countries up to 1910 were included in the category of southeastern Europe, although only Hungary actually belongs to southeastern Europe.

3. Newfoundland.

4. Caribbean Islands.

5. Middle East.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957*, Series A 9–22, A 34–50, C 23–28 & C 228–295 (Washington, D.C., 1960); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, Series A 9–22, A 44–50, C 23–28 & C 228–295 (Washington, D.C., 1973); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1980 Census of Population, PC: 80-1-B1, U.S. Summary, Table 39 and PC-80-D 1-A, United States Summary, Table 253* (Washington, D.C., 1983); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1990 Census of Population, Social and Economic Characteristics, United States, Table 24* (Washington, D.C., 1993); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1997 Demographic File, March Current Population Survey: Immigration and Naturalization Service, National Database, 1985, Tables 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5* (Washington, D.C., 1996 and 1997).

COMPARING CONTENT

two mass migration periods. The period, differs from the previous immigration and in the region, overwhelming majority of immigrants from northwestern European, Protestant immigrants began in the next number of immigrants from contributed to the sharp rise in. In the peak decade of the among the top source countries the United Kingdom and the United States.

The immigrants from these countries were mostly Catholic, language, religious, "racist" native-born Protestants. very foundation of American attitudes toward Italians resulted in the early Eastern European countries anti-Semitic prejudice against immigrants" developed "scientific evidence" of "old stock," or the "T

Immigrants' class based on their and their children the southern and eastern period were farmers. These were significant national ground. Among the occupations, 94 percent southern Italians, a compared to only The illiteracy rate groups admitted Italians, 32 percent. Southern and Eastern had largely urban of the occupation foreign-born white workers manufacturing their class disaffected even many occupations.

two mass migration periods. The period of 1881–1930, the first mass migration period, differs from the previous migration period both in the size of annual immigration and in the region of origin of immigrants. While an overwhelming majority of immigrants admitted before 1881 were drawn from northwestern European, Protestant countries—the United Kingdom, Germany, and Ireland in particular—the proportion of southeastern, non-Protestant immigrants began to increase in the 1880s, reaching the majority of immigrants in the next three decades. The phenomenal increase in the number of immigrants from these less-developed European countries contributed to the sharp rise in the overall immigration scale during the period. In the peak decade of the 1900s, Italy, Russia, Hungary, and Poland were among the top source countries of immigrants, with the first two replacing the United Kingdom and Germany as the top two source countries.

The immigrants from these economically less-developed European countries were mostly Catholic, Jewish, or Eastern Orthodox Christian. Their language, religious, “racial,” and other differences, along with nativism, led native-born Protestants to consider their mass migration as a threat to the very foundation of American cultural and political systems. The negative attitudes toward Italians resulted in racial violence against and killings of Italian immigrants in the early twentieth century. Jews, who left Russia and other Eastern European countries to escape pogroms, encountered new forms of anti-Semitic prejudice and discrimination. The nativist reactions to the “new immigrants” developed into scientific racism in the 1910s, according to which “scientific evidence” was alleged to support the biological superiority of the “old stock,” or the “Teutonic race,” to southern and eastern Europeans.

Immigrants' class background is one of the key variables that determine their and their children's socioeconomic adjustments. A large proportion of the southern and eastern European immigrants of the first mass migration period were farmers and unskilled workers who were illiterate, although there were significant national origin differences in the immigrants' class background. Among the European immigrants of 1889–1910 who reported their occupations, 94 percent of Rumanians, 83 percent of Russians, 78 percent of southern Italians, and 76 percent of Poles were unskilled workers or farmers, compared to only 12 percent of Scotch and 14 percent of Jews and English. The illiteracy rates of major southern and eastern European immigrant groups admitted in 1920 were 60 percent for the Portuguese, 47 percent for Italians, 32 percent for Poles, and 23 percent for Jews. As a result, most of the Southern and Eastern European immigrants, with the exception of Jews who had largely urban and higher educational backgrounds, occupied the bottom of the occupational hierarchy in American society. In 1910, only 6 percent of foreign-born white workers engaged in professional and other white-collar occupations (public service and clerical) in comparison to 17 percent of native white workers with native parentage, while they were overrepresented in manufacturing with the ratio of 43 percent to 26 percent. Partly because of their class disadvantages and partly because of the industrial structure of the time, even many of their second-generation descendants remained in blue-collar occupations.

1910
Scientific
evidence
racism

Earlier southern and eastern European immigrants of a heavy rural background kept their "old world traits" in urban America. Many working-class immigrants who settled in ethnic enclaves were able to transmit their ethnic language and customs to their children. However, these "inassimilable" white ethnic groups also experienced an inexorable march toward acculturation. Beyond the second generation, they lost their ethnic language and much of their ethnic customs. Already in the 1970s, their third and fourth generations achieved cultural and social assimilation to the extent that they maintained their ethnicity loosely, using only ethnic symbols such as ethnic food and ethnic festivals. In the 1950s and 1960s, descendants of southern and eastern European immigrants were slightly behind those of Protestant ethnic groups in their socioeconomic statistics. However, by the 1970s most of the non-Protestant ethnic groups caught up with or outperformed Protestant ethnic groups socioeconomically. In the process of racial formation in the United States, these "inassimilable races" have become white Americans.

Contemporary Immigrants' Contribution to Racial and Ethnic Diversity and Disadvantages for Intergenerational Mobility

The contemporary migration period is similar to the first mass migration period in that an exceptionally large number of immigrants were admitted annually to the United States. Yet the differences in the region of origin and physical characteristics of immigrants sharply separate the two waves. While nearly 90 percent of immigrants admitted between 1881 and 1930 were drawn from Europe and Canada, only about 15 percent of post-1965 immigrants have originated from these regions. Mexico, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Cuba, the Philippines, Vietnam, China, and South Korea are among the major sending countries of contemporary immigration to the United States, with Jews from the former Soviet Union and the Middle East being the only major contemporary white immigrant group.

Contribution to Racial and Ethnic Diversity

As shown in table 1.1, the mass migration of immigrants beginning in 1880 did not change the racial composition of American society at all. Until the 1960s the white population had maintained its numerical supremacy with almost 90 percent. The only significant racial minority group before the 1960s was African American; thus race relations in the United States was synonymous with black-white relations. However, the influx of immigrants from Latin American, Asian, and Caribbean countries since the late 1960s has led to a phenomenal increase in Latino and Asian populations, while it has gradually reduced the proportion of the non-Hispanic white population.

COMPARING CON

In 1997, the non-Hispanic the Latino and Asian/Pacific respectively. In the population statistically significant difference and Latino (11.1 percent) population approximately four million outnumbered non-Hispanic

The liberalization of immigration the mass migration of immigrants in the post-1965 era. But the United States linkages with many Latin American with other structural factors migration. There is little change revised in the foreseeable immigration. Further, mass cannot stem the tide of immigration. If that is the case, Latino with a concomitant decline According to population statistics will be reduced to 53 percent American populations will respectively.

As will be shown in the immigrants are concentrated much more highly concentrated grants. As a result, non-minority in several metropolitan San Francisco, and Miami and multiethnic than the ethnically more diverse post-1965 era has made more complex than before. Many theories based on the racial and ethnic relations

Disadvantages

Although the contemporary made American society more racial stratification system minorities. While descendants melted into white Americans and some immigrants not been incorporated enacted in the 1960s minority groups; affirmative action women some advantages

migrants of a heavy rural
America. Many working-
were able to transmit their
However, these "inassimil-
inexorable march toward
lost their ethnic language
the 1970s, their third and
simulation to the extent
only ethnic symbols such
d 1960s, descendants of
lightly behind those of
tistics. However, by the
ght up with or outper-
In the process of racial
ances" have become

tion to
vantages

first mass migration
ants were admitted
gion of origin and
two waves. While
1 and 1930 were
post-1965 immi-
the Dominican
Vietnam, China,
of contemporary
r Soviet Union
white immigrant

In 1997, the non-Hispanic white population dropped to 72 percent, while the Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander populations rose to 11 and 4 percent, respectively. In the population estimate made in March 1997, there was no statistically significant differential between non-Hispanic black (12.6 percent) and Latino (11.1 percent) populations. Considering that the majority of the approximately four million illegals are Latinos, Latinos may have already outnumbered non-Hispanic blacks in 1997.

The liberalization of immigration law in 1965 is partly responsible for the mass migration of immigrants from Third World countries in the post-1965 era. But the United States government's military and political linkages with many Latin American, Asian, and Caribbean countries, along with other structural factors, are mainly responsible for the current flow of migration. There is little chance that the immigration laws will be drastically revised in the foreseeable future to substantially reduce the current level of immigration. Further, many researchers have warned that the government cannot stem the tide of the current immigration flow through its policies. If that is the case, Latino and Asian populations will continue to increase, with a concomitant decline in the proportion of the white population. According to population projections, the non-Hispanic white population will be reduced to 53 percent in 2050 while the Latino, black, and Asian American populations will grow to 25 percent, 14 percent, and 8 percent, respectively.

As will be shown in the next section, the contemporary Third World immigrants are concentrated in several states and metropolitan areas, and much more highly concentrated than turn-of-the-century white immigrants. As a result, non-Hispanic whites have already become a numerical minority in several metropolitan cities, including New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Miami. American cities have grown far more multiracial and multiethnic than they were thirty years ago; they will grow racially and ethnically more diverse in the future. Thus the influx of immigrants in the post-1965 era has made American racial and ethnic relations far more complex than before. Many scholars have pointed out that racial and ethnic theories based on the black-white dichotomy cannot explain complex racial and ethnic relations in contemporary America.

Disadvantages for Intergenerational Mobility

Although the contemporary mass migration of Third World people has made American society far more diverse than before, it has not changed the racial stratification system in which white Americans dominate other racial minorities. While descendants of the earlier European immigrants have melted into white society structurally as well as culturally, African Americans and some Latino groups (like Puerto Ricans and Mexicans) have not been incorporated into American society structurally. Civil rights laws enacted in the 1960s have eliminated legal barriers encountered by minority groups; affirmative action programs have given minority members and women some advantages for finding jobs and gaining admission to colleges.

ning in 1880
all. Until the
remacy with
p before the
d States was
immigrants
e late 1960s
ns, while it
population.

and universities. However, blacks and other racial minorities are still subject to prejudice and subtle forms of discrimination. A gradual increase in minority populations and a concomitant decline in the white population in the future may further moderate racial prejudice and discrimination. Yet white racism and racial inequality are unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future.

Thus, the descendants of post-1965 immigrants, with the exception of the descendants of white immigrants, will encounter barriers to social mobility and structural assimilation that the descendants of turn-of-the-century white immigrants did not experience. The children of black immigrants from the Caribbean Basin, and those of lower-class black immigrants in particular, are more likely to assimilate to black Americans than to white Americans, although, as will be discussed below, the social class variable will have effects on the children's socioeconomic adjustments in interaction with race. Overall, the descendants of contemporary Latino immigrants will be better accepted than those of black immigrants. But the children of darker-skinned Latino immigrants, like Dominicans, are likely to encounter more social barriers than light-skinned Latinos and Asian Americans. The 1990 census shows that United States-born Dominican households have a higher poverty rate than their foreign-born counterparts.

As far as socioeconomic adjustments are concerned, Asian Americans seem to do very well. The 1990 census reveals that for all Asian groups, with the exception of Filipinos, the native-born populations fare better than both the foreign-born and white Americans in their socioeconomic status in general and in educational level in particular. However, even second-generation Asian Americans, regardless of their socioeconomic status, are subjected to a moderate level of prejudice by white Americans because of their color. Personal interviews with 1.5¹—and second-generation Asian American adults and their narratives reveal that even native-born Asian American children suffer from prejudice and harassment by white children because of their physical differences. The later-generation descendants of the earlier white immigrants are now accepted as one-hundred-percent Americans. Thus for them ethnic identity is a matter of a personal choice mainly to meet their psychological need to belong to a community. However, even later-generation Asian Americans cannot but accept their ethnic identity because they are not accepted by "real Americans."

The class background of immigrants, along with their race, is an important determinant of their own and their descendants' socioeconomic adjustment. While immigrants' skin color is likely to have long-term effects on the socioeconomic adjustment of not only the second but also later generations, their class background will have positive effects particularly on their children's socioeconomic adaptations. As noted above, the 1884-1930 white immigrants, with the exception of Jews, had heavily rural and lower class backgrounds, lower than the native population in the United States, which partly contributed to their initial adjustment difficulties and their slower intergenerational mobility. By contrast, the vast majority of contemporary immigrants originated from urban areas, with a significant proportion

COMPARING CONTEMPORARY AND NEW IMMIGRANTS

having professional and middle-class backgrounds. Asia, with the exception of Indochinese refugees and Chinese immigrants from mainland China, were predominantly from metropolitan cities. The 1990 census shows that 36 percent of Asian immigrants completed at least four years of college, compared to only 22 percent for the native-born white population. Latino and Caribbean immigrants on average have a higher premigrant class background than both Asian and white Americans. In the 1990 census, only 9 percent of Asian immigrants reported that they completed a four-year college education, and Caribbean migrants in the United States, even prior to migration and they represent a higher class background than the general populations in their home countries.

Segmented assimilation theory proposes that immigrants' social class have combined effects on their locale of residence and determine their children's acculturation patterns. For example, many oldtimers with lower-class backgrounds tend to settle in immigrant enclaves, while professional and middle-class immigrants usually live in white middle-class neighborhoods and assimilate into the mainstream through residential mobility. Asian American and other children who settle in ethnic enclaves may not be fluent in English. These children will have lower socioeconomic mobility in an ethnic community than those who live up in white middle-class neighborhoods are. Proponents of segmented assimilation theory argue that acculturation to the white middle class has positive effects on school performance. Thus, the children of Asian immigrants who settled in white middle-class neighborhoods have higher social mobility in the mainstream economy and higher educational attainment. This mode of adaptation that requires prerequisites for social mobility is a representation of classical assimilationist theorists.

Lower-class immigrants in general and Asian immigrants in particular often settle in inner-city neighborhoods. [Sociologist Alejandro Portes] argues that their settlement in low-income, minority neighborhoods may lead their children to have contact with native-born youth thereby to assimilate to the "adversarial subculture of the inner city." The idea that native-born youth have developed their own subculture "adversarial" to academic achievement was developed in the late 1980s to explain the lower school achievement of blacks. Drawing from these anthropological arguments, segmented assimilation theory proposes that immigrants to the minority youth culture may have lower achievements and thereby their social mobility is limited. Immigrant groups settled in low-income, minority neighborhoods

having professional and middle-class backgrounds. Asian immigrants, with the exception of Indochinese refugees and Chinese immigrants from mainland China, were predominantly from metropolitan cities and were drawn heavily from professional and middle-class segments of the populations. The 1990 census shows that 36 percent of Asian immigrants had completed at least four years of college, compared to only 22 percent of the white population. Latino and Caribbean immigrants on average represent a lower premigrant class background than both Asian immigrants and white Americans. In the 1990 census, only 9 percent of Latino and Caribbean immigrants reported that they completed a four-year college. Yet, Latino and Caribbean migrants in the United States, even illegals, lived in cities prior to migration and they represent a higher class background than the general populations in their home countries.

transfer of resources

Segmented assimilation theory proposes that immigrants' race and social class have combined effects on their locale of residence, which, in turn, determine their children's acculturation patterns. New Asian immigrants and many oldtimers with lower-class backgrounds tend to reside in immigrant enclaves, while professional and middle-class Asian immigrants generally live in white middle-class neighborhoods either through the initial settlement upon immigration or through re-migration from immigrant enclaves. Asian American and other children who live in immigrant enclaves can maintain their language and ethnic culture successfully, although they may not be fluent in English. These children will find an opportunity for socioeconomic mobility in an ethnic community. The children who grow up in white middle-class neighborhoods are likely to acculturate to the white middle class. Proponents of segmented assimilation assume that the acculturation to the white middle class has positive effects on children's school performance. Thus, the children of Asian and other immigrants settled in white middle-class neighborhoods have a greater chance to achieve high social mobility in the mainstream economy through a high level of education. This mode of adaptation that requires acculturation and education as prerequisites for social mobility is a replication of a path suggested by classical assimilationist theorists.

Lower-class immigrants in general and poor Latino and Caribbean immigrants in particular often settle in inner-city, low-income minority neighborhoods. [Sociologist Alejandro] Portes and his associates argue that their settlement in low-income, minority neighborhoods is likely to lead their children to have contact with native-born minority children and thereby to assimilate to the "adversarial subculture developed by marginalized native youth." The idea that native-born minority youth create their own subculture "adversarial" to academic performance was originally developed in the late 1980s to explain the poor academic performance of blacks. Drawing from these anthropological studies, proponents of segmented assimilation theory propose that the acculturation of the children of immigrants to the minority youth culture will block their academic achievements and thereby their social mobility. However, not all immigrant groups settled in low-income, minority neighborhoods are vulnerable to

their children's acculturation to the adversarial subculture. Vietnamese refugees settled in a black neighborhood in New Orleans were able to teach their children immigrant values through strong family and community ties and thereby helped them to resist the adversarial minority youth culture.

Because of the differences in the structure of economic opportunities, education is far more important for social mobility for the children of contemporary immigrants than for those of turn-of-the-century white immigrants. At the beginning of the twentieth century, when the United States economy was in its industrial stage, a large number of well-paying blue-collar jobs were available to the children of immigrants. Thus many second-generation white ethnics were able to achieve intergenerational mobility without getting a higher education. However, the deindustrialization process during recent decades has drastically reduced the proportion of manufacturing and particularly unskilled jobs, while creating a large number of high-paying high-tech and professional occupations. Moreover, the earnings gap between the high earners and the low earners has significantly increased recently. This means that the highly educated children of contemporary immigrants can achieve a high level of intergenerational mobility within one generation—probably from their parents' small business to a computer programmer or a medical doctor—while those with no high school degree do not have an opportunity to find stable jobs.

Social scientists consider a combination of the residents' low education and the disappearance and exodus of low-level blue-collar jobs as major factors for an exceptionally high unemployment rate and poverty in inner-city, low-income black neighborhoods. As noted above, as a result of their acculturation to a local youth culture, the children of Caribbean and Latino immigrants who live in inner-city, minority neighborhoods may not have the motivation to excel in school. These children, like the children of native-born minority members, are likely to be trapped in permanent poverty. Many of their immigrant parents can escape from poverty because they are ready to undertake low-level blue-collar and service-related jobs and work long hours. The second-generation children who do not hold their immigrant parents' values of work and mobility will not accept these unattractive jobs that demand long hours of work. This is why some sociologists predict that a large segment of the new second generation will experience downward mobility.

The New Second Generation's Advantages for Retaining their Ethnic Culture and Remaining Bicultural

Almost all contemporary immigrant parents would want their children to achieve high social mobility while maintaining their ethnic cultural traditions. The above observations indicate that the descendants of post-1965 immigrants are disadvantaged for social assimilation (being accepted as full American citizens) and social mobility compared to those of the earlier white immigrants because of their skin color and a changed economic

structure. While the new second social assimilation and social mobility their ethnic language and culture of contemporary immigrants will than those of turn-of-the-century forces that push the children of co ation. As a result of their retent acculturation, a large proportion descendants of post-1965 immig

Contemporary Immigrants

There are four major reasons that for transmitting their cultural 1880-1930 waves of immigrant higher level of population conc settlement patterns between t based on 1910 and 1990 censu New York metropolitan area w the 1880-1930 era, California the major immigrant state and c ing, considering the fact that major destinations of many Lat of Latinos were concentrated in

Table 1.2 Major foreign-born states and

Year	Major States	Number (in 1,000s)
1910	New York	2,748
	Pennsylvania	1,442
	Illinois	1,205
	Massachusetts	1,059
	Ohio	598
	Michigan	597
	Total	7,649
	U.S. Total	13,516
1990	California	6,459
	New York	2,852
	Florida	1,663
	Texas	1,523
	New Jersey	967
	Illinois	952
	Total	14,416
	U.S. Total	19,767

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910*, Tables 14 and 210 (Washington, D.C., 1912); *Economic Characteristics, United States, Table 32*

structure. While the new second generation have disadvantages for their social assimilation and social mobility, they have advantages for retaining their ethnic language and culture. This does not mean that the descendants of contemporary immigrants will be slower in adopting American culture than those of turn-of-the-century white immigrants. There are also strong forces that push the children of contemporary immigrants toward acculturation. As a result of their retention of ethnic culture and a high level of acculturation, a large proportion of the second- and even third-generation descendants of post-1965 immigrants are likely to remain bicultural.

Contemporary Immigrants' Higher Level of Concentration

There are four major reasons that contemporary immigrants have advantages for transmitting their cultural traditions to their descendants over the 1880-1930 waves of immigrants. First, contemporary immigrants have a higher level of population concentration. Table 1.2 shows the differences in settlement patterns between the earlier and contemporary immigrants based on 1910 and 1990 census reports. While New York State and the New York metropolitan area were the premier immigrant state and city in the 1880-1930 era, California and Los Angeles have replaced New York as the major immigrant state and city in the post-1965 era. This is not surprising, considering the fact that Los Angeles and other California cities are major destinations of many Latino and Asian immigrants. In 1990, 34 percent of Latinos were concentrated in California and 21 percent in the Los Angeles

Table 1.2 Major foreign-born states and metropolitan cities in 1910 and 1990

Year	Major States	Number (in 1,000s)	% of Total Foreign Born	Major Cities	Number (in 1,000s)	% of Total Foreign Born
1910	New York	2,748	20.3	New York	1,944	14.4
	Pennsylvania	1,442	10.7	Chicago	783	5.8
	Illinois	1,205	8.9	Philadelphia	385	2.8
	Massachusetts	1,059	7.8	Boston	243	1.8
	Ohio	598	4.4	Cleveland	196	1.5
	Michigan	597	4.4	San Francisco	142	1.1
	Total	7,649	56.6	Total	3,693	27.4
	U.S. Total	13,516	100.0	U.S. Total	13,516	100.0
1990	California	6,459	32.7	Los Angeles	3,945	19.9
	New York	2,852	14.4	New York	3,554	18.0
	Florida	1,663	8.4	San Francisco	1,251	6.3
	Texas	1,523	7.7	Miami	1,073	5.4
	New Jersey	967	4.9	Chicago	910	4.6
	Illinois	952	4.8	Washington	484	2.4
	Total	14,416	72.9	Total	11,217	56.7
	U.S. Total	19,767	100.0	U.S. Total	19,767	100.0

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Abstracts of the Census*, Tables 14 and 210 (Washington, D.C., 1913); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1990 Census of Population, Social and Economic Characteristics, United States, Table 32 & Metropolitan Areas, Table 32* (Washington, D.C., 1993).

metropolitan area, while 39 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans resided in the state and 18 percent in the city. The concentration of the majority of Cuban immigrants in the Miami area and many other Latino and Caribbean immigrant populations in the area have established Florida as the third largest immigrant state. It is quite natural that a significant proportion of Mexican immigrants have chosen cities in Texas as their destinations.

A more important piece of information from Table 1.2 for the purpose of this article is not the difference in the major destination states and cities between the two waves of immigrants, but the differential levels of concentration of immigrants in particular states and cities. In 1910, approximately 57 percent of the immigrant population resided in six major immigrant states and 27 percent, in six major immigrant cities. By contrast, in 1990 nearly three-fourths of the immigrant population was concentrated in the six major immigrant states and the majority of immigrants lived in six major immigrant cities. Whereas in 1990 four cities had 5 percent or more of the immigrant population, in 1910 only New York and Chicago had such a large proportion of immigrants.

Contemporary immigrants' higher level of residential concentration generally suggests that they have advantages over the earlier immigrant groups for maintaining their language and culture. Yet we need to compare two immigration periods in residential concentration by the country of origin because members of each country of origin group usually share the same language and culture. When examining settlement patterns by the country of origin, we find the differential levels of residential concentration between the two waves of immigrants to be even greater.

Contemporary Latino and Caribbean immigrant groups show extremely high levels of concentration in one or a few cities. For example, 70 percent of Guyanese, over 60 percent of Dominicans, 50 percent of Ecuadorians, and 45 percent of Jamaicans who immigrated to the United States between 1982 and 1989 chose New York City as their destination. The 1990 census shows that each of the three largest Latino groups is highly concentrated in a metropolitan area: 56 percent of Cubans in the Miami-Fort Lauderdale area, 47 percent of Puerto Ricans in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area, and 28 percent of Mexicans in the Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside area. However, with the exception of Jews in New York, the major immigrant groups at the turn of the century did not have levels of residential concentration in one or a few areas comparable to those of contemporary immigrant groups. Russian, Italian, Irish, and Hungarian immigrants composed major non-Protestant immigrant groups at the turn of the century, and all had the largest population concentration in New York City. But their New York City concentration rates in 1910 respectively were 30 percent for Russians (mostly Jews), 26 percent for Italians, 19 percent for Irish, and 16 percent for Hungarians.

Latino immigrants, who compose the largest panethnic² group in many cities, share a common language. Consequently, they have an advantage over both the earlier white immigrant groups and other contemporary immigrant groups for transmitting their language to their children. Already in

1990, Latinos comprised 24 percent of the population in Los Angeles and 40 percent of the population in Los Angeles, United States, while they composed the majority in many other cities, El Paso (69 percent), Miami (61 percent), and San Antonio (56 percent). They comprise a significant proportion of the population in many other major cities, including Houston and Chicago. Latinos in these cities have access to television and radio channels. In these and other small cities, Spanish is often used as a language of commerce and the virtue of a large Latino population, Spanish is an important foreign language in American public life. Thus, descendants of Latino immigrants can maintain their language more easily than other immigrant groups.

Contemporary Immigrants' Greater Proximity to Home Countries

Latino and Caribbean immigrant groups have maintained stronger ties to their home countries than the earlier white immigrant groups in transit to their children partly because of their closer proximity to their home countries. The earlier immigrants chose New York and other East Coast cities as their destinations in the United States—as their destinations. Even though they were physically so far away from Europe that they had little direct linkage to their home countries. By contrast, contemporary Caribbean immigrants are generally settled in cities close to their home countries. Mexican immigrants are concentrated in the border states, such as California, where they are within a matter of one or a few hours from their home country. Miami, which is only 90 miles from Havana, is a major destination for Cuban immigrants in Miami currently do not maintain strong ties to their home country. Yet the situation will change as Cuban political relations improve in the future. Caribbean immigrants maintain stronger ties to their home countries than both the earlier white immigrant groups and other immigrant groups because of the geographical proximity of Latin America and the Caribbean Islands and the United States, Miami, and Los Angeles.

Contemporary Immigrants' Stronger Sociocultural Ties to Home Countries

As noted above, contemporary Latino and Caribbean immigrants have stronger sociocultural ties with their home countries than the earlier white immigrant groups. However, the greater physical proximity of contemporary immigrants' multiple li-

1990, Latinos comprised 24 percent of the population in New York City and 40 percent of the population in Los Angeles, the two largest cities in the United States, while they composed the majority of the population in three other cities, El Paso (69 percent), Miami (63 percent), and San Antonio (56 percent). They comprise a significant proportion of the population in many other major cities, including Houston, Dallas, San Diego, and Chicago. Latinos in these cities have access to several Spanish-language TV and radio channels. In these and other smaller cities with a large Latino population, Spanish is often used as a language for business transactions. By virtue of a large Latino population, Spanish has been adopted as the most important foreign language in American public schools for several decades. Thus, descendants of Latino immigrants can learn the Spanish language more easily than other immigrant groups.

Contemporary Immigrants' Greater Proximity to Their Home Countries

Latino and Caribbean immigrant groups have an additional advantage over the earlier white immigrant groups in transmitting their language and culture to their children partly because of their settlement in the cities much closer to their home countries. The earlier European immigrants usually chose New York and other East Coast cities—the gateways from Europe to the United States—as their destinations. Even these “Atlantic bridges” were physically so far away from Europe that the immigrants had little immediate linkage to their home countries. By contrast, the post-1965 Latino and Caribbean immigrants are generally settled in the destinations physically close to their home countries. Mexican immigrants, who compose approximately one-fourth of the total post-1965 immigrants, are heavily concentrated in the border states, such as California, Texas, and Arizona. The Mexicans settled in the former Mexican territory can visit their home cities within a matter of one or a few hours. Most Cuban immigrants settled in Miami, which is only 90 miles from Havana. For political reasons, Cubans in Miami currently do not maintain strong sociocultural ties with their home country. Yet the situation will change drastically when United States-Cuban political relations improve in the future. Other Latino and Caribbean immigrants maintain stronger ties with their home countries than both the earlier white immigrant groups and even contemporary Asian immigrant groups because of the geographical closeness between Latin America and the Caribbean Islands and such American cities as New York, Miami, and Los Angeles.

Contemporary Immigrants' Stronger Transnational Ties

As noted above, contemporary Latino and Caribbean immigrants maintain stronger sociocultural ties with their home countries partly because of their greater physical proximity. However, the major factor that contributes to contemporary immigrants' multiple linkages to their homelands is not

their geographical closeness but their transnational ties, made possible by technological advances in communication, transportation, and the mass media. The turn-of-the-century white immigrants also maintained transnational ties with their home countries. They usually sent letters to their relatives and friends in their homelands. Many immigrants at that time were male sojourners who left their spouses and children at home. They sent remittances to their family members regularly. Some of the immigrants even visited their home countries to see their relatives and friends, buy land, and/or bring back their spouses.

However, by virtue of advanced technologies, contemporary immigrants maintain high levels of transnational ties with their home countries unimaginable to earlier immigrants. The only means of communication between immigrants and their relatives in the home country in Europe at the turn of the century was sending letters, which took several weeks for delivery. By contrast, contemporary immigrants can communicate with their relatives and friends in the home country almost every day, using long-distance telephone calls, fax messages, and electronic mail. The affordability of long-distance calls, in particular, has had revolutionary effects on contemporary immigrants' communication patterns with their relatives left behind in their homeland. A 1996 survey in New York revealed that about one-third of Korean immigrants talked to their relatives in Korea at least once a week while half communicated by phone once or twice a month.

The entry of steamships into the immigrant trade in the mid-nineteenth century led to a drastic reduction in the length of passage from Europe to America. Yet the trans-Atlantic voyage at the turn of the century still took approximately two weeks. Because of great expense, time, and the threat of accidents and epidemics involved in the voyage, only a relatively small minority of immigrants visited their home countries to take care of important matters. By contrast, the international air travel connecting contemporary immigrants' American destinations to their home cities in the Third World is far less expensive, far more convenient, and much faster than turn-of-the-century trans-Atlantic voyages. Most Latino and Caribbean immigrants in New York can fly to their home cities within four to six hours, while Asian immigrants in Los Angeles need to spend only seven to nine hours to visit their home cities in Asia. As a result, contemporary immigrants exchange visits with their relatives and friends at home regularly—to celebrate a parent's birthday, participate in a brother's wedding, or enjoy a vacation. In fact, some immigrants move back and forth between American destinations and Third World cities while others maintain commuter marriages, with wives and children remaining in American cities and husbands working in Third World cities.

Finally, great improvements in media technologies during the last two decades have given contemporary immigrants access to active ethnic media—ethnic dailies and weeklies and ethnic radio and TV stations. The earlier immigrants did establish a number of ethnic newspapers. Yet, as they did not have communication channels with their home countries on a daily basis, the ethnic media could not provide the earlier immigrants with day-to-day news from their homelands. By contrast, the ethnic media today

tie immigrants to their homelands by their homelands. Ethnic TV programs, ethnic movies and TV programs on community in New York has four Korean branches of major dailies in Korea, headquarters in Seoul. There are also Korean radio stations in the Korean language programs 24 hours as well as in other major Korean language ethnic media for news. Their heavy dependence on the media and their ties to the ethnic community, by virtue of temporary technological advances, have similarly active ethnic media, which have strengthened the origin community at multiple levels.

To sum up the preceding discussion, international travel, telecommunication, and the ability of immigrants to maintain active and continuous ties with their community of origin, overcome the geographical boundary. Because of the active ties of immigrants in the home country, second-generation immigrants have taken measures to preserve their residents' cultural, social, and political ties. Several major source countries, such as the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, and Columbia, have encouraged their residents' dual citizenship.

Strong transnational ties between immigrants' destination and origin communities, but also their children to their origin community. Second-generation children maintain ties with their origin community through the language instruction. Ethnic TV stations offer such information, and is popularized, immigrant parents return to their origin countries during summer vacation. A 1989 survey showed that 40 percent of school students in New York had visited Korea twice, while 30 percent of Caribbean and Latino second-generation children had visited their home countries more frequently than their counterparts. In addition, second-generation children are familiar with pop songs, even if they may

tie immigrants to their homelands by supplying them with daily news from their homelands. Ethnic TV programs also offer contemporary immigrants ethnic movies and TV programs on videotape. For example, the Korean community in New York has four Korean-language dailies, all of which, as branches of major dailies in Korea, republish articles published in their headquarters in Seoul. There are also two Korean TV stations and two Korean radio stations in the Korean community in New York, which air Korean-language programs 24 hours a day. Korean immigrants in New York as well as in other major Korean communities depend mainly on the Korean-language ethnic media for news, information, and leisure activities. Their heavy dependence on the ethnic media, in turn, has strengthened their ties to the ethnic community and the home country. By virtue of contemporary technological advances, other immigrant groups have developed similarly active ethnic media, which, in turn, tie immigrants to the homeland and the origin community at multiple levels.

To sum up the preceding discussions, technological improvements in international travel, telecommunications, and the media help contemporary immigrants to maintain active and continuous contacts with the homeland and community of origin, overcoming any barriers deriving from the physical boundary. Because of the active and sustained involvement of immigrants in the home country, several source countries of United States immigrants have taken measures in recent years to strengthen their overseas residents' cultural, social, and political ties to the home country. Recently, several major source countries, including Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and Columbia, have passed laws that recognize their American residents' dual citizenship.

Strong transnational ties between host and home countries, and between destination and origin communities, help not only contemporary immigrants but also their children to maintain their ethnic subculture and identity. Second-generation children can learn their ethnic language formally through the language instruction provided by ethnic TV stations, as most ethnic TV stations offer such instruction. Moreover, as international air travel is popularized, immigrant parents send their children to their home countries during summer vacation to help them learn the language and culture. A 1989 survey showed that 80 percent of American-born Korean high school students in New York had visited Korea at least once and that 20 percent had visited Korea twice or more. Because of physical proximity, Caribbean and Latino second-generation children seem to visit their parental home countries more frequently than their Korean and Asian American counterparts. In addition, popularization of video and music tapes helps second-generation children watch ethnic-language movies and learn ethnic pop songs, even if they may not be fluent in their mother tongues.

Multicultural Policy since the Early 1970s

Multicultural policy is another factor that gives contemporary immigrant groups advantages over earlier white immigrants in transmitting their

language and culture to their children. The dominant social policy in the United States up to the 1960s had been Anglo conformity, according to which immigrants and members of minority groups should replace their language with English and their cultural patterns with those of British origin. The Anglo conformity policy or ideology was most influentially expressed in the Americanization movement that tried to force immigrants and their children to get rid of their cultural traditions and to accept American culture as soon as possible. The Americanization movement reached its peak during World War I after a large number of immigrants from Eastern and Southern European countries had arrived. Squads of women were sent out "on home visits to immigrants, telling them to create a more 'American' household by preparing 'non-ethnic' foods, modifying their grooming and personal hygiene habits, and advocating the use of English in the home." The English language was associated with being "American" and "patriotic," and bilingualism was interpreted as a sign of disloyalty to the United States. In this context, one major function of public schools was to Americanize immigrant children and children of immigrants by teaching them English and inculcating American values.

However, since the early 1970s all levels of government—the federal government in particular—and local school districts have changed their policies toward minority members and immigrants from "Anglo conformity" to cultural pluralism. The policy changes were partly in response to various minority movements—the civil rights movement, the black cultural nationalist movement, the Chicano movement, and the Third World students' movement—and the women's movement, and partly in response to the influx of new immigrants from Third World countries. Probably the most noteworthy event in the United States government's multicultural policy in the early 1970s was the *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court decision. In 1974, the Supreme Court declared that students with limited English proficiency were to be given special remedial aid to facilitate their learning of English. Armed with the landmark Supreme Court decision, the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare established a series of guidelines to require all school districts to provide bilingual education programs for "language minority children." In addition to bilingual programs, public schools have changed their curriculum by including more courses related to minority groups' language, history, and culture. They have also tried to promote cultural diversity through such extracurricular activities as ethnic festivals and symposiums on minority groups to foster ethnic pride.

Colleges and universities, too, have done a great deal to increase ethnic diversity in curricular and extracurricular activities. As a result of the influx of nonwhite immigrants and minority groups' improvement in education, colleges and universities have become racially and ethnically far more diverse than before. Employment through affirmative action programs and establishment of ethnic, area, and women's studies programs have also increased the number and proportion of minority and women faculty members. Under pressure from minority and women students and faculty

members, many colleges and curriculum by including women in traditional liberal arts, relating to the experiences of ethnic and women's studies. This resulted in a significant re-

There have been some response to the rapid immigration, more than a dozen states have passed laws that recognize the contributions of immigrants. California passed a referendum that encouraged intellectuals have attacked public institutions. Despite these efforts, governments and schools are still struggling with the policy. For example, in New York, teachers try actively to promote and glorify the city's multiculturalism and are likely to strengthen racial diversity in the future, particularly because of the growing population. The children of immigrants face challenges for retaining their identity at the turn of the century.

Bili

New immigrants replace the old in their homeland and thus the loss of ethnic cultural traditions. The century immigrant group's tradition is that their immigration peaked in the 1930s and did not revive until the current immigration flow sharply in the foreseeable future. Of post-1965 immigrants, the white immigrant group is the largest.

I have thus far examined contemporary immigration over those of the early century, that the children of immigrants are becoming a majority. In fact, these children are more American culture than their parents. For two major reasons. First, they have a stronger effect on the turn of the century, and second, the children are more American than before. Children are in preventing their children from becoming immigrant parents or

members, many colleges and universities have revised the white-male-oriented curriculum by including contributions made by people of color and women in traditional liberal arts courses and adding numerous courses pertaining to the experiences of minority groups and women. Establishment of ethnic and women's studies programs on many campuses in particular has resulted in a significant revision of the traditional curriculum.

There have been some conservative reactions to multiculturalism. In response to the rapid increase in the non-English speaking immigrant population, more than a dozen states, including California and Florida, have passed laws that recognize English as the standard language. In 1998, California passed a referendum to abolish bilingual education. Conservative intellectuals have attacked multicultural education in higher educational institutions. Despite these reactionary movements and measures, both governments and schools are currently strongly committed to the multicultural policy. For example, in New York City, local officials, social workers, and teachers try actively to promote festivals and events to foster ethnic pride and glorify the city's multiethnic character. Both governments and schools are likely to strengthen rather than moderate the multicultural policy in the future, particularly because of the continuous increase in the non-white population. The children of contemporary immigrants have distinct advantages for retaining their ethnic culture over those of the earlier immigrants at the turn of the century because of the multicultural policy.

Bilingual and Bicultural Orientations

New immigrants replenish the ethnic community with the culture of the homeland and thus the continuity of immigration is essential to maintaining ethnic cultural traditions. One of the major reasons why turn-of-the-century immigrant groups have almost completely lost their ethnic cultural traditions is that their immigration almost came to an end around the early 1930s and did not revive for a long period of time. As previously noted, the current immigration flow is not likely to come to an end or even decline sharply in the foreseeable future. This is another reason why the descendants of post-1965 immigrants will be more successful than those of the earlier white immigrant groups in retaining their cultural traditions.

I have thus far examined several factors that give the children of contemporary immigrants advantages for preserving their cultural traditions over those of the earlier immigrants. However, I do not intend to suggest that the children of contemporary immigrants have disadvantages for acculturation. In fact, these children are under greater pressure to assimilate to American culture than the children of turn-of-the-century immigrants, for two major reasons. First, the media, American peers, and schools currently have a stronger effect on the behavior and attitude of children than at the turn of the century, while immigrant parents have less control over their children than before. Contemporary immigrant parents may be less effective in preventing their children from being culturally Americanized than the immigrant parents one hundred years ago, particularly because, a much

larger proportion of contemporary immigrant mothers work full-time outside the home. Second, the children of today's immigrants have a greater pressure to assimilate to American culture than their counterparts a century ago partly because of the global influence of American popular culture today. Due to the presence of American servicemen, multinational corporations, and/or media in their home countries, most contemporary immigrants from Third World countries, including immigrant children, became familiar with American mass culture prior to migration.

My argument that the children of contemporary immigrants have advantages over those of the earlier immigrants for both retaining their ethnic culture and acculturating to American society may sound contradictory to many readers. But it is not contradictory because retention of ethnic culture and acculturation are not always mutually exclusive. Classical assimilationists proposed a zero sum model of acculturation, according to which immigrants' acculturation involves a gradual replacement of their ethnic culture with American culture. As indicated elsewhere, although the zero sum model may be useful as a description of the Anglo conformist policy or ideology up to the 1960s, it is not helpful in understanding the experiences of contemporary immigrants and their children. Contemporary immigrants can achieve a high level of acculturation while maintaining their ethnic culture almost perfectly, whereas their Americanized children can achieve a high level of ethnic attachment. A large proportion of the descendants of post-1965 immigrants—much larger than those of the turn-of-the-century-immigrants—are likely to remain fluently bilingual and strongly bicultural because of the factors described above: their high ethnic and panethnic concentration in a particular city, their proximity to and transnational ties to their parents' home countries, and multicultural policy.

A more systematic survey study of ethnic attachment among the descendants of post-1965 immigrants is needed to test the validity of the above bilingual, bicultural hypothesis. However, both quantitative and qualitative data available at present seem to support the hypothesis. David Lopez analyzed the Public Use Sample of the 1989 Current Population Survey to examine intergenerational language maintenance and shift among Latino and Asian populations in Los Angeles. According to his analysis, 53 percent of second-generation Hispanics 25–44 years old spoke English “very well” but used their ethnic language at home, in comparison to 19 percent of their Asian American counterparts. It also showed that 47 percent of third- and later-generation Latino adults (natives of natives) and 11 percent of their Asian American counterparts were fluent in English but used their ethnic language at home.

The Latino and Asian American adults who can speak English very well but use their ethnic language at home are bilinguals. As expected, Latinos show a much higher rate of intergenerational transmission of their ethnic language than Asian Americans. But even third-generation Asian Americans include a higher proportion of bilinguals (11 percent) than expected from studies of the descendants of the 1880–1930 wave of immigrants, according to which “by the third generation, knowledge of an ethnic language beyond

a few words and phrases is often lost.”¹ occurred between 1885 and 1924, rou migration period. A major survey study of the early 1960s reveals that only 2 percent reported that they spoke Japanese. American respondents (25–44 years of age) in the 1965 Population Survey were born and grew up in the United States. Thus, structural factors facilitating the retention of ethnic language are discussed in this article. Accordingly, the descendants of post-1965 Latino and Asian immigrants are likely to retain their ethnic language. The sample of the 1989 Current Population Survey pre-1965 Latino and Asian immigrants.

Research on the descendants of the immigrants with a commonsense assumption support that lower-class family background and lower socioeconomic status are associated with lower retention of ethnic language. However, recent studies of the children of immigrants show that fluent bilingualism is highly correlated with higher socioeconomic status. The children who have grown up to be fluent in their ethnic language but remain bilingual in their ethnic language and English in bilingual families in a suburban with resources to make their children fluent in both languages and high-income business families in New York enroll their children in bilingual schools. Some of them send them to Korea for a Korean summer vacation. Some of them send them to college in Korea for a long-term study. Many of them are 1.5- and second-generation young adults, including those married to native-born Americans, with bilingual orientations, although a large proportion are from lower- and upper-middle-class neighborhoods and universities.

1. Born outside the United States and immigrated to the United States.
2. People of many different national origins who speak a common language—that serves potentially to unite them.

Public
vs.
Private

a few words and phrases is often lost." The earlier Japanese immigration occurred between 1885 and 1924, roughly during the European mass migration period. A major survey study of Japanese Americans conducted in the early 1960s reveals that only 2 percent of the third-generation respondents reported that they spoke Japanese fluently. The Latino and Asian American respondents (25–44 years old) included in the 1989 Current Population Survey were born and grew up before the mass influx of post-1965 Latino and Asian immigrants. Thus, they did not benefit fully from the structural factors facilitating the retention of their ethnic language discussed in this article. Accordingly, the descendants of post-1965 Latino and Asian immigrants are likely to retain their ethnic language more successfully than the sample of the 1989 Current Population Survey, the descendants of the pre-1965 Latino and Asian immigrant cohorts.

Research on the descendants of the earlier white immigrant groups and a commonsense assumption support a view that bilingualism is associated with lower-class family background and residence in an immigrant enclave. However, recent studies of the children of post-1965 immigrants suggest that fluent bilingualism is highly correlated with a professional family background. The children who have grown up in an immigrant enclave may be fluent in their ethnic language but may not be fluent in English. Yet professional families in a suburban white middle-class neighborhood have resources to make their children fluent bilinguals. Many Korean professional and high-income business families in a white, middle-class neighborhood in New York enroll their children in Saturday ethnic language schools and send them to Korea for a Korean cultural program regularly during the summer vacation. Some of them send their college-graduated children to college in Korea for a long-term ethnic education. Personal narratives by 1.5- and second-generation young Asian American professionals reveal that many, including those married to white partners, have strong bicultural and binational orientations, although all grew up in predominantly white, middle- and upper-middle-class neighborhoods and graduated from prestigious universities.

Notes

1. Born outside the United States and immigrated as children.
2. People of many different national origins who share a common trait—in this example, the Spanish language—that serves potentially to unite them; a group composed of many different ethnic groups.