LEARNING A NEW LAND:
IMMIGRANT STUDENTS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

ON-LINE SUPPLEMENT NOTES

Carola Suarez-Orozco

Marcelo Suarez-Orozco

Irina Todorova

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[1] **Sending Country Contexts** *(page 7)*

<u>*Migration from Mexico.*</u>

Mexicans lived on both sides of the current border long before the United States became the country it is today (Suárez-Orozco, M. and Paez, M., 2002). After the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (see below), many Mexicans found themselves on the U.S. side of the border – without ever moving. From its very beginning, Mexican migration was stimulated by U.S. employers' need for labor. Mexican migrants were the workers of choice during labor shortages in the western half of the United States. The Chinese Exclusion Act (1882), the exclusion of Japanese workers (1907), and the ebb in European migration during the First World War created the context for the first large-scale migration of Mexican workers to the United States. While the Great Depression froze the flow of new migrants, World War Two opened the gates once more (Gonzalez, S., Bean, F., Latapi, A. and Weintraub, S., 1998). The need for Mexican workers during the war led to the *Bracero* program (1943-1964), which sanctioned temporary Mexican migration to the United States. But the Bracero program did more than solve a temporary labor shortage: it began slowly to generate a momentum that led to a new pattern of large-scale permanent Mexican migration to the United States. The new social networks established during the Bracero years, the new appetite of Mexican workers for American wages, an emerging predilection for Mexican workers by American employers, and the deep Mexican crises of the 1980s and 1990s proved to be the high octane driving the current and largest migration movement in the history of the United States. Indeed, Mexican migration thoroughly dominates the so-called "new immigration" to the United States (See the various essays in Suárez-Orozco, M. 1998).

With a total land area of 1,972,550 square kilometers (about three times the size of Texas) and a population of 106,202,903 (July 2005), Mexico and the United States are eternally tied by geography (3,141 miles of shared border), history (on February 2, 1848 at the signing of Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexico lost 55 percent of its territory to the United States, including present-day Arizona, California, New Mexico, Texas, and parts of Colorado, Nevada and Utah), and demography (of the over 26 million Mexican-origin population of the US, approximately, 11 million were born in Mexico, which represents roughly a third of all immigrants in the nation) (U.S. Census Bureau. 2006. *The 2005 American Community Survey.* http://www.census.gov/acs. Internet Release Date August 2006).

Yet the border divides two profoundly different societies. With a median age of 24.93 years (the U.S. median age is 36.27 years) and a fertility rate of 2.45 children born per woman (the U.S. rate is 2.08 children born per woman), Mexico is a richly complex country that eludes facile generalizations. While it is largely a conservative and Catholic country, it also contains rich cultural, ethnic, and linguistic pluralities in which the "mixing" of peoples and traditions (*mestizaje*) has been normative for centuries. A country plagued by deep and growing inequalities, Mexico is undergoing profound social transformations and rapid economic growth. A sudden devaluation of the peso in the mid 1990s left well over 40 percent of the population below the poverty rate, sending Mexico into a deep recession and creating economic upheaval felt well beyond its borders, with the so called "tequila effect" felt from Canada in the north all the way to Argentina in the south. It is not a coincidence that during Mexico's crisis of the1990s, the United States saw the greatest numbers of new immigrants in its history with Mexico leading the way. Nearly all the families in our study brought up "*la crisis*" when talking about the decision to migrate.

Mexico's entry into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in the mid 1990s has had paradoxical effects, resulting in a tripling of trade with Canada and the United States but also an exacerbation of Mexico's internal and regional inequalities. NAFTA has created massive changes, especially in the rural sector, sending millions of displaced workers to look for work elsewhere, often north of the border. Post-NAFTA, the Mexican economy reached over a trillion dollars and is now even more deeply enmeshed with the U.S. economy than before: fully 81 percent of its exports go to the United States, and 66 percent of its imports come from the United States (Dussel, E., 1998).

The Bureau of the Census estimates that in 2005 there were approximately 11 million Mexican immigrants living in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006). In the year 2000 ,about 2.6 of the adult Mexican immigrant population had a bachelor's degree and about 15 percent had attained a high school education. Almost half (48.3 percent) have had less than a ninth-grade education. According to U.S. census data, 8.1 percent of all Mexican immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations and about 25 percent in the service economy. Approximately a quarter (24.4 percent) of all Mexican immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000).

Migration from El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Honduras.

Our Central American sample consisted of 28 participants from El Salvador; 17 participants from Guatemala; 10 participants from Nicaragua; and 2 participants from Honduras. The Central American participants, like the Mexican participants, were recruited in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The nations of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua – along with Belize, Costa Rica, and Panama, collectively known as Central America (540,000 square kilometers, or slightly less than twice the area of Colorado), sit south of the Gulf of Mexico in the fertile landmass between Mexico and Colombia. This disparate region, a center without a center (Womack 1983: ix), is a land of paradoxes. The great volcanic lands of Central America have been blessed by their rich soil and cursed with eruptions and earthquakes. The fertile volcanic lands and the ingenious agricultural and political traditions of the native peoples made possible the rise of magnificent pre-Columbian civilizations in Central America, including the once-thriving Maya empire.

A geologic feature of the region -- the fact that it occupies the narrowest distance between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans – has likewise blessed and cursed these lands. From the beginning of the its encounter with European – and, eventually, American – powers, the region's strategic importance as a passageway between the two great oceans made it a node of global exchanges, ever vulnerable to foreign incursions. The decline of the Spanish and British empires led to the steady ascendancy and eventual triumph of American interests in this region fractured by geology, history, and politics (Womack 1983).

As Walter La Fever, the eminent historian of American foreign policy, has claimed, "from Thomas Jefferson to Ronald Reagan, no part of the world has been more vital to the United States, or less understood by most Americans" (LeFeber 1984, p.5) than Central America. Understood or not, soon it became colloquially known as "America's backyard," because of the United State's near-total control – economic, military, and political -- of the region. A pattern of domination by the "colossus of the North" (Coatsworth 1994) created the unsavory "banana republics" where U.S. fruit companies, especially the United Fruit Company, were the arbiters of power (See Schlesinger and Kinzer 1999), perfecting a political sensibility that historian John Womack, Jr. aptly termed "banana fascism."(Womack, 1983: xi).

The United States dominated the region's economic fortunes and political processes for much of the twentieth century, either via direct military intervention, with U.S. Marines

invading the region multiple times, or by establishing puppet regimes like the Somoza dynasty in Nicaragua. "He is a sonofabitch," said Franklin D. Roosevelt of the dictator Anastasio Somoza, "but he's ours" (Womack,. 1983: xi). By the second half of the twentieth century, various national liberation movements began to challenge deep-rooted inequities and the social and environmental devastation left by centuries of exploitation by outside powers and their native proxies. But it was when the Central American nations began to play a serious role in the Cold War that the region moved from its "backyard" to "front burner" status.

The region heated up very fast. Indeed, by the early 1980s LaFeber would write, "No area in the world is more tightly integrated into the United States political-economic system, and none – as President Reagan warned a joint session of Congress in April 1983 – more vital for North American security than Central America" (LaFeber 1984: 5). The various insurgencies (some inspired and supported by Cuba and the former Soviet Union) and counter-insurgencies (all supported by the United States) led to the increasing militarization of the region, culminating in full-scale low-intensity warfare in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. The conflict in Central America had hemispheric repercussions involving both regular and irregular forces all the way from the United States to Argentina.

The militarization of Central America during the last chapter of the Cold War resulted in massive social trauma. There were an estimated 200,000 politically motivated killings in Guatemala --part of an arguably genocidal campaign against the Maya-origin peasant population, and an estimated 75,000 political killings in El Salvador (mostly of noncombatant civilians) – with much of the killing taking place in the 1980s. By the early 1980s, the intensification of Cold War tensions in Central America and increased direct U.S. involvement in the conflict generated unprecedented population displacements and stimulated new migratory flows. In Guatemala alone, approximately 1 million people were displaced from their homes. While during the 1960s and again briefly in 1980 (more than 129,000 Cuban *Marielitos* arrived in Florida over the course of a few weeks), Cubans had dominated the Latin America refugee experience in the United States, the 1980s were characterized by large-scale emigration from war-torn areas in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, and, to a lesser extent, Honduras. By the year 2000, 1.7 million Central Americans made the United States their home (US Census Bureau, 2000). By the mid-1990's, "one in every six Salvadoreans" was living in the United States (Mahler, S., 1995, p.37). United States involvement in Central America intensified the conflicts and fueled new refugee and migratory waves. A rough formula might be applied: A decade after U.S. intervention, a million asylum seekers, refugees, and immigrants from that area of the world had permanently settled in the United States. Indeed, just as it was the case in the earlier U.S. involvement in Vietnam, more than a million new asylum seekers and migrants fled Central America during the 1980s and now make the United States their home (see Suárez-Orozco, 1989).

Over the past century, Central Americans have been leaving a continent rich in culture, natural resources, and beauty but poor in terms of economic social development, and human rights. It is a region of startling inequalities. A few social and economic indicators reveal the breadth of the region's "distribution of sadness" (Vélez-Ibánez, 1996). In the 1990s, when Central Americans were heading "*hacia el Norte*" in big numbers, the GNP per capita was $1,671 for El Salvador, $1,337 for Guatemala, $672 for Honduras, and $379 for Nicaragua – compared with $27,550 for the United States (Suárez-Orozco & Paez, 2002). It has been estimated that the "average U.S. cat eats more beef than the average person in Central America" (Barry and Preusch, 1986, p. 142). In 1995, at the time of the *"exodo"* from Central America, life expectancy was 63.9 years for women in El Salvador and 67.6 years for men; 59.4 for women in Guatemala and 55.1 for men; 67.7 for women in Nicaragua and 64.8 for men;

70.1 for women in Honduras and 65.4 for men –compared with 78.8 years for women and 72.2 years for men in the United States (Wilkie, Alemán, and Ortega, 2000). More than 60 percent of the Guatemalan population, more than half of the Nicaraguan population, and more than a third of the Honduran population have had no schooling – compared to 0.6 percent of the U.S. population (Wilkie, Alemán, and Ortega, 2000). Increasing inequalities coupled with the extraordinary burden of meeting foreign debt payments have made it so that most of the region "was still staggering" in the beginning of the new century (See Skidmore and Smith, 2001).

According to the Bureau of the Census, in 2005 there are more than one million Salvadorian immigrants living in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006). Approximately 5 percent of the adult Salvadorian immigrant population have a bachelor's degree, and about 17 percent have attained a high school education. Census data suggest that a large number of Salvadorians in the United States – more than 41 percent – have had less than a ninth-grade education. According to U.S. census data, 9.5 percent of all Salvadorian immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional, and related occupations, and about 32 percent in the service economy. Approximately 19.2 percent of all Salvadorian immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000.)

Most recent estimates (2005) reveal that over 500,000 Guatemalan immigrants living in the United States (US Bureau of the Census, March CPS Supplements (adjusted for undercount), 2005 (courtesy of the Pew Hispanic Center, September 2006). About 6 percent of the adult Guatemalan immigrant population has a bachelor's degree and 17.6 percent have attained a high school education. According to census data, almost 43 percent of Guatemalan adults in the United States have had less than a ninth-grade education. U.S. Census materials suggest that 9.8 percent of all Guatemalan immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional, and related occupations and nearly 30 percent in the service economy. Approximately 20 percent of all Guatemalan immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000,)

According to the Bureau of the Census, in 2005 there were nearly 400,000 Honduran immigrants living in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006). Approximately 8 percent of the adult Honduran immigrant population has a bachelor's degree and 20 percent have attained a high school education. Census data reveal that over 35 percent of Honduran adults in the US have had less than a ninth-grade education. According to U.S. Census data, 10 percent of all Honduran immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations and about 28 percent in the service economy. Approximately 22 percent of all Honduran immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000.)

Bureau of the Census data for 2005 reveal that there are slightly more than 220,000 Nicaraguan immigrants living in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006). About 13 percent of the adult Nicaraguan immigrant population has a bachelor's degree, and 22.7 percent have attained a high school education. Slightly more than 19 percent of Nicaraguan adults in the United States have had less than a ninth- grade education. U.S. Census data suggest that more than 17 percent of all Nicaraguan immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations, 28 percent in sales and office occupations, and 22.8 percent in the service economy. Some 15.3 percent of all Nicaraguan immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000.)

Haitian and Dominican Migration

Sitting between the Caribbean Sea and the North Atlantic Ocean, the small island of Hispaniola became, by accidents of history, the epicenter of the wave of globalization that began to gain momentum with the arrival of Columbus on its shores in 1492. The island's history and character have been shaped by four defining experiences: 1) a colonial period that included the extermination of the original inhabitants, the Arawak or Taino peoples, by the Europeans and the establishment of strict hierarchies of power, privilege, and attendant inequalities; 2) the various and almost constant transnational flows of voluntary migrants and involuntary slaves, of cultures, of capital, and of goods and services; 3) a succession of foreign powers – Spanish, French, Dutch, American – vying for hegemonic ascendancy to control the region's natural and strategic resources; and 4) a legacy of reprisals from other nations for being the first independent black nation. Taken together, these legacies have defined the island's economy and society for centuries.

Both Spain and later (in 1697) France laid claims to the island, which eventually became a divided home with two republics: the Dominican Republic and, in the western third of the island, the Republic of Haiti. Having quickly destroyed the native population, the Europeans turned to massive slavery so that they could develop and extract the island's wealth. In Haiti, the French developed a powerful and wealthy economy based on the twin evils of human and the environmental exploitation. The French administration lasted about a century. In 1804, Haiti's slave population declared its independence after a long revolt, giving birth to the first black republic in the world. That painful birth left the proud new republic threatened by political violence, chronic poverty, and environmental degradation, conditions that have endured for the past two centuries. Much of Haiti's continuous poverty can be attributed to the long history of sanctions, embargos, and reprisals from the United States, France, and other nations for Haiti's audacity in daring to become a free black nation.

Haiti, a small country of 27,750 square kilometers, about the size of Maryland, is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Approximately 80 percent of the population lives in poverty, and its literacy rate (the proportion of the population 15 years and older that can read and write) is 53 percent (CIA-The World Fact Book, 2006). An enduring regime of what Paul Farmer calls "structural violence" (Farmer, P., 2003) has driven Haitians to migrate for centuries. More recently, it is estimated that the migration current that began to build in the second half of the twentieth century eventually sent well over a million Haitians as migrants and asylum seekers to the United States, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Canada, France, and elsewhere.

The Haitian-origin population of the United States has grown significantly over the last half century. Former President Jean-Baptiste Aristide once said to a group of our students at Harvard that he "was happy to be back in the Tenth Department" (Haiti is divided into nine administrative Départments, making the Haitian Diaspora in the United States, symbolically, its tenth department.) Each wave of new arrivals has been characterized by distinct socioeconomic profiles and has faced different challenges in the United States. Over the second half of the twentieth century, Haitians escaping "Papa Doc" Duvalier's terrorist regime (1957-1971) tended to be highly educated members of the elite who saw themselves as temporary migrants eager to return home when politics allowed it. Few ever did. Over time the Haitian migration flow was democratized, and by the 1970s larger numbers of the Haitian popular classes began entering the migration stream in significant numbers. By the early 1980s, more than 100,000 Haitian "boat people" arrived in Florida, seeking to escape deep poverty and violence. The escalating, random political terror of the 1990s continued to stimulate out-migration and touched the lives of nearly all of our participants. As the father of one of our participants put it, "We came here because there is less killing than in Haiti."

But in recent years, Haitians who arrived as political refugees escaping "structural violence" and organized state-sponsored terror have not been welcome. The "boat people" crises, along with the finding by the Centers for Disease Control that labeled Haitians as carriers of the HIV virus, came to define the recent Haitian experience in the United States. These twin events created a climate of stigma, hysteria, and xenophobia (Zephír, 1996) perhaps best embodied in the high seas interdiction program of the Clinton and Bush administrations, whereby hundreds of thousands of would-be asylum seekers from Haiti have been apprehended on the high seas and prevented from reaching American shores.

In 2005, the Bureau of the Census estimated that over half a million Haitian immigrants were living in the United States (US Bureau of the Census, March CPS Supplements, adjusted for undercount, 2005—courtesy of the Pew Hispanic Center, September 2006). About 8.9 percent of the adult Haitian immigrant population have a bachelor's degree and less than a quarter have attained a high school education. It is estimated that 15.7 percent have had less than a ninth-grade education. According to U.S. Census data, nearly 20 percent of all Haitian immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations and about 36 percent in the service economy. Approximately 19 percent of all Haitian immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000, Profile of Selected Demographic and Social Characteristics, People born in Haiti -- Table FBP-2).

From its moment of entry into the world system of production, distribution and consumption, the Dominican Republic (48,730 square kilometers or about twice the size of New Hampshire) has been a country whose history, economy, and society were profoundly shaped by global forces and the whims of ambition– Spanish, Dominican, and American. Columbus claimed it for Spain, which in turn used its strategically placed new possession as a toehold in its conquest of the Americas. Santo Domingo struggled for independence but eventually came under the dominion of the recently freed Haitians. Haitian control lasted for a couple of decades. Dominicans experimented with independence followed by a brief re-entry into the Spanish Crown, and the Dominican Republic became an independent nation in 1865.

With the decline of European hegemony in the New World and the concomitant rise of American power, the United States quickly became a dominant force in Dominican economy and society. Everything seemed to have a "Made in the USA" stamp: from investments in sugar, coffee, cocoa and bananas to the formal control of the customs department, to various military occupations, to the training of the Dominican National Guard. When the Marines departed from the Dominican Republic in the 1920s – they would return to occupy the country in 1965 -- they left a little-known National Guardsman named Rafael Molino Trujillo in charge of the Dominican forces. Over time and with U.S. support, General Trujillo came to embody the worst traits of the Latin American dictator. He ruled with an iron fist for more than 30 years. In 1937, "El Jefe," as he came to be known, ordered the massacre of more than 20,000 Haitian sugar-cane workers living in the Dominican Republic. As his control over the country became ever more tight, Trujillo amassed great personal wealth, brutalized the opposition, and eventually, a most egomaniacal gesture, had the capital, Santo Domingo, renamed "Ciudad Trujillo." The Dominican Republic had become a nightmarish, Kafkaesque world with equal parts of magical realism and unspeakable brutality immortalized in Mario Vargas Llosa's brilliant historical novel "La Fiesta del Chivo" ("The Feast of the Goat"). Trujillo was finally assassinated in a coup d'etat in 1961.

Joaquin Balaguer was the next strongman to dominate Dominican politics. He took control in 1966 and was the arbiter of power for thirty years – until 1996, when international outcry over rigged elections augured his demise. Over the decades of varying degrees of political terror, corruption, economic dependency, social instability, and rising inequality,

Dominican families have had to migrate to find safety and work. Like the Haitian case, at first, it was the members of more privileged classes in the political opposition that chose to leave. Over time, more and more working class Dominicans looked for opportunities beyond the boundaries of their native country.

Over the last decade, Dominican politics and economy have been significantly transformed. In recent years the Dominican economy has been one of the fastest-growing economies in the hemisphere, growing by more than 7 percent in the last years of the twentieth century (CIA-The World Fact Book, 2006). Yet the Dominican Republic suffers from one of the most unequal wealth distributions in the region: The richest 10 percent of the population controls more than 40 percent of all income. Nevertheless, competition and, increasingly, the legitimate transfer of power between opposing parties have come to define Dominican politics over the last decade.

Over the last half century, more and more Dominicans have been forced to physically leave their country to search for safety and work elsewhere, but in their hearts, Dominicans seldom if ever leave their beloved land behind them. Indeed, Dominicans—arguably, more than any other immigrant group -- have come to embody a new practice of international migration: a constant back-and-forth movement between the "home" and the "host" countries that enables them to pursue their passions and interests in more than one national space (Levitt, P, 2001; Bailey, 2001).

Since the 1960s, the number of Dominicans who have left their country to pursue their interests in the United States, Spain, Venezuela, and elsewhere has continued to grow at a fast pace. Over the last two decades, well over one million Dominicans have emigrated. The growth of the Dominican community in the United States has been impressive. In 1950, there were just over 4,000 Dominicans citizens living in the United States. By the year 2005, the Census Bureau counted over 700,000 Dominican-born immigrants in the United States (US Bureau of the Census, March CPS Supplements (adjusted for undercount), 2005 (courtesy of the Pew Hispanic Center, September 2006). Today, roughly one in 10 persons of Dominican origin live in the United States, with a quarter of them born in the United States (Levitt, P., 2001). Dominicans in the United States have been concentrated in a handful of states, with New York (especially Washington Heights, with satellite communities in New Jersey), Florida, and Massachusetts leading the way. Puerto Rico also has a considerable Dominican immigrant community.

According to the Bureau of the Census, about 5.6 percent of the adult Dominican immigrant population has a bachelor's degree and 20 percent have attained a high school education. It is estimated that almost 30 percent have had less than a ninth-grade education. According to U.S. Census data, 15 percent of all Dominican immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations and over 26 percent in the service economy. More than 28 percent of all Dominican immigrant families in the US live below the poverty line (US Census 2000, Profile of Selected Demographic and Social Characteristics, People born in the Dominican Republic—Table FBP-3).

Dominicans in the United States loom large in the Dominican reality. From politics to economics, to changing ideas about race and gender, the impact of Dominicans overseas on the life of the island is considerable. Jorge Duany summarized this new phenomenon well: "The Dominican diaspora has reshaped practically every aspect of daily life in the homeland— from family structure and business enterprises to political ideology and religious affiliation. Since the 1960s, migration has thoroughly transnationalized the Dominican Republic, metaphorically blurring its frontier with the United States. It has also transformed the physical and cultural landscape of several American neighborhoods, cities, and states" (Duany, J.,

2002).

Chinese Migration.

Our Chinese sample consisted of 59 participants from China (42 from Guangdong; 6 from Fujian; and 10 from other provinces and cities of Mainland China); 17 came from Hong Kong and one arrived from Macau. Eighty-one percent of our sample reported being Cantonese dominant (with 37 percent of these reporting fluency in another dialect); 19 percent reported Mandarin language dominance when hey first arrived to the U.S.

With an estimated population of more than 1.3 billion people and its GDP quadrupling over the last quarter of the twentieth century, China's economic reforms and the entry of more than 760 million Chinese workers into the global system of capitalist production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services represent a landmark change in world economic history. China's exports are worth more than a half-trillion dollars per annum, and its yearly imports account for another half-trillion dollars. By any measure, China is a country on the move. China's unprecedented growth has stimulated the largest migration wave in human history. There are now well over 150 million internal migrants, mostly from the rural hinterlands, pursuing their fortunes in the coastal areas that have generated the most economic growth.

China's recent migration momentum does not stop at its borders. Indeed, Chinese immigration to the United States, a migration pattern that goes back two centuries, continues to surge. The Chinese-origin population of the United States grew by 700 percent between 1940 and 1980 and by more than 100 percent between 1980 and 1990 (Loo, 1998: 4). By the year 2005, Chinese immigrants were second only to Mexicans as the nation's largest group of new arrivals. Of the more than 2.5 million Chinese Americans in the United States, more than a million were born in China, and about half-million arrived in the United States within the last decade of the twentieth century. Chinese immigrants in the United States are a hyper-urban population heavily concentrated in a handful of large metropolitan centers.

A number of our informants originated in Hong Kong. China ceded Hong Kong to the British in 1842, who ruled the colony for over 150 years until it became the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China on 1 July 1997. Under the so-called "one country, two systems" formula, Hong Kong continues to enjoy a high degree of autonomy – especially in economic matters – from mainland China. Hong Kong is naturally blessed by a deepwater harbor but few other natural resources. In reality, Honk Kong's greatest recourse is its human capital. The estimated 6.9 million people of Hong Kong have achieved a high level of literacy (nearly 94 percent) both in Cantonese and in English. Hong Kong has constant experienced migrations both in terms of inflows and outflows. Hong Kong has a long history of out migration to as Anglophone countries-first the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States, and more recently Australia and New Zealand. In recent years migrants from Hong Kong have tended to be highly educated and skilled people.

Approximately half of all Chinese immigrants have a bachelor's degree or higher levels of education and well over 70 percent have attained at least a high school education. According to U.S. Census data, nearly half of all Chinese immigrants in the U.S. labor force work in management, professional and related occupations and about 18 percent in the service economy. Yet, it is estimated that 18.4 percent of all Chinese immigrants in the United States have had less than a ninth-grade education, and some 11.5 percent of all Chinese immigrant families in the United States live below the poverty line (US Census 2000, Profile of Selected Demographic and Social Characteristics, People born in China -- Table FBP-1).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[2] Recruitment Procedures *(page 7)*

The youth took home permission slips for parental signature. Parents were sent a letter (in their language of origin) requesting their informed consent. Both students and parents were assured confidentiality. In many cases, the RAs followed up with phone calls to the students' homes. We were fortunate to have a high rate of positive response with this recruitment strategy. More than 90 percent of the students who met our inclusion criteria agreed to participate.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[3] *(page 7)*

Given the high mobility rates of immigrant origin youth, we over-sampled the groups that we anticipated would be most at risk for attrition based on our previous fieldwork experience.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[4] *(page 7)*

According to Erin Phelbs, former Associate Director of the Murray Center on Longitudinal Research at the Radcliffe Center for Advanced Studies 5 percent per year attrition for a longitudinal study is typical (personal communication, May 2006).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[5] Attrition *(page 8)*

Over three quarters of the 407 students interviewed in the first year of the study also participated in the fifth interview wave (N=309). We assessed the significance of differences at baseline between those who completed the study and those who started in the study but dropped out in order to determine if they had any specific characteristics that might affect outcomes or might lead us to misinterpret our findings (such as would have been the case if the lowest performing students in the beginning of the study had dropped out of the study at greater rates than students who began the study as high performers.) We examined differences in over 40 constructs and measures including grades Year 1, socio-demographic and family characteristics, experience with migration, schooling, mental health, language barriers, and social supports among others. Statistical differences were examined using Chi Square measures of association (for categorical variables) and T Tests (for continuous variables) for both student and parent interviews. We found only a few significant differences: students of Chinese origin had higher participation completion rates (90%) than Dominicans, Mexicans, or Central Americans (approximately 75%) or Haitians (69%); more girls than boys completed the 5 interviews (81% compared to 70%), and non-completers had attended the most highly "toxic" schools as indicated by reports of having witnessed violence at their schools (37% compared to 23%). In all other respects the group of students who began the study were nearly identical to those who completed the study.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[6] *(page 8)*

Boys were also more likely to drop out of the study. By the last year of the study, 57 percent of our participants were girls.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[7] *(page 8)*

Note that in the past new immigrants were much more uniformly from lower educational backgrounds.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[8] *(page 8)*

A one-way analysis of variance found a significant difference in education among mothers from different countries of origin ($F_{(4,238)} = 7.1$, $p < .001$).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[9] *(page XX8)*

A one-way analysis of variance found a significant difference among fathers from different countries of origin ($F_{(4,176)} = 8.2$, $p < .001$).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[10] *(page 9)*

A chi-square of the country of origin by household income relationship fell short of statistical significance ($\chi^2_{(32)} = 45$, $p = .064$).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[11] *(page 9)*

Note that in the case of Mexican families, large household sizes, with several working family members contributing to the household income, inflate this figure. See Rodriguez, G. (1996).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[12] *(page 10)*

Capps, R., Fix, M., Ost, J., Reardon-Anderson, J., & Passel, J. S. (2004) of the Urban Institute, entitled "The Health and Wellbeing of Young Children of Immigrants" reported that 86 percent of the participants in his study lived in two parent homes. This figure is approximately 20 percent higher than the figure in our sample. Note that Capps sample not only included both first and second-generation children but was also focused on young children. Our sample consisted of recently arrived pre-adolescent and adolescent aged children which may account for the difference in percentage of children living in two parental figure homes.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[13] *(page 10)*

A chi-square of the country of origin by urban/rural origins was statistically significant ($\chi^2_{(8)} = 26.6$, $p = .001$).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[14] *(page 8)*

Many RAs were recruited by posting announcements on campus in social science departments. We also recruited through professional organizations such as the Haitian Studies Association. Midway through the study, we began to receive unsolicited requests from graduate students to join the study. All RAs were compensated at the standard graduate assistant rate.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[15] *(page 19)*

We used structured interviews, sentence completion tasks, narrative techniques, and achievement testing to establish "baselines" of psychological, social, educational, health, and economic resources at the entry point of immigration. These tools were calibrated to take into consideration the age of our participants, as developmental factors influence the social adaptations of immigrant youth.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[16] *(page 20)*

The inter-rater reliability ranged from .89 to .98.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[17] *(page 21)*

We established the Cronbach's alpha measure of reliability for each of the scales and for each of the countries-of-origin participants (Knight & Hill, 1993), all of which were

generally high. When items fell to a alpha below .70, we revisited the coding and clarified the coding categories by refining the definition and adding examples. The problematic items were coded in a set of 10 new interviews. If the overall alpha did not reach the level of .70, the item was dropped from our analyses.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[18] *(page 21)*

The original consists of a series of 30 pictures, 10 to 20 of which are presented sequentially to subjects.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[19] *(page 21)*

The Thematic Apperception Test has been used cross-culturally to examine a variety of interpersonal concerns and patterns of achievement motivation. For a review of these and other studies using the TAT, see Abel, T., 1973; Lindzey, 1961; M. Suárez-Orozco, 1989.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[20] *(page 22)*

The use of the TAT, though widely used in cross-cultural research, is not without criticism. Mainstream cultural anthropologists have by and large been skeptical of the usefulness of such a tool (see M. Suárez-Orozco 1989). This can be related to two factors. First, as Richard Shweder has rightly observed, cultural anthropologists in general have been quite "psychophobic" (Shweder 1991; see also Spindler, G. & Suárez-Orozco, M.1994). Systematic analysis of psychological processes is simply not the *forte* of most cultural anthropologists (see Suárez-Orozco 1994).

A second factor accounting for the general skepticism of the TAT -- and projective techniques in general -- in anthropology has to do with the fact that, with precious few exceptions, the TAT simply has not been used properly within anthropology. Lindzey (1961) carefully considered a number of cross-cultural studies in which projective instruments had been improperly used. He delineated typical ways in which the strategy was misused, including inadequate training in administration, small sample sizes, and a tendency to psychopathologize groups. Others have criticized the TAT for being culturally bound (Abel, 1973) and for not having a standardized scoring method (Vane 1981).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[21] *(page 22)*

TAT Cards 1 and 2 administered in Year 1 and Year 5 of our study were redrawn to suggest more phenotypically ambiguous individuals (Caribbean, Asian, and Latino) because the original drawings depict Caucasian-looking individuals.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[22] *(page 22)*

The list was narrowed to conceptual categories that were noted on a rating form and each category was defined in a first draft of scoring procedures. The raters scored twenty-five stories together, discussing the rationale for why each scale was scored in a specific manner for each story. When there was disagreement, the item was discussed until a consensus was obtained. The rationale was articulated and noted in the emerging scoring procedures. Once these first 20 stories were scored, each rater received a copy of the draft of the scoring procedures, and the raters scored another 20 stories separately. The inter-rater reliability was calculated for each scale. The inter-rater reliability for the 14 sub-scales ranged from .80 to 1.0; the average inter-rater reliability for the combined scales was .90. The remaining stories were then coded by raters trained to this assessment tool. After all stories were scored, the

incidence of each theme was tallied for each group under consideration. Chi square analyses were conducted to check for significant differences between groups.

For TAT Scoring Protocol see end of On-line Supplement

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[23] *(page 23)*

The Sentence Completion responses were translated into English by bilingual RAs. Coders were blind to the participants' identity, ethnicity, gender, and age. We began with a priori categories that were expanded as responses emerged from the collected data. Each coding category was carefully defined in a scoring manual. Each year, inter-rater reliability was established across groups at (minimal) the "substantial" level of agreement. Reponses were scored by trained RAs. Once scored, the incidence of each response category was calculated for each group under consideration. Chi square analyses were then conducted.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[24] *(page 24)*

At the beginning of the study, we thanked students for their time by giving them a token gift (such as movie tickets, a calculator, a colored marker set). By the end of the study we reimbursed them with $20 cash. We increased the compensation in order to maximize the likelihood that participants would continue through the duration of the study.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[25] *(page 25)*

Parents were paid $20 for the first interview and $50 for the last interview; again, concerns about retention rates informed this practice.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[26] *(page 25)*

In several interviews, several adults were present (both parental figures and occasionally aunts and uncles also.) In such cases, RAs were instructed to explain that it would be hard to keep track of two sets of responses. Therefore, parents were asked to decide who spends the most time with the child as well as who knew the child the best. That person was designated as the parent interviewee. Questions were directed only to that person.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[27] *(page 26)*

After piloting the use of the instrument, we instructed our RAs to begin administration several items below the recommended starting point. We found that for many of our participants we were unable to establish a basal rate without administering some items backwards.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[28] *(page 26)*

RAs were carefully trained in two-hour sessions on the administration of these tests. They were required to practice on a peer as well as on a student not involved in the study before collecting any data.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[29] *(page 27)*

These case studies integrated multiple sources of both qualitative and quantitative data, including: ethnographic observations over the five-year period, which allowed sustained contact with the students' schools and families; data emerging from the structured interviews of students, parents, and teachers; grades; standardized achievement and language-proficiency data; and projective and narrative materials. The case studies were read multiple times by the

qualitative analyst Irina Todorova as well as the project PIs.   In weekly meetings, the PIs and analysts discussed emerging portraits on a case-by-case basis.

To manage and analyze all of the data collected during the course of the study, particularly those relevant to the case studies, we used the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti. This program assisted us in analyzing open-ended interviews, ethnographic field notes, TAT narratives, and documents emerging from the team discussions. It provided a structured electronic environment in which we analyzed the described a variety of data sources, building our conceptual and theoretical codes across data sources, and creating conceptual models from our results. ATLAS.ti has search-and-retrieve functions, categorizing functions that assist in the creation of higher-order categories and complex query capabilities that facilitated our interpretation and discussions. (Muhr, 1991; 1997). The memorizing functions of the software were used extensively to keep track of the emerging ideas and insights from the team discussions.

We proceeded through a very close reading of the text, identifying and selecting passages, words, and phrases relevant to particular themes we had initially deemed important. As we continued with the reading of the texts, additional themes emerged and were coded. These initial open codes and in-vivo codes were subsequently organized into broader categories and families of codes. Throughout the analytic process, codes were revised to include new themes and ideas that emerged from the data The coding process was informed by grounded theory approaches to data analysis and case study methods (Strauss & Corbin, 1994; Yin, 2002).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[30] *(page 28)*

Another criterion for inclusion in the book was for the student to have had participated in the project for the five-year duration of the LISA study, independent of whether he or she had dropped out of school. Although some students dropped out of school, our research assistants were able to sustain contact with them and continue to gather information for the case study.

CHAPTER 1 —
ACADEMIC ENGAGMENT & PERFORMANCE

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[1] *(page 31)*

Positive associations towards school remained remarkably consistent across all five years of the study: Year 1=71 percent; Year 2=77 percent; Year 3=79 percent; Year 4=75 percent; Year 5=70 percent.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[2] *(page 31)*

Positive associations towards school remained remarkably consistent across all five years of the study: Year 1—71 percent; Year 2—77 percent; Year 3—79 percent; Year 4—75 percent; Year 5—70 percent

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[3] *(page 39)*

Brandon's (1991) study of Asian American high school seniors showed that females reached higher levels of educational attainment more quickly than males. In their recent report on second generation youth of various Latino and Asian origins, sociologists Portes and Rumbaut (2001) found that boys were less engaged; had significantly lower grades, lower level of interest and work effort, as well as lower career and educational goals; and were less likely to adhere to their parents' language compared to girls. Interestingly, this gap has been established in many other countries around the world such as with North African immigrant students in Europe (Hassini, M., 1997; Haw, K., 1998; Raissiguier, C., 1994). Previous work emerging from our study showed that, over time, girls received higher grades and expressed higher future expectations than did boys (Qin, 2003). Also see Suárez-Orozco, C. & Qin, D.B., 2006.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[4] *(page 33)*

Note the GPA means reported here are for the 309 students who remained in our sample through the 5 years of the study. An analysis of variance for the mean difference between the children from each of the countries of origin was significant. $F (1, 308) = 10.06$, $p<.0001$.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[5] *(page 34)*

The Nagin Cluster Analysis was developed as a strategy to model developmental trajectories. Nagin cluster analysis uses a multinomial modeling strategy to identify clusters of individuals based on developmental trajectories. See Nagin & Tremblay (1999) for a complete description of Nagin cluster analysis. These analyses establish the number of groups that best fit the data based on both patterns of individual change and probability of group membership. The key outputs of the model estimation consider the shape of the group's trajectory, the estimated proportion of the population that belongs to each trajectory, and the probability that an individual would belong to each group. This semi-parametric approach does not make the assumption that parameters are normally distributed in a population (Nagin, D. & Tremblay, R. E, 1999). Several models with a variety of groups are tested. A determination is then made about the number of groups that best describe the data. It is recommended that the model with the largest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) be selected. We tested several models

ranging from 3 to 6 categories. The model with 5 categories had the highest BIC and was thus selected to describe the data.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[6] *(page 35)*

Table 1: Percent of Gender in Each Pathway of Achievement

	Boys	Girls	Total
Low Achievers	21.3%	9.3%	14.4%
Precipitous Decliners	30.3%	25.9%	27.8%
Slow decliners	23.8%	25.3%	24.7%
Improving	8.2%	12.4%	10.6%
High Achievers	16.4%	27.2%	22.5%
Chi Square—(4, 281) = 12.27, p <.05			

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[7] *(page 35)*

Table 2: Percent of Country of Origin in Each Pathway of Achievement

	Chinese	Dominican	Central American	Haitian	Mexican
Low Achievers	7.4% (5)	11.1% (6)	19.6% (10)	19.2% (9)	17.1% (11)
Improvers	19.1% (13)	7.41% (4)	5.9% (3)	6.4% (3)	10.9% (7)
Precipitous Decliners	10.3% (7)	42.6% (23)	25.5% (13)	36.2% (17)	29.7% (19)
Slow Decliners	16.2% (11)	25.9% (14)	31.4% (16)	27.7% (13)	25.0% (16)
High	47.1% (32)	13.0% (7)	17.7% (9)	10.6% (5)	17.2% (11)
Percent (N)	100% (N=68)	100% (N=54)	100% (N=51)	100% (N=47)	100% (N=64)
Chi square—(16, 268) = 52.72 p <.0001					

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[8] *(page 41)*

We examined the risks associated with children's perceptions of school threats of violence. Student perception of school threats of violence has a strong connection with neighborhood poverty, racism, family distress, and other risk factors. As such, it is a useful indicator of contextual risk. Moreover, it has strong associations with relational and academic disengagement, permitting a targeted search for the processes at work in attenuating risk and in promoting success.

The 10-item School Violence scale included responses coded on a 5-point scale ranging from "never" (1) to "several times a day" (5) (Cronbach's alpha = .77, with alpha coefficients ranging from .67 to .79 across ethnic groups). The School Violence scale included the following items: I do not feel safe in my school; My school is badly affected by crime and violence in the community; I feel unsafe on my way to and from school; Someone in school does a good job of stopping kids from making trouble (reversed); Gangs make me feel unsafe in school; I frequently see students getting into fights; I frequently see students threatening or bullying each other; I frequently see students carrying weapons; I frequently see student exchanging, selling, or offering drugs; I frequently see racial or ethnic conflicts.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[9] *(page 41)*

The English Language Proficiency Standard Score of the *Bilingual Verbal Abilities Test* (Muñoz-Sandoval, Cummins, Alvarado, & Ruef, 1998) was used as the measure of English language proficiency. The BVAT has been normed on all of the languages represented in the study. The BVAT manual (Munoz-Sandoval et al., 1998, p. 68) reports the median reliability across age groups for the English Language Proficiency scale as .96.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[10] *(page 43)*

The 3-item scale cognitive engagement scale developed for the study included responses coded on a 4-point scale. The cognitive engagement scale included the following: I enjoy learning new things; I get bored easily with school work; I feel good when I learn something new even when it is hard. (Cronbach's α =.75).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[11] *(page 44)*

Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling techniques applied to the LISA data set, we tested a support-varying model in which all available support scores for each Latino youth were entered into the regression equations, permitting consideration of change from year to year. Relationships between changes in support and engagement were then examined. We found that rather than adhering to linear trajectories, students reported that their school based support fluctuated from year to year. Specifically, changes in youths' perceptions of support were linked to their engagement in school that year. During a year when youth experienced an above average amount of support (relative to him or herself), the student also reported higher behavioral engagement. In contrast, a less-than-average support year was associated with lower engagement that year; these findings suggest that perceptions of relationships are neither fixed within-persons nor in time. For the Latino youth in this study, support and engagement rose and fell together in tandem. A student may experience a good fit with his or her teachers one year, and then a less-than-optimal fit in another which in turn affects the effort that the student expends in his or her studies. See Green, G., Rhodes, J., Heitler-Hirsch, A. & Suárez-Orozco, C. (under review).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[12] *(page 45)*

Responses were coded on a 5-point scale ranging from "never" (1) to "always" (5) Relational engagement items included the following: I can count on at least one adult in school; No one in school can help me (reversed); Teachers do not treat me with respect (reversed); I have at least one friend at school to help me with homework; Teachers care about me and what happens to me; I can count on someone if I have a problem at school; Teachers do not care about my future (reversed); Someone at school makes me feel successful; School is a lonely place where no one cares about me (reversed); I can count on someone in school to help me with my schoolwork; & I can talk about troubles with people at school. (Cronbach's α =.80).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[13] *(page 45)*

Relational engagement for total sample Year 3 (X =26.14; sd =2.22) Year 4 (X =37.13; sd =5.08), and Year 5 (X =36.50; sd =4.90). The analysis of variance was significant F (2, 280)=546.75, p<.001.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[14] *(page 45)*

A series of t-tests were conducted on the relational engagement construct comparing the means of the girls and boys at each year. In Year 3 the mean relational engagement score for girls was 25.99 and for boys it was 26.41; the t-test revealed that the differences between these scores approached significance at the trend level . In Year 4 the mean engagement score for girls was 37.71 and while for boys it was 36.30: the t-test revealed that the differences between these scores reached significance. In Year 5 the mean relational engagement score for girls was 36.82 and while for boys it was 36.05: the ANOVA revealed that the differences between these scores reached significance – $F(1,307) = 5.16$, $p < .02$.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[15] *(page 46)*

As part of the psychosocial measures included in our study, our cross-cultural research team developed a psychological symptom scale, informed by the DSM-IV (APA) items included on the SCL-90 questionnaire (Derogatis, 1977) that included questions determined by our interdisciplinary research team to be developmentally appropriate and cross-culturally relevant. The questions were piloted on informants at the same developmental level as our participants, representing each of the country of origin groups under consideration. This 26-item scale consisted of 5 subscales—depression, anxiety, cognitive functioning, inter-personal sensitivity and hostility. The subscales of the Symptom checklist we used included the following items: "Lately, do you": <u>Depression:</u> not have much energy, not feel like eating, cry easily, feel sad, feel not interested in much of anything, worry too much. <u>Interpersonal sensitivity</u>: feel critical of others, feel shy, feel others do not understand you, feel people do not like you, feel like you are not as good as other people. <u>Cognitive Functioning</u>: have trouble remembering things, have trouble making decisions, have trouble concentrating <u>Anxiety:</u> feel nervous, feel something terrible is going to happen, feel like your heart is racing, feel tense, keep remembering something frightening. <u>Hostility:</u> feel annoyed too easily, lose temper too easily, get into arguments too easily.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[16]

Editing error in endnote numeration. Please disregard.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[17] *(page 47)*

We assessed attitudes towards school using a 2-item scale with items that divided students into two groups (e.g., "Some students do X BUT other students do Y"). Respondents were asked to determine whether they were more like the first or second group, and then were asked whether the statement was either "sort of true" or "really true" for them. The attitude towards school items were: Some students really like their school BUT other students do not like their school at all; and Some students really like their teachers BUT other students do not like their teachers at all.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[18] *(page 47)*

We utilized multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in Relational Engagement. To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that results in the highest R-squared. This selection method allows us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected 3 variables as predictors of relational engagement—wellbeing, schooling attitudes, and academic self-efficacy. Of these factors, school attitudes explained the most variance, followed by self-efficacy and emotional

wellbeing. These factors collectively accounted for 20.16 percent of the variance. See Table Predicting Relational Engagement below.

Table 3: Predicting Relational Engagement: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Student's Relational Engagement at Year 5 to Student's School Attitudes, Self-Efficacy, and Well Being.

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	24.012	2.543	9.44	***
School Attitudes	1.261	0.201	6.27	***
Self-efficacy	0.311	0.118	2.64	**
Well Being	-0.0563	0.0282	-2	*
R-Square = 20.16, F (3,.264) = 22.22 ***				

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[19] *(page 48)*

We assessed behavioral engagement using a 7-item scale that focused on behaviors of academic engagement reported by the students. The behavioral engagement items divided students into two groups (e.g., "Some students turn in most of their homework on time/other students often do not turn in their homework on time"). Respondents were asked to determine whether they were more like the first or second group, and then were asked whether the statement was either "sort of true" or "really true" for them. Behavioral engagement items included the following: Some students always finish their work BUT other students often do not finish it; Some students always turn in their homework on time BUT other students often do not; Some students pay close attention in class BUT other do not; Some students just get by in school BUT others always try their best (reversed); Hours generally spent on homework after school; How many times late to class in the last week; How many times skipped classed in the last week. Scores ranged from 1 to 4 with higher scores indicating higher levels of engagement (Cronbach's α =.79).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[20] *(page 49)*

Mean behavioral engagement for the total sample in Year 3 was 21.96(sd =3.12), 20.82 in Year 4 (sd =4.09), and in Year 5 the mean was 20.88 (sd =4.21). An analysis of variance found significant difference between these scores. $F(2,840)=4.26< .05)$.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[21] *(page 49)*

An analysis of variance was conducted on the behavioral engagement construct comparing the means of girls to boys. In Year 3 the mean behavioral engagement score for girls was 21.85 while for boys 21.34: the ANOVA revealed no significant differences between these scores. $F(1,299) =1.61, p <.21$. In Year 4 the mean behavioral engagement score for girls was 21.06 and for boys 20.21: the ANOVA revealed that the differences between these scores approached significance at the trend level. $F(1,299) =2.98, p <.08$. In Year 5 the mean behavioral engagement score for girls was 21.57 and for boys 19.75: an ANOVA revealed that the differences between these scores had reached significance. $F(1,305) =13.34, p <.001$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[22] *(page 49)*

We utilized multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in behavioral engagement. To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or

explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected 4 variables as predictors of behavioral engagement—relational engagement; cognitive engagement; school problems; and gender. Of these factors, school problems explained the most variance, followed by relational engagement, cognitive engagement, and gender, in that order. These factors collectively accounted for 25.25 percent of the variance. See Table: Predicting Behavioral Engagement Year 5 below.

Table 4: Predicting Behavioral Engagement Year 5: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Students' Behavioral Engagement to Students' Perception of School Problems and Violence, Relational Engagement Students' Cognitive Engagement, and Gender

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	12.172	2.224	5.47	***
School Problems	-0.188	0.0415	-4.54	***
Relational Engagement	0.19	0.0514	3.7	***
Cognitive Engagement	0.406	0.13	3.13	**
Gender	1.363	0.46	2.96	**
R-Square = 25.25, F (4,.263) = 22.21 ***				

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[23] *(page 50*

We utilized step-wise multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in grade point average (GPA). To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or explanatory variables, we used a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected 5 variables as predictors of GPA: behavioral engagement, English Language Proficiency (ELP), maternal education, having a working father, and family structure. Of these factors, ELP explained the most variance, followed by behavioral engagement. Living in a home with two parental figures, having an employed father, and educational attainmnent of the mother all contributed to an incremental augmentation of the R-squared but did not maintain statistical significance in the model. These factors collectively accounted for 29.67 percent of the variance. See Regression Table: Predicting GPA below.

Table 5: Predicting GPA—Student Centered Perspective: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Student's GPA at Year 5 to Student's Behavioral Engagement, English Proficiency (ELP). Household Composition (two parental figures in home), Father employment status, and Mother's Educational attainment

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	-0.273	0.271	-1.01	ns
English Proficiency	0.0151	0.00256	5.9	***
Behavioral Engagement	0.0655	0.0114	5.72	***
Two-Parent Household	0.161	0.139	1.16	ns

Employed Father	0.132	0.137	0.97	ns
Maternal Education	0.00907	0.103	0.09	ns
R-Square = 29.67, F (5,261) = 22.03 ***				

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[24] *(page XX)*

See Boston, C. (2003) for a review of research summarizing trends in grading practices and issues related to standards-based reporting. Boston finds that there is evidence of considerable variation in grading practices between schools and teachers. Brookhart, S. M. (1994) found that high school teachers demonstrate significant autonomy in determining grades based on student performance.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[25] *(page 51)*

The U.S. Department of Education (1994) examined student reports of grades from the NELS 88 and found large variation between grades and reading scores for students attending high poverty schools versus affluent schools. For students with the same reading score in the sample, those in high-poverty schools reported grades of mostly A's in English, while students in more affluent schools reported mostly grades of C and D. Willingham, W. W., Pollack, J. M., and Lewis, C. (2002) using NELS database also found significant variation of reported grades among schools based on SES.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[26] *(page 51)*

We administered the Broad Math which includes Calculation and Applied Problems and Broad Math which includes Letter Word Identification and Passage Comprehension. See Mather, N. and Woodcock, R.W. (2001). These subtests were designed to be used in conjunction with the Bilingual Verbal Abilities (see Chapter 4) in order to determine whether gaps in achievement were related to second language learning issues or to cognitive challenges academic language proficiency (Muñoz-Sandoval, A. F., Cummins, J., Alvarado, C. G., & Ruef, M. L., 1998). For the achievement test outcome we combined the Broad Math and Broad Reading Standard Score and divided by 2; a score of 100 represents the mean and a standard deviation is 15 points.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[27] *(page 52)*

We used multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in the Standardized Achievement Test score outcome. To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected the same 5 variables as predictors that we used to predict GPA—behavioral engagement, English Language Proficiency, having an employed father, maternal educational atainment and living in a household with a two parental figures. Of these factors, English Language Proficiency explained, by far, the most variance. Maternal education, behavioral engagement, having a working father, having a two-parent family and gender contributed to the R-square but did not maintain significance in the model. These factors collectively accounted for fully 75 percent of the variance. See Table: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test—Student Centered Perspective below.

Table 6: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test—Student Centered Perspective: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Student's Standardized Achievement Test at Year 5 to Student's Behavioral Engagement, English Language Proficiency (ELP). Household Composition (two parental figures), Father employment status, and mother's educational attainment

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	34.19	3.12	10.96	***
ELP	0.732	0.0291	25.2	***
Maternal Education	1.0272	1.174	0.87	ns
Two-Parent household	2.67	1.571	1.7	ns
Behavioral Engagement	-0.034	0.13	-0.26	ns
Employed Father	0.157	1.544	0.1	ns
R-Square = 74.14, F (5, 259) = 148.248 ***				

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[28] *(page 52)*

We ran multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in the Standardize Achievement Test score outcome excluding the ELP score. To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected 4 variables as predictors— behavioral engagement, English Language Proficiency, having an employed father, mother's level of educational atainment and living in a household with a two parental figures. Mother's level of educational attainment explained the most variance followed by behavioral engagement. Having an employed father and living in a household with two-parental figures contributed to the R-square but did not maintain significance in the model. These factors collectively accounted for only 10.7 percent of the variance. See Table: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test—Student Centered Perspective—Removing English Language Proficiency below.

Table 7: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test—Student Centered Perspective—Removing English Language Proficiency: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Student's Standardized Achievement Test at Year 5 to Student's Behavioral Engagement, Household Composition (two parental figures), Father employment status, and Maternal Education

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	74.15	4.983	14.88	***
Maternal Education	8.384	2.109	3.97	***
Behavioral Engagement	0.499	0.239	2.09	*
Employed Father	2.638	2.857	0.92	ns
Two-Parent Household	2.239	2.913	0.8	ns
R-Square = 10.7, F (5, 260) =7.81***				

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[29] *(page 52)*

We ran multiple regression analysis to explain the variance in the Standardized Achievement Test score outcome focusing on school level factors. To model the relationship between academic performance and school-level explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected t4 variables to reflect school quality—school racial segregation (percentage of students of color), school poverty (percentage of low income students), the average daily attendance rate at each school, and the percent of students who performed at proficiency or above on the district high stakes standardized English Language Arts (ELA) exam. Of these factors and in order of strength, the ELA proficiency rate predicted the most variance followed by the school average daily attendance rate, school poverty, and school racial segregation. These factors collectively accounted for fully 32.2 percent of the variance. See Table: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test— School Perspective below.

Table 8: Predicting Standardized Achievement Test— School Perspective: Multiple Regression Analysis Describing the Relationship of Student's Standardized Achievement Test Score at Year 5 to ELA proficiency rate, School Racial Segregation, School Poverty; and School Attendance Rate

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	42.357	17.134	2.47	*
ELA Proficiency Rate	0.299	0.0541	5.54	***
School Daily Avg. Attendance Rate	0.478	0.17	2.81	**
School Poverty	0.127	0.0568	2.24	*
School Racial Segregation	-0.151	0.0701	-2.15	*
R-Square = 32.19, F (4, 256) = 30.38***				

Note that for the sake of comparison, we ran this same School Perspective model, substituting GPA as the outcome measure. The model worked much less well for GPA accounting for only 15 percent of the variance (R^2= 15.07 F (5,258) = 11.45 ***). See Supplimental Note 25.

CHAPTER 2 —
NETWORKS OF RELATIONS

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[1] *(page 59)*

Note that for all tables presented in this paper, chi square analyses reached the significance level of $p < .01$. Also please note that the percentages may not always add up to exactly 100% as all numbers were rounded.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[2] *(page 62)*

We conducted a one-way analyses of variance, ANOVA, using the different family separation patterns as predictors and the psychological symptom scales as outcomes.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[3] *(page 62)*

$F(1,388) = 4.54$, $p < 0.05$.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[4] *(page 62)*

$F(1, 387) = 3.52$, $p < 0.05$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[5] *(page 69)*

This task was inspired by the Q-sorting technique developed by Stephenson in 1953 (see Stephensen 1953: 1982). The questions posed using this technique included: Who do you have fun with?; Who helps you with your schoolwork?; Who expects you to get good grades?; Who talks to you about the future? Who makes you feel loved?; Who makes you feel respected?; Who is proud of you?; Who do you go to for help if you need it?: Who do you tell your problems to?; Who do you ask for money if you need it?; Who do you tell your secrets to?; Who expects you to behave? Who usually knows where you are?; Who disciplines you?; Who distracts you from your school work?; Who gets you in trouble?; Who do you want to be like when you grow up? This data were analyzed by categorizing these responses into different groupings of social supports—family (including extended family living in the US); peers; adults in school; adults in the community; and those who remain in the country of origin.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[6] *(page 71)*

	Chinese	Dominican	Central America	Haitian	Mexican	Total
Never	48.6%	45%	28.1%	26%	35.7%	37.5%
From time to time	44.4%	30%	43.9%	38%	47.1%	41.1%
Often	4.2%	18.3%	17.5%	20%	12.9%	13.9%
All the time	2.8%	5%	7%	16%	4.3%	6.5%

Table 9: Responses to: Sometimes parents want kids to behave the way they do in [their country of origin] but sometime kids want to behave like Americans. How often is this happen in your family?

$\chi^2(16, 308) = 32.18$, $p < .01$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[7] *(page 72)*

How much are the following things a problem for you:	Not a Problem	Somewhat a Problem	A Serious Problem
Your parents work long hours and are not around much?	66.0%	27.2%	6.8%
Your parents are upset about your grades?	41.5%	33.7%	24.8%
Your parents don't understand what it is like to grow up in another country?	52.1%	38.1%	9.8%
You were separated from your parents for some time and it has taken a while to get used to each other?	58.9%	25.7%	15.4%
New people joined your family (like a step-parent or new kids)?	76.0%	14.0%	10.0%
Your parents don't like your friends?	60.8%	30.1%	9.1%
You disagree with parents about curfews?	57.8%	30.5%	11.7%
You have too many responsibilities around the house?	72.2%	20.4%	7.4%

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[8] *(page 72)*

$\chi^2 (4, 308) = 9.09, \ p < .0001$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[9] *(page 72)*

Correlation between family problems and psychosomatic symptoms: Pearson r=0.29, p<.0001

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[10] *(page 72)*

Correlation between family problems and academic performance: Pearson r=-0.26, p<.0001

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[11] *(page 81)*

The cluster analyses for turning to peers for help, approached but did not reach, statistical significance.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[12] *(page 81*

Chinese = 38.8%; Dominican=31%; Central American = 18%; Haitian= 29%; & Mexican= 12.7 percent, χ^2 df (4,276)= 14.07 <.01*).*

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[13] *(page 82)*

Mostly congratulate = 66.7 percent; Mostly make fun =1.6 percent; Some of both =23.3 percent.

CHAPTER 3 —
'LESS-THAN-OPTIMAL' SCHOOLS

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[1] *(page 91)*

      Students were asked to endorse the following statements on a four-point scale: I do not feel safe in my school; My school is badly affected by crime and violence in the community; I feel unsafe on my way to and from school; Someone in school does a good job of stopping kids from making trouble. Gangs make me feel unsafe in school; I frequently see students getting into fights; I frequently see students threatening or bullying each other; I frequently see students carrying weapons; I frequently see student exchanging, selling, or offering drugs; I frequently see racial or ethnic conflicts.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[2] *(page 91)*

      Pearson, 2-tailed correlation: Percentage of students of color and Student perception of school problems =.28, $p < .001$; Percentage of low income students and Student perception of school problems =.25, $p < .001$; Percentage of students within the school who do not pass the state mandated English Language Arts high stakes test at or above proficiency and Student perception of school problems =.33, $p < .001$.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[3] *(page 92)*

      Note that throughout this chapter as well as in the Educational Pathway Portrait Chapters, we provided data collected from state as well as district websites. For all for all Massachusetts schools the source was: www.doe.mass.edu. For most California schools we referred to: www.cde.ca.gov. If students attended Oakland and San Francisco schools, the data also came from their district websites. Private schools came from the school's website as they do not have to report to the state and amount of information made available by these schools varied greatly . Note that there is some variance between sources so some caution should be taken in interpreting the school data.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[4] *(page 93)*

      Forty-one percent of the schools our students attended had higher than state average attendance rates; 56 percent of the schools our students attended had higher than state average drop-out rates; and 89 percent of the schools our students attended had higher than state average suspension rates.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[5] *(page 93)*

      60.5 percent of the schools our students attended had higher than state average teacher/student ratios; and 73 percent of the schools our students attended had fewer than average teachers that were accredited and teaching in their areas of specialization.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[6] *(page 95)*

      All district data unless otherwise noted are taken from the 2002-2003 school year due to availability of complete public data. Where possible, our sample data were taken from 2001-2002. Because of well known inconsistencies in the ways states, school districts, and individual schools calculate data, in particular those related to suspension, attendance, low income/ free

and reduced lunch qualification, and teacher quality (e.g. student teacher ratio) great care should be taken in interpreting or comparing data out of context. The best use of the data reported is to compare the schools the students in our study attended relative to the schools in their surrounding area, hence the schools the students in the study attended were compared to averages at the state-level.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[7] *(page 95)*

Using fifth year GPA as our outcome, we entered: Percent of Students reaching proficiency or above on English Language Arts exam, Racial Segregation, School Poverty; and School Attendance Rate and accounted for 15 percent of the variance $F (5, 258) = 11.45$ $p < .0001$). See Chapter 1.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[8] *(page 95)*

Using fifth year Woodcock Johnson-R combined broad achievement score as our outcome, we entered: Percent of Students reaching proficiency or above on English Language Arts exam, Racial Segregation, School Poverty; and School Attendance Rate and accounted for 32.2 percent of the variance $F (4, 256) = 30.38$, $p < .0001$). See Chapter 1.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[9] *(page 116)*

The average scaled score for all eighth-grade students in the school was 239 in English, compared to 238 across the state. The school average in history and social studies was 219, compared to 221 for the state. The school average for math was 226, the same as the state score; and the school average for science was 218, compared to 224 for the state.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[10] *(page 135)*

Based on the interviews of 75 teachers and administrators.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[11] *(page 135)*

This is a pattern we identified over a decade ago in a comparative study of Mexican adolescent students in Mexico, Mexican immigrants students; second-generation Mexican origin students, and white American students (Suárez-Orozco, C and Suárez-Orozco, M. 1995).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[12] *(page 139)*

Pearson $r = 0.53944$, $p<.0001$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[13] *(page 139)*

Pearson $r = 0.22$, $p<.01$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[14] *(page 139)*

Teachers were asked to rate a series of academic behaviors on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very poor to very good for each participant in our study on a variety of dimensions including: paying attention; motivation; behavior; punctuality, and the like.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[15] *(page 139)*

All difference reported between boys and girls are tested with chi-square analyses. Only differences that reach statistical significance are reported.

Table 10: Teacher Report of Levels of Behavioral Engagement by Gender (n=297)

		Boys	Girls	Chi-Square P value
Attention	Very Poor/Poor	24%	13%	
	Good/Very Good	47%	67%	.002
Motivation	Very Poor/Poor	30%	11%	
Effort	Good/Very Good	44%	68%	.0001
Behavior	Very Poor/Poor	13%	9%	
	Good/Very Good	61%	77%	.002
Attendance	Very Poor/Poor	9%	8%	
	Good/Very Good	71%	79%	.02
	Very Poor/Poor	8%	7%	
Punctuality	Good/Very Good	68%	79%	.02
Homework	Never	7%	1%	
	Occasionally	21%	12%	
	Almost Always	27%	38%	.0001
	Always	19%	36%	

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[16] *(page 140)*

According to the teacher reports, no significant gender differences emerged for the following academic behaviors—asking questions, teacher relations, peer relations, helping peers, or principal referrals. Interestingly, although teachers also did not report significant differences between boys and girls in English reading or English oral expression, nor native language reading, oral, and written language, they did report that girls demonstrated better understanding of English. Furthermore, teachers reported that boys were more likely to have very poor or poor written English skills (79 percent of boys compared to 42 percent of girls).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[17] *(page 140)*

(F= 5.25, df = 1, p < .05). See Chapter 1 for a description of the relational engagement scale.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[18] *(page 142)*

Note that we only calculated the responses of the students in high school. Students in middle school or students who had either gone on to college or had dropped out were excluded from this analysis.

CHAPTER 4 —
LEARNING ENGLISH

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[1] *(page 147)*

  Another 10 percent described it as "easy" to learn; 8 percent at positive affective responses to English (including "fun"; "exciting," or "my favorite subject"); and 7 percent gave descriptive responses (a language;" the main language of the U.S.)

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[2] *(page 148)*

Table 11: For Some People Learning English Is Easy But For Others It Is Hard		
	N	Percent
Really true for me-easy	77	27.11
Sort of true for me-easy	98	34.51
Sort of true for me-hard	85	29.93
Really true for me-hard	24	8.45

Note: Year 4 completed with year 3 when values were missing

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[3] *(page 148)*

  Pearson Correlation r=.31, p<.0001

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[4] *(page 150)*

  Pearson Correlation r=.37, p<.0001

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[5] *(page 150)*

  From BVAT language use survey.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[6] *(page 152)*

  When we first began this study, we wanted to have two measures of academic performance—grades as well as achievement tests. We recognized that each of these "objective" performance outcomes are biased in their own way. Grades are highly influenced by teacher perceptions and student behaviors and achievement tests have all sorts of biases against second language learners (see Valdés and Figueroa, 1994). We originally intended to use district-testing results but decided against this approach as there were so many districts using incommensurable measures. Further, we decided to individually administer a measure specifically designed for second language learners.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[7] *(page 152)*

  Note that both the Spanish and Chinese versions of the protocols were modified slightly by our research team in order to reflect the different dialects included in the study (Mexican, Dominican, and Central American) as well as Hong Kong. These revisions consisted of adding approximately 20 words that would be considered correct usage in each of the countries under consideration based on our research teams knowledge of language use norms in each of these settings. See Paez, M. 2001, a dissertation developed using the BVAT data, for detail.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[8] *(page 152)*

According to the Comprehensive Manual, English language normative data for the BVAT are the same data gathered from 8,818 subjects in more than 100 geographically diverse U.S. communities during the standardization of the Woodcock-Johnson® III (WJ—III) and provide basis for interpretation of English Language Proficiency (ELP) and Bilingual Verbal Ability (BVAT) scores. Alternate-form procedure reliabilities are provided for the BVAT score. The BVAT score was validated by comparing estimates of bilingual verbal ability obtained by two parallel, but independent, testing procedures.

This norming by age is standard for using the BVAT outside of program evaluation. Note, however, that about a third of the students were overage for their grade, so they are being compared with native speaking peers who have had more advanced coursework & possibly more exposure to school. Thus, our results should be interpreted with caution. They are likely an underestimation of students' cognitive ability. It is for this reason that we have not highlighted the BVAT score in our findings nor have we used them in regressions. The ELP score, however, is a powerful predictor of academic performance—grades and achievement test scores are highly influenced by academic English skills.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[9] *(page 153)*

Language Proficiency Year 5

	N	Mean	SD	range
Overall	309	74.7	19.3	31 - 156
Overall limited by clusters	286	74.7	19.3	31 - 156

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[10] *(page 153)*
Technical Appendix Table 13: English Language Proficiency Year 5 By Country of Origin

	N	Mean	SD	range
Overall	**284**	**74.7**	**19.3**	**31 - 156**
China	68	83.9	28.6	40 - 156
Dominican Republic	54	71.0	13.0	39 - 109
Central America	51	69.7	16.3	31 - 99
Haiti	47	74.8	11.2	55 - 107
Mexico	64	71.8	15.1	50 - 119

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$,***$p<.001$
Note: The omnibus test did not find statistically significant differences between country of origin groups. $F_{(4, 280)}=2.4$, $p<.51$

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[11] *(page 153)*
Note that High achievers scored more than one standard deviation above the total sample average and demonstrated more within group variation than any of the other groups.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[12] *(page 153)*

**Table 14: Gain Score Year 5 By
Performance Cluster**

	N	Mean
Overall	284	18.4
Low	41	17.3
Improvers	30	19.8
Precipitous Decliners	79	16.0
Slow Decliners	70	16.4
High	64	18.9

$*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001$
Note: There are no statistically significant differences between groups.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[13] *(page 153)*

**Table 15: Increase In English Language Proficiency
Standard Score From Year 3 To Year 5 By Country Of
Origin**

	Year 3	Year 5	Improvement Year 3 to Year 5
Overall N=264	66.9	74.7	7.8
China	76.8	85.0	8.2
Dominican Rep	64.8	70.9	6.1
Central America	59.0	69.4	10.4
Haiti	72.7	76.0	3.3
Mexico	60.0	72.0	12.0

$*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001$
Note: Chinese > Haitians*; DR > Haitians **; Mexicans > Haitians ***; Mexicans > DR *

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[14] *(page 155)*

**Table 16: Increase In English Language Proficiency
Standard Score Year 3 To Year 5 By Performance Cluster**

	Year 3	Year 5	Improvement Year 3 to Year 5
Overall N=264	66.9	74.7	7.8
Low	57.4	64.8	7.3
Improvers	61.6	70.5	8.9
Prec. Decliners	61.4	68.5	7.1
Slow Decliners	65.4	74.8	9.4
High	82.2	91.0	8.8

$*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001$
Note: There are no statistically significant differences between groups.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[15] *(page 157)*
Our own data showed that age of arrival and time in the U.S. were both strongly correlated with the ELP score Age of arrival, r= -.35.(p<.0001), time in US r=.23 (p<.0001).

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[16] *(page 157)*
The covariance between age of arrival and length of residence was .84 (p< .0001). We selected length of time in the U.S. (and thus greater time exposure to English) as the predictor used in our model predicting English Language Proficiency the last year of the study.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[17] *(page 159)*
Note that these data were collected in the fifth year of our study.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[18] *(page 160)*
Pearson r =.34 (p<.0001)

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[19] *(page 163)*
The LISA study was not a study of language acquisition. We recognized, however, that English language skills were likely to play an important role on achievement—as measured both by GPA as well as on "objective" achievement tests. Thus, we gathered information on this topic and are able to shed light on some of these domains. We do not claim, however, this study to be an all-inclusive study of language acquisition among newcomer youth.

SUPPLIMENTAL NOTE[20] *(page 164)*
We ran a multiple regression to explain the variance in **English Language Proficiency** as measured by the ELP sub-score of the BVAT. To model the relationship between academic performance and predictors or explanatory variables, we utilized a forward selection method to fit the best model that resulted in the highest R-squared. This selection method allowed us to identify the relative predictive importance of each independent predictor variable. We selected 7 variables as predictors of ELP— state mandated high stakes exam in English Language Arts (ELA); the daily average attendance rate of the school; the length of time students had been in the U.S; the students' prior years of schooling before migrating; percent of time the student reported speaking English in informal (not at home or in school) situations; their parents' reported English proficiency the first year of the study; and parental literacy (In the first year of the study, parents were asked to respond on a 4 point scale to the question: How well do you read in your native language? How well do you write in your native language? These two items were combined as a parental (self-report) literacy scale). Of these factors, the school context variable of percent of students in the school the student was attending that reached proficiency on the standardized state mandated exam in English Language Arts explained the most variance. These factors collectively accounted for 48 percent of the variance. (Note the N for this model was 257). See Table: Predicting English Language Proficiency below.

Table 17: Predicting English Language Proficiency: Multiple Regression Analysis explaining English Language Proficiency (ELP Year 5) with Parental Literacy in Native Language, Parent English Language Skills, Student's Years of Schooling in the CO, Time in the U.S., Percentage of Time Student Speaks English in Informal Settings, School Attendance Rate, and Percentage of School Population reaching proficiency or above on English Language Arts (ELA Exam)

Independent Variable	B	S.E	t	p
Intercept	-23.57	17.93	-1.31	ns
ELA exam	0.26	0.04	6.98	***
English Use in Informal Settings	4.63	1.00	4.76	***
Parents' English Proficiency	1.31	0.40	3.32	***

Prior Schooling	-1.41	0.51	-2.74	**
Parental Literacy	2.25	0.67	3.34	**
School Daily Avg. Attendance Rate	0.60	0.18	3.32	**
Time in US	0.16	0.06	2.54	*

$R^2 = .48$, $F(8, 249) = 33.01$, ***

SUPPLEMENTAL REFERENCES

Barry, T. & Preusch, D, 1986. *The Central American Fact Book* New York: Grove Press

Derogatis, L. R. (1977). The SCL-90 Manual I: Scoring, administration and procedures for the SCL-90. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. *,*

Shweder, R. 1991. *Thinking through cultures: Expeditions in cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spindler, G. & M. M. Suárez-Orozco (Eds). (1994). *The making of psychological anthropology*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Stephenson, W. 1953. *The study of behavior: Q technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. 1982. Q methodology: Interbehavioral psychology, and quantum theory. *The psychological record*, 32, 235-248.

Protocols from Longitudinal Immigrant Student Adaptation Study
Included in Online Supplement for
Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society
Carola Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, & Irina Todorova
Harvard University Press (2008)

*Note that all materials below were specially developed fro the Longitudinal Immigrant Student Adaptation
Study. Researchers are welcome to make use of these protocols if appropriately cited.*

- o Behavior Checklist
- o Network of Relations Chinese
- o Network of Relations English
- o Network of Relations Kreyol
- o Network of Relations Spanish
- o Parent Interview Year 1 (Initial) Chinese
- o Parent Interview Year 1 (Initial) English
- o Parent Interview Year 1 (Initial) Kreyol
- o Parent Interview Year 1 (Initial) Spanish
- o Parent Interview Year 5 (Final) Chinese
- o Parent Interview Year 5 (Final) English
- o Parent Interview Year 5 (Final) Spanish
- o Sentence Completion Manual
- o Student Interview Year 1 Chinese
- o Student Interview Year 1 English
- o Student Interview Year 1 Kreyol
- o Student Interview Year 1 Spanish
- o Student Interview Year 2 Chinese
- o Student Interview Year 2 English
- o Student Interview Year 2 Kreyol
- o Student Interview Year 2 Spanish
- o Student Interview Year 3 Chinese
- o Student Interview Year 3 English
- o Student Interview Year 3 Kreyol
- o Student Interview Year 3 Spanish
- o Student Interview Year 4 Chinese
- o Student Interview Year 4 English
- o Student Interview Year 4 Kreyol
- o Student Interview Year 4 Spanish
- o Student Interview Year 5 Chinese
- o Student Interview Year 5 English
- o Student Interview Year 5 Kreyol
- o Student Interview Year 5 Spanish
- o TAT1 Manual
- o TAT1 Scoring Form
- o TAT2 Manual
- o TAT2 Scoring Form
- o Teacher Intervie