

**From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library,
Princeton, NJ**

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyright law. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material in our collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff. For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information on the Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.

<https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines>. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. <https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us>

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026

Sociology

2016

Tiger Children in Old and New Immigrant Destinations: The Divergent Educational Experiences of Chinese Immigrant Youth in Spain, Italy and the U.S

Yiu, Jessica

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

<http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01wd375z702>

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf>

TIGER CHILDREN IN OLD AND NEW IMMIGRANT DESTINATIONS:
THE DIVERGENT EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF CHINESE
IMMIGRANT YOUTH IN SPAIN, ITALY AND THE U.S

JESSICA YIU

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE
FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
AND THE OFFICE OF POPULATION RESEARCH

ADVISOR: ALEJANDRO PORTES

APRIL 2016

© Copyright by Jessica Yiu, 2016.

All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgement.....	iii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. Background Theoretical and Empirical Research.....	23
Chapter 3. “Tickets to Mobility”: Educational vs. Entrepreneurial Success Frames.....	56
Chapter 4. An “Italian” or “Spanish” Equivalent of the “American Dream”? Perceptions of Opportunity and the Formation of Success Frames.....	96
Chapter 5. “Tiger Parenting” and its Influence on Youth’s Success Frames: The Role of Parental Expectations, Experiences and Engagement.....	142
Chapter 6. Conclusion.....	189
Appendix.....	205
References.....	213

ABSTRACT

Deemed ‘model minorities,’ second-generation Chinese-Americans have, on average, high levels of educational attainment and, as a result, they have experienced more upward mobility than other groups. Yet, on the other side of the Atlantic, a strikingly different story about Chinese immigrants and their offspring emerges. Findings from my preliminary research show that Chinese youths in Spain and Italy have substantially *lower* educational ambitions and attainment than youths from every other ethno-national origin group.

What are the explanations for these drastic divergences in the educational trajectories of Chinese immigrant youth across different host societies? My research highlights three potential explanations: cultural understandings of success, perceptions of blocked opportunity and sense of belonging in the host societies, and the role of parental influence in shaping youth’s educational and career ambitions. Based on analysis of three comparable, large-scale datasets in the U.S., Spain and Italy, I find that a key factor in determining minority youth’s educational ambitions is the availability of alternative channels for mobility – namely, entrepreneurship – in the ethnic community and the host society. Unlike their counterparts in the U.S., Chinese youth in Spain and Italy tend to express entrepreneurial rather than academic ambitions. Met with discrimination at school and in the labor market, yet finding financial success in niche markets as small business owners, it appears that the Chinese in Southern Europe have, at least temporarily, forged an alternative pathway of mobility based on entrepreneurial endeavors rather than educational accomplishments – a formula passed on from immigrant parents to their offspring. In addition to findings from multivariate regression analyses, additional evidence is provided in in-depth interviews with Chinese youth and their parents across the three host societies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to thank upon completing my dissertation. First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee. Alex Portes, my chair, provided the genesis for this research topic. Never would I have thought when I first entered grad school that my research would bring me to Spain and Italy. As his research assistant, I had the opportunity to gain early access to analyzing the ILSEG data set and to serendipitously come across the empirical puzzle that would become my dissertation topic. I am inspired by his intellectual rigor, his sociological imagination and above all, his enduring patience after all these years he served as my advisor and mentor. I would also like to thank Sara McLanahan for her endlessly constructive feedback and strong support, as well as Eddie Telles for his keen insights and persistent encouragement. My utmost appreciation also goes to my external readers, Alicia Adsera and Maggie Frye, for reviewing my dissertation.

I was fortunate to get advice and help from many scholars in the U.S. and abroad for my research. Many thanks to the researchers at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra, the Center of Migration at La Fundación José Ortega y Gasset, and the Sociology Department at the University of Padova. I would also like to thank the ISMGNY group at the CUNY Graduate School for letting me access their interview transcripts. Most importantly, I would like to thank my respondents in Madrid and Milan who so generously offered their time and honesty to a complete stranger from another land. I am so grateful that they were willing to open up about their personal lives as well as their greatest fears and disappointments. Without their interviews, my dissertation would truly be lacking.

Finally, I would like to give my most heartfelt thanks to my friends and family whose unconditional support and encouragement powered me through grad school. I'm thankful for my

awesome SOC cohort and the fine folks at OPR (a special shout out to Wallace 227!). Thanks to my kind and caring friends in NYC, Princeton and Toronto for always lending an ear and making me laugh when I needed to the most. I am especially grateful to my two sisters, Amanda and Michelle – you have kept me sane throughout this entire process. Above all, I owe all of this to my parents for their unfailing love.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The Empirical Puzzle

Historically, education has proven to be an important vehicle of upward mobility for immigrant groups in the U.S. One of the best exemplars is Chinese-Americans. Deemed ‘model minorities,’ the children of Chinese immigrants have, on average, high levels of educational attainment and, as a result, they have experienced more upward mobility than most other groups. Seventy-two percent of the children of Chinese immigrants¹ have, at least, a bachelor’s degree, compared to 49 and 15 percent of their European and Mexican counterparts, respectively (CPS 2009).

Yet, on the other side of the Atlantic, a strikingly different story about Chinese immigrants and their offspring – a vastly understudied group – emerges. It appears that Chinese youths in Southern Europe have substantially *lower* educational ambitions and attainment than youths from every other ethno-national origin group. Statistics show that only 20 per cent of Chinese youths are enrolled in post-compulsory secondary education, the prerequisite level of schooling to enter university compared to 40 per cent of the entire adolescent population and nearly 30 per cent of the immigrant youth population in Spain (Generalitat de Catalunya 2010).² Likewise, Chinese youths in Italy exhibit similarly low levels of educational ambition: compared to native Italians and most ethno-immigrant groups (except Moroccans and Macedonians), only a small percentage of Chinese youths have aspirations to attend university, even after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics (Minello and Barban 2011). How then do we explain the drastically divergent educational experiences and outcomes of Chinese-origin youths across different countries? In other words, how does a group that is held as a shining example of

academic achievement in some contexts (e.g. the U.S.) display, on the contrary, such low educational ambitions in other contexts (e.g. Spain and Italy)? This is the empirical puzzle which motivates my dissertation.

Disparate Levels of Educational Expectations: Chinese Youth in the U.S. versus in Spain and Italy

Prior to presenting a proposed theory for understanding this empirical puzzle, I present descriptive statistics that show the educational expectations of Chinese youth across the three contexts of reception based on the data analyzed in this study. (Note that detailed descriptions about the analytical data – CILS, ILSEG, ITAGEN, and ISGMNY – are discussed later in this chapter.) Table 1.1 shows the level of educational expectations among immigrant youth across the three countries. Comparing the Chinese to the other groups, relatively small proportions of Chinese youth in Spain and Italy – only 14 and 33 percent, respectively – expect to attend university or to pursue the university preparatory track, compared to the sample averages which are 40 and 50 percent (if the native Italians are not included in calculating the sample averages) in Spain and Italy, respectively. In contrast, high proportions of Chinese-American youth (i.e. 95 percent) expect to attend university to pursue their bachelor's degree or even beyond, even though it is only slightly higher than the sample average which is 90 percent.

Table 1.1. Levels of Educational Expectations across National Origins in Spain (ILSEG), Italy (ITAGEN) and the U.S. (CILS)

EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS								
Spain (ILSEG)			Italy (ITAGEN)			U.S. (CILS)		
National Origin	ESO	University or higher	National Origin	Lower Secondary	University or higher	National Origin	H.S. degree	B.A. or higher
China	39.3	13.5	China	17.3	33.2	China	4.2	95.8
Philippines	14.8	23.9	Philippines	0.0	60.9	Philippines	5.6	94.4
Colombia	22.8	24.9	Colombia	0.0	45.0	Colombia	7.9	92.1
Dominican Republic	29.2	15.8	Dominican Republic	2.9	51.4	Dominican Republic	11.4	88.6
South or Other Asia	22.2	27.5	South or Other Asia	8.7	33.6	Vietnamese	9.9	90.1
Morocco	28.0	22.4	Morocco	6.4	41.4	Cuban	6.7	93.3
Romania	24.0	17.3	Romania	3.5	53.3	Mexican	19.9	80.1
Ecuador	14.1	36.3	Albania	4.8	49.9	Asia	19.4	80.6
Peru	11.9	41.1	Macedonia	13.8	31.3	South and Central America	8.1	91.9
Bolivia	11.3	48.3	Europe, U.S., Canada	3.8	56.2	West Indies	5.8	94.2
South or Central America	9.2	50.2	Africa and Middle East	1.2	54.0	Other countries	3.2	96.8
Africa and Middle East	11.1	39.8	Asia	3.2	62.9	<i>Sample Average</i>	9.8	90.3
Europe and North America	11.1	47.1	South or Central America	3.1	58.1			
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>15.1</i>	<i>39.2</i>	Native Italian	3.4	62.8			
			<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>57.6</i>			

Sources: ILSEG (2008), ITAGEN (2006), CILS (1992)

Theoretical Framework: Towards Understanding the Formulation of Educational Ambitions among Immigrant and Minority Youth

Probing into this empirical puzzle, my dissertation examines the formulation of educational plans among immigrant minority youths and the factors which shape them, by studying the case of Chinese youths in three countries. Its greater purpose extends beyond explaining the counter-intuitiveness of finding that Chinese immigrant youths, whose level of educational achievement exceeds even native whites in the U.S., display such low levels of educational ambition in Spain and Italy. On a broader level, my dissertation should contribute to a more general theory about how minority youths interact with the opportunity structures of the dominant societies and respond to blocked opportunity by seeking alternative channels of mobility.

Existing theories tend to focus on cultural traits and/or group selectivity by economic and socio-demographic characteristics in explaining racial and ethnic differences in educational

outcomes. In understanding why some groups are more ambitious than others, scholars such as Fordham and Ogbu (1986) have argued that youths with low educational ambitions have adopted an ‘oppositional culture,’ eschewing mainstream norms and values of upward mobility as a form of resistance against racial and ethnic discrimination. Conversely, in the case of Chinese-Americans, conventional wisdom has attributed their high educational ambitions and achievements to the norms and values that are intrinsic to Chinese cultures – namely, the disciplinarian style of childrearing among Asian parents, and their unshakable expectations for their children to strive for academic excellence. This is more vividly illustrated by the recent entry of the phrase, “Tiger Mom,” into popular parlance to describe the demanding style of Asian parenting determined to raise straight-A students. Yet, if shared norms about the utmost value of education that are allegedly intrinsic to Chinese culture explain the educational success of Chinese-Americans, then why are their counterparts in Spain and Italy – who, in theory, would also possess the same cultural orientations – not equally driven in their academic pursuits? Clearly, the divergent ambitions of Chinese youths across national contexts highlight the fallacy of purely cultural explanations.

Another possible explanation is that the types of Chinese immigrants and their offspring who settle in the U.S. and other traditional immigrant-receiving countries are fundamentally different – namely in their socioeconomic profiles – from those who are settling in relatively ‘new’ destination countries, such as Spain and Italy. In other words, the divergent outcomes of Chinese youths in the U.S. versus Spain and Italy are due to the selectivity of the migratory streams to different countries, with the possibility that Chinese-American immigrants are positively selected in terms of their class origins and educational backgrounds compared to the Chinese in Spain and Italy. This is certainly a valid explanation, which is why the regression

analyses in the subsequent chapters will incorporate various socio-economic and demographic factors into the analytical models. That said, results from initial research that I have already conducted confirm that compositional differences across immigrant groups by class origins and education backgrounds, while substantial, do not fully account for why some groups have higher ambitions than others (Yiu 2013). Moreover, existing studies have pointed out that even among Chinese-American youths from humble, working-class origins, their drive for academic success is still strong, most likely due to their parents' and even co-ethnic communities' high expectations for them (e.g. Kasinitz et al. 2008; Kao 1995; Louie 2004).

Instead of cultural traits or group selectivity, I focus on the contexts into which immigrants and their descendants are received as the most salient factors which account for their divergent educational experiences and outcomes across countries (Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In studying the contexts of reception, I identify two junctures of interaction between minority youths, their families, and the host societies as they formulate their educational and occupational ambitions. First, there are the kinds of opportunity structures in which immigrant youths are embedded, mainly determined by the accessibility of the higher educational system as well as the occupational prestige ladder – and how such interactions alter their educational and occupational plans for the future. Second, faced with blocked opportunity structures, there is the availability of alternative channels of mobility such that immigrant youths and their families can forgo investments into higher education if there are other viable means to socioeconomic advancement, one of which is ethnic entrepreneurship. The formulation of ambitions among immigrant youths represents a form of “strategic adaptation” (Xie and Goyette 2003) in the sense that they calibrate their ambitions to adapt to pathways of blocked opportunity by seizing alternative channels of mobility. The concept of ‘strategic adaptation’ argues that

individuals from marginalized groups make conscious decisions related to their social mobility to effectively cope with discrimination and other societal disadvantages in the educational system and the labor market. The personal ambitions of minority youths, ultimately, represent the product of individual preferences, familial expectations, group resources, and social constraints.

In other words, the theoretical framework that I present shifts the focus from the intrinsic cultural traits of a group to its ‘mobilizing strategies’ vis-à-vis the barriers to adaptation and social mobility in the receiving context. There are thus two important factors which shape the educational ambitions of minority youths. On the one hand, there is the degree of openness in the receiving society towards immigrant and ethnic minorities. Key institutions which determine the degree of openness for minority groups in the contexts for reception are the educational system and labor market. Countries of immigrant destination have vastly different educational systems, in addition to unequal experiences with integrating immigrants and their descendants into the dominant institutions of the host society given that their histories of immigration vary so widely (Alba et al. 2011). Compared to other countries – most notably, those in Western and Southern Europe – the U.S. stands out for its long history of immigration and thus, its more ample experiences with integrating generations of immigrants into its core institutions, including the educational system and labor market. (Whether it has been more successful than other countries, however, is up for scholarly debate.)

Moreover, the U.S. is perceived to be a relatively open society, as exemplified by the popularity of its national discourse of the “American Dream”: no matter how dire the circumstances into which individuals are born, they can overcome such barriers at birth through individual effort and fortitude (Beller and Hout 2006). Education, in particular, is deemed the great equalizer in the pursuit of the American Dream. By comparison, the opportunity structures

of Spain and Italy are deemed more rigid, whether in actuality or by perception (Breen and Jonsson 2005; Güell et al, 2007; Pisati 1997). In these relatively ‘new’ immigrant countries, social mobility is particularly curtailed for immigrant and ethnic minorities (Portes et al. 2010).

On the other hand, youth formulate their ambitions according to their group’s mobilizing strategies for adapting to societal conditions of blocked opportunity. Aspirations for higher education depend not so much on the socioeconomic background of immigrant families; instead, the impetus for pursuing college degrees depends on the availability of viable channels of mobility other than higher education, such as ethnic entrepreneurship. Met with discrimination at school and in the labor market, yet finding financial success in niche markets as small business owners, the Chinese in Spain and Italy have, at least temporarily, forged an alternative pathway of mobility based on entrepreneurial endeavors – a formula which I hypothesize is passed on from Chinese immigrant parents to their children, who formulate their educational and occupational plans in large part according to how their parents have interacted with the opportunity structures of the host societies.

Key Research Areas

Given this general theoretical framework, I examine three particular aspects of the formation of immigrant youth’s educational expectations.

1. Success Frames and Cultural Understandings of Success

Rather than discount cultural theories altogether, there is increasing acknowledgement amongst scholars of inequality that culture and structure interact in the production and reproduction of social stratification. In understanding disparate educational outcomes among different groups of immigrant youth, Zhou and Lee (2013) propose that the concept of frames is integral to

explaining interethnic differences in second-generation educational achievement. They argue that although the vast majority of immigrant parents and their children value education, the frame through which they define a ‘good education’ differs across ethnic groups. For some groups, obtaining a high school diploma and attending community college might suffice. For other groups, a good education might represent graduating from high school as valedictorian and attending a high competitive university where they study in a major for a high-status profession. Based on their interviews with Chinese, Vietnamese and Mexican second-generation in the U.S., they find that the Chinese and to a lesser extent, the Vietnamese generally have a much more exacting and loftier definition of what constitutes as a good education, whereas Mexican youth see being well-educated as surpassing their parents’ and co-ethnic peers’ level of educational attainment back in home country. Therefore, it is not that some second-generation groups value education more than others; instead, they construct remarkably different notions of what a good education and academic mean depending on the frame that is accessible to them, and that which they adopt.

Cultural frames of success are shaped by values – which are necessary but not sufficient conditions to enact a frame – as well as resources within a given ethnic community. Middle-class members of the first generation who typically arrive earlier in the host society oftentimes marshal the kinds of ethnic resources that enable newer immigrant families, with lower levels of parental human capital, to achieve intergenerational mobility. Ethnic resources include tangible resources from the ethnic economy (e.g. self-employment opportunities, supplementary tutoring programs), intangible resources (e.g. information sharing among co-ethnic parents and students about educational opportunities and college requirements), and a sizeable presence of middle-class and professionally successful co-ethnics to act as role models. With a high standard for

what defines a good education as well as access to resources which can enact this more parochial cultural frame of success, certain immigrant groups – such as Chinese youth in the U.S. – formulate high levels of educational expectations.

II. Perceptions of Blocked Opportunity

The formation of success frames is both a proactive and reactive process. It is proactive in that ethnic communities provide the resources which immigrant parents and youth can actively leverage to construct their ambitions, as discussed above. Simultaneously, it is a reactive process in that cultural understandings of success are reactionary developments to barriers to upward mobility, whether they are real or perceived. A popular debate within the literature on minority youth and educational outcomes is whether perceptions of unequal opportunity discourage or motivate them to excel in their studies.

On the one hand, minority groups that are particularly resource-deprived are likely to face discrimination from natives due to their class origins and skin color. Met with racial discrimination, these downwardly mobile groups are at risk of developing an oppositional attitude towards mainstream institutions, such as the education and labor market systems. Youth, in particular, are susceptible to adopting this oppositional attitude as a way of coping to social and economic exclusion, which includes questioning the value of schooling (Ogbu 1978; Portes and Zhou 1993). On the other hand, prejudice and discrimination – perceived or actual – can provide the impetus for minority youth to work harder at school in order to overcome the potential discrimination that they will face in other societal domains. In the eyes of these minority youth, the classroom is a meritocratic setting in which individual effort and talent are rewarded, while the same meritocracy may not be found in other institutional settings in the host

society as their parents' may attest. In this way, perceptions of unequal opportunity play a potentially powerful role in shaping youth's success frames.

III. Parental Influence

In addition to cultural frames and perceptions of blocked opportunity, parental influence is also a potential determinant of youth's educational ambitions and outcomes. Rather than independently altering youth's educational and career plans, parental influencer can work in tandem with, as well as shape, youth's cultural frames and perceptions of blocked opportunity in determining youth's educational expectations. The extant literature has highlighted parental involvement as an important determinant of youth's schooling experiences and outcomes. Ideally, parents and educators should work closely in youth's learning process; in the home, parents should conduct activities and encourage conversations with their children that reinforce the ideal environment of high achievement and ambitions found in the classroom (Epstein 1996). In reality, of course, immigrant and minority youth – particularly those who grow up in resource-deprived schools – are unlikely to be in classrooms in which such high standards of academic achievement are enforced. In these cases, scholars and policymakers would argue that positive parental involvement can substitute or counteract the inadequacy of teachers and schools in promoting high ambitions and achievement (e.g. Sheldon 2002).

Ethnic and racial differences in parental involvement have been suggested as contributors to disparities in educational ambitions and achievement among minority youth. Alleged cultural differences in childrearing styles are often popularly invoked – for instance, Asian parents practice the sort of strict and authoritarian childrearing that produces straight-A students, whereas Hispanic (especially Mexican) and black parents are assumed to be disinterested in their schooling of their children (Bol and Berry 2005; DeCastro-Ambrosetti and

Cho 2005). Cultural theories about disparities in educational investment by parents are often cited, although actual evidence is tenuous. By comparison, structural theories of inter-ethnic differences in parenting are more empirical grounded. Most notable is John Ogbu's theory of voluntary versus involuntary migration, which he argues determines the way different ethno-racial groups interact with the opportunity structures of the host societies (Ogbu 1978; Ogbu and Simons 1998). Voluntary minorities, who willingly migrate to the host society to seek better opportunities, see education as a primary mechanism for realizing such opportunities and therefore, make high investments in their children's education. By contrast, involuntary minorities are groups who have been historically enslaved, colonized or conquered in their host societies. Faced with greater and more persistent forms of discrimination which hinder their upward mobility, they are more suspicious about the efficacy of higher education and therefore, make fewer educational investments for their children (Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi 1986).

Data

For this study, I analyze data from three studies that examine the children of immigrants in the U.S., Spain and Italy, respectively. Note that the studies in Spain and Italy purposefully replicate the U.S. study in their survey designs which allows for comparability of most of the key variables across the studies. Also, keep in mind that because the Italian data (ITAGEN) does not include a parental survey, analyses that involve predictors and outcomes derived from parental responses are based only on the U.S. (CILS) and Spanish (ILSEG) data (namely, in Chapter 5). Here are brief descriptions of the three primary data sets analyzed in this study, in addition to a supplementary data set:

- *The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS) in the U.S.:* CILS is a longitudinal study designed to study the adaptation process of the immigrant second-generation which is

defined broadly as U.S.-born children with at least one foreign-born parent or children born abroad but moved to the U.S. at an early age. The original survey was conducted in 1992 with samples of second-generation children attending the 8th and 9th grades in public and private schools in the metropolitan areas of Miami/Fort Lauderdale in Florida and San Diego, California. The total sample size at Wave I is 5,262 respondents at Wave I. Respondents came from 77 different nationalities, with the Chinese constituting approximately 2 percent of the sample.³

- *The Children of Immigrants in Spain Study (ILSEG in its Spanish acronym)*: ILSEG is a replication of CILS in its survey design. A stratified random sample of 6,884 immigrant youth, between the ages of 12 and 17, were contacted and interviewed in 176 public and private schools in Madrid and Barcelona in 2008. The stratified sample design maintained the same sampling fraction by school type (i.e. public and private-dependent) and by region within each metropolitan area, thus making the sample self-weighting (Portes et al. 2010). Within each school, all eligible students were included. Over sixty different foreign-born groups were identified in the survey. The Chinese constitutes approximately 5 percent of the analytical sample.⁴
- *The Children of Immigrants in Italy Longitudinal Study (ITAGEN in its Italian acronym)*: ITAGEN is the first nationwide survey on the children of immigrants in Italy. The survey also includes a substantial subsample of native Italian youths (i.e. third-plus generations) as a reference group. The first wave of data was collected in the 2005-6 school year when the respondents were attending middle school at approximately ages 13 and 14 years. The respondents lived in 44 provinces and attended 229 different middle schools. Schools were randomly chosen in five of the Central and Northern regions (i.e. Lombardy, Veneto,

Tuscany, Marches, and Lazio), in which there are higher concentrations of immigrants, and four of the Southern regions (i.e. Campania, Apulia, Calabria and Sicily). The first wave sample includes 8,618 immigrant youth and 11,910 “native Italians”. The Chinese constitutes approximately 5 percent of the immigrant youth sample.

- *Immigrant Second-Generation in Metropolitan New York Study (ISGMNY)*: The study draws its sample from the greater metropolitan area of New York City, including surrounding counties in the inner-part of the New York-New Jersey metropolitan region, sampling the children of immigrants as well as “native” whites and African Americans between the ages of 18 and 32 years old. The older age range of the sample respondent provides information about their experiences in making the school-to-work transition, which supplements information about the U.S. youth sample drawn from the CILS data who are still in early adolescence. Moreover, the parental SES characteristics of the Chinese respondents in the ISGMNY study are more comparable to their counterparts’ in the ILSEG and ITAGEN studies. Data collection took place in 1999 over telephone interviews. The sample includes 3,417 respondents, 829 of whom were native whites and African Americans. The Chinese constituted the largest ethnic subgroup at 18 percent of the sample.

Additionally, parental surveys from CILS and ILSEG are analyzed in Chapter 5:

- *CILS Parental Survey*: During the follow-up CILS Youth Survey in 1996, a parental survey was also conducted. The parental survey targeted half of the total universe of parents, selecting them on a random basis. Whereas the student surveys were conducted mostly via self-administered questionnaires in school, the parental interviews were conducted face-to-face and mostly at home. Due to the many of the parents’ limited English proficiency, the questionnaire was translated and administered in six different foreign languages. The purpose

of this interview was to establish directly characteristics of immigrant parents and families and their outlooks for the future, including aspirations and plans for the children. In total, 2,442 parents (i.e. 46 percent of the original student sample) were interviewed. Their national origins closely resemble, in proportional terms, those of the student sample.

- *ILSEG Parental Survey:* As part of the second phase of the ILSEG Youth Study, a survey of a subset of the youth respondents' parents was conducted to complement the data obtained from children. Through questionnaire administered via mail and over the telephone, 1,843 parent respondents were included in the survey – representing 28 percent of the original student survey in Wave 1. Note that proportions of major nationalities in both parental and youth surveys are nearly identical.

In addition to conducting multivariate regression analyses of the aforementioned data sets, I will present qualitative data that I collected firsthand based on 29 in-person, in-depth interviews with Chinese immigrant youth (and, in some cases, their parents), mostly living in Madrid, Spain and Milan, Italy. These semi-structured, tape-recorded interviews lasted from twenty minutes to three hours. The interviews covered a range of topics, including the reasons for and circumstances of the youth's educational and occupational decisions, perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in their host societies, parental ambitions for and influences on their children, as well as, if applicable, the role of their family business on youth's future plans. The interviews were conducted in either Chinese or Italian/Spanish, the latter for which I hired a translator to be present at the interviews. For Chinese immigrant youth living in the U.S., I present evidence from transcripts based on in-depth, in-person, follow-up interviews conducted for the ISGMNY study by members of their original team.⁵ Although the primary methodology of this study is

survey data analysis, the qualitative data serve to illustrate and enrich the conclusions drawn from the quantitative data analysis.

Key Variables

Key predictors and outcomes included in the analytical models for each empirical chapter are as follows:

	Chapter 3	Chapter 4	Chapter 5
Predictor(s)	• Educational / Entrepreneurial Success Frames • Occupational Indicators • Youth's National Origins • Youth's Socio-demographic Background	• Perceptions of Blocked Mobility / Sense of Belonging • Youth's National Origins • Youth's Socio-demographic Background	• Parent's University Expectations • Parental Engagement / Experiences • Parent's National Origins • Youth's and Parent's Socio-demographic Background
Outcome(s)	• Youth's University Expectations	• Educational / Entrepreneurial Success Frames	• Youth's University Expectations • Parent's University Expectations

Their precise definitions and operationalizations are described in their respective empirical chapters. National origins and control variables are included in all of the analytical models and thus, described here:

National Origins. The main predictor of interest is the youth's self-reported national origin.

Given sufficient numbers of cases, the same set of nationality groups are coded across all the different data sets. For the remainder of the categories, groups with a sizeable number of cases in

each country (e.g. Ecuadorans in Spain, Macedonians in Italy, Cubans and Mexicans in the U.S.) and regional categories aggregated from smaller nationality groups are coded. Given that the primary comparison of interest in this study is between Chinese and non-Chinese youth in the multivariate analyses, the Chinese is the reference category. The degree to which the addition of other covariates changes the coefficients of the origin groups in a series of nested models (e.g. reducing the magnitude of the coefficient and the level of significance) represents the degree to which they account for Chinese-versus-non-Chinese group differences across the key outcomes.

Socio-demographic and Economic Variables (“Control” Variables): To account for the compositional variations between different nationality groups, the following ‘control’ variables are included in the analysis in Chapters 3, 4 and 5: the youth’s nativity status (i.e. birthplace and, for those not born in the receiving country, their age at arrival); sex; age; their course or grade level⁶; the type of school attended (i.e. private/semi-private versus public)⁷; whether or not they lived with both biological parents⁸; number of siblings; their report of their parents’ highest level of schooling attained (i.e. less than secondary, completed secondary or some post-secondary, and completed post-secondary)⁹; city or region of residence¹⁰; and, whether their home language is the official language of the receiving country¹¹. (See Tables A, B, C, and D in the Appendix for the descriptive statistics for the analytical sample of the different datasets.)

In Chapter 5, parental socio-demographic variables are also included into the analysis as ‘control’ variables. They include: gender; age; length of residence in the U.S. or Spain (and in CILS, U.S. citizenship); knowledge of English/Spanish index; highest level of educational attainment (i.e. less than secondary, completed secondary or some post-secondary, and

completed post-secondary); and, self-employment status. (See Tables F and G in the Appendix for the cross-tabulations of the parental and youth control variables by ethno-national origins.¹²)

Chapter Outlines

Chapter 2. Background Theoretical and Empirical Research

In this chapter, I discuss in greater detail the theoretical frameworks and empirical research which guide the analyses presented in the subsequent chapters. First, I provide a brief demographic and historical overview of the Chinese in the U.S. and Southern Europe, drawing comparisons in the selectivity of the immigrant cohorts as well as their assimilative trajectories across immigrant generations. Then, I review the extant literature on discrimination and perceptions of blocked opportunity, focusing on theories and empirical examples regarding racism and xenophobia in the U.S. versus Southern Europe (in Chapter 4). Finally, I compare the educational systems and different models of parent-school partnerships across the host societies, in order to preface subsequent analyses about the role of parental influence (in Chapter 5).

Chapter 3. “Tickets to Mobility”: Educational vs. Entrepreneurial Success Frames

This chapter examines the formation of success frames – educational versus entrepreneurial – and the degree to which they predict immigrant youths’ educational expectations. At the outset, I define the meaning of “success frames”. Then I address to sets of specific research questions. First, how does the adoption of educational versus entrepreneurial success frames compare between Chinese and non-Chinese youth in Spain, Italy and the U.S.? Second, to what degree to these opposing success frames account for differences in the expected levels of educational attainment among Chinese youth across the host societies? As opposed to variations in

immigrant selectivity of the Chinese vis-à-vis demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, the focus is on the role of success frames – namely, the valuation of educational versus entrepreneurial ambitions – in shaping actual educational expectations.

Chapter 4. An “Italian” or “Spanish” Equivalent of the “American Dream”? Perceptions of Opportunity and the Formation of Success Frames

In this chapter, I examine the ways in which perceptions of blocked opportunity and sense of belonging shape the formation of success frames among immigrant youth. I delve into the broader comparisons of the contexts of reception across the host societies vis-à-vis how their opportunity structures are perceived by immigrants and ethnic minorities. The implication of these comparisons is to understand whether there is an equivalent of the “American Dream” in Spain and Italy. Do immigrants and their children in Southern Europe, as they do in the U.S., subscribe to a national ethos which believes that access to opportunities for success and prosperity are purely meritocratic and thus, higher education is the most effective means for accessing those opportunities? For the analysis, in addition to comparing the perceptions of opportunity among Chinese versus non-Chinese youth across the three countries, I also run regression analyses examining the degree to which perceptions of blocked opportunity and sense of belonging predict the adoption of educational versus entrepreneurial opportunities.

Chapter 5. “Tiger Parenting” and its Influence on Youth’s Success Frames: The Role of Parental Expectations, Experiences and Engagement

In this chapter, I examine the role of parental influence on youth’s educational attitudes and outcomes. Specifically, two questions are addressed. First, to what degree does parental involvement significantly influence their children’s educational experiences and outcomes?

Second, are there significant ethno-racial variations that exist in parenting styles and levels of engagement? Such cultural variations can manifest as differences in childrearing styles across immigrant groups, as well as differences in how parent-school partnerships are organized across educational systems. The analysis examines whether parental involvement – measured in terms of their expectations, engagement and experiences regarding their children’s schooling – significantly predicts youth’s success frames and their level of educational expectations.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

The conclusion will summarize the key findings of the previous empirical chapters. Following the summary is a discussion of the greater implications for understanding the formation of educational and career plans among immigrant minority youth as well as the disparities that emerge between different ethnic groups across host societies. To conclude, directions for future research are laid out.

NOTES:

1. Includes the children of immigrants from other East Asian countries between the ages of 24 and 35.
2. Basic secondary education in Spain ends at the U.S. equivalent of grade 10. Thereafter, post-compulsory secondary education is separated into two tracks: vocational training and preparation into the university system.
3. Follow-up surveys were conducted in 1995-6 and 2002-3.

4. A follow-up survey was conducted in 2012-3.
5. Interview transcripts from the ISGMNY study were analyzed in-house at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. The author was given permission to access and to analyze the interview transcripts by the principal investigators of the ISGMNY study.
6. For ILSEG, the course level is coded as the first, second and third year of ESO or basic compulsory schooling. For ITAGEN, the grade level is coded as the first, second, and third year of lower secondary schooling. For CILS, the grade level is coded as eighth or ninth grade.
7. The type of school attended is not available in the ITAGEN data.
8. For ISGMNY, the relevant question asks the respondent retrospectively whether he/she grew up living with his/her biological parents during childhood and adolescence given that this is an older cohort of respondents (i.e. 18 to 32 years old).
9. When parental control variables are included in the analysis in Chapter 5, parents' own response to their highest level of schooling is considered in lieu of the youth's response.
10. For ILSEG, the city of residence is Barcelona or Madrid. For ITAGEN, the region of residence is classified in North, Central or Southern Italy. For CILS, the city of residence is San Diego or Miami/Fort Lauderdale.
11. For ILSEG, the language in reference to the home language is Spanish. For ITAGEN, it is Italian, whereas for CILS and ISGMNY, it is English.
12. One can get a sense of the general profiles of the Chinese versus non-Chinese parents and their children on both sides of the Atlantic. In terms of parental control variables, among the

Chinese parents in the U.S., fathers are more likely to be interviewed than among other groups. They also tend to be slightly older, to have U.S. citizenship and are married. As for two (presumably) key predictors, parental education and self-employment, it is interesting to note that although the proportion of college-educated Chinese parents is higher than the sample average, a sizeable proportion also have just completed middle school or less. On average, Chinese parents are more or less just as likely to be self-employed as other groups. (Cubans have the highest rates of self-employment in the parental sample.) Comparing the parental sample in Spain to the one in the U.S., there are some similarities between them. In Spain, Chinese fathers are relatively more likely to be interviewed than fathers in other groups and Chinese parents are more likely to be married than the rest of the sample. However, there are stark differences when considering other characteristics. For instance, Chinese parents in Spain are much less likely to have obtained Spanish nationality compared to the rest of the sample, They are also comparably less educated than their Chinese counterparts in the U.S., although it is important to note that their educational profiles are quite similar to other immigrant groups in Spain, which overall, tend to be less educated. Finally, the Chinese parents in Spain have much higher levels of self-employment than the sample average. As for the youth control variables, the Chinese youth respondents in the U.S. are more likely to be born in the U.S. and among the foreign-born, to have arrived to the U.S. at a younger age than the rest of the sample. The majority are also likely to be either an only child or have one sibling. By comparison, the Chinese youth respondents in Spain are more likely than the rest of the sample to be born in Spain and among the foreign-born, to have arrived before the age of 6; however, compared to their Chinese counterparts in the U.S., they are slightly less likely to be native-born. Note also that the Chinese in Spain are more likely than their counterparts in the U.S. to have more than one sibling, which is similar to the rest of

the sample in Spain. They are also more likely to be female and overwhelmingly, live with both parents compared to the sample average.

CHAPTER 2. BACKGROUND THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Introduction

In this chapter, I review and synthesize relevant theoretical and empirical research which grounds the subsequent analytical chapters. First, I provide a brief historical and contemporary overview of the Chinese across the host societies' different reception contexts in intergenerational perspective. The key measure of comparison for the integration of the Chinese across the host societies is the assimilative trajectories of the first- and second-generations, including immigrant youth's educational outcomes. Additional focus is paid to differences in the selectivity of Chinese migration streams to the U.S. versus Southern Europe, which albeit significant, are arguably not the primary contributors to the disparate assimilation trajectories across the Atlantic. The review of the literature on selectivity primes the empirical analyses in Chapter 3 which examines the different factors predicting youth's educational expectations, including their background characteristics as well as their cultural framings of success.

Then, I review the existing literature on discrimination and perceptions of blocked opportunity. Most of the theories which examine the relationship between perceived belonging and discrimination are based upon the U.S. experience, drawing comparisons between upwardly and downwardly mobile minority groups. Given the relative recency of mass immigration as a phenomenon in Southern Europe, studies about discrimination and inequality among their immigrants tend to heavily draw upon U.S. theories. Therefore, given the widely known history of racism in the U.S., I cast the spotlight on the less represented cases of Italy and Spain,

focusing on empirical studies which refer to examples of racism and xenophobia. Specifically, I focus on nascent research on discrimination experienced by the Chinese in Southern Europe. This literature provides context for the empirical analyses conducted in Chapter 4 on the role of perceived discrimination and sense of mobility on youth's adoption of success frames.

Finally, I turn to a review of different educational systems and models of parent, school, and community partnerships. Cross-continental comparisons of legislations, policies and general public expectations regarding parental involvement in children's education both inside and outside the classroom are drawn. This comparative literature serves as background research for understanding the role of parental involvement in immigrant minority youth's educational experiences and outcomes across the different receiving contexts of the host countries, which will be further examined in Chapter 5.

A Brief Historical and Contemporary Overview of the Chinese across the Host Societies

The Chinese in Spain and Italy

Both Spain and Italy have historically been countries of out-migration, sending millions of workers to the North and Latin Americas and, after World War II, to Northern Europe. Since joining the European Union and experiencing a large economic boom in the 1980s, however, both countries have quickly transitioned from countries of net emigration to immigration. In addition to the return of millions of former emigrants, migrant workers from countries abroad also settled in both countries – first, from nearby countries, such as Romania and Morocco, and then diversifying to countries in Latin America and Asia (Cachon 2009; ISTAT 2012). In 2000, only 2 per cent of the Spanish and Italian populations were foreign-born; a decade later, the foreign-born constituted nearly 12 and 8 per cents of the Spanish and Italian populations,

respectively. In major cities which are the magnet destinations for immigrants, these figures increase to approximately 16 per cent in Madrid and Barcelona, Spain, and 20 per cent in Milan (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 2012; ISTAT 2012). The proportions of the foreign-born in the population of both countries are among the highest in the world, even comparable to countries with much longer histories of immigration, including the U.S.

At present, the Chinese represents one of the largest minority groups in both countries. In Spain, the Chinese forms the ninth-largest non-European Union foreign community and represents the most populous Asian nationality group. In Italy, the Chinese forms the fourth-largest ethnic group; Milan has the largest population of Chinese people in all of continental Europe. In 2011, official statistics recorded approximately 171,000 and 209,934 Chinese citizens or nationals residing in Spain and Italy, respectively, although the number is probably substantially higher if people of Chinese ethnicity without Chinese citizenship (e.g. overseas Chinese or Chinese with Spanish or Italian citizenship) are included (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 2012; ISTAT 2012). There are sizeable undocumented migrant populations living and working in both countries, the size of which is difficult to ascertain; by the few accounts that exist, it is known that a substantial proportion of Chinese immigrants do not have legal status, many of whom are employed in the informal economy (Laczko 2003).

Facing similar plights as other ethnic minorities, the Chinese have been subjected to prejudice and discrimination in both societies. In Spain, they have been described as a “closed and somewhat mysterious community” in the eyes of the native population (Nieto 2003: 215). In 2007, the Chinese in Milan – who have kept a very low profile and experienced few run-ins with the authorities – took to the streets to protest against the alleged rampant discrimination perpetrated by the locals (Goldsmith 2007). In spite of their growing presence in the countries’

cities and suburbs, the Chinese are perceived as a tightknit, inward and self-isolating group. Anxieties about the assimilability of this group by the public, while widespread, are not atypical, given that most immigrant groups elsewhere in Spain, Italy and other parts of Europe have been subjected to similar processes of stereotyping and marginalization. Compared to other groups, the Chinese are generally not perceived in threatening or dangerous terms, in the same way as other groups, such as Algerians and Moroccans, have been targeted as scapegoats for rising crime rates (Alonso-Borrego et al. 2008). That said, they occupy the margins of the Spanish and Italian mainstream as both societies are in the early stages of formulating their racial structures.

Chinese immigration to Spain and Italy can be traced back to as early as the mid-nineteenth century, although the number of immigrants was miniscule. By the 1950s, they gradually diversified their economic activities into the restaurant industry and later on, into textiles and trade (Nieto 2003; Pieke 2002; Thunø 1999). For most of the twentieth century, Chinese migration to Spain and Italy remained sporadic and insignificant. Starting in the 1980s, however, drastic socioeconomic transformations – the economic boom in Southern Europe and the liberalization of the economy in the People’s Republic of China (PRC) – attracted sizeable numbers of Chinese immigrants to Southern Europe (Nieto 2003; Pieke 2002). The geographic origins of Chinese migrants to Spain and Italy are highly concentrated, with over 80 percent coming from the PRC province of Zhejiang and the remainder from the provinces of Fujian, Guangdong and Dongbei (ibid.).

The modes of entry and migratory intentions of the Chinese in Spain and Italy differ from those of other groups in several ways. Unlike their Chinese counterparts who migrate to other E.U. countries (e.g. United Kingdom, Germany, France or the Netherlands) to pursue advanced studies or to seek political asylum, the Chinese predominantly immigrate to the two countries for

economic reasons. Furthermore, the Chinese immigrate to Spain and Italy as a family unit. Even when they arrive as individual migrants, they quickly sponsor their family members through reunification policies or they pursue other chain migration processes (Beltrán 2002; Cologna 2005; Nieto 2002; Pieke 2002). Finally, unlike many other migrant groups which temporarily reside in Spain and intend to return to their origin countries, the Chinese tend to permanently settle in Spain and Italy, therefore, they sponsor their children from the PRC and/or bear their children on native soil (Nieto 2003; Pieke 2002).¹

The Chinese who immigrate to Spain and Italy tend not to be the highly-educated, professional migrants who the U.S. tends to attract. That said, they are also not drawn from the least educated or least skilled segments of the origin population either (Beltrán 2005; Skeldon 2011). While the skills distribution among Chinese American immigrants is highly bifurcated – with roughly equal proportions who hold advanced degrees versus having less than a secondary education – the skills distribution of the Chinese in Spain is relatively less extreme (Kasinitz et al. 2008). Given the dearth of census-based data on the educational profiles of specific immigrant groups in Spain and Italy, I provide the relevant statistics on the immigrant parents of Chinese youth according to data from the ILSEG and ITAGEN studies, respectively. In Spain, about ten percent of fathers and mothers have less than a primary school education while about 40 percent have completed high school and less than five percent have a university degree (ILSEG 2008). In Italy, about one-quarter of Chinese parents have a primary school education or less, whereas about ten percent have a university degree (ITAGEN 2006).

In terms of their economic activities, the Chinese in Spain and Italy are disproportionately concentrated in small co-ethnic businesses, either as employees or owners. In Spain, the Chinese have the highest rates of self-employment, at approximately 40 to 45 per cent

of all Chinese workers, which is far higher than self-employment rates for Chinese-Americans at approximately 10 to 15 per cent (Beltrán 2005). Initially, the Chinese were concentrated in the catering and restaurant trades, which were expanding largely due to the growing middle Spanish class and booming tourist industry. By the early 2000s, this sector reached a saturation point, and newly arrived Chinese entrepreneurs started to seek new opportunities in less competitive economic niches such as garment workshops, wholesale and retail stores, grocery stores, and imported goods shops that cater to Spanish and Chinese clientele (Nieto 2001). Overall, self-employment rates among the Chinese are high compared to other immigrant groups as well as native Spaniards. Although they account for 3 percent of Spain's 5.7 million immigrants, the Chinese comprise nearly one-quarter of the country's foreign-born entrepreneurs (Ma 2012).

Likewise, rates of self-employment among the Chinese in Italy are high. The first waves of Chinese migrants who arrived in Milan and Prato in the early 1980s purchased faltering small leather workshops from their Italian owners, recruiting fellow kinsmen from China to work at their factories for low wages and long hours. By the early 1990s, garment and leather workshops in the area employed somewhere between 5,000 to 7,000 Chinese employees, driving much of the migrant inflow from China to Italy (Pieke et al. 2003). Soon after, the more successful entrepreneurs started to branch out into the more capital intensive restaurant business. A 2010 study finds that approximately 70 per cent of Chinese immigrants in Italy work in the restaurant and food industry (CESNUR and University of Turin 2010).

In both countries, Chinese-owned businesses are most aptly characterized as family enterprises. Owners are mostly likely to employ household members and relatives; even when they hire fellow co-ethnics, the employment arrangements are fairly informal and flexible. It is typical for relatives and fellow kinsmen from the same village to pool their capital to open a

small business. If the business is successful, the profit is invested into another business, which is also funded by credits received from other relatives, and managed by one of the associates of the original business or another family member. In turn, the owners of the new business sponsor relatives from China to work in the family business. This cycle repeats itself over the course of migrant inflows from China to the destination countries (Nieto 2003; Pieke et al. 2003).

There is a paucity of research about how the children of Chinese immigrants in Spain and Italy are faring in school and adapting to the host societies in general. Preliminary evidence for how they are faring is largely drawn from a few existing studies which describe and compare the general experiences and outcome of immigrant offspring across national origin groups (e.g. Barban and White 2011; Gibson and Carrasco 2009; Portes et al. 2010). These studies repeatedly identify several ‘vulnerable’ ethno-immigrant groups including North Africans (e.g. Moroccans and Algerians), Eastern Europeans (e.g. Romanians), and certain Latin American groups (Gibson and Carrasco 2009; Teese et al. 2005; Portes et al. 2010). Aside from obvious language barriers experienced by children who come from non-Spanish and non-Italian speaking families, other barriers in school – perceptions and experiences of discrimination and prejudice as well as the lack of preparedness on the part of teachers and administrators to deal with diversity in the classroom – are also matters of concern (Carrasco 2005; Zufiaurre 2006). African and Muslim immigrants, in particular, have become the foci of researchers as the targets of discrimination given their widely reported experiences of marginality in other European countries such as France, the Netherlands, and Scandinavian countries (e.g. Peach and Glebe 1995). Such barriers are compounded by the fact that immigrants tend to come from disproportionately low SES backgrounds which means that their children lack the family resources which facilitate achievement in school (Barban and White 2011; Gibson and Carrasco 2009).

Whereas existing research has focused on the vulnerable situations of the aforementioned groups, scant attention has been paid to the offspring of Chinese immigrants in Spain and Italy. Given the marginalized status of Chinese immigrants, it is likely that their children are also met with similar challenges to integration into the educational systems and host societies at large, as other ‘at-risk’ groups. That said, the most recent studies which compare educational outcomes among different groups of immigrant offspring have pointed out the relatively low levels of educational attainment among the Chinese, given the very low proportions who have aspirations to pursue post-secondary education (Generalitat de Catalunya 2010; Minello and Barban 2011). The authors of these studies struggle to make sense of why the Chinese in both Spain and Italy have such low educational ambitions. Speculative explanations for why Chinese youths in both countries have low educational ambitions include their families’ lack of Spanish and Italian proficiency and their more recent arrival status (Generalitat de Catalunya 2010). However, neither of these conjectures is convincing. Youth from other national origins which have non-Italian or non-Spanish speaking backgrounds as well as equally recent immigration histories – such as South Asians and Filipinos – do not share such low educational ambitions as the Chinese. Thus, it is important to turn to alternative theories that take more seriously the contexts of opportunity into which these youth are incorporated and how these contexts shape their cultural framings of success, which will be further examined in Chapter 3.

The Chinese in the U.S.

Compared to the Chinese in ‘new’ destination countries, such as Italy and Spain, there is extensive research on the Chinese in the U.S., given their longer histories of settlement and more sizeable presence. According to government records, the first Chinese immigrants arrived in the

U.S. in the 1820s. In 1885, Chinese immigration came to an abrupt halt when the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed. Even after the Act was repealed in 1943, Chinese immigration continued to be heavily restricted. Inflows from China to the U.S. reinitiated starting in 1965 when the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed, replacing the national origins quota system with a preference system that focused on immigrants' skills and family reunification. Since then, particularly due to the liberalization of emigration restrictions in the PRC in the 1980s, a steady stream of migrants from mainland China has moved to the U.S. In 2010, the size of the Chinese American population is approximately 4 million, constituting just over 1 per cent of the U.S. population (Hoeffel et al. 2012).

In terms of intergenerational adaptation, research shows that Chinese-American youth, on the whole, are a highly academically-oriented group: regardless of actual educational performance, there is generally value consensus between parents and children over the importance of education as a vehicle for social mobility (Kao and Tienda 1995; Louie 2004; Zhou and Bankston 1994). Even among 'low-achieving' Chinese-American youths, higher education remains the idealized goal: those who do not end up at prestigious, four-year universities – the gold standard for the children of Chinese families, as well as those from other Asian nationalities – express feelings of failure and inadequacy by not fulfilling the aspirations and expectations of their families and ethnic communities writ large which they too have internalized (Kibria 2002; Louie 2004). These aspirations are rooted in what I describe as an “educational” success frame.

In explaining the high educational ambitions among Chinese-Americans, scholars have alluded to distinct cultural traits, such as the “traditional mindedness” of Chinese parents and the inextricable linkages between family, honor and education in their expectations for their children

(Zhou and Bankston 1994). The socioeconomic composition of Chinese immigrants in the U.S. also matter: the ‘new’ waves of Chinese immigration since the 1960s have disproportionately been drawn from the highly-educated and skilled classes. Based on 2010 estimates, 45 per cent of Chinese-born males living in the U.S. age 25 and older had a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 27 per cent among foreign-born adults of other nationalities (McCabe 2012). Chinese immigrants are also disproportionately concentrated in occupations related to science, engineering, business, finance, and information technology. Among those employed in the civilian labor force, nearly one-quarter of Chinese-born men were employed in management, business, finance, and information technology occupations (Terrazas and Devani 2008). The selectivity of Chinese immigration on these positive characteristics clearly contributes to their children’s educational achievement (e.g. Barringer et al. 1990; Glenn and Yap 1994). However, it is important to keep in mind that there are comparable proportions of Chinese immigrants with low levels of educational attainment, given that roughly one-quarter of Chinese immigrant males have no high school diploma or the equivalent credentials (McCabe 2012) That said, the sizeable group of less educated Chinese immigrants seems to produce offspring who have commensurately high levels of educational ambitions and achievement as their highly educated and skilled co-ethnics (Kasinitz et al. 2008; Louie 2004).

Equally, if not more, important than individual socioeconomic profiles are the particular structural factors which have contributed to the success of Chinese Americans, many of whom arrived at an opportune time. After the Civil Rights Movement, explicit racial and ethnic barriers in the educational system were removed, offering immigrant offspring – including those from Chinese families – to benefit from a relatively open and accessible K-12 school system (Alba and Nee 2003). Immigrant parents are particularly optimistic about their children’s chances of

upward mobility, confident that their children are offered ample opportunities in the host society if they work and study hard; second-generation children thus, inherit their parents' positive attitudes and determinism, translating shared aspirations for higher education into actual attainment (Kao and Tienda 1995; Landale et al. 1998).

Aside from the progressive changes occurring at the host societal level, scholars have also focused on the role of the growing ethnic economy in launching immigrant offspring into the mainstream economy. The ethnic economy, largely formed due to the lack of primary sector labor-market opportunities for Chinese immigrants, allows the first-generation to gain substantial financial footholds in the host society and to create economic opportunities for the next generation through investments in their education (Hirschmann and Wong 1986; Sanchirico 1991). Yet, unlike their Spanish and Italian counterparts, studies on Chinese-American immigrant entrepreneurship have generally found that it is a first-generation phenomenon (Sanchirico 1991; Zhou 1992). Chinese-American immigrants – like their counterparts from other Asian countries such as Koreans (see: Raijman and Tienda 2000) – perceive business ownership as a way of overcoming labor market disadvantages and to accumulate the requisite resources to provide their children with opportunities to enter the open labor market. By contrast, for other groups (e.g. Hispanics working in the Little Village neighborhood of Chicago, as documented in Raijman and Tienda 2000), self-employment is not merely a transitional pathway to economic mobility but a sustained strategy for creating and transmitting economic resources to their offspring, who are expected to assume ownership of the family business someday. This strategy is aligned with the “entrepreneurial” success frame.

In summary, the Chinese in Spain and Italy versus the U.S. share similarities as well as have their differences. While they are differentially selected across the destination countries,

with Chinese immigrants in the U.S. generally more educated than their counterparts in Spain and Italy, the more important differences are related to the perceptions of opportunity in the host societies – most notably, the valuation of education versus entrepreneurship as vehicles for intergenerational adaptation and mobility, as Chapter 3 will examine in greater detail.

Discourses about Racism and Nativism in the U.S. and Southern Europe

The concepts of race and ethnicity are often conceived in relational terms – as boundaries with both symbolic and social aspects (Barth 1969; Lamont and Molnár 2002). The salience of racial and ethnic boundaries are embedded in the social and cultural differences between majority and minority groups, which in turn, shape the decisions and actions that individuals make in their everyday lives. In a comparative study on second-generation integration in France, Germany and the U.S., Alba (2005) makes the distinction between “bright” and “blurred” boundaries. The former refers to unambiguous distinctions between individuals of the majority and minority groups that are institutionalized in different domains (e.g. language, citizenship, religion). The latter refers to a greater degree of ambiguity in terms of the location and rigidity of the boundary. Depending on the nature of the boundary, individuals of the minority group gain differential access to the opportunities afforded to the majority.

Based on his analysis, Alba (2005) argues that the second-generation – using Mexican-Americans as the case study – in the U.S. face relatively “blurred” boundaries, whereas those in France and Germany – using the North Africans and Turks, respectively – are deemed to face “brighter” boundaries across most domains (e.g. language, citizenship, religion). The only exception is race whereby there are starker divisions in the U.S. than France and Germany. Given the legacy of slavery, the black-white color line has arguably been the main fault line of

the U.S. racial landscape and continues to shape contemporary race relations for all other groups. For individuals with non-white phenotypes, they stand on the other side of the color line, which is virtually uncrossable despite similarities within other domains such as language and religion. In her study on English-speaking West Indian immigrants and their children, Waters (1999) finds that the second-generation comes to identify with being black rather than West Indian by virtue of their everyday experiences which are refracted through the prism of race.

As for Asian-Americans, they are often neglected to being “ignored minorities”. Even though they are often seen as fairly well-integrated into U.S. society along multiple objective measures (including SES and intermarriage), their plight and predicaments as a group are often disregarded (Chou and Feagin 2010; Lee 2009). Some would even go so far as to argue that they have suffered from “reverse discrimination” because their relative success has made them ineligible for, or even lose out on, affirmative action programs serving other minority groups (Pincus 2008; Takagi 1990). In this way, race is still a master status which categorically excludes Asians from the mainstream.

By comparison, the concept of race is far less entrenched in Europe than the U.S. but increasingly salient. Due to the rapid influx of immigrants across nearly all of its countries, Europe has been with met with unprecedented diversity that has in turn, led to the drawing of symbolic boundaries vis-à-vis racial, ethnic and cultural differences. Certainly, the clarity and rigidity of these boundaries partly depend on the history of immigration in the individual countries (Bail 2008). Scholars have made an important distinction between established versus recent immigration countries within Europe. In “old” immigration countries in Western Europe (e.g. France, Germany and Britain), where immigration began in the immediate postwar period, philosophies and policies of integration have had more time to develop, thereby symbolic

boundaries are more fully formed (e.g., Brubaker 1992; Kastoryano 2002). In Alba's analysis (2005), he argues that, with the exception of race, second-generation minorities in France and Germany face "brighter" boundaries in the domains of language, religion and citizenship compared to those in the U.S.

In contrast, "new" immigration countries of Southern Europe have yet to develop philosophies of integration among their regimes (e.g. Triandafyllidou 2001). As such, their symbolic boundaries are relatively unstable and vague. At the onset of mass immigration during the 1980s and early 1990s, public opinion polls have suggested that race is less salient in Southern Europe than in Western Europe (Sniderman et al. 2000). A possible explanation is that historically, the culture of Southern Europe has been heavily influenced by North Africa and the Middle East, predating the existence of Western states (Bail 2008). Generally, in Southern Europe, the recency of immigration means that "integration happens without a blueprint".

However, as immigration streams into Southern Europe have matured, the symbolic boundaries have simultaneously been etched and grown starker. There is even preliminary evidence that Western-style racism is being "imported" to Southern Europe via popular culture (Lentin 2004). Racism is intertwined with classism: native Southern Europeans are particularly preoccupied with new immigrants' lower levels of human capital as well as their high levels of unemployment and illegal migration (Totah 2002). Studies based on analysis of public opinion polls show that while antiracist discourse has yet to permeate Southern Europe to the same degree as it has in the old immigration countries of Western and Northern Europe, it has grown increasingly widespread (Bail 2008). Policies too have been enacted to reflect the rising anti-immigrant sentiment – for example, the Bossi-Fini Amendments which were enacted in 2002 in

Italy introduced stricter entry rules and the criminalization of undocumented immigration, as well as removed pathways to regularization (Totah 2002).

As symbolic boundaries between natives and foreigners as well as whites and non-whites harden, the notion of “extracomunitari” solidifies the distinctions. An Italian term meaning “non-EU citizen” or “non-EU immigrant,” it is typically applied to immigrants and their descendants from Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africans, whereas those from North and South America are simply referred to as “immigrato” or immigrant/expatriate (Angel-Anjani 2001). The underlying connotation of “extracomunitari” is non-belonging, referring to those who are “beyond the pale” or “people who were outside of the community” (Maher 1996). Those who are considered “immigrato” belong to another category of foreigner, one which immigrated to Europe by their own volition rather than out of economic and/or political insecurity (Smith 2014). Scholars have noted that in the European context, “European” refers not so much to geographic location or origin but rather to one who is “white, wealthy, and Christian” (Totah 2002). This kind of racist discourse is rooted in cultural essentialism rather than biological superiority; the focus is on foreigners’ presumed “way of life” in their ancestral homeland which is incongruent with the “way of life” of the host society (Barker 1981). Crucial to the idea of the “extracomunitari” is the notion of Orientalism and its representation of a supposedly primitive and backward culture, which is the foil to a civilized and thus superior European culture. This cultural binary, perhaps most famously theorized by Edward Said (1978) provides the basis for a collective notion that identifies the distinction of Europeans (“us”) versus non-Europeans (“other”).

In addition to casting immigrants as unassimilable outsiders, they are increasingly being depicted as potential criminals, as undocumented immigration has become a state priority with

the rise in repressive regimes and border controls in Southern Europe (Calavita 2005; Totah 2002). Public opinion polls show that natives often place immigrants in the same category as criminals: in one survey, almost three-quarters of Italians polled are convinced that immigrants are responsible for most of the crimes in Italy and moreover, there is a growing fear of “too many aliens” invading Europe (Totah 2002: 1481). Another poll reveals that one-third of Spaniards and Italians strongly agree with statements that characterize immigrants as threatening, harmful or dangerous; increasing levels of immigration have been accompanied by rising levels of xenophobia as the percentage of those who believe that immigrants pose a threat to job security and to public safety almost tripled within a few years (Calavita 2005).

Beyond symbolic boundaries, immigrants – particularly those who are considered “extracomunitari” – also face concrete barriers in various domains of everyday life including marginalized work, inadequate healthcare and substandard housing (Calavita 2005). Due to their “institutionalized irregularity” – that is, the dynamics of legal exclusion and their ripple effects for even immigrants who are temporarily legal – they are subject to discrimination and exclusion from political, social and economic spheres. Immigrants with undocumented status are particularly vulnerable to employers, although legal or not, they tend to concentrate in low-skilled, low-paying, unstable jobs regardless of their educational background. Despite their comparable educational levels vis-à-vis those of the natives, immigrants tend to have modest career aspirations. Particularly telling is a newspaper report summarizing findings from a study about immigrant job seekers in Spain with the headline, “I Want to be a Cleaner,” which revealed that three quarter of immigrants were seeking jobs as maids, construction worker, factory or farm hand (Altozano 2002). Immigrants who are not employed in the mainstream labor market are likely to working in the shadow or underground economies, where they are

particularly vulnerable to exploitation although natives are likely to use this as another justification to criminalize them (King and Rodriguez-Melguizo 1999).

Despite their constrained entry into the labor market, immigrants are met with even greater systematic exclusion in other domains. The model of integration in Southern Europe has been described as neither assimilationist nor pluralist – both models which can describe the paradox of the U.S. model. Instead, it can be described as “differential exclusion,” whereby migrants are incorporated into certain societal domains (e.g. labor market) but denied access to other domains (e.g. welfare systems, citizenship, political enfranchisement) (King and Rodriguez-Melguizo 1999: 74). Immigrants who are considered “extracomunitari” – that is, non-EU citizens who are typically non-white or visible minorities – face different rules for acquiring citizenship: European migrants to Italy can acquire citizenship after four years of residence, whereas non-Europeans need to have ten years of residency (Daly and Barot 2000: 48).

These forms of discrimination being faced by immigrants in Southern Europe have led to the calcification of group boundaries. Some have argued that an emergent form of “European racism” – which combines a distinct mix of racism and xenophobia – has yielded a particular constellation of ethnic and race based discourses and practices across societal levels (Anthias and Lazaridis 2000). On the other hand, others have argued that there is a much less insidious and incendiary form of discrimination at play. As Zapata-Barrero argues, the Spanish government has addressed the surging migrant population in a rather pragmatic if not, unplanned manner (2013). Given the “integration happens without a blueprint,” foreign minority groups can integrate into the host society at their own pace, even though they are faced by negative stereotypes and some degree of prejudice.

The Chinese in Southern Europe: A Socially Marginalized yet Economically Mobile Group

Given this context of “brightening” symbolic boundaries as well as the dual ascension of racism and xenophobia, the Chinese assumes a distinct position relative to other ethno-immigrant groups in Southern Europe. According to public opinions polls conducted on native Italians and Spaniards, asking them to rank different ethno-immigrant groups by favorability, the Chinese are ranked among the *least* liked groups alongside Moroccans, Albanians and “gypsies”: in both countries, over 40% of the native respondents thought that the Chinese were “not at all likeable” (Calavita 2005: 127-8). Anecdotes that float around the local press echo this negative impression about the Chinese in the eyes of the natives. In the town of Altivole in northeast Italy, its population of 6000 residents includes 900 immigrants. As the town struggles with a rapidly aging population, one out of every two hires is an immigrant. One elderly local resident, who was born and raised in this small rural town, remarked with a reported glint in her eyes: “I came to expect just about anything out of life, except that I would grow old in a Chinese industrial district” (Antonio Stella, *Corriere della Sera*: 19 March 2001). One small Tuscan town, San Donnino, was “re-baptized” into “San Pechino” (Beijing in Italian) by journalists in the early 1990s when thousands of Chinese immigrants arrived to work in the leather-tanning industry (Berti 2000).

A recurring theme illustrated by such anecdotes is the Chinese are “useful invaders” – rather than seeking asylum and becoming dependent on the welfare state, they are self-sufficient and efficiently inserted into the labor market (Calavita 2005). By popular accounts, the Chinese are perceived as entrepreneurial, cunning and business savvy. One article describes how many of the Chinese immigrants in Spain have managed to not only survive but thrive in a tough economy given their intense labor, willingness to work long hours, and a strong Confucian

model of family loyalty that help their businesses succeed (Bilefsky, NY Times: 2 January 2013). Likewise, natives as well as overseas Chinese themselves often explain their entrepreneurial success using a cultural gloss: their ethic of hard work, self-reliance and mutual help is the key to their success (Christiansen 2003: 148).

Yet while they were once lauded for their financial successes, the ongoing opening of Chinese-owned businesses and their relative profitability in a recession-stricken Southern Europe have turned the Chinese into a formidable economic threat. Over the course of the past few decades of growing Chinese presence in Southern Europe, popular opinion that Chinese businesses engage in “unfair” competitive practices that take business and jobs away from the natives have become increasingly widespread (Ceccagno 2007: 132). As Chinese immigrants prosper, they have started to buy up local real estate, particularly small shops owned by native Italians and Spaniards that have gone out of business in the face of competition from an influx of supermarket chains and megastores. Given their own declining fortunes, native Europeans are struggling to accept and to integrate burgeoning Chinese communities that are increasingly prosperous and empowered (Rosenthal and Povoledo, NY Times: 26 April 2007).

Media representation of the Chinese, which reflects the sentiments of the native population, has been largely negative. Prominent media outlets in both Italy and Spain have tended to portray the Chinese in an unforgiving and sensationalist light, often focusing on stories about the alleged “yellow mafia” and the near enslavement of employees working in miserable conditions for Chinese employers (Di Castro and Vicziany 2009). A study which conducted content analysis on one of the most widely circulated and oldest regional newspapers, *La Nazione*, reveals that over fifty per cent of articles related to the Chinese used the term “mafia,” suggesting that they are a menace to public order (Johanson et al. 2009: 11). If they are not

portrayed as a menace, then they are depicted as the ‘uncivilized’ other. At the most extreme, Chinese-owned restaurants across Europe have been accused of serving dog meat, igniting a media firestorm that wrongfully point to the ‘primitive’ and ‘savage’ customs and practices of the group (Christiansen 2003: 161).

In addition to the unfavorable media portrayal, the success of Chinese businesses has elicited various forms of backlash, including responses by politicians and government officials. In one notable instance, in 2003, the Italian Minister of Economy issued a statement expressing his concerns that products imported from China were threatening local manufacturers and their livelihood; garnering much support from the public, his complaints are translated into more restrictive importation guidelines for merchandise originating from China (Ceccagno 2007: 129). In a similar incident in Elche, a shoe-producing town in Spain, local workers took matters into their own hands by setting fire to containers of shoes imported from China by Chinese migrants (Ibid.,132).

The most definitive moment thus far is perhaps the Chinese protests that happened in Milan in April 2007. With the largest population of Chinese in continental Europe, Milan epitomizes the increasingly tumultuous relationship between the immigrant Chinese and native communities. Popularly known as the “Battle of Milan,” the massive disputes between Chinese protestors and Italian authorities escalated from a seemingly minor incident involving the confiscation of pushcarts which Chinese wholesale clothing merchants use to ferry huge volumes of apparel that are allegedly parked in prohibited public places (Tarantino and Tosoni 2009). On Via Sarpi, the main thoroughfare that defines Milan’s Chinatown, the pushcarts themselves are symbols of a “battle of cultures, businesses, and lifestyles” (Rosenthal and Povoledo, NY Times: 26 April 2007). A longtime resident of the neighborhood surrounding Via Sarpi expresses his

frustrations over the ‘Chinese takeover’ of a storied Milanese area steeped in rich history: “This used to be a Milanese neighborhood with stores to buy thread, bread, electrical things – the kind of stores neighborhoods have. The Chinese have taken over the neighborhood, they have stolen spaces from Italians, but they haven’t developed relationships with the residents.” (Rosenthal and Povoledo, 26 April 2007). In the aftermath of the protest, with dozens of protestors either injured or arrested, the bitter strain between the Chinese and native residents has lingered on.

Another issue which plagues the public image of the Chinese community is illegal immigration. Accused of lurking in the shadows, the high rates of undocumented immigration and the prominence of the underground economy have led to a siege mentality in the Chinese community. Although the Italian and Spanish governments have followed the European Commission’s lead by developing integration policies and programs for their diverse immigrant populations, such efforts are countervailed by the rising demands for a restrictive European immigration policy, popularly known as “Fortress Europe” (Christiansen 2003: 30). Given increasingly restrictive immigration policies in Europe, plus the difficulties of securing both a passport and travel visa in the People’s Republic of China, many migrants rely on migration brokers – or, “snakeheads” as they are referred to colloquially in Chinese – to help them get to their destination (Pieke et al. 2004). Upon arrival, many illegal immigrants are beholden to their “snakeheads” to whom they owe thousands of dollars in fees and therefore, are coerced into working in the informal economy, such as garment sweatshops. Paid at piece rate, they work long hours – 18-hour days are not uncommon – in deplorable conditions, making just about 350 euros per month (Calavita 2005: 60).

In December 2013, the worst imaginable outcome happened in Prato, a town in Florence with a highly concentrated Chinese population, when a fire swept through a Chinese-owned and

operated apparel factory, killing 7 workers in-residence. With no emergency exits and windows blocked by bars, the workers were barricaded in the building engulfed in flames (Polovedo, NY Times, 6 December 2013). While there is sympathy for the victims, the fire also exemplified what some Italians say angers them the most – namely that Chinese businesses have flourished whereas Italian companies have failed, in their opinion, because the former depend on poorly paid labor and neglect workplace safety standards in order to cut costs. Another case that surfaced in the news involves a prominent and very successful Chinese businessman in Rome who was accused of facilitating illegal immigration as a lucrative side business (Christiansen 2003: 59). The negative reportage of the story sensationalized the business of illegal migration brokerage as a global triad activity, spearheading the mass influx of Chinese immigration across Europe that is akin to a “yellow invasion”. From the perspective of the Chinese, they argue that although public rhetoric against illegal immigration is vehement, the Italian government has yet to take concrete actions towards enforcement, such as deporting illegal immigrants; prominent leaders of the Chinese community argue that the government’s inaction inadvertently harms the image of the community – even legal immigrants – who become the target of intense scrutiny, intolerance and suspicion (ibid.).

Altogether, in Southern Europe, the Chinese community is perceived as tightknit, insular and mysterious. As one longtime Italian resident of Milan commented, “[The Chinese] shop at their own stores – their culture closes them off.... The new immigrants don’t learn Italian and tend to isolate themselves.” (Rosenthal and Povoledo, NY Times, 26 April 2007). Economically mobile but socially marginalized, the closing in on itself of a community is often a reaction to deep-seated mistrust and thus, a self-protective measure. In this climate of increasing polarity, whether the Chinese second-generation can cross over the brightening boundaries into the social

and economic spheres of the mainstream – particularly via higher education – is a question that merits consideration. Given the importance of parental involvement in children’s schooling, the last section of this chapter will review cross-national differences in the educational systems and models of parental involvement across the host societies.

The Educational Systems and Parent-School Partnerships across the Host Countries

Cross-national comparisons of the relationship between families, schools and the wider community highlight similarities and differences. Different models of parental involvement across countries have developed as a result of changes in family life in the context of broader social, political and economic transformations – namely, the division of education responsibilities between the state and family. Over time and across societal contexts, parents, teachers and schools developed different models of partnerships, as described by Ravn (2005), including models of compensation, consensus, participation, and shared/distributed responsibility. Generally, as educational systems evolve and mature, parents are encouraged to take a more active role in their children’s education and ideally, collaborate with teachers to ensure that their children are fully engaged in their studies both in the classroom and at home. In the participatory and shared responsibility models, parents and teachers are equal partners in the schooling process, which is in stark contrast to traditional compensatory models, whereby parents cede authority to teachers in their children’s education. Generally, in established post-industrial societies, more symmetric relationships are more formed between parents and teachers, as well as families and schools. (Recall that empirical analysis on the role of parental involvement on children’s ambitious will only be conducted on the U.S. and Spain in Chapter 5 as only CILS and ILSEG have parental data, whereas ITAGEN does not. To align with the

empirical analysis, I will only conduct a literature review of the educational systems in U.S. and Spain, and not Italy.)

Spain

Relative to the educational systems in Western and Northern Europe, whereby parents are seen as negotiating partners of the state with equal rights, responsibilities and interests regarding educational matters, the educational system in Spain has traditionally been founded upon an authoritative model whereby the state and the Catholic church dictated and regulated children's schooling while parents were expected to keep them in order (Ravn 2005). Yet, in the latter half of the twentieth century, this authoritarian model of the education system has been largely upended as Spain transitioned from an agrarian to post-industrial society, in addition to having its political system undergo drastic changes from a dictatorship to democracy and eventually, a member of the European Union. Corresponding to these broad social-political changes, the state attempted to make vast improvements to its education system. In 1970, the Ley General de Educación (General Education Law) was passed, mandating that Primary Education and later on Basic Secondary Schooling become compulsory and free for all public schools (Martínez González 1996). Other laws were subsequently developed to improve the quality of Spanish education, including Ley de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo (LOGSE) which was implemented in 1990. Its main objective was to restructure the Spanish educational system by introducing alternate tracks (academic versus vocational) after students complete Basic Secondary Schooling.

In terms of parental involvement, for much of Spanish history, the Catholic Church held supreme dominance over the public and private lives of its citizens, directing the content of

“moral education” – the indoctrination of children and youth into upstanding Spanish citizens – exclusively towards its own values and superseding the authority of parents (Buxarrais et al. 1994). Since the demise of the Franco regime, however, the influence of the Church on Spanish society has dramatically weakened. As part of its democratization efforts, the State has pushed back on the longstanding authority of the Church over parents in the education of their children. In principle, parental involvement is legislated in Spain. The Spanish Constitution, passed in 1978, outlines the rights and obligations that parents have to participate in their children’s schooling. (Specifically, Article 27.3, states that public powers guarantee the right to assist parents so that their children receive moral and religious education in accordance with their own convictions.) Accordingly, they are entrusted with the civic duty to direct the moral education of their children and in return, they are entitled to participate in the management of public schools (Buxarrais and Martinez 1994). Other educational laws address the rights and obligations of parents in their children’s schooling. For instance, LOGSE has as one of its objectives to promote cooperation between parents and school staff, particularly by encouraging parents and the wider community to be stakeholders in the creation and revision of school curricula (Martínez González 1996).

Formally, educational laws like LOGSE attempt to recognize the importance of family-school-partnerships in Spain. However, in actuality, there are few programs and practices implemented in schools which actively encourage parental involvement. The main opportunities of parental engagement are parents’ associations at school and their participation in school councils (Martínez González 1998). While these are important channels of parental involvement, only a minority of parents participate and in the associations and councils, the partnerships between parents and teachers are often adversarial than collaborative. There has been some

experimentation with more extensive and integrative engagements of parents by schools but, by and large, they have not been implemented province- or nation-wide.

The relationship between parents and teachers has evolved according to the formalization of the educational system and, in particular, family-school partnerships. Traditionally, Spanish schools rarely engaged with parents and, under the pretense of professionalism, teachers limit parental involvement in their classrooms. Schools, with the support of the State and the Church, implicitly had more authority than parents in matters related to their children's education (Martínez González 1998). However, with the democratization of education and new educational regulation, Spanish schools are compelled to involve parents and take into their account their needs and concerns by sharing information and having them actively participate in schoolwork.

An important distinction in how Spanish families interact with the Spanish educational system is predicated upon the unique work schedule in Southern Europe. The “split work schedule” – whereby the work day is split in half with a long midday break known as the ‘siesta’ – arguably disrupts and interferes with the quantity and quality of childcare on weeknights. Research shows that parents with a continuous working timetable (without the siesta) and especially parents who complete their working day no longer than 6 p.m. tend to spend more time with their children (Gutiérrez-Domènech 2010). The absence of synchronization between work and school timetables as well as truncated school days make it particularly difficult for working mothers to provide adequate childcare. There are also few afterschool programs offered to students, leaving working parents scrambling to find alternative arrangements for childcare (Carrasco and Recio 2001). Therefore, due to the strictures of the labor market, the irreconcilability of parents' and children's schedules constrains parental involvement – both at home and in the classroom.

One of the oft cited consequences of inadequate parental involvement is school dropout. Although rates of enrolment into higher education has increased manifolds, the rate of drop among Spanish youth from basic secondary schooling is also relatively higher than their counterparts in other OECD countries, at least based on data from the mid-1980s (Petrongolo and San Segundo 2002). Parents' level of education is a strong predictor of youths' decision to stay in school, in large part due to the mediating effect of parental investments into elevating their children's academic performance and educational expectations. The shift into a knowledge-based post-industrial economy has also reduced employment opportunities for dropouts. Researchers acknowledge that one method of mitigating dropping out is to improve parental management skills and therefore, promoting parental engagement in their children's schooling (Peraita and Pastor 2000).

In summary, parental involvement has historically both directly and indirectly been entrenched into the Spanish educational system. A distinctive feature is the significant role of the Catholic Church in the moral education of Spanish youth, which historically was partially substitutive of parental involvement. That said, with the diminishing authority of the Church over time, expectations for parental involvement have increased in a commensurate manner. The growing expectations for parental involvement are, however, tempered by women's mass entry into the labor market which poses the challenge of childcare in dual earner households.

The U.S.

There are parallels and divergences in the content and style of family-school relations in Spain and the U.S. One notable similarity is that the U.S., as in Spain, parental involvement is enacted into educational legislations. For instance, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001,

mainly known for its support of standards-based education reform, also includes important requirements for schools, districts and states to organize programs of parental involvement and to communicate with parents about students' achievement and the quality of schools. Section 1118 of the NCLB Act directly outlines the role of parental involvement in education reform (Booth and Dunn 1996; Epstein 2001). In effect, the law draws inspiration from the theory of overlapping spheres of influence, which posits that students learn more and better when the home, school and community share responsibilities for their success (Epstein 1995).

In recognizing the importance of school, family and community partnerships, the NCLB Act's requirements acknowledge multiple facets of parental involvement. First, parental involvement requires multilevel leadership from states, districts and schools to develop and implement policies and programs to reach all families. Schools alone cannot create meaningful partnerships with parents and families unless districts and states provide professional development to build educators' and parents' capacities to understand partnerships and help schools develop goal-oriented partnership programs. Second, parental involvement is a component of school and classroom organization. Every school that receives public funding must implement a program to involve parents in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, assessment and other aspects of school management. Third, parental involvement recognizes the shared responsibilities of educators and families for children's learning and success in school. Accordingly, Section 1118 calls for educators to share information and decisions to parents about the quality of schools, students' performance and placements, and the availability of supplementary educational services. Finally, parent-school initiatives must strive to include all families, even those who are not currently involved and not the easiest to reach.

This last objective is perhaps the most difficult to achieve even though it is integral to mitigating gaps in education due to social inequalities (Epstein 2005).

Actual examples of parent-school partnership programs initiated by the NCLB Act abound across states. For instance, the Action Team for Partnerships in an elementary school serving mainly Latino and Hmong families in Saint Paul, Minnesota, writes annual plans with a variety of activities for parental involvement including a monthly open forum for parents and educators to discuss school-related matters over coffee in a casual setting as well as a reading-at home program to engage students and families in reading. Another example is Seattle public schools where district leaders are helping the schools develop partnership programs with highly diverse families, including creating materials for parents translated in a number of languages to promote parent-school partnerships for families from diverse ethno-racial backgrounds (Epstein 2005).

The NCLB Act represents the culmination of a long history of the role of parental involvement in American education policy. Historically, a child's education laid almost exclusively under the purview of his/her parents; educational activities were carried out privately within the family, rather than publicly through the use of public institutions (Berger 1981). During the early years after the U.S. was founded, the colonies were granted local control of education (Pullman 1987). The first schools were created by religious leaders and later placed under governance of townships. Under townships, boards were comprised of lay citizens, who were parents in the community. Early on in U.S. history, elementary education was one of local parental control of school governance, parental support of curriculum, parental choice of teachers, and parental support of religious teachings of the school. However, as the shape and character of the nation began to change with increasing industrialization and urbanization, many

policymakers' thoughts turned to the issue of national progress and what roles schools could – and should – play in its facilitation (Albright and Conley 2004).

As public education developed in America, parent involvement in education changed. In its attempt to elevate the knowledge base of its fledging population as well as to assimilate diverse immigrant groups, curricula were created to be both practical and standardized (Albright and Conley 2004). With the emergence and consolidation of the public education system, children's primary domain of learning accordingly shifted from the home into the classroom. Moreover, the increasing bureaucratization of schools and the professionalization of teachers meant that teachers and school administrators held the authoritative voice over parents in education-related matters. Parents became excluded from the daily decision-making operations of the education process and the control of schools by lay parent boards was subsumed by school superintendents (Davies 1992; Hiatt-Michael 1994).

However, there has been a growing movement to assert parental influence and authority in the American educational system. Parents have mounted several notable challenges against public school bureaucracy. First, Parent/Teacher Associations (PTA) were developed in large part due to the increasing separation between parent control and public schools as perceived by parents. Started by the National Congress of Mothers, comprised of middle and upper class mothers who met with teachers on Saturdays and expressed their concerns to school principals through petitions, their influence grew rapidly and the group eventually evolved into the Parent/Teacher Association (Hiatt-Michael 1994). In addition, since the 1970s, parents have increasingly resorted to courts in order to effect changes within the bureaucracy of the public schools. School choice debates – including whether to send children different school types (public or private) or different academic tracks (comprehensive or differentiated) – represent

how institutional features of the American educational system influences parental involvement (Powell et al. 2004). Moreover, home schooling has become an alternative to public schools; armed with knowledge of court cases and parental rights over their children's education, parents are increasingly opting to teach their children at home (Pullman 1987). Furthermore, school restructuring, which has become a popular movement starting in the mid-1980s, advocates site-based management in which school districts return control to school sites. In turn, each school must have a governing board whose membership must include a majority of local school parents (Hiatt-Michael 1994).

Another very important development to pedagogical reform starting in the 1960s and 1970s which opened up classrooms to parental involvement is the impact of educational research on legislation and policy. Policymakers have to some extent taken advantage of this literature in designing and implementing programs and policies to promote positive developmental outcomes for children and their families. Several types of prevention efforts that focus on parental engagement as the mechanism for disparities in early childhood development and academic achievement have been developed including home visit programs, intergenerational or family literacy programs as well as parenting support programs. These programs often focus their service delivery on the parents rather than child – for instance, literacy programs aimed at increasing parents' reading proficiency – while other programs may include a direct child component, such as home nurse visiting programs whereby nurses teach best parenting practices (Linver et al 2004). In conjunction with court rules, parent-school partnerships have been supported by educational researchers whose policy recommendations have been incorporated into educational legislation that mandate parent involvement components. The Head Start Program – which provides comprehensive early childhood education, health, nutrition, and

parent involvement services to low-income children and their families – required that parents serve on school advisory boards and participate in classroom activities (Hiatt-Michael 2001).

Most notably, the Coleman Report – which sociologist James Coleman and his coauthors issued to draw attention to the effects of racial segregation on student outcomes – raised an important sociological insight: family background, not schools, was primarily responsible for differences in educational attainment. The upshot of the release of the report is the reframing of educational policy debates to fully recognize that family influence and parental involvement matter considerably for academic achievement (Coleman et al. 1966; Jencks 1972). Practical offshoots of this academic discussion include the design and implementation of policy interventions beyond the school that addresses the importance of family factors such as stimulating home environments, affirmative parental behaviors and positive maternal well-being (Albright and Conley 2004).

To sum, there are parallel developments in the role of parental involvement in their respective public education systems in both the U.S. and Spain. In both countries, children's education which was historically under nearly the exclusive purview of parental authority gave way to state control as a result of increasingly industrializing and bureaucratizing societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the case of Spain, the Catholic Church was also a major influence on children's schooling, dictating the content of curricula, particularly the teachings of moral education. Likewise, in both countries, there have eventually been pushbacks by parents to assert their opinion about their children's schooling and major educational reforms that recognize the importance of parent-school partnerships in providing children a comprehensive learning environment. As a result, both countries have entrenched parental involvement into their educational legislation in recent years.

Summary

The relevant bodies of literature reviewed in this chapter – including the composition and history of Chinese immigration across the host societies, their experiences of discrimination and access to opportunities, as well as general models of parent-school partnerships across the different educational systems – provide the theoretical grounding for the subsequent empirical chapters.

The following chapter will examine the ways in which the formation of educational expectations is significantly shaped by cultural understandings of how success in the host society is achieved, which in turn, are influenced by the characteristics of the co-ethnic community and its prevailing values, attitudes, norms and expectations regarding upward mobility.

CHAPTER 3. “TICKETS TO MOBILITY”: EDUCATIONAL VS. ENTREPRENEURIAL SUCCESS FRAMES

Introduction

In Chapter 1, there are startling statistics on the drastic differences in expected levels of education between the Chinese in the U.S versus those in Southern Europe. Recall that just over one-tenth and one-third of Chinese youth in Spain and Italy, respectively, expect to attend university, whereas a whopping 95 per cent of Chinese youth in the U.S. expect to attend university. (In fact, their expectation are corroborated by high levels of actual educational attainment, with nearly three-quarters obtaining a bachelor’s or post-graduate degree.)

In the following analysis, I seek potential explanations for these drastic divergences in educational experiences and outcomes among Chinese youth across the receiving countries. More than variations in immigrant selectivity of the Chinese across the three countries by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, I predict that the valuation of education and its role in the cultural framings of success substantially account for the divergent educational experiences among Chinese youth across the different host societies. Ethnic communities have different understandings of success and, more importantly, possess different prescriptions for achieving success based on how they perceive the opportunity structure of their host societies. Moreover, I posit that in situations whereby entrepreneurship offers a viable alternative to education as a vehicle for mobility, immigrant families – such as the Chinese in Spain and Italy – formulate a different strategy for socioeconomic adaptation by forgoing the necessity of higher education in favor of entrepreneurial endeavors.

The organization of the paper is as follows. First, I will define the meaning of “success frames,” introducing the distinction between educational and entrepreneurial success frames. Then I describe the data and method, followed by the presentation of analytical results. This is a mixed-method study. I present the descriptive and multivariate regression results from a series of analyses that were conducted based on four large-scale datasets. This is followed by the presentation of findings from in-depth interviews conducted with Chinese youth (and, in some cases, their parents) across the three countries. A discussion of the results and its implications concludes this paper.

Educational versus Entrepreneurial Success Frames

Traditionally, cultural explanations for the disparate educational outcomes of different racial and ethnic groups tend to focus on their inherent norms and values. Scholars such as Signithia Fordham and John Ogbu (1986) have argued that youth with low educational ambitions have adopted an ‘oppositional culture,’ eschewing mainstream norms and values of upward mobility as a form of resistance against racial and ethnic discrimination. Conversely, in the case of Chinese-Americans, conventional wisdom has attributed their high educational ambitions and achievements to the norms and values that are intrinsic to Chinese cultures – namely, the disciplinarian style of childrearing among Asian parents, and their unshakable expectations for their children to strive for academic excellence (Sakamoto et al. 2009). Moreover, as a legacy of Confucianism in many East Asian countries, immigrants from these societies allegedly value hard work more than talent as a means for academic achievement, and compensate academic achievement with stronger rewards than other groups; in turn, these values, attitudes and beliefs are supposedly transmitted to their children, who uphold these intrinsic cultural traits that explain their academic advantage (Chen and Stevenson 1995; Schneider and Lee 1990).

However, these essentialist and reductionist explanations based on culture are logically flawed for obvious reasons, and indeed, contemporary scholars are weary of invoking these outdated versions of cultural arguments. There has been a concerted effort in recent years to “bring culture back in” in better understanding various topics of social stratification, including group differences in educational outcomes (Small et al. 2010). Unlike its previous representations, the new generation of culture research seldom divides explanations into exclusively ‘structural’ versus ‘cultural’ because of the increasingly questionable utility of this distinction; instead, it would posit that structural and cultural factors are intrinsically intertwined.

A particularly useful concept for understanding group differences in educational outcomes is “frames,” a concept first introduced by Erving Goffman (1974), which refers to the ways in which people observe, interpret and make sense of their social life (Lee 2012). Based on prior experiences and understandings, different individuals or groups have distinct perceptions and interpretations of how the social world works, and therefore, adopt different behaviors and make different decisions (Small et al. 2010). In other words, frames consist of cultural repertoires which are used in decision-making processes based upon perceptions of opportunities and constraints within a given society.

In studying group differences in educational outcomes, the value of education is conceived through cultural frames. Even if all groups positively value education (contrary to what essentialist arguments predict), the meaning of what constitutes a ‘good education’ and the rewards conferred to a getting a good education varies by group and the unique contexts in which groups are situated. Groups construct remarkably different ideas of what a ‘good education’ means depending on which frames are accessible to them. In turn, frames that are adopted by immigrant offspring are partly shaped by immigrant selectivity, the average socioeconomic

profile of an ethnic group, and the group's capacity to mobilize resources (Lee 2012). Most importantly, I argue that cultural framings about the importance of education are shaped by perceptions about the efficacy of education in achieving success in life within a given societal context, as well as the availability of alternative means for upward mobility – most notably, entrepreneurship.

Therefore, I propose that there are two types of success frames utilized by immigrant parents who have passed them down to their offspring: educational and entrepreneurial. *Educational* success frames presume that success in life is predicated upon excelling in one's studies in order to gain admission into an elite university, followed by entry into stable and well-paid professional occupations in the mainstream labor market. As it is well-established in the literature, the success frames adopted by Asian immigrant families in the U.S. tend to be narrow and specific (e.g. Li and Wang 2008; Louie 2004; Kasinitz et al. 2008). Based on findings from interviews that Jennifer Lee and Min Zhou conducted with their Chinese informants living in the Los Angeles area, one consistent response on what is the definition of success in life is academic success. "Across the board, these kids told us high school is mandatory, college is an expectation, and only an advanced degree will gain kudos." (Lee 2012: 2) Academic success, inasmuch as it takes on utmost symbolic value, is also a pragmatic goal given that Asian immigrant parents perceive education as the only sure path to a better life in the U.S. As Stanley Sue and Sumie Okazaki (1990) argue, based upon their theory of relative functionalism, to the extent that mobility is limited in non-educational avenues (e.g. entertainment, sports, politics) for Asian Americans, education becomes increasingly salient as a means of mobility.

Having achieved higher educational credentials, Chinese-American parents then expect their children to translate their high educational achievements into entering commensurately

desirable “top professions” including physicians, lawyers, engineers and pharmacists. Success in life, as defined by Asian immigrant families, often refers not just to the financial compensation of jobs, but the prestige and security conferred to those occupations. Yu Xie and Kimberly Goyette (2003) introduce the concept of “strategic adaptations” to explain the educational choices of Asian Americans, arguing that Chinese and other Asian groups consciously choose occupations in which they can effectively cope with potential discrimination and other disadvantages by achieving marketable credentials. In the U.S., where the educational system and labor market are both relatively open and higher education is the prerequisite for upward mobility, it makes rational sense for Asian American youths to aspire for a university education and, likewise, to major in fields that have high financial payoffs.

By comparison, *entrepreneurial* success frames provide an alternative to educational success frames such that getting rich and gaining social status depend not so much on excelling in one’s studies and acquiring a college degree but instead, sharpening one’s business acumen and becoming your own boss. Anecdotal evidence and preliminary research on Chinese youth in Spain and Italy suggest that educational and occupational ambitions are less narrowly defined by parents and youth, compared to their U.S. counterparts. Rather than banking on higher education as *the* ticket to intergenerational mobility, Chinese families in these new destinations envision alternative pathways for social mobility, whereby management of the family business is a viable career option for the next generation who do not necessarily need a college degree.

There is a vast literature on immigrant entrepreneurship; however, the literature on the role of immigrant entrepreneurship and small business in intergenerational mobility is relatively sparse and has almost focused exclusively on the U.S. context. In theorizing about this link, the functions of immigrant entrepreneurship for second-generation adaptive outcomes appear to be

threefold: the springboard, safety net and mobility trap functions (Kim 2006). The “springboard” theory argues that the rapid economic integration of immigrant entrepreneurs, despite having to endure grueling working conditions, accelerates the professionalization of the second-generation via investments into higher education. The children of these successful entrepreneurs are expected to excel at school and to enter into prestigious and remunerative careers, in part because of high parental aspirations as well as having access to important financial and institutional resources embedded within the ethnic community to support their academic achievements (Portes and Zhou 1993; Sanchirio 1991). Certainly, there is empirical evidence for the springboard functions of immigrant entrepreneurship in launching the children of entrepreneurs into mainstream professional occupations. For instance, in Vivian Louie’s (2004) study about Chinese youth in the New York City area, many of her interviewees would recount lessons from their parents, who toiled in the enclave economy, reinforcing the idea that higher education is the only ticket out of the enclave economy and into a better life.

In addition to its potential “springboard” function, immigrant entrepreneurship has alternative and less effectual functions vis-à-vis second generation adaptation. For one, the family business and ethnic economy can merely serve as a “safety net” for the second-generation, particularly those who are downwardly mobile. For children who fell off the academic tracks, parents would leverage their own business to provide their children with alternative means of mobility from professional routes by preparing them to take over the family business or providing them the financial capital to set up new businesses (Kim 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Nevertheless, in these cases, the entrepreneurial pathway of immigrant offspring represents a deviation from the intended course of upward mobility via higher education.

More detrimental to the “safety net” function of immigrant family businesses is their potential to be “mobility traps” when immigrant offspring are obligated to help out in a family business at the expense of time and effort that can be spent on schoolwork. Because small businesses often depend on unpaid family labor for survival, including children’s labor, the educational and occupational choices of the children of immigrant entrepreneurs can be severely constrained by their obligations to the family business (Song 1999). This is particularly the case when entrepreneurial families face sudden and unexpected predicaments such as parents’ deaths, illness or other financial circumstances which force children to sacrifice their educational and occupational aspirations in order to sustain the family business (Kim 2006).

Chinese immigrant parents in Southern Europe – specifically, those who are business owners or have intentions to become one – perhaps envision alternative pathways for their children’s social mobility. For those who see immigrant entrepreneurship as a springboard into the mainstream economy, they will invest in their children’s education in order to facilitate their entry into professional occupations rather than have them stay in the family business. By contrast, for those who see entrepreneurship as a sustained mobility strategy, they will either groom their children to take over the family business and even request that they forego higher education, or among those with less concrete goals for their children, they will conceive of the family business as a safety net for their children given the costs of higher education (i.e. money, time and effort) and its risks (i.e. incommensurate returns to a university degree)

Therefore, I posit that for second-generation Chinese in the U.S., the family business is an important stepladder into the mainstream economy, while it is a strategy for sustained mobility strategy inherited from their parents in Spain and Italy. Whereas academic achievement is endorsed as an avenue of social mobility – and quite possibly, as the only available avenue –

among Chinese immigrant parents and those of many other immigrant nationalities in the U.S., entrepreneurial endeavors are touted as viable, if not superior, vehicles of social mobility in other countries such as Spain and Italy.

Analysis and Findings

Key Variables

The main outcome of interest is educational expectations. The main predictors of interest are: youth's self-reported national origin and their adoption of educational versus entrepreneurial success frames.

Educational Expectations. Educational expectations represent the highest level of education that youth respondents realistically expect to attain. The survey instruments for CILS, ILSEG and ITAGEN measure educational expectations in closed ordinal categories.¹ I recoded the ordinal variables into two binary variables: expectations to attend university and expectations to stop schooling after completion of high school in the U.S. or basic secondary schooling in Spain and Italy (which is roughly the equivalent of grade 10 or 11 in the U.S. educational system).

Educational and Entrepreneurial Success Frames. Success frames represent the paradigm through which success in life is understood to be achieved. Parents, teachers, the ethnic community and the host society at large inculcate minority youth with a sense of how to best attain upward mobility, whether via educational or entrepreneurial means.

Those who adopt “educational” success frames tend to commit to the notion that education is the key to getting ahead so it is important to do well in school and to acquire higher education. Ultimately, the point of acquiring higher education is to enter into professional occupations in the mainstream economy, which represents the paragon of immigrant

intergenerational mobility. An “educational” success frame is measured based on the following survey items:

- Educational success frame is captured by the youth’s attitudes towards the valuation of education. CILS and ILSEG ask how important it is for the respondent to get good grades at school, whereas ITAGEN asks how strongly does the respondent agree that success in life depends on getting a good education.

By contrast, those who adopt an “entrepreneurial” success frame are inclined to believe that upward mobility can be achieved through business pursuits which preclude the need for degrees and diplomas. An “entrepreneurial” success frame is measured based on three items available in CILS, ILSEG and ITAGEN:

- In a hypothetical debate between two friends, the respondent is asked to agree with either one of two opposing viewpoints on whether it is more valuable to stay in school or to take a job that will let them earn money and learn the business.²
- Whether the respondent’s aspired occupation involves being an entrepreneur or self-employed.³
- Whether the respondent’s father or mother is self-employed, which would influence their decision to follow in their parents’ footsteps and assume ownership of the family business.

Supplementary analyses are conducted on the ISGMNY, which provides insight into the actual achieved educational and occupational statuses of immigrant youth among major nationalities as represented in New York City. Occupational indicators – namely, the propensity for self-employment among youth respondents and their parents – are used as predictors of youth’s level of educational attainment. These occupational indicators are:

- Whether the respondent is currently self-employed.
- Whether at least one of the parents is/was self-employed.

National Origins. The main predictor of interest is the youth's self-reported national origin.

Given sufficient numbers of cases, the same set of nationality groups are coded across all the different data sets. For the remainder of the categories, groups with a sizeable number of cases in each country (e.g. Ecuadorans in Spain, Macedonians in Italy, Cubans and Mexicans in the U.S.) and regional categories aggregated from smaller nationality groups are coded. Given that the primary comparison of interest in this study is between Chinese and non-Chinese youth in the multivariate analyses, the Chinese is the reference category. The degree to which the addition of other covariates changes the coefficients of the origin groups in a series of nested models (e.g. reducing the magnitude of the coefficient and the level of significance) represents the degree to which they account for Chinese-versus-non-Chinese group differences across the key outcomes.

Educational versus Entrepreneurial Success Frames: Descriptive Results

Tables 3.1a, 3.1b, and 3.1c provide the frequency distributions of the three items used to measure an “entrepreneurial” success frame and the two items used to measure an “educational” success frame by nationalities for Spain, Italy and the U.S., respectively. In Spain and Italy, Chinese youth are generally more likely than most other groups to adopt an “entrepreneurial” success frame – on average, relatively higher percentages of them would drop out of school to take up a business opportunity, aspire to be self-employed or an entrepreneur, and have at least one parent who is self-employed. Conversely, Chinese youth in Spain and Italy are less likely than other groups to adopt an “educational” success frame – on average, they are less likely than other groups to think that it is very important to get good grades (Spain) or that success in life depends

on getting a good education (Italy) and they are less likely to aspire for a high-skilled professional occupation.

Table 3.1a. Frequency Distribution of Indicators of Entrepreneurial versus Educational Success

Frames across National Origins in Spain (%)

National Origins	"ENTREPRENEURIAL" SUCCESS FRAME			"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS	
	Take job over staying in school	Aspires to be self-employed or entrepreneur	At least one parent is self-employed	Very important to get good grades	Aspires for occupation req. at least BA
China	31.5	10.0	23.1	37.9	14.5
Philippines	23.7	2.4	2.4	65.2	31.5
Colombia	7.4	2.6	4.1	46.6	37.6
Dominican Republic	11.3	2.6	3.7	55.9	33.3
South or Other Asia	17.6	1.3	10.4	67.6	33.8
Morocco	19.1	2.5	3.7	65.6	37.1
Romania	12.7	3.0	3.7	49.5	35.0
Ecuador	10.5	3.3	3.2	45.9	36.6
Peru	9.8	2.1	3.0	52.2	45.0
Bolivia	10.9	3.2	3.6	48.8	44.0
South or Central America	9.2	4.0	5.6	49.3	39.0
Africa and Middle East	16.6	1.1	6.0	60.8	37.9
Europe and North America	9.0	2.5	5.3	48.6	37.5
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>12.3</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>50.9</i>	<i>36.6</i>

Source: ILSEG 2008

Table 3.1b. Frequency Distribution of Indicators of Entrepreneurial versus Educational Success

Frames across National Origins in Italy

National Origins	"ENTREPRENEURIAL" SUCCESS FRAME			"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS	
	Take job over staying in school	Aspires to be self-employed or entrepreneur	At least one parent is self-employed	Success in life depends on getting a good education	Aspires for occupation req. at least BA
China	21.7	9.8	31.0	58.2	5.6
Philippines	5.6	0.7	0.0	62.2	30.4
Colombia	12.7	0.0	4.6	67.3	36.4
Dominican Republic	18.4	2.0	0.0	67.4	28.6
South Asia	22.9	1.8	5.7	60.9	17.4
Morocco	16.5	1.1	18.7	72.9	25.0
Romania	11.4	1.0	3.0	74.2	19.7
Albania	15.0	0.0	2.1	72.7	21.9
Macedonia	22.3	4.3	4.1	67.0	13.5
Europe, U.S., Canada	14.5	1.0	7.1	68.5	19.5
Africa and Middle East	14.8	0.6	3.6	74.7	25.0
Other Asia	14.4	2.2	5.6	82.2	24.4
South or Central America	14.5	0.9	4.6	70.4	23.7
Native Italian	13.7	1.5	8.3	79.9	20.7
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>75.3</i>	<i>20.6</i>

Source: ITAGEN 2005

Table 3.1c. Frequency Distribution of Indicators of Entrepreneurial versus Educational Success Frames across National Origins in the U.S.

National Origins	"ENTREPRENEURIAL" SUCCESS FRAME			"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS	
	Take job over staying in school	Aspires to be self-employed or entrepreneur	At least one parent is self-employed	Very important to get good grades	Aspires for occupation req. at least BA
China	8.3	3.1	20.8	77.5	81.9
Philippines	2.8	0.4	2.3	80.8	68.3
Colombia	3.5	0.0	16.3	71.6	65.2
Dominican Republic	2.9	2.1	14.3	74.8	62.9
Vietnamese	6.9	2.8	9.5	78.0	68.9
Cuban	2.0	0.7	15.7	74.7	69.7
Mexican	4.7	1.0	5.7	72.1	59.7
Other Asian	5.3	2.1	5.0	79.0	67.0
Other South American	2.6	0.9	13.4	75.1	70.1
West Indies	2.5	0.7	10.4	82.6	69.8
Other countries	1.6	0.8	23.8	79.2	68.3
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>76.6</i>	<i>67.6</i>

Source: CILS 1992

By comparison, Chinese-American youth tend to adopt a strong “educational” success frame – on average, a high percentage of them think that it is very important to get good grades (although their non-Chinese peers tend to think the same as well) and aspire for high-skilled occupations. However, they are also more likely than other groups to adhere to the measures of an “entrepreneurial” success frame with relatively higher percentages than other groups who agree that it is better to take up a business opportunity rather than stay in school, have aspirations to be self-employed or an entrepreneur, and have at least one parent who is self-employed. That said, relative to their Spanish and Italian counterparts, smaller percentages of the Chinese in the U.S. conform to these entrepreneurial-oriented measures. In actuality, once they reach working age, fewer Chinese youth in the ISMGNY sample are self-employed (at 6 percent) compared to the sample average (10 percent). (See Table E in the Appendix for the frequency distribution of self-employment by national origins in the ISGMNY sample.)

Results from the Multivariate Regression Analyses

To examine these drastic divergences in educational expectations among Chinese youth across the receiving countries, I run a series of regression analyses to test which predictors account for the gap in educational expectations between Chinese and non-Chinese youth for each dataset. More than variations in immigrant selectivity by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, I predict that the kind of framing – entrepreneurial versus educational – through which youth define success in life is a stronger determinant of their expected level of education.

For the multivariate regression, I focus on only one outcome: the expectation to attend university versus not.⁴ Standard logistic regression is performed for a series of nested analytical models using the ILSEG, ITAGEN and CILS data. (The results are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 respectively.) The first model is the “baseline” model which includes the youth’s national origin as the only predictor. The second model is the “controlled” model which adds the socio-demographic and economic variables as predictors in order to account for the variation by group selectivity. The third model is the “full” model which, in addition to the “control” variables, includes the items to measure the success frames. To facilitate interpretation, the average marginal effects are presented for significant predictors.

In Spain, youth from most other groups are significantly more likely than Chinese youth to expect to attend university, as seen from the results from Model 1 in Table 3.2a. (Exceptions include Filipinos, Dominicans, Romanians and Ecuadorans for whom the coefficients are not statistically significant.) Once socio-demographic and economic variables are accounted for in Model 2, only the difference between the Chinese and Peruvians, Europeans and North Americans are rendered statistically insignificant. In Model 3 (i.e. the full model), the differences in university expectations between the Chinese and all of the other groups are no longer

Table 3.2a. Logistic regression of having university expectations by “educational” versus “entrepreneurial” success frames in Spain

	OUTCOME: HAS UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Variables			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	0.621*	0.314	0.108	-0.024	0.330	--	-0.241	0.339	--
Colombia	0.818***	0.255	0.142	0.864***	0.270	0.137	0.688**	0.278	0.106
Dominican Republic	0.268	0.285	--	0.256	0.301	--	0.016	0.309	--
South or Other Asia	0.959***	0.300	0.166	0.877**	0.314	0.139	0.569	0.321	--
Morocco	0.642**	0.257	0.111	0.670**	0.270	0.106	0.378	0.278	--
Romania	0.215	0.286	--	-0.030	0.303	--	-0.246	0.312	--
Ecuador	0.278	0.240	--	0.293	0.253	--	0.118	0.261	--
Peru	0.756***	0.262	0.131	0.449	0.276	--	0.222	0.285	--
Bolivia	1.030***	0.270	0.179	0.972***	0.286	0.154	0.824**	0.294	0.127
South or Central America	1.056***	0.248	0.183	0.833***	0.260	0.132	0.691**	0.268	0.106
Africa and Middle East	0.836**	0.298	0.145	0.778**	0.315	0.123	0.506	0.324	--
Europe and North America	0.984***	0.254	0.171	0.551*	0.268	0.087	0.355	0.277	--
"Entrepreneurial" Success Frame									
Take job rather than stay in school	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.298*	0.128	-0.046
Aspires to be self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1.077***	0.282	-0.166
Has at least one self-employed parent	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.036	0.165	--
"Educational" Success Frame									
Thinks that it is very important to get good grades	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.749***	0.078	0.115
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes		
Constant	-1.843			5.967			4.996		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.029			0.148			0.181		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-2548.008			-2347.024			-2287.187		
N				4524					

Source:

ILSEG (2008)

Table 3.2b. Logistic regression of having university expectations by “educational” versus “entrepreneurial” success frames among Chinese respondents only in Spain

Predictors	Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
"Entrepreneurial" Success Frame			
Take job rather than stay in school	-0.633	0.608	--
Aspires to be self-employed	-1.122	0.981	--
Has at least one self-employed parent	-1.051*	0.620	-0.112
"Educational" Success Frame			
Thinks it is very important to get good grades	1.609***	0.538	0.171
"Control" variables included in the model?	Yes		
Constant	8.587		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.327		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-59.715		
N	269		

Source: ILSEG (2008)

significant, which suggest that the success frames *fully* explain why Chinese youth have, on average, lower university expectations than their non-Chinese peers. The coefficients for the measures of the two kinds of success frames, except for parental self-employment, are statistically significant and in their expected directions. Those who adopt an “entrepreneurial” success frame are *less* likely to expect to attend university. The net probability of having university expectations among respondents who would drop out of school to take up a business opportunity are 5 percent lower than those who would prefer to stay in school, while the net probability of having university expectations among those who aspire to become self-employed are nearly 20 percent lower than those who do not aspire to be self-employed. Contrary to expectations, however, parental self-employment is not a significant predictor of university expectations for the entire sample. Conversely, those who adopt an “educational” success frame are *more* likely to expect to attend university: the net probability of having university expectations among respondents who think that it is very important to get good grades are over ten percent higher than those who think otherwise.

In a separate analysis conducted on only the subsample of Chinese respondents in ILSEG, two of the measures of the success frames are significant and the magnitude of their effects on university expectations are more dramatic than the general sample. The net probability of having university expectations among Chinese youth whose parents are self-employed are about 10 percent lower than those whose parents are not self-employed. The fact that the coefficient for parental self-employment is significant and sizeable in this subsample analysis, even though it was not significant for the entire sample, suggests that there is an interaction effect between being Chinese and parental self-employment on youth’s university expectations. This finding aligns with the “Chinese model” of how family businesses in Spain operate,

whereby parents expect their children to take over the family business rather than pursue higher education. Conversely, the net probability of having university expectations among Chinese youth who think it is very important to get good grades is nearly 20 percent higher than their counterparts who think otherwise. (See Table 3.2b.)

In Italy, Chinese youth are significantly less likely than most other groups to expect to attend university (except South Asians and Macedonians, for whom the coefficients are not statistically significant), as seen in the results for Model 1 in Table 3.4a. The addition of the “control” variables in Model 2 fully explains the difference in university expectations between the Chinese and Colombian, as well as partially explain the difference for several other groups (e.g. Filipinos, Dominicans). In the “full” model, the measures of the success frames further explain why most groups are more likely to have university expectations than the Chinese although it appears that the control variables are generally more powerful predictors than the success frames. Aspirations for self-employment appears to be the most important measure of success frames -- the net probability of having university expectations among those who aspires for self-employment is nearly 15 percent lower than their counterparts who think otherwise. Based on a subsample analysis of the Chinese respondents only, adherence to the idea that success in life depends on getting a good education appears to be the most important predictor of having university expectations – the net probability of having university expectations among those with a strong educational success frame is nearly 14 per cent higher than those who do not have a strong educational success frame. (See Table 3.4b for the complete regression results for this subsample analysis.)

Table 3.4a. Logistic regression of having university expectations by “educational” versus “entrepreneurial” success frames in Italy

	OUTCOME: HAS UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Variables			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	1.077***	0.160	0.231	0.643***	0.173	0.124	0.616***	0.179	0.117
Colombia	0.747**	0.305	0.160	0.447	0.325	0.086	0.427	0.329	0.081
Dominican Republic	0.923***	0.313	0.198	0.804*	0.334	0.155	0.796*	0.335	0.151
South Asia	-0.062	0.151	-0.013	0.052	0.162	0.010	0.050	0.166	0.010
Morocco	0.480***	0.134	0.103	0.384**	0.147	0.074	0.317*	0.150	0.060
Romania	0.953***	0.131	0.204	0.824***	0.143	0.159	0.755***	0.148	0.144
Albania	0.871***	0.119	0.187	0.538***	0.129	0.104	0.515***	0.136	0.098
Macedonia	-0.067	0.186	-0.014	-0.173	0.195	-0.033	-0.147	0.199	-0.028
Europe and North America	1.034***	0.117	0.222	0.673***	0.127	0.129	0.654***	0.132	0.124
Africa and Middle East	0.985***	0.124	0.211	0.663***	0.137	0.128	0.628***	0.143	0.119
Other Asia	1.199***	0.235	0.257	0.722**	0.250	0.139	0.685**	0.254	0.130
South and Central America	1.099***	0.124	0.236	0.921***	0.138	0.177	0.893***	0.143	0.170
"Entrepreneurial" Success Frame									
Take job rather than stay in school	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.531***	0.087	-0.101
Aspires to be self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.769***	0.247	-0.146
Has at least one self-employed parent	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.179	0.110	0.034
"Educational" Success Frame									
Thinks success in life depends on a good education	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.299***	0.063	0.057
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes		
Constant	-1.468			0.846			0.552		
Nagelkerke R2	0.047			0.178			0.192		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-4360.906			-3997.985			-3955.668		
N				16293					

Source: ITAGEN (2005)

Table 3.4b. Logistic regression of having university expectations by “educational” versus “entrepreneurial” success frames among Chinese respondents only in Italy

Predictors	OUTCOME: HAS UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS		
	Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
"Entrepreneurial" Success Frame			
Take job rather than stay in school	-0.276	0.306	-0.035
Aspires to be self-employed	-0.995*	0.475	-0.127
Has at least one self-employed parent	-0.113	0.256	-0.014
"Educational" Success Frame			
Thinks success in life depends on a good education	1.066***	0.258	0.136
"Control" variables included in the model?	Yes		
Constant	-0.009		
Nagelkerke R2	0.230		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-261.798		
N	646		

Source: ITAGEN (2005)

In contrast to the relatively low university expectations among Chinese youth in Spain and Italy, the proportion of Chinese youth in the U.S. who have university expectations are on par or even higher than the proportions of their non-Chinese peers. Based on the results from Model 1 in Table 3.5, Chinese youth are significantly more likely than Dominicans, Mexicans and youth from the “other Asian”⁵ category to have university expectations – on average, the odds of expecting to attend university among the other groups are approximately three-quarters lower than the odds among Chinese youth. The control variables in Model 2 only minimally accounts for these group differences.

Measures of the success frames partially explain the gap in university expectations between the Chinese and these three groups, as seen in the results of Model 3. Even accounting for group selectivity and differences in success frames, the net probability of expecting to attend university among Dominicans, Mexicans and “other Asians” are about 16-18 percent lower than the Chinese. In terms of the measures of the success frames, only two out of the four measures are significant. As an indicator of adopting an “entrepreneurial” success frame, the net probability of having university expectations among those who would quit school to take up a business opportunity is ten percent lower than among those who prefer to stay in school. In contrast, as an indicator of adopting an “educational” success frame, the net probability of having university expectations among those who think good grades is important is eleven percent higher than those who think otherwise. (The number of respondents in the Chinese sample of CILS is too small to permit a subsample analysis.)

Table 3.5 Logistic regression of having university expectations by “educational” versus “entrepreneurial” success frames in the U.S.

	OUTCOME: HAS UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Variables			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	-0.539	0.386	-0.087	-0.691	0.402	-0.105	-0.720	0.433	-0.102
Colombia	-0.411	0.417	-0.067	-0.507	0.450	-0.077	-0.391	0.484	-0.055
Dominican Republic	-1.299***	0.430	-0.210	-1.361***	0.464	-0.208	-1.292**	0.499	-0.183
Vietnam	-0.840*	0.395	-0.136	-0.399	0.413	-0.061	-0.315	0.448	-0.045
Cuba	-0.369	0.383	-0.060	-0.552	0.420	-0.084	-0.488	0.450	-0.069
Mexico	-1.612***	0.382	-0.261	-1.163***	0.398	-0.178	-1.152**	0.430	-0.163
Other Asia	-1.541***	0.389	-0.250	-1.128**	0.406	-0.172	-1.116*	0.439	-0.158
Other South and Central America	-0.639	0.387	-0.104	-0.734	0.417	-0.112	-0.571	0.449	-0.081
West Indies	-0.361	0.397	-0.059	-0.326	0.433	-0.050	-0.272	0.464	-0.039
Other Countries	0.268	0.490	0.043	-0.006	0.521	-0.001	-0.026	0.551	-0.004
"Entrepreneurial" Success Frame									
Take job rather than stay in school	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.677***	0.187	-0.096
Aspires to be self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.455	0.338	-0.065
Has at least one self-employed parent	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.264	0.142	0.037
"Educational" Success Frame									
Thinks it is very important to get good grades	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.778***	0.085	0.110
"Control" variables included in the model?		No			Yes			Yes	
Constant		2.079			6.314			5.673	
Nagelkerke R2		0.070			0.151			0.167	
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq		-2620.066			-2468.640			-2144.261	
N					4844				

Source: CILS (1992)

While university expectations are generally high across all groups of immigrant youth in the U.S. based on the CILS data, once actual educational outcomes are examined using the ISGMNY data, there are substantial differences in levels of university attainment between Chinese and non-Chinese youth. As presented in Table 3.6a, based on results from the analysis of the data, all of the groups (except Russians) are significantly less likely than the Chinese to have a bachelor's degree or higher in Model 1. In the “control” model, the gaps in university attainment between the Chinese and other groups widen substantially, particularly for the Russians and native Whites. Given the relatively humble origins of the Chinese immigrant population in New York, as indicated by the relatively lower levels of educational attainment among first-generation parents, the high levels of university attainment among their offspring in comparison to other groups is particularly extraordinary.

Table 3.6a. Logistic regression of having attained a bachelor's degree or higher by occupational indicators in the U.S.

	OUTCOME: HAS ATTAINED BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR HIGHER								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Variables			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: Chinese)									
Puerto Rico	-1.591***	0.185	-0.251	-2.267***	0.230	-0.278	-2.338***	0.244	-0.331
Dominican Republic	-1.290***	0.170	-0.204	-1.737***	0.204	-0.213	-1.815***	0.214	-0.257
West Indies	-1.088***	0.164	-0.172	-1.880***	0.258	-0.231	-2.057***	0.272	-0.291
Colombia, Ecuador, Peru	-0.998***	0.161	-0.158	-1.734***	0.194	-0.213	-1.839***	0.206	-0.261
Russia	-0.352*	0.155	-0.056	-2.257***	0.431	-0.277	-2.237***	0.449	-0.317
Native Blacks	-1.109***	0.163	-0.175	-2.344***	0.268	-0.288	-2.383***	0.281	-0.338
Native Whites	0.724***	0.131	0.114	-0.687**	0.241	-0.084	-0.837***	0.256	-0.119
Occupational indicators									
Respondent is currently self-employed							-0.266	0.185	-0.038
At least one parent is self-employed							-0.002	0.114	0.000
"Control" variables included in the model?		No		Yes			Yes		
Constant		-0.666		-7.821			-6.533		
Nagelkerke R2		0.140		0.390			0.371		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq		-1666.806		-1318.871			-1165.405		
N				2579					

Source: ISGMNY (2006)

In the “full” model, which includes variables for whether the respondent is currently self-employed and has at least one parent who had been or is currently self-employed, the Chinese are still significantly more likely than any other group to have a bachelor's degree. Neither occupational indicators are significant indicators nor do they explain Chinese youth's much stronger predisposition to attain higher educational credentials – the net probability to attain a bachelor's degree among other groups range from being ten (i.e. Native Whites) to over thirty percent (i.e. Native Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Russians) lower than the Chinese.

In a separate analysis for the subsample of Chinese respondents only, the negative association between self-employment and university attainment is highlighted –among the Chinese, the net probability of having a bachelor's degree among the self-employed is over 20 percent lower than those who are not self-employed. (See Table 3.6b for the subsample analysis of the Chinese respondents.)

Table 3.6b. Logistic regression of having attained a bachelor's degree or higher by occupational indicators among Chinese respondents only in the U.S.

OUTCOME: HAS ATTAINED BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR HIGHER			
Predictors	Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
Occupational indicators			
Respondent is currently self-employed	-1.453**	0.583	-0.231
At least one parent is self-employed	-0.079	0.263	-0.013
"Control" variables included in the model?	Yes		
Constant	-9.958		
Nagelkerke R2	0.446		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-206.412		
N	607		

Source: ISGMNY (2006)

In brief, results from the multivariate analysis show that Chinese youth in Spain and Italy are relatively less likely than other groups to expect to attend university, whereas Chinese youth in the U.S. are equally – if not, *more* likely – to expect to and to actually attend university than their non-Chinese peers. These patterns generally hold true even after group variations in terms of socio-demographic and economic characteristics are held constant. Moreover, the adoption of different kinds of success frames at least, partially explains these differences between the Chinese and other groups. That said, it is important to keep in mind that these are only correlations and not causal relationships. As this is only a cross-sectional analysis, the direction of influence on attitudinal predictors and outcomes can go both ways – it is as likely that adoption of an entrepreneurial success frame leads to low educational aspiration as it is the opposite. In the next section, I present qualitative evidence for the role of success frames in shaping youth's educational plans. In-depth interviews illustrate how Chinese youth growing up in Spain and Italy versus those in the U.S. express divergent ideas of how to get ahead in their respective host societies and, in so doing, have adopted different kinds of success frames.

Exploring Success Frames: Chinese Youth in their Own Words

Entrepreneurial Success Frames in Spain and Italy

In my interviews with Chinese youth and their parents living in Madrid, Spain and Milan, Italy, it became apparent that the “entrepreneurial” success frame was strongly implanted in their mindsets. For instance, Mario⁶, a 21-year-old waiter who arrived in Italy when he was 8-years-old, had plans to help his parents open up their store. He started working as a full-time waiter after finishing secondary school at age 17. When asked whether he would prefer to pursue post-secondary schooling or to help for his parents after their shop is open, he responded without hesitation that he would prefer to help his parents. When pressed for a reason, he explained that he wanted to help his parents out of filial duty since it took them a long time to save money to invest into the business, as well as for better opportunities for himself. In his own words: “I do it [*i.e. help his parents*] for my future – a better future – and for my parents.” Part of the reason for his optimism for entrepreneurship as a vehicle for upward mobility for himself and for his family was due to his incredulity about the utility of education in achieving the same thing. When asked whether it is important to get a good education in Italy, he said: “Right now, even if you get a college degree, it’s still hard to find a job. Even the native Italians are poor right now, even if they have college degrees.” When I pointed out the poor state of the Italian economy, suggesting that it is a risky time to start a business, his rebuttal was that as long as the store opened up in prime location, business should be good too, just like the restaurant that he worked at.

Mario’s colleague, Dai Yi, aged 30 and having arrived in Italy 5 years ago, provided further insight about the mentality of immigrant youth such as Mario. He argued that for youth who grew up in Italy, they do not think it is important to get a good education in order to get ahead in Italian society, which is a jarring difference in mentality from those who grew up in

China, like himself, where getting a good education is believed to be vitally important given how competitive the school system and labor market are. When I asked him why he thinks many Chinese youth in Italy quit school while they are still so young, he explained:

A lot of Chinese parents here don't require their kids to get top grades or get into the best schools. To them, getting an education means learning Italian, which is important for doing business in Italy. They don't need the kids to become professionals or PhD holders.... Know enough Italian to do business with Italians. They can use their own abilities rather than what they learn in school to open up a shop and make a living. No need to go to school.

Indeed, Dai Yi's explanation was echoed in the sentiments of my other respondents. Many of the Chinese youth who were interviewed expressed a lack of concrete educational plans because of their parents' strong expectations for them help out – and perhaps, eventually take over – the family business. Luigi, age 20 and born in Italy, was working full-time in his parents' Chinese restaurant when I interviewed him, despite having attended *liceo*, which is the university preparatory track. While he was in the midst of his studies in Milan, his parents pulled him out of school so that he can go to China to learn Chinese in order to help with the daily operation of the restaurant, such as taking orders from Chinese-speaking customers and picking up ingredients from the Chinese market. When I asked him whether he thinks his education has gone to waste since he dropped out in order to work at the restaurant, his reply was: “When I went to *liceo*, I learned many things that I never use. So slowly, I've forgotten what I've learned because I don't use it.” Despite his relatively good grades and ability to enter into *liceo*, his belief about the lack of utility of a university education in the Italian labor market, in addition to his parents' investment into improving his Chinese proficiency, led him to forego the pursuit of university.

The sentiment that a university degree has minimal payoff in the real labor market was reverberated in many of the interviews. Xiao Yao, age 18 and having arrived in Italy when she was 5-years-old, was attending *liceo* at the time of the interview and had dreams of going to design school after graduation. However, even though her parents were proud of her good grades and her scholarship granted by *Associna* (i.e. the Chinese-Italian Association), her parents had discouraged her from attending design school because they believed that such education credentials serve minimal practical purpose in the labor market. Xiao Yao, herself, held similar reservations. Her father expected that after graduation, she would work as a waitress at a Chinese restaurant. Given his connections with the owners of Chinese restaurants, he was confident that she would easily get a job working as a waitress and earning a steady paycheck. As for her prospects of entering university, her parents were not supportive of that decision because according to her, they thought getting a university degree would be a “big risk”: “We are not such a confident family. We try to take the safer path. We don’t like to take risks. I’ve heard that many students with a university degree still don’t have a job that corresponds with their level of education.”

Likewise, Rosario, aged 22, born in Italy and having immigrated to Madrid during adolescence, shared similar sentiments. Working full-time at her parents’ bakery after graduating from vocational school for clerical studies, she justified her decision to work at her parents’ bakery by citing how difficult it had been to find work in Spain, even with a university degree, given the poor economy: “Well, nowadays, even if you have a university degree, you may still not be able to find a job because the economy is so bad. For people who don’t have a university degree, you can still make money by becoming a business owner.” Since her parents discussed

the prospect of having her take over the bakery someday, she was prepared to do so despite having her degree in clerical studies.

Youth who were less educated than Luigi and Xiao Yao were even more inclined to rely on their family business as their permanent mode of livelihood. Dino, aged 18 who arrived in Milan when he was 9-years-old, was a part-time secondary school student on the vocational track who spent more time working at his parents' accessories store than attending classes and doing schoolwork. When asked about his plans for the future, he told me that he had no plans to pursue further education after he finished high school and even so, at his current pace, he did not anticipate completing his requirements for another two years, which meant his plans to finish high school were also tenuous. He expressed no concrete career plans and when I asked him whether he thought he would be working at his parents' shop full-time, he replied, "It depends. If the store needs me, then yes. I haven't really thought about it too much." Likewise, Pietro, aged 17 and born in Italy, who was a part-time secondary school student on the vocational track at the time of the interview, expressed a lack of concrete plans for his future. He also worked at his parents' accessories store. When asked whether his parents wanted him to work at their store permanently after graduation, he said that they would prefer he become a boss for his own business but that in the meanwhile, he should help out at the store. As for himself, becoming a boss was not his own aspiration although he admitted that he had put little thought into his career plans. In the cases of both Dino and Pietro, working many hours at their parents' shops appears to have stunted any career aspirations, which remain ambiguous.

Even among the rare cases of Chinese youth who pursued a university degree, dreams of owning a business and becoming your own boss remained salient. Liu Xia, a 22-year-old student who arrived in Spain at the age of 13, was in his last year of studies at one of the most

prestigious universities in Madrid when I interviewed him. After graduation, he planned to open up a business – perhaps a restaurant that he intended to eventually turn into a franchise – with his friends. When asked about his entrepreneurial ambitions, he said that although he was not completely dismissing the idea of finding work at a company, he wanted to pursue his business plans before taking the employment route. Given the bad economy, he thought it would be difficult to find work in the first place, despite having a degree from a prestigious university. Moreover, he thought that the time was ripe for entrepreneurial opportunities because start-up costs, including rent, had decreased and the government had been offering incentives for first-time business owners (e.g. tax credits) in the hopes of spurring the economy. His father, Mr. Quan, shared similar ambitions for his son, even though Liu Xia has not yet discussed his post-graduation plans with his parents. In my interview with his parents, they expressed tremendous pride regarding Liu Xia's academic achievements, attributing them entirely to his own dedication and hard work; they insisted that they played no role at all, neither helping him with schoolwork nor setting expectations for him to attend university. Despite their moral support for his university goal, which set them apart from many Chinese parents in Spain and Italy, his father still expressed some reservations about Liu Xia's career options after graduation. When asked whether they wanted him to take over their grocery store someday, Mr. Quan replied:

How should I say this? I think doing well in school is good. But, realistically speaking, the ultimate point of coming to another country is to make money. An education should be good for one's future. That I understand. But, if you're working for someone else, let's say you're making a thousand dollars. That's it. But if you're your own boss, that money will multiple. That said, owning your own business is tough. It's hard work. Especially for Chinese bosses. You have to do a lot of things yourself and work long hours.

When probed on whether he felt conflicted about whether his son should work for himself or someone else, Mr. Quan said:

Yes, I feel conflicted. I don't want him to have a hard life like us because owning your own business is a lot of hard work. But, working for someone else, you probably won't make that much. What is he going to do after he's married and has a family? You need money to support your family. And to make that money, you should become your own boss. That's just what I think.

For some youth, the prospect of taking over the family business someday was entirely their parents' ambitions for them, rather than their own. In some cases, their own dreams were deferred or at risk of being deferred given their parents' expectations. Lorena, aged 20 and born in Italy, was working full-time at her parents' travel agency at the time of interview. She went to vocational school for fashion design. Even though she had no plans to become a designer, since she thought it was too competitive, she would like to work as a shop assistant at one of the designer boutiques in the Quadrilatero d'Oro area ("The Golden Rectangle" in English) in Milan where all the high fashion houses are located. Despite her own ambitions, her parents expected her to eventually take over their other family business, a bar (i.e. a kind of convenience store that also serves breakfast which is a mainstay in the Italian cityscape). As to how she felt about working at her parents' bar:

I don't think I'd make a very good businesswoman. I don't want to keep working at my parents' bar even though they've talked about giving it to me eventually. It also depends on who my future husband is, and whether he can take over the bar. I don't really know about my future because right now, I'll just take whatever job I can take as long as I don't have to work at the bar. I don't want to open a business because it's just not in my character.

Although the majority of Chinese youth who were interviewed had adopted an entrepreneurial success frame and/or had depressed their educational ambitions, there were a few exceptional cases whereby Chinese youth had entered into white-collar work in the mainstream labor market. (One of the interviewees was a 29-year-old female who, according to herself, was the first Chinese person to have graduated from her nursing program in Milan. Another one of the

interviewees was a 34-year-old Ph.D. candidate in educational studies.) Gianna, aged 28 and born in Italy, worked as a cultural mediator and interpreter for the Milan school board. Her personal history was paradoxically, typical and atypical vis-à-vis the personal histories of her Chinese peers. Like many of her peers, her parents owned a restaurant, where she worked long hours after school and on weekends. Unlike the vast majority of her peers, however, she was adamant about pursuing higher education, attending *liceo* and then university. After attaining her university degree, she pursued neither an entrepreneurial path (like Liu Xia) nor a high-paying job at an Italian corporation. Instead, she was committed to using her unique skills set – being fluently bilingual in Italian and Chinese, as well as having firsthand experience with both cultures – to act as a bridge between the Chinese immigrant community and the Italian mainstream society. Given the meaningfulness of her job, I asked her what her parents thought of her job. She replied:

Oh, my mom thinks that I don't have a real job. I was one of the first second-generation Chinese here who went to university. My Chinese is okay and my Italian is very good because I grew up here. So, my relatives' expectations for me were very high; they thought with my education I can become a big boss.

When I asked her to compare her experience with the typical experiences of her Chinese peers, she offered her own explanation based on her counseling work with Chinese families. According to Gianna, for many Chinese parents, their primary aspiration for their children is for them to become rich and in pursuing this goal, they view higher education as not a particularly effective instrument:

You have to know that the Chinese parents here want and hope that their kids will become rich. If the restaurants, massage parlors, import/export business is the way to become rich, then school? Forget about it. The expectation of the parents for the kids is to not do the same kind of hard work that they did.

When I followed-up by asking her why taking over the family business would not be considered the same kind of “hard” work that their parents had to endure, she replied:

Not exactly. The kids would know Italian, which the parents don’t know. Also, they’re not doing hard labor like the parents. They’re going to be bosses. All the profits will be theirs to keep. So to the parents, it’s an ideal occupation to become a business owner. It’s not such a good thing to just be an employee.

In a moment of introspection, I asked her to reflect on why she turned out so exceptionally, even though she also had to endure the pressures of helping out at her parents’ restaurant. She explained that, first of all, her parents were supportive of her desires to continue her studies by entering *liceo*, something which eluded her Chinese peers because of their parents’ disapproval. Second, while she juggled between her schoolwork and helping out at the restaurant, she realized that between the two, she somehow knew that school offered an opportunity to escape from the drudgery of working at the restaurant and the prospect of having to take over it someday. Although many of her Chinese peers chose to forego education to help out and eventually, inherit the family business, Gianna made an executive decision early on during adolescence to not follow in their same footsteps. Ultimately, her decision was prompted by this reason: “Perhaps it’s because I’m selfish. I wanted to seek an alternative future.”

In brief, my interviews with Chinese youth in Milan and Madrid (and in some cases, their parents) revealed several patterns in how they formulated their educational and occupational plans. In many instances, the “entrepreneurial” success frame had already been firmly implanted into their mentalities; among those who aspire to be business owners, even those with a university education, entrepreneurship was perceived as a pathway to mobility or a sustained mode of livelihood in the Spanish and Italian economies, particularly given their recent downturns. For youth who already worked long hours on a regular basis at their family business while they were still in school, the transition into full-time work at the family business after – or

if – they graduate was the next logical step, especially for those who lacked concrete career plans. Other respondents clearly deferred their own dreams to continue assisting their parents, justifying their decision by arguing that higher education is not an effective means for mobility in Italian and Spanish society anyway. Finally, there were a few exceptional cases whereby, against all odds, Chinese youth pursued higher education and entered into “mainstream” occupations which have been considered unconventional by the Chinese community.

Educational Success Frames in the U.S.

Based on the interview transcriptions from the ISMGNY study, the majority of Chinese interviewees mentioned the importance of higher education for achieving success in life. For these Chinese-American youth, an “educational” success frame had been firmly implanted into their mindsets. When asked about the advice that her parents gave her regarding how to be successful in life, Miranda, a second-generation, 32-year-old attorney, said that although her parents never dispensed any words of wisdom to her and her siblings, they did emphasize that “... if you did well in school and obeyed the rules of society, nothing can go wrong in your life”. In fact, she also equated getting a good education and a strong sense of familism as quintessentially Chinese values. As she explained, these two Chinese values are “... like a two-edged sword. On the one hand, it is really the two most positive things of being Chinese but it turns out to be bad because then some kids puts too much on that or the other, and nothing else to round out your life”. In this way, the inextricable link between academic performance and filial duty has become synonymous with the experience of growing up in Chinese-American families.

In comparing the Chinese youth in the U.S. versus those in Spain and Italy, what is interesting is that while Chinese parents on both sides of the Atlantic often state high aspirations for their children to become rich, their ideas about the most effective means to making money

are different. In Spain and Italy, parents stressed that self-employment – being your own boss – is the most effective, whereas those in the U.S. emphasized getting a university education and majoring in a discipline that would lead to entry into a high-paying profession. Irene, aged 22 and born in the U.S., was in her senior year at Columbia University, majoring in computer science, at the time of her interview. When asked whether her parents ever gave her advice about how to be successful, she responded that given her parents defined success as “being rich”, her parents wanted her to get at least, a Master’s degree so she could go into day trading, where her parents believed the money is at. Likewise, Ruby, aged 27 with a Master’s degree, said that in terms of how her parents defined success, her mother was “very much a ‘making money’ type of successful, [meaning] you go to school so you can get a good job so you can buy things and, you know, not have to struggle”.

For children with less educated parents, even though they had little concrete and practical advice for their children on how to get through school and make it to college, they still set strong expectations for them to attain a university education. John, aged 25 and U.S.-born, was a college graduate who worked as an analyst at one of the big finance firms on Wall Street. Even though his parents had only a middle school education and low-skilled occupations – his father co-owned a Chinese takeout place and his mother was a seamstress – the majority of his siblings, seven brothers and sisters, attained university degrees, including himself. Growing up, John remembered that his parents rarely gave life advice and instead, deflected responsibility on to his teachers: “Their famous quotes would be, if I did something wrong, ‘Didn’t the school teach you that? Didn’t your teachers tell you that?’ It was just ridiculous.” As long as John and his siblings were still in college, passed and graduated, his parents were generally satisfied, although they definitely expected them to attend college which they provided financial support for.

Many of the ISGMNY respondents reported that their parents had very strong opinions about which disciplines to major in. Namely, these disciplines would correspond with occupations that were generally high-paying and considered “steady” occupations with lower rates of unemployment. The strong preference among Chinese students to enter into occupations that are related to the sciences and engineering, a phenomenon that has been examined by Xie and Goyette (2003), was documented in many cases in the ISGMNY study. Both Irene and her brother majored in computer science in college. Her parents actively encouraged both of them to major in computer science in order to pursue day trading as an occupation. She explained that the relatives who sponsored her parents for immigration to the U.S. were all in computer science. Her parents have made them into role models for Irene and her brother because they clearly “made it” in the U.S. with their high salaries and their ownership of multiple homes in New Jersey. Even though Irene was doing well in her studies because she described herself as “academically inclined,” she admitted that she would prefer to major in something else other than computer science: “If I weren’t studying computer science, I would do something more liberal artsy, like math or physics. That’s the real arts. (Laughs.)” When asked why she did not major in math or physics instead, she explained that her family could not afford to have her “major in something and be a researcher and make very little money. And be a postdoc slave.” For Irene’s parents, they expected financial payoff from investing in their daughter’s education, which was why Irene was inclined to be realistic about the practicalities of what she chose to major in rather than just consider where her interests laid.

Similarly, Miranda’s sister, who had wanted to become a writer, was dissuaded by their parents to choose a more practical career. As she explained:

... My sister had a mind of her own from when she was young. She wanted to be a writer so instead of trying to persuade my sister to go into a particular career,

my parents did try to dissuade her from being a writer, because they think that that's not something that's gonna make enough money for her to, you know, have a good living. And I think that's a very primary concern of theirs, that whatever you're gonna do in your life, is that going to give you a good lifestyle so that you don't have to worry about where your next meal's gonna be. And I don't know, that's always a priority with them.

It was not uncommon for the respondents' parents to recommend certain "safe" career pathways for their children. Even if the stated goal was not to become obscenely wealthy, parents hoped that their children would take the route that they have charted so that they could make a good living and not have to worry about their next meal. Heidi, aged 24, graduated from an Ivy League college with a degree in computer programming. Her father, a medical doctor with his own clinic, and her mother, a stay-at-home mom, encouraged her to enter the sciences because they perceived the sciences as a "safer" career choice offering greater "job security". Once she was in college, she was given a certain degree of leeway in terms of what to major in but her parents would still dispense advice on what kind of courses to take that were considered "useful" and what courses to avoid taking: "[They] try to scare me about things, like 'Oh, so many millions of people got laid off at IBM, so you've got to be really good. Horror stories like that which don't apply to me because I'm not in those fields.'"

Likewise, Ruby's parents dissuaded her from becoming a teacher because her mother, in particular, saw minimal opportunity in upward mobility in the teaching profession. At age 27 with both Bachelor's and Master's degrees, Ruby worked as branch manager at a bank. While she was in college, her parents did not specify which discipline to major in, but they did push for a career that was business-oriented. When she had expressed an interest in becoming a teacher to her parents, her mother immediately opposed. When asked why, she replied: "They felt the potential for earnings was limited and they felt that just the risks associated with the New York Public Schools are there."

Even though a substantial number of interviewees mentioned that their ideal career plans had been deferred in following their parents' advice about entering a "safer" or "more practical" career, the interviewees themselves acknowledged the instrumentality of getting a good education. For instance, Heidi agreed that a college education, preferably from a highly-ranked institution, played a very important role in getting a good job: "I think it's [i.e. a college education] important, especially in a place like New York, where you go by your resume, and it's tough to get people to look at you without even the sign of a B.A., so it's helpful – I mean besides the ways in which it exercises your mind." Many of the interviewees also echoed their parents' beliefs about the importance of money in defining success in life. Irene, a college student, agreed with her parents' belief that without money, other things in life would be much harder to attain as well. According to her, "even if you have a lot of friends but you don't have money, once they find out they'll all leave". Other interviewees took a more nuanced perspective on the role of money in defining life success. Miranda, the attorney in her early 30s, said that it was important for her to remember what it was like to not have much while she was growing up to remind herself to not become too comfortable so that she could keep the embers of her ambition glowing. As the eldest out of three siblings, she recalled living in "not-so-nice" places with her parents and then having their quality of life increase over time as their business grew. She explained why being successful is motivated, in part, by ensuring that you know where your next meal is going to come from:

[M]y brother and sister, I think they're too comfortable even now. I think they take a lot of things for granted so I do think you do need to know where your next meal is – you've got to keep that in perspective. Not as much as my parents have, because I think that's all they had to look to, but I think there should be some hunger there, because otherwise.... Which is why we worry about our kids. We're gonna deprive them of things. (Laughs.)

John, the financial analyst in his mid-20s, echoed this sentiment by replying that his definition of success for someone at his age involved making enough money to be self-sufficient: “I’m not struggling. I’m not that ambitious with my career but as long as I know that I get that check every two weeks and financially stable that I can save money, that to me that’s being successful.” What is interesting about the way that the majority of Chinese respondents answered the question about how they would define success for someone at their age was their emphasis on having a career and making a good living. When this same question was posed to respondents from other ethnic and national backgrounds in the ISGMNY study, they were much more inclined to provide more heterogeneous and all-encompassing responses, describing success in life in terms of getting married, having children, making an impact on society, being happy, being a boss, and so forth (Kasinitz et al. 2009).

In addition to having parents who expected their children to become rich and defining success in similarly materialistic terms, the Chinese respondents in the ISGMNY study were similar to the Chinese youth in Madrid and Milan, who I interviewed, in terms of the high proportions whose parents were business owners. However, their experiences of growing up in the family business were rather dissimilar. Recall that in Spain and Italy, Chinese youth were mostly expected to work long hours after school and during weekends, leaving minimal time for school work. As a result of this time commitment, academics tended to fall off the wayside. By contrast, their U.S. counterparts did not work nearly as much in their family business because parents explicitly made their children’s education a priority so that schoolwork came before work shifts at the family business. The parents of Miranda, the attorney, owned a wholesale restaurant supply store. She would help out with office work but mostly just in the summertime

so it did not get in the way of her studies. She looked back at those days when she helped out at the store with fond memories:

I didn't mind that much. You know, growing up, I watched the Brady Bunch and it was always wonderful to hear about oh, you know, you have to save up your allowance money in order to buy this one toy you'd want, and my family wasn't like that. My parents never gave me an allowance, but they never deprived me of anything. "Mommy, I want that Barbie doll." If I'd been good, if I'd gotten like good grades, then they'll get it for me, so I never had to save up money. So working for my parents... I was glad to help out. I didn't mind that much. Plus, it made me feel like useful.

Her parents also never expected her to take over the business, mostly because she is female.

They had contemplated giving the business to her younger brother, although since he has college and career plans of his own, their transferal plan was indeterminate.

Not all of the respondents whose parents were self-employed had such positive experiences. John, the financial analyst, worked at his father's takeout place, which he co-owned with an uncle. He would work there on weekends and when asked to sum up his experiences, all he had to say was: "I hated it. I really hated it. It was just terrible. I just hated it." When asked why he said, "I just didn't like working there. It was just sitting there and you had to deal with customers. Being in the kitchen all day is not something I like." John expressed no plans to become self-employed, and was particularly perturbed by the possibility of ever becoming a restaurant owner.

Based on their interviews, compared to their Chinese counterparts in Spain and Italy, Chinese immigrant offspring in the U.S. – specifically, those who live in New York City – adopted a strong "educational" success frame, which was in large part instilled into them by their parents. There are some points of similarities across all three countries. First, many of the respondents had parents who owned a business, where they helped out – although the degree to which they helped out varied widely with Chinese youth in Spain and Italy working, on average,

much longer hours than their U.S. counterparts. Second, for many of the respondents' parents and to some extent, the respondents themselves, success in life was largely defined in financial terms – for some, this might be the explicit goal of becoming wealthy, while for others, it was a more nuanced goal of making enough money to ensure a certain quality of life. Regardless of these variations, a unifying theme which tied together all of these cases of Chinese-American youth is the widespread belief in the importance of education in achieving upward mobility.

Summary

To reiterate, the purpose of this chapter is to seek potential explanations for the drastic divergences in educational experiences and outcomes among Chinese youth across the receiving countries. I posit that the valuation of education and its role in the cultural framings of success is an important mediator. Results from the multivariate regression analyses show that, for the most part, variations in immigrant selectivity of the Chinese across the three countries by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics only partially explain the Chinese youth's lower levels of university expectations in Spain and Italy and conversely, higher levels of university expectations and attainment in the U.S. Instead, entrepreneurial and educational success frames are more significant and stronger predictors of youth's educational expectations. Generally, Chinese youth in Spain and Italy are more likely to conform to an "entrepreneurial" success frame than an "educational" one, whereas Chinese youth in the U.S, similar to immigrant youth from other nationalities, are more likely to adopt an "educational" success frame. Indeed, the power of higher education in achieving the American Dream has a stronghold on the imagination of almost all immigrant youth.

Findings from the in-depth interviews largely confirm these quantitative results, in addition to elucidating how different success frames are adopted based on immigrant youth's and their families' perceptions of opportunity in their respective host societies. Generally, the Chinese interviewees in Spain and Italy have minimal regard for the value of higher education in facilitating their upward mobility; as a result, the "entrepreneurial" success frame is firmly implanted in their mindsets given that those who have achieved success – defined in largely financial terms – within the Chinese community are business owners, who in turn, become role models for immigrants and their offspring. Likewise, Chinese respondents in New York City tend to adopt a strong "educational" success frame, mentioning that both they and their parents place much faith in a university education in getting them secure and well-paid jobs. Few mentioned aspirations to become self-employed, and in fact, based on analysis of the ISGMNY data, there was a significant negative association between the respondent's university attainment and self-employment. Having established the relationship between the adoption of cultural frames and youth's educational expectations, the following chapter will examine the structural contexts – namely, perceptions of opportunity in the host societies – which shape the formation of these cultural frames.

Notes:

1. The questions regarding educational expectations are phrased in the following manner with the possible set of response in each questionnaire. For ILSEG, the question is, "What is the highest level of education that you think you can realistically expect to attain?" with the following categories of response: complete ESO (i.e. compulsory secondary education); complete baccalaureate; middle-grade training cycles (vocational training); superior-level training cycles

(vocational training); college certificate; university degree; and, post-graduate degree. For ITAGEN, the question is, “Which kind of high school would you like to attend?” which is a proxy for the type of academic track (i.e. university versus technical or vocational) that the respondent expects to pursue. Those who expect to attend university would expect to attend *licei* or secondary school focusing on the humanities, sciences, languages or the arts. Those who do not expect to attend university would respond to the question by choosing one of the following categories: none, polytechnic or vocational school, or do not know. For CILS, the question is, “What is the highest level of education that you think you will get, realistically speaking?” with the following categories of response: less than high school; finish high school; finish some college; finish college; and, finish a graduate degree.

2. The exact wording of the item is as follows in the CILS and ILSEG questionnaires, which are nearly identical with the exception of different first names being used: “Juan/Luis and Pedro are students. An older friend asks them to work for him because they will earn money and learn the business. Luis says: ‘I agree. It is better than going to school and I’ll learn about the real world.’ Pedro says: ‘I disagree. I will stay in school because in the long run, it is better for me.’ Who do you think is right, Juan/Luis or Pedro?” In the ITAGEN questionnaire, the question is worded slightly differently: “Hassan and Mohammed are 18 years old and go to school together. A friend offers to give them a good job, saying that it’s better quit school in order to earn money and learn a profession right away. Hassan says: ‘I want the job, because it’s better to learn right away how the real world works, rather than sitting around in school.’ Mohammed says: ‘I don’t want the job, because it’s better to study in order to find better employment later.’ Who do you agree with more, Hassan or Mohammed?”

3. The dummy variables for self-employment aspirations are constructed based on an open-ended question that asks the respondents about their aspired occupation in all three questionnaires. Individual responses including “entrepreneur,” business owner,” “self-employed,” etc. were coded as 1, whereas all other responses were coded as 0.
4. I do not present the results for expectations to only complete compulsory secondary schooling (i.e. Spain and Italy) or high school (i.e. U.S.) without pursuing further education given the similarity of results between the two binary outcomes across the analytical models.
5. The most populous nationalities represented in the “Other Asia” category in ITAGEN are Sri Lanka and Thailand.
6. Pseudonyms are used for all of the respondents.

CHAPTER 4. AN “ITALIAN” OR “SPANISH” EQUIVALENT OF THE “AMERICAN DREAM”? PERCEPTIONS OF OPPORTUNITY AND THE FORMATION OF SUCCESS FRAMES

Introduction

The “American Dream” is a national ethos which refers to a set of ideals in which an inalienable freedom includes the opportunity for prosperity and success, and upward social mobility is achieved through hard work. Most commonly, achievement of the American Dream is predicated upon the belief that higher education is a meritocratic system which equalizes the playing field for all groups, including immigrants and ethnic minorities; in Spain and Italy, there appears to be less faith given to the equalizing role of higher education. Since Spain and Italy are relatively new immigrant societies, they are grappling with how to make the successful transition into becoming multicultural societies; at the same time, immigrants and ethnic minorities – including the Chinese – are struggling to understand how they fit into their host societies. In this chapter, I delve into the broader comparison of the contexts of reception across the three host societies vis-à-vis their opportunity structures (or at least, immigrants’ and ethnic minorities’ perceptions of them). In other words, is there an equivalent of the “American Dream” in Spain and Italy – a national ethos to which immigrants and their offspring subscribe as they seek opportunities to succeed and prosper in their new adopted homelands? Specifically, how prominently does higher education figure into immigrants youth’s ambitions?

The chapter is organized in the following manner. I will review the existing literature on the impact of immigrant youth’s perceived discrimination and sense of belonging in their host societies on their educational ambitions and attainment. The bulk of this literature is based on

studies conducted in the U.S. Then I will briefly review existing research on racism and nativism in Southern Europe, although at present there is a paucity of studies which thoroughly examines the character and consequences of discrimination on immigrant and ethnic minorities in these societies. Much of this literature draws upon the body of U.S. research, making comparisons between the different contexts across the Atlantic. After laying out the analytical plan, I present the descriptive and multivariate regression results. To conclude, I discuss the implications of the results for understanding the impact of perceived discrimination on the formation of educational and occupational ambitions among immigrant youth – particularly the Chinese – in a cross-national context.

Perceptions of Opportunity and Sense of Belonging on Educational Outcomes

The United States

In the literature on educational outcomes among racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S., the role of perceived discrimination has been extensively studied (e.g. Loo and Rolison 1986; Tracey and Sedlacek 1987). An ongoing debate within the literature is whether the perception of unequal opportunity in the host society has a positive or negative impact on educational outcomes among immigrant and minority youth – in other words, do the belief of and encounters with discrimination depress or promote educational expectations? On the one hand, immigrant minority groups – particularly those who are resource-deprived – could encounter native resistance due to their social class origins and skin color. In turn, as this “downwardly” mobile group perceives racial discrimination, they could develop an adversarial stance to cope with social and economic exclusion (Ogbu 1978; Portes and Zhou 1993). On the other hand, perceptions of discrimination could drive immigrant minority youth to work harder insofar that

they would attribute individual effort and talent to overcoming these structural barriers (Louie 2002, 2012). Moreover, immigrant youth from middle-class backgrounds tend to reside in more ethnically-integrated setting and therefore, encounter – or at least, have a more heightened awareness of – discrimination, whether in the classroom or other institutional settings (Portes et al. 1980; Waters 1994).

Much of the research conducted thus far that examines the issue of perceived discrimination and attitudes towards schooling have focused on blacks and Latinos. One of the earliest and most influential theories regarding group disparities in academic outcomes is oppositional theory, as conceived by anthropologist John Ogbu (1978). In a nutshell, he argued that differential access to opportunities triggers attitudinal disparities among minority groups. Given that the motivation for maximizing academic achievements is predicated upon the belief that education is the key to success in life – whether in the form of better jobs, higher wages, higher social status or more self-esteem – members of minority groups who encounter barriers within the opportunity structure eventually develop the perception – real or not – that their rewards for getting an education are not commensurate to those of the dominant group and/or the school system itself is not entirely meritocratic. Such perceptions give rise to a supposed oppositional culture whereby some minority groups define certain behaviors, such as educational goals, as inappropriate for them because they represent a form of dominance by their oppressors. As a result of this repudiation for academic achievements, minority students allegedly have higher-than-average levels of truancy, delinquency, a lack of serious efforts and attitudes toward school, and even early school withdrawal (Harris 2009).

As influential as oppositional theory has been in guiding the research agenda on explaining group differences in academic achievement, evidence in support of the theory is

uneven. In his extensive research on the validity of oppositional theory, Harris (2011) finds that, contrary to Ogbu's argument, although blacks are more likely than whites to perceive the persistence of racial barriers in the U.S. and they are more likely to report experiencing prejudice and racism in their everyday lives, blacks – especially poor blacks – are more likely than other groups to endow great confidence in schools as a vehicle for upward mobility. Moreover, findings from his study show that blacks who are most pessimistic about “getting ahead” in U.S. society and most inclined to perceive barriers to advancement, incidentally, have the highest educational expectations and are the most likely to invest in their schooling. Likewise, other studies have found that blacks perceive equally high returns to education as whites, maintaining a strong academic orientation, despite beliefs in the enduring structural barriers facing minority groups within the opportunity structure (Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; O'Connor 1999; Tyson et al. 2005).

Studies which have examined the educational ambitions of immigrant minority youth, such as those who originate from the West Indies, Caribbean and South and Central America, also provide insight into the interplay between shifting perceptions of discrimination and the assumed role of higher education in overcoming those racial barriers. In Waters' study (1994) on the experiences of West Indian immigrant parents and their children in their interactions with U.S. race relations, the parent respondents are quite optimistic that their children can overcome the structural racism of U.S. society – which they were prepared to encounter upon immigrating to the U.S. – by working hard towards getting a good education. Among the children, however, their attitude towards schooling is more ambiguous. For those who live in segregated and poor neighborhoods, they tend to get funneled into foundering inner-city schools, where they are met with inadequate curricula, low quality teaching and the threat of violence. Eventually, some of

these disadvantaged youth reject the high aspirations of their immigrant parents, developing perceptions of the overwhelming influence of race on their lives (p. 813). In this case, the process of racialization is predicated upon the realization of the limited opportunities for mobility available to racial and ethnic minorities (Roth 2012).

Among high-achieving Dominican and Colombian youth, as studied by Louie (2012), both immigrant parents and their children subscribe to the notion of the “immigrant bargain” – a term coined by Smith (2006) to capture the hope of immigrant parents that their children will recognize their sacrifices with migration by excelling in their studies and achieving upward mobility. Although the immigrant youth recognized the substantial barriers to upward mobility in the U.S., particularly those erected at the intersection of race, ethnicity and class, the majority of the youth respondents in Louie’s study (2012) believed that discrimination would not limit their social mobility given that they placed much faith in their individual abilities and efforts to persevere against these societal barriers. More worried about the power of their own self-defeatism than the power of discrimination in their lives, many cast a judgmental eye on fellow Latinos and blacks who do not achieve educational success because they have allegedly succumbed to negative thinking and held onto an “inferiority complex” (p. 124). Therefore, despite their widespread criticism of the U.S. social structure and their belief in the existence of racial discrimination, most respondents were unequivocally hopeful that their hard work would overcome these challenges.

The belief that education as a means to circumvent racial discrimination is commonly held by numerous minority groups in the U.S., as discussed above, although with varying degrees of success in terms of translating these abstract convictions into actual academic achievements across groups. Along a similar vein, researchers have pointed out the potentially

constructive impact of perceived discrimination on educational ambitions and achievement in understanding the educational success of Chinese American youth. Theories such as the theory of strategic adaptation (Xie and Goyette 2003) and the theory of relative functionalism (Sue and Okazaki 1990) have argued that Asian Americans have generally, higher-than-average levels of educational attainment as a strategy for coping with actual and anticipated discrimination in the labor market. According to Xie and Goyette (2003), in the minds of Asian Americans, entry into occupations in the sciences and engineering do not rely as much on personal networks and soft skills, which generally favor whites, as they do on objective measures, such as demonstration of expertise knowledge which is acquired during postsecondary education. More broadly, as Sue and Okazaki (1990) propose, higher education serves the function of being the primary means for mobility when other avenues are blocked.

There is empirical evidence that perceptions of discrimination and prejudice in U.S. society shape the educational ambitions of Chinese youth. In her study about the high educational motivations of Chinese American youth, Louie (2004) refers to this phenomenon as the “specter of discrimination” (p.55). The immigrant parents whom she interviewed mentioned the opposing strains that they felt: on the one hand, they were filled with a sense of immigrant optimism, that is, a sense of unlimited possibility in a free and meritocratic society like the U.S. yet, on the other hand, they felt an underlying sense of pessimism as well, since they recognized that despite the ample opportunities available in U.S. society, they are not equally accessible to all groups. As a result of these contradictory sentiments, Chinese parents taught their children about what they perceived as a clear racial hierarchy in the U.S. that privileges whites; in order to mitigate this disadvantage, Chinese youth are taught that higher education is the single most effective “credentialing mechanism to safeguard against potential discrimination” (p.56).

Likewise, the Fuzhounese students in Guest and Liang's (2012) study on undergraduate students enrolled at Baruch College in New York City have developed a strong academic orientation, despite their extremely humble origins. Many have parents who have less than a middle school education, hailing from the rural areas of the Fuzhou province of China and immigrated to the U.S. without authorization through the hired help of 'snakeheads'. Moreover, many of the Fuzhounese students were not born in the U.S. and, especially for those who arrived at later ages, they experience significant language barriers. Because of their language barriers and their parents' undocumented status, they experience social isolation on campus, facing marginalization not just from their non-Asian peers but even fellow Chinese peers who originate from other regions (e.g. Taiwanese, Hong Kongese). Despite these formidable challenges, they are highly motivated to excel in their studies with the help and support of their co-ethnic peers in tightly knit social circles where information sharing about how to navigate the higher educational system is commonplace.

Parental perceptions about the pervasiveness of racial discrimination in U.S. society transcend class backgrounds. Both middle- and working-class Chinese immigrants invested in their children's education – for instance, enrolling them in extracurricular activities and sharing information about getting into the best school – because school is deemed as a neutral and relatively meritocratic institution (Louie 2004; Zhou 1992). By contrast, they cast a more critical eye on the American workplace, wherein they felt that they will eventually encounter the alleged “bamboo ceiling,” which refer to the internal barriers within organizations that impede Asian American's promotion into managerial and executive positions (Hyun 2005).

Similar to the question of whether perceived discrimination and prejudice have a positive or negative influence in shaping immigrant youths' ambitions, there is the question about how

their sense of belonging in the host society – as measured by the degree to which they self-identify with the dominant nationality – molds their educational expectations, if at all. Ethnic self-identification plays an important role in segmented assimilation theory, as proposed by Portes and Rumbaut (2001). According to them, “people whose ethnic, racial or other social markers place them in a minority status in their group or community are more likely to be self-conscious of those characteristics” (p. 153). Immigrant youth may cope with the psychological pressure of adapting to this dissimilarity between themselves and the mainstream by seeking to reduce conflict and to assimilate within the relevant social context, which entails adopting the identity of the host society. In this way, identification with the dominant nationality (e.g. American, Spaniard, Italian), whether fully (mono-national) or partially (hyphenated), captures one’s sense of belonging in the host society.

In turn, sense of belonging is closely associated with various measures of assimilation, including academic performance and educational attainment. Based on analysis of the CILS longitudinal data, those who label themselves as fully American or a hyphenated American and ethnic identity have, on average, better grades and higher levels of educational attainment compared to those who identify with a pan-ethnic or a solely origin ethnic identity. In the specific case of Chinese-Americans, Louie (2004) argues that Chinese-American youth are likely to orient their expectations based upon their co-ethnic high academic achievers in the U.S. as the reference group, rather than their compatriots in the home country. In their eyes, assimilation is therefore, predicated upon academic success.

Southern Europe

Turning to Southern Europe, as a relatively new destination region, both natives and immigrants are grappling with the meaning of belonging. Based on in-depth interviews that Colombo (2010) conducted with students in Italian secondary schools, native Italians conceptualized belonging as two-pronged: membership and identification. Membership is constituted by citizenship. In the opinion of native Italians, everyone is entitled to citizenship under the conditions that they follow the rule of law and show a desire to integrate into Italian society. On the other hand, identification is less achieved than ascribed; it is related to a primordial conceptualization of culture based on intrinsic traits and ancestral ties. In the words of one of the respondents, a native Italian adolescent: “Even if you live here all your life you will never be an Italian because Italian means being born an Italian, that is, being born in Italy to Italian parents with generations of Italians, like your grandfather, your great-grandfather and your great-great-grandfather have to be Italian too, not that you just come here for fifteen years and then you’re Italian.” (p.141)

Put differently, immigrants and their children can become citizens of Italy but will never be considered as truly Italian. In a study by Andall (2002), one of the respondents noted that even if second-generation youth born on Italian soil themselves identified as Italian, native Italians would be quick to “correct” her by pointing out that she is African (p.396). As for the possibility of a hyphenated identity, native Italian youth were largely opposed for fear of its manifestation into differentiated loyalties and plural identifications. This belief arises from a broader anti-multiculturalism sentiment which refuses to allow and safeguard immigrants’ cultural differences in lieu of acculturation into the host Italian society. As such, a monolingual Italian identity is the only acceptable one.

Research on the role of perceived opportunity and sense of belonging on educational outcomes in Europe is under-researched and under-theorized, in comparison to the U.S. Studies which have examined this relationship are mostly based on Western and Northern Europe, which have substantially different receiving contexts and educational systems from Southern Europe. Nevertheless, it is useful to draw from this literature, albeit scant. In the Netherlands, evidence for the impact of racism and discrimination – in school or general societal context at large – has on educational outcomes is inconclusive (Lindo 2000). If anything, it appears to have a positive impact such that the shared experience of racism or discrimination in the Dutch educational system leads to greater solidarity between co-ethnic peers, in this case Moroccan and Turkish youth (Crul and Doornik 2003). Contrary to the image of being underachievers, these immigrant youth aspired to attain high levels of education, as they are deeply convinced by its importance as a vehicle for upward mobility in Dutch society. This is particularly true for the offspring of more recent arrivals who have encountered more hostility and marginalization from mainstream Dutch society, compared to earlier cohorts whose trajectories of integration were relatively smoother. Likewise, in Britain, migrants often suffered downward social mobility and as a result, immigrant parents value education more than native Britons because they perceive it as a means to reverse the initial downward mobility that their children can avoid (Modood 2011).

In one of the few studies on how immigrant-origin students fare in the Spanish school system (in this case, specifically, the Catalan system), the authors argue that although official school policy seeks to promote cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom, there is a glaring discrepancy between rhetoric and reality (Gibson and Carrasco 2009). Based on their observations, immigrant students often feel unsupported, silenced and marginalized in the classrooms, particularly those who are facing language barriers. Oftentimes, schools' and

teachers' espousal of a meritocratic ideology inadvertently leads immigrant students to blame themselves when they underachieve. Conversely, in many cases, teachers often have lower academic standards for immigrant-origin students who, in turn, seldom receive constructive feedback to improve their academic skills. In a study about second-generation Africans in Milan by Andall (2002), her respondents discuss their perception about the public invisibility of ethnic minorities, particularly in relation to their employment in the mainstream labor market. Based on her personal experience and observations, one of her youth respondents says, "Here [in Milan] it's only in the last two years that I've seen a black girl working at Benetton... All the colours in the world! Do you know how many people used to bring their CVs there and were never employed? You see, it just would have been too strange to see a black girl behind the counter. As I've said to you, for them [white Italians], black people can only speak pidgin Italian." (pp. 398-9) The perception is that ignorance against minorities of color is so rampant that their credentials – including their educational achievements – are simply ignored.

Recently, Marsden (2014) examined the growing role of Chinese descendants in Italy, highlighting their processes of identity formation – including their educational and career ambitions – and the prejudices that they face as ethnic minorities. Most relevantly, the study finds that many Chinese youth appear uncertain about their national identity and react to social exclusion by abandoning hope and dropping out of school. Moreover, it notes the role of family entrepreneurship in the lives of Chinese youth, suggesting that few of those who are obliged to help out in the family business see a bright future outside Chinese entrepreneurship. Likewise, teachers have commented that the Chinese seem a generation without dreams – they are convinced that others have determined their fate and there is nothing that they can do to change it. As one of the study's male Chinese high school students put it: "I will probably drop out of

school. I'm tired to be derided by my Italian schoolmates, and in any case, having a higher education will not change my future. I'll work in my family's small workshop and help develop the business." (p.1248) The general finding of the study is that the idea of entrepreneurship as the only possible future is a message that is dually reinforced by, on the one hand, Italian society – where they are identified with their enterprises and opportunities of social mobility are quite limited, and on the other hand, by their parents – who often identify in entrepreneurship the best opportunity for social mobility. This finding is very similar to the hypothesis of the present study, which will attempt to validate the significance and generalizability of the largely anecdotal evidence presented in Marsden's study.

Finally, another study which comes close to the situation of the Chinese in Spain and Italy focuses on the experiences of Chinese immigrants and their children who own and work in takeaway restaurants in the U.K (Song 1999). The case of the Chinese in the U.K is particularly interesting given that their situation has parallels to their co-ethnics in both Southern Europe and in the U.S.: just as in the former case, working-class Chinese Britons concentrated in the catering industry tend not to be academically inclined, and just as in the latter case, middle-class Chinese Britons have exceptionally high levels of educational attainment and enter into professional occupations. Nevertheless, regardless of class and educational background, young Chinese Britons tend to perceive racial discrimination and stereotyping as major barriers in obtaining higher-level professional occupations (p.181). Among academically-inclined youth working in the catering business, there is a strong belief – perhaps with some degree of accuracy – that their work experience in the takeaways is discounted as “real” work experience to potential employers, particularly in the context of a family business (pp.181-182). With this cross-national overview of a relatively sparse literature on the Chinese in comparative perspective in mind, I

will examine how Chinese youth across Spain, Italy and the U.S. perceive and respond to discrimination below.

Analysis and Findings

Key Variables

The main outcome of interest is youth's adoption of educational versus entrepreneurial success frames. The main predictors of interest are youth's self-reported national origin, in addition to perceptions of blocked opportunity and sense of belonging among immigrant youth in the host societies. (Chapter 1 provides a full description of how educational expectations and national origin is defined.)

Educational and Entrepreneurial Success Frames. An “entrepreneurial” success frame is measured based on the following variable in CILS, ILSEG and ITAGEN:

- In a hypothetical debate between two friends, the respondent is asked to agree with either one of two opposing viewpoints on whether it is more valuable to stay in school or to take a job that will let them earn money and learn the business.⁷

By contrast, an “educational” success frame is measured based on the following survey items:

- Educational success frame is captured by the youth's attitudes towards the valuation of education. CILS and ILSEG ask how important it is for the respondent to get good grades at school, whereas ITAGEN asks how strongly does the respondent agree that success in life depends on getting a good education.

Perceptions of Blocked Opportunity and Sense of Belonging. In ILSEG and CILS, the following questions are asked (the first three questions are asked on a five-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree):

- The belief that no matter how much education one gets, you can still be the target of discrimination.
- Not everyone has the same economic opportunities in Spain/the U.S.
- People of color don't have as many opportunities as Whites to advance in Spain/the U.S.
- Self-reported experience of at least one incidence of discrimination in the past year.
- Self-identifies as Spaniard/American (hyphenated or mono-national).

In ITAGEN, a slightly differently worded set of questions are asked that similarly capture the items in ILSEG and CILS:

- Foreigners in Italy are disadvantaged in many ways.
- Skin color matters in Italy.
- Self-identifies as Italian.

Cross-national Comparisons of Success Frames and Perceptions of Opportunity among Chinese versus Non-Chinese Youth

Table 4.1 shows the level of adoption of educational versus entrepreneurial success frames among immigrant youth across the three countries. In terms of educational success frames, Chinese youth in the U.S. are similarly as likely as other groups to think that it is very important to get good grades, with nearly 80% of Chinese youth agreeing with that statement which is also the sample average. By comparison, the Chinese in Spain and Italy are substantially less likely than other groups to think likewise – in Spain, less than 40% of the Chinese versus over 50% of

the rest of the sample thinks that it is very important to get grades while in Italy, less than 60% of the Chinese versus three-quarters of the rest of the sample thinks that education is very important to success in life. Conversely, in all three countries (including the U.S., surprisingly but only by a minor margin), Chinese youth are generally more likely than other ethno-national groups to choose entrepreneurship over education, ranging from about 30% of Chinese youth in Spain to 20% in Italy and just 8% in the U.S. Therefore, in terms of cross-national comparisons, immigrant youth in Spain and Italy (including the Chinese) are generally less likely than those in the U.S. to adopt an educational success frame, whereas immigrant youth in Spain and Italy (including the Chinese) are much more likely than those in the U.S. to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame.

Table 4.1: Adopting Educational vs. Entrepreneurial Success Frame by National Origins across Spain, Italy and the U.S. (%)

National Origins	Spain (ILSEG)		National Origins	Italy (ITAGEN)		National Origins	U.S. (CILS)	
	"Educ."	"Entrep."		"Educ."	"Entrep."		"Educ."	"Entrep."
	Success Frame	Success Frame		Success Frame	Success Frame		Success Frame	Success Frame
China	37.9	31.5	China	58.2	21.7	China	77.5	8.3
Philippines	65.2	23.7	Philippines	62.2	5.6	Philippines	80.8	2.8
Colombia	46.6	7.4	Colombia	67.3	12.7	Colombia	71.6	3.5
DR	55.9	11.3	DR	67.4	18.4	DR	74.8	2.9
Morocco	65.6	19.1	South Asia	60.9	22.9	Vietnam	78.0	6.9
Romania	49.5	12.7	Morocco	72.9	16.5	Cuba	74.7	2.0
Ecuador	45.9	10.5	Romania	74.2	11.4	Mexico	72.1	4.7
Peru	52.2	9.8	Albania	72.7	15.0	Asia	79.0	5.3
Bolivia	48.8	10.9	Macedonia	67.0	22.3	South America	75.1	2.6
Asia	67.6	17.6	Europe, U.S., Canada	68.5	14.5	West Indies	82.6	2.5
South & Central America	49.3	9.2	Africa & Middle East	74.7	14.8	Other countries	79.2	1.6
Africa & Middle East	60.8	16.6	Asia	82.2	14.4			
Europe & North America	48.6	9.0	South & Central America	70.4	14.5			
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>50.9</i>	<i>12.3</i>	<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>75.3</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>76.6</i>	<i>3.4</i>

Sources:

ILSEG (2008); ITAGEN (2005); CILS (1992)

The next set of tables show the descriptive statistics for the various measures of perceptions of blocked opportunity and sense of belonging. (See Table 4.2a for Spain, Table 4.2b for Italy and Table 4.3c for the U.S.) There are substantial cross-national differences depending on which attitudinal item is measured. In terms of feeling discriminated despite having education, the Chinese in both Spain and the U.S. are more likely than other groups to feel this way – there is over a 25 percentage point between the Chinese and other groups in Spain and 16 percentage points in the U.S. (The question was not asked in ITAGEN.) As for the perception of unequal economic opportunities for foreigners (captured by slightly differently phrased questions across all three surveys), there are surprisingly, minimal differences between the Chinese and other groups in all three countries. However, in terms of the perception of racial inequality (i.e. skin color matters), the Chinese in all three countries are more likely to perceive racial inequality than other groups (about a 20 percentage points difference in ILSEG and a 10 percentage points difference in ITAGEN and CILS). As for sense of belonging in the host society, as measured by self-identification with the host nationality, over 60 percent of Chinese in the U.S. identify with being American (solely American or hyphenated identity) versus just over 50 percent of the sample average. In Spain, the Chinese are just about as likely as most other groups to identify with being a Spaniard (just over 30 percent), whereas in Italy, the Chinese are less likely to identify with being Italian (23 percent versus 38 percent, respectively).

Table 4.2a. Perceptions of Blocked Mobility and Sense of Belonging in Spain

National Origins	Spain (ILSEG)							Sense of Belonging Self-identifies as Spaniard
	Perception of Blocked Mobility							
	Discrimination despite higher education		Unequal economic opportunities		People of color unfairly treated		Experienced ≥1 incidence of discrimination	
	Partly True	Very True	Partly True	Very True	Partly True	Very True		
China	70.1	6.7	82.4	12.4	70.1	6.2	61.0	37.2
Philippines	64.2	3.4	79.0	15.8	64.2	12.5	55.2	61.9
Colombia	35.9	2.6	67.9	22.0	35.9	7.7	41.3	19.0
Dominican Republic	40.4	6.6	57.6	30.3	40.4	8.5	45.5	15.4
Morocco	44.1	10.6	67.1	24.1	44.1	11.8	43.8	40.1
Romania	40.0	7.0	60.7	24.4	40.0	11.4	56.1	25.7
Ecuador	41.6	3.2	66.1	19.2	41.6	5.2	38.4	15.8
Peru	48.0	3.3	69.3	21.1	48.0	6.8	43.9	28.6
Bolivia	38.6	3.5	64.1	24.1	38.6	8.4	39.7	11.0
Asia	46.1	2.9	70.7	15.4	46.1	4.0	50.5	47.6
South & Central America	36.2	2.5	64.1	24.6	36.2	7.3	39.8	30.8
Africa & Middle East	37.7	3.7	60.7	28.2	37.7	9.2	48.0	42.2
Europe & North America	39.1	4.5	71.9	19.6	39.1	7.4	44.4	43.6
Sample Average	43.5	4.1	67.4	21.9	43.5	7.7	43.5	27.1

Source: ILSEG (2008)

Table 4.2b. Perceptions of Blocked Mobility and Sense of Belonging in Italy

National Origins	Italy (ITAGEN)				Sense of Belonging Self-identifies as Italian
	Perception of Blocked Mobility				
	Foreigners are disadvantaged		Skin color matters in Italy		
	Partly True	Very True	Partly True	Very True	
China	63.3	25.2	48.8	22.6	23.5
Philippines	74.4	12.2	42.6	8.9	37.0
Colombia	70.9	16.4	40.0	21.8	49.1
Dominican Republic	53.1	34.7	40.8	16.3	36.7
South Asia	66.2	22.0	48.1	21.1	33.6
Morocco	56.5	25.0	38.9	19.0	35.9
Romania	58.3	29.6	38.1	14.1	34.3
Albania	62.9	23.2	39.7	15.5	38.5
Macedonia	61.4	23.1	38.7	19.5	33.7
Europe, U.S., Canada	65.7	19.7	44.2	15.4	50.7
Africa & Middle East	56.6	27.8	40.2	23.8	51.3
Asia	60.0	23.3	40.0	20.0	45.6
South & Central America	62.1	24.1	41.4	14.7	33.2
Sample Average	60.1	24.9	39.6	13.3	39.2

Source: ITAGEN (2006)

Table 4.2c. Perceptions of Blocked Mobility and Sense of Belonging in the U.S.

National Origins	U.S. (CILS)								
	Perception of Blocked Mobility							Sense of Belonging	
	Discrimination despite		Unequal economic		People of color		Experienced	Self-identifies	Self-identifies
	higher education		opportunities		unfairly treated		≥1 incidence of	as only	as hyphenated
	Partly True	Very True	Partly True	Very True	Partly True	Very True	discrimination	American	American
China	63.4	12.7	52.8	43.1	75.7	8.6	66.7	9.7	51.4
Philippines	58.5	12.3	64.9	31.1	63.9	13.5	62.9	3.5	61.5
Colombia	39.6	7.2	50.7	43.1	57.1	17.4	44.9	18.5	32.6
DR	48.5	8.7	50.0	44.2	48.1	25.0	56.2	24.8	22.9
Vietnam	59.4	10.2	61.9	32.8	59.3	21.4	66.0	3.5	44.6
Cuba	35.4	6.4	53.2	40.5	52.9	19.9	38.0	21.3	54.5
Mexico	49.8	14.1	57.2	36.5	53.8	21.7	64.4	2.4	31.0
Asia	59.5	10.3	64.0	31.5	64.5	15.4	61.8	6.0	33.5
South America	38.2	7.5	52.6	40.7	56.1	18.1	47.7	15.2	19.3
West Indies	54.9	18.8	44.2	52.4	47.0	29.6	66.7	15.8	42.9
Other countries	36.0	8.8	50.0	44.4	56.0	21.6	61.1	32.5	32.5
Sample Average	47.5	10.4	55.9	38.6	56.5	19.4	54.8	12.2	42.0

Source: CILS (1992)

Overall, comparing the countries, minority youth in the U.S. are, on average, slightly more likely than those in Spain to perceive discrimination despite having a good education. As for the perception of unequal economic opportunities for foreigners and a sense of racial inequality, U.S. minority youth (the majority, in fact) are much more likely than their counterparts in Spain and Italy to have these perceptions. That said, even though perceptions of discrimination are comparable across the three countries, minority youth in Spain and Italy (including the Chinese) are much less likely to report a strong sense of integration in their host societies compared to those in the U.S.

Turning to corroborative evidence about the U.S. second-generation in young adulthood from the ISMGNY study (see Table 4.2d), it is interesting that the Chinese are more likely than other groups to report being treated unequally at school. Based on in-depth interviews with the respondents, however, the reason that the Chinese gave for feeling prejudiced at school is that their teachers and peers *over-* rather than *under-*estimated their abilities, which is in line with the model minority myth. As for feeling prejudiced at work or during the job search process, the

Chinese are generally less likely to report feeling prejudiced than all other immigrant minority groups (except the Russians). Finally, in terms of conversations about racism, the Chinese are more likely than most other groups to have talked about racism with their parents, in addition to being told that they have to be better in school than white Americans to get ahead in American society. Based on these results, it is important to note that while Chinese youth in the U.S. do perceive discrimination to some degree, they do not think that such unequal treatment will block their mobility if they work hard at school. Moreover, Chinese parents prime their children about the racism that they will encounter and actively encourage them to get ahead in society by outperforming their white counterparts.

Table 4.2d. Perceptions about Race, Prejudice and Blocked Mobility in the U.S.

National Origins	U.S. (ISGMNY)				
	Feelings of prejudice:			In conversation with their parents:	
	At school	At work	While job searching	Discussed racism and discrimination	Told them to be better than white Americans
China	25.2	13.8	12.9	60.8	30.0
Puerto Rico	15.3	25.8	22.8	59.5	15.0
Dominican Republic	13.9	19.1	20.2	58.5	18.3
West Indies	17.3	30.5	25.9	55.0	35.1
Colombia, Ecuador & Peru	17.0	19.4	16.3	43.3	18.0
Russia	10.7	7.8	9.2	66.2	0.0
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>19.5</i>	<i>17.9</i>	<i>57.1</i>	<i>24.1</i>

Source: ISGMNY (1998)

Results from the Multivariate Regression Analysis

To examine differences in the adoption of success frames between Chinese and non-Chinese youth across the three countries, I run a series of regression analyses to test which predictors account for the gap in adopting success frames, if it exists. In addition to immigrant selectivity by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, I predict that perceptions of opportunity and

sense of belonging are significant determinants of the kind of framing – entrepreneurial versus educational – through which youth define success in life.

For the multivariate regression, standard logistic regression is performed for a series of nested analytical models using the ILSEG, ITAGEN and CILS data. The first model is the “baseline” model which includes the youth’s national origin as the only predictor. The second model adds the variables which are related to perceptions of opportunity and sense of belonging. The third model is the “full” model which, in addition to the predictors in the previous models, includes the control variables.

a. Predicting Educational Success Frames:

As the descriptive statistics show, whereas the vast majority of Chinese youth in the U.S. adopt an educational success frame (just as their non-Chinese peers do), much smaller proportions of the Chinese in Spain and Italy do compared to their non-Chinese peers. Table 4.3 shows the nested regression results from Spain. In the unadjusted model, the Chinese are less likely than all other groups – in many cases, at least less than twice as likely – to adopt an educational success frame. The addition of control variables (Model 2) minimally accounts for the gap between the Chinese and other group, and for some groups (e.g. Dominicans and Africans/Middle Easterners), the differences are actually more pronounced which suggests the suppression effect of socio-demographic factors. By comparison, the measures of perceived opportunity and belonging are much stronger predictors that account for the gap in educational success frames between the Chinese and other groups. In fact, the only groups for which a significant difference remains are Filipinos, Moroccans, South Asians, and Africans/Middle Easterners – in particular,

the net probability for adopting an educational success frame among Filipinos and South Asians is over 20 percent higher than the Chinese.

Table 4.3. Logistic regression of adopting “educational” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in Spain

	"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Model			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	1.218***	0.261	0.298	1.118***	0.269	0.261	1.066***	0.278	0.224
Colombia	0.416*	0.196	0.102	0.469*	0.206	0.110	-0.051	0.214	-0.011
Dominican Republic	0.730***	0.214	0.179	0.766***	0.223	0.179	0.220	0.229	0.046
South Asia	1.637***	0.273	0.400	1.531***	0.284	0.358	1.210***	0.297	0.254
Morocco	1.134***	0.198	0.277	1.123***	0.206	0.263	0.755***	0.211	0.159
Romania	0.521*	0.214	0.127	0.564**	0.223	0.132	0.090	0.233	0.019
Ecuador	0.419*	0.177	0.103	0.443*	0.185	0.104	0.032	0.191	0.007
Peru	0.750***	0.204	0.183	0.689***	0.211	0.161	0.200	0.220	0.042
Bolivia	0.445*	0.217	0.109	0.383	0.226	0.089	-0.006	0.237	-0.001
South & Central America	0.470**	0.191	0.115	0.367	0.199	0.086	-0.159	0.205	-0.033
Africa & Middle East	0.848***	0.241	0.207	0.961***	0.248	0.225	0.554*	0.260	0.116
Europe & North America	0.460*	0.197	0.113	0.485**	0.205	0.113	0.084	0.213	0.018
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True :Discrimination despite higher educ.	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.960***	0.071	-0.202
Very True: Discrimination despite higher educ.	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.115	0.185	0.024
Partly True: Unequal econ. opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.223*	0.111	-0.047
Very True: Unequal econ. opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.380***	0.125	0.080
Partly True: People of color treated unfairly	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.653***	0.072	-0.137
Very True: People of color treated unfairly	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.451***	0.129	-0.095
Experienced ≥ 1 incidence of discrimination	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.098	0.068	0.020
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as Spaniard	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.181*	0.081	0.038
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes		
Constant	-0.539			4.117			4.688		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.030			0.086			0.209		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-3058.482			-2958.865			-2727.027		
N				4487					

Source: ILSEG 2008

Table 4.4. Logistic regression of adopting “educational” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in Italy

	"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	0.168	0.149	0.035	-0.230	0.159	-0.047	-0.200	0.159	-0.040
Colombia	0.389	0.298	0.082	0.075	0.309	0.015	0.050	0.316	0.010
Dominican Republic	0.393	0.315	0.082	0.279	0.331	0.056	0.236	0.338	0.047
South Asia	0.113	0.119	0.024	0.098	0.128	0.020	0.089	0.129	0.018
Morocco	0.656***	0.119	0.138	0.470***	0.130	0.095	0.445***	0.131	0.089
Romania	0.723***	0.123	0.152	0.682***	0.131	0.138	0.638***	0.132	0.128
Albania	0.648***	0.104	0.136	0.352**	0.113	0.071	0.322**	0.114	0.065
Macedonia	0.377**	0.150	0.079	0.194	0.156	0.039	0.171	0.157	0.034
Europe, U.S., Canada	0.443***	0.101	0.093	0.138	0.110	0.028	0.122	0.111	0.024
Africa & Middle East	0.752***	0.114	0.158	0.403***	0.126	0.082	0.363**	0.126	0.073
Asia	1.200***	0.287	0.252	0.884**	0.299	0.179	0.859**	0.303	0.173
South & Central America	0.534***	0.112	0.112	0.351**	0.124	0.071	0.334**	0.124	0.067
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True : Foreigners are disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.128	0.080	-0.026
Very True : Foreigners are disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.104	0.093	0.021
Partly True: Skin color matters	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.225***	0.060	-0.045
Very True: Skin color matters	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.068	0.081	0.014
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as Italian	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.137*	0.060	0.028
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes ^a		
Constant	0.331			1.462			1.486		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.019			0.070			0.078		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-4306.329			-4172.715			-4150.708		
N				7057					

Source: ITAGEN (2005)

In terms of the indicators of opportunity and belonging, those who moderately feel that discrimination prevails despite having higher education have a net disadvantage of adopting and educational success frame relative to those who do not feel this way at all. (Note that those who strongly feel discrimination despite higher education do not have a significant disadvantage.) Likewise, those who perceive racial inequality – moderately or strongly – are less likely to think it is very important to get good grades. Interestingly, perceptions of economic inequality against foreigners have mixed results: moderate perceptions of nativism negatively predict the adoption of educational success frames, whereas strong perceptions have positive associations. Finally, self-identification as a Spaniard is a positive predictor of adopting an educational success frame.

Analysis of the Italian data in Table 4.4 shows that, in the unadjusted model, most groups are significantly more likely than the Chinese to think that it is very important to get good grades, with the exception of Filipinos, Colombians, Dominicans and South Asians. In the “control” model, the addition of socio-demographic variables appear to fully explain the differences for Macedonians and Europeans/North Americans, as well as decrease the net advantage of most other groups by almost a half. (For example, the net unadjusted advantage of Albanians over the Chinese is 14 per cent in Model 1 while it decreases to just 7 percent in Model 2.) The inclusion of measures of perceived opportunity and belonging minimally explains the gap between the Chinese and other groups, unlike in Spain. Nevertheless, some of the measures significantly predict adoption of educational success frames. Those who moderately agree that skin color matters in Italian society are nearly 5 percent less likely to adopt an educational success frame compared to those who think skin color does not matter at all. In contrast, those who self-identify as Italian are about 3 percent more likely to adopt an educational success frame.

Finally, turning to the U.S. results in Table 4.5, even in the unadjusted model, the Chinese are not significantly more likely than any other group to think it is very important to get good grades, which illustrates the strong sense of immigrant optimism among the second-generation regardless of ethnicity. In terms of perceptions of integration, those who strongly or moderately believe that discrimination persists despite higher education and those who moderately believe that there is racial inequality are significantly less likely to adopt an educational success frame. However, the perception of general economic inequality (i.e. “not everyone has the same opportunities in U.S. society) does not significantly predict adopting educational success frames.

Table 4.5. Logistic regression of adopting “educational” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in the U.S.

	"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Model			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	0.205	0.298	0.036	0.212	0.309	0.037	0.029	0.331	0.005
Colombia	-0.309	0.321	-0.055	-0.218	0.342	-0.038	-0.429	0.365	-0.075
Dominican Republic	-0.149	0.364	-0.027	0.062	0.382	0.011	-0.154	0.401	-0.027
Vietnam	0.032	0.311	0.006	-0.070	0.324	-0.012	-0.232	0.345	-0.040
Cuba	-0.154	0.292	-0.027	0.028	0.316	0.005	-0.245	0.340	-0.043
Mexico	-0.285	0.295	-0.051	-0.099	0.306	-0.017	-0.243	0.328	-0.042
Asia	0.087	0.309	0.016	0.014	0.320	0.002	-0.143	0.341	-0.025
South America	-0.129	0.297	-0.023	-0.154	0.317	-0.027	-0.371	0.342	-0.065
West Indies	0.322	0.310	0.057	0.542	0.334	0.095	0.408	0.356	0.071
Other countries	0.102	0.360	0.018	0.283	0.381	0.050	0.068	0.403	0.012
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True :Discrimination despite higher educ.	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.252***	0.078	-0.044
Very True: Discrimination despite higher educ.	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.290**	0.123	-0.050
Partly True: Unequal econ. opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.096	0.151	0.017
Very True: Unequal econ. opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.183	0.155	0.032
Partly True: People of color treated unfairly	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.278***	0.085	-0.048
Very True: People of color treated unfairly	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.203*	0.106	-0.035
Experienced ≥ 1 incidence of discrimination	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.120	0.075	-0.021
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as a hyphenated American	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.077	0.079	0.013
Self-identifies as only American	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.104	0.120	0.018
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes		
Constant	1.235			2.476			3.092		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.010			0.032			0.043		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-2825.189			-2777.594			-2703.733		
N				5108					

Source: CILS (1992)

b. Predicting Entrepreneurial Success Frames:

Generally, the Chinese are more likely than most of the other groups to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame across all three countries; however, the percentage of Chinese who would take a job over stay in school is much higher in Spain and Italy (i.e. about 30 and 20 percent, respectively) than in the U.S. (i.e. less than 10 percent). Table 4.6 shows the results for the nested regression analyses using the Spanish data. In the unadjusted model, the Chinese in Spain are 10 to 20 percent more likely than most other groups to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame. Moving to the control model, it appears that socio-demographic background variables

Table 4.6. Logistic regression of adopting “entrepreneurial” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in Spain

	"ENTREPRENEURIAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Model			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	-0.396	0.289	-0.038	-0.319	0.313	-0.029	-0.287	0.314	-0.026
Colombia	-1.891***	0.276	-0.180	-1.854***	0.298	-0.171	-1.658***	0.301	-0.152
Dominican Republic	-1.560***	0.299	-0.148	-1.613***	0.321	-0.149	-1.444***	0.325	-0.132
South Asia	-0.505	0.291	-0.048	-0.641*	0.303	-0.059	-0.595	0.311	-0.054
Morocco	-0.787***	0.225	-0.075	-0.700**	0.246	-0.065	-0.597*	0.251	-0.055
Romania	-1.048***	0.265	-0.100	-0.906**	0.286	-0.084	-0.782**	0.288	-0.072
Ecuador	-1.438***	0.202	-0.137	-1.398***	0.221	-0.129	-1.232***	0.225	-0.113
Peru	-1.712***	0.285	-0.163	-1.604***	0.302	-0.148	-1.435***	0.307	-0.132
Bolivia	-1.384***	0.291	-0.132	-1.498***	0.314	-0.138	-1.328***	0.318	-0.122
South & Central America	-1.652***	0.246	-0.157	-1.671***	0.266	-0.154	-1.497***	0.271	-0.137
Africa & Middle East	-1.043***	0.310	-0.099	0.973**	0.328	-0.090	-0.815**	0.330	-0.075
Europe & North America	-1.494***	0.253	-0.142	-1.223***	0.274	-0.113	-1.111***	0.275	-0.102
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True :Discrimination despite higher educ.							0.334***	0.111	0.031
Very True: Discrimination despite higher educ.							0.749***	0.219	0.069
Partly True: Unequal econ. opportunities							-0.235	0.166	-0.022
Very True: Unequal econ. opportunities							-0.225	0.185	-0.021
Partly True: People of color treated unfairly							0.108	0.112	0.010
Very True: People of color treated unfairly							0.206	0.194	0.019
Experienced ≥1 incidence of discrimination							0.141	0.103	0.013
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as Spaniard							0.073	0.120	0.007
"Control" variables included in the model?		No			Yes			Yes	
Constant		-0.828			-2.796			-2.869	
Nagelkerke R ²		0.046			0.096			0.106	
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq		-1485.882			-1428.376			-1417.061	
N					4441.000				

Source: ILSEG (2008)

play a minimal role in expanding the differences between the Chinese and non-Chinese; in fact, the control variables seem to suppress the net significant disadvantage of entrepreneurship among South Asian youth compared to the Chinese. In the full model, the addition of measures of perceived opportunity and belonging partially accounts for the entrepreneurial success frame disparity between the Chinese and some other groups – for example, the net disadvantage among Colombians and Africans/Middle Easterners decreases by approximately 2 percent between the control and full models. As for the efficacy of the measures of perceived opportunity and belonging, only one measure is significant: those who moderately feel that discrimination prevails despite having higher education are 3 percent more likely than those who don't feel this

way to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame, while the net advantage increases to 6 percent among those who strongly feel this way.

Table 4.7. Logistic regression of adopting “educational” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in Italy

	"EDUCATIONAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Model			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	-1.548***	0.282	-0.204	-1.148***	0.288	-0.147	-1.125***	0.289	-0.143
Colombia	-0.640	0.416	-0.084	-0.372	0.428	-0.048	-0.377	0.428	-0.048
Dominican Republic	-0.207	0.381	-0.027	-0.078	0.400	-0.010	-0.065	0.402	-0.008
South Asia	0.073	0.140	0.010	0.056	0.153	0.007	0.048	0.153	0.006
Morocco	-0.333*	0.143	-0.044	-0.281	0.158	-0.036	-0.268	0.159	-0.034
Romania	-0.763***	0.160	-0.100	-0.602***	0.169	-0.077	-0.567***	0.171	-0.072
Albania	-0.448***	0.127	-0.059	-0.192	0.139	-0.024	-0.173	0.140	-0.022
Macedonia	0.039	0.172	0.005	0.158	0.183	0.020	0.170	0.183	0.022
Europe, U.S., Canada	-0.488***	0.126	-0.064	-0.200	0.137	-0.026	-0.201	0.138	-0.026
Africa & Middle East	-0.467***	0.138	-0.062	-0.235	0.151	-0.030	-0.245	0.152	-0.031
Asia	-0.494	0.315	-0.065	-0.105	0.320	-0.013	-0.116	0.325	-0.015
South & Central America	-0.490***	0.140	-0.065	-0.289	0.156	-0.037	-0.268	0.157	-0.034
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True : Foreigners are disadvantaged							-0.070	0.099	-0.009
Very True : Foreigners are disadvantaged							-0.103	0.115	-0.013
Partly True: Skin color matters							0.209**	0.077	0.027
Very True: Skin color matters							0.218*	0.098	0.028
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as Italian							0.079	0.075	0.010
"Control" variables included in the model?		No			Yes			Yes	
Constant		-1.285			-2.926			-3.031	
Nagelkerke R ²		0.020			0.066			0.069	
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq		-3041.041			-2940.199			-2935.171	
N					7057				

Source: ITAGEN (2005)

In Italy, the majority of non-Chinese groups are significantly less likely than the Chinese to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame, as shown in the unadjusted model in Table 4.7.

However, unlike in Spain, control variables appear to fully explain discrepancy between the Chinese and most other groups – except Filipinos and Romanians who remain significantly less likely than the Chinese to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame (15 percent and 8 percent respectively). In the full model, this net disadvantage among Filipinos and Romanians are not

accounted for by measures of perceived belonging and opportunity. Among these measures, only perceptions that skin color matters in Italian is significant – those who moderately and strongly perceive the significance of skin color are approximately 3 percent more likely than those who do not have this perception to have entrepreneurial proclivities. (The perception that foreigners are disadvantaged and self-identification as an Italian do not significantly predict entrepreneurial ambitions.)

Table 4.8. Logistic regression of adopting “entrepreneurial” success frames by perceptions of blocked mobility and sense of belonging in the U.S.

	"ENTREPRENEURIAL" SUCCESS FRAME								
	M1: National Origins			M2: Control Model			M3: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)									
Philippines	-1.146*	0.476	-0.037	-1.079*	0.490	-0.034	-1.026*	0.483	-0.031
Colombia	-0.912	0.558	-0.029	-0.568	0.561	-0.018	-0.813	0.580	-0.025
DR	-1.128	0.725	-0.036	-0.802	0.778	-0.025	-0.933	0.792	-0.028
Vietnam	-0.227	0.474	-0.007	-0.473	0.481	-0.015	-0.430	0.487	-0.013
Cuba	-1.474***	0.472	-0.048	-1.172*	0.494	-0.037	-1.113*	0.505	-0.034
Mexico	-0.626	0.460	-0.020	-0.933*	0.453	-0.029	-1.054*	0.461	-0.032
Asia	-0.503	0.482	-0.016	-0.608	0.478	-0.019	-0.635	0.483	-0.019
South America	-1.249**	0.489	-0.040	-0.840	0.474	-0.026	-0.991*	0.481	-0.030
West Indies	-1.288**	0.524	-0.042	-0.985	0.565	-0.031	-1.504**	0.601	-0.046
Other countries	-1.729*	0.831	-0.056	-1.358	0.833	-0.043	-1.534	0.854	-0.047
Perceptions of Blocked Mobility									
Partly True :Discrimination despite higher educ.							0.106	0.208	0.003
Very True: Discrimination despite higher educ.							0.387	0.265	0.012
Partly True: Unequal econ. opportunities							-0.514	0.325	-0.016
Very True: Unequal econ. opportunities							-0.096	0.333	-0.003
Partly True: People of color treated unfairly							0.020	0.196	0.001
Very True: People of color treated unfairly							-0.172	0.258	-0.005
Experienced ≥ 1 incidence of discrimination							0.154	0.191	0.005
Sense of Belonging									
Self-identifies as a hyphenated American							-0.615***	0.190	-0.019
Self-identifies as only American							-0.351	0.293	-0.011
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes ^a			Yes ^a		
Constant	-2.398			-3.212			-2.175		
Nagelkerke R ²	.025			.071			.090		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-757.312			-719.320			-674.331		
N				5117					

Source: CILS (1992)

In the U.S, the unadjusted model in Table 4.8 shows that the Chinese are significantly more likely than several groups (e.g. Filipinos and Cubans) to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame. The addition of control variables fully explains the Chinese youth's higher adoption of entrepreneurial success frames over South American, West Indian and youth from other countries; however, the net negative rate of adoption among Filipinos, Cubans and Mexicans, compared to the Chinese, remains. In the full model, self-identified ethnicity is the only significant measure of perceived opportunity and belonging in the U.S.: those who self-identify as exclusively or hyphenated American are less likely than those who identify as their own ethnicity to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame. Perceptions of integration partially account for the difference in entrepreneurial proclivity between the Chinese and Filipinos and Cubans. However, perceived opportunity and belonging also seem to exacerbate the difference among Mexicans, South Americans, and West Indian youth – which suggest that although these groups are even less likely to adopt entrepreneurial success frames if they were not more likely to self-identify with their own ethnic group.

Summary of the Regression Results

There are several main summary points from the regression results above. First, in the unadjusted models, the Chinese are *more* likely than most – if not, all – of the other groups to adopt an educational success frame and alternatively, *less* likely than most other groups to adopt an entrepreneurial success frame across all three countries. (The only exception is in the U.S., where Chinese youth are not significantly more likely than other groups to adopt an educational success frame.) The degree to which perceptions of opportunity and sense of belonging explain these differences between the Chinese and non-Chinese varies cross the countries. In Spain, they *fully*

account for the significant difference between the Chinese and all other groups in adopting educational success frames. Alternatively, they reduce the size of the difference in the propensity to adopt entrepreneurial success frames between the Chinese and most of the groups, although they do not completely render the difference non-significant. Similarly, in Italy, they partially – but not fully – explain the differences between the Chinese and most of the other groups in terms of adopting both educational and entrepreneurial success frames. By contrast, in the U.S., the variables related to perceptions of opportunity and integration play a minimal role in explaining the adoption of success frames, in large part due to the negligible differences between the Chinese and the other groups. The addition of the control variables does not substantially change the results, with the exception of explaining the difference between the Chinese and many groups in the adoption of entrepreneurial success frames in Italy. Of course, the major caveat in these findings is that these are only correlations and not causal relationships. As this is only a cross-sectional analysis, attitudinal predictors and outcomes are closely intertwined – while perceptions of discrimination may reduce the likelihood of an educational success frame, it can also be the case that highly motivated immigrants and their children do not perceive discrimination as an obstacle to upward mobility.

For the most part, perceptions of opportunity and integration operated as expected in determining the kind of success frame adopted by youth across the three countries. The belief that minorities are discriminated against regardless of their educational background (which is only available in ILSEG and CILS) is inversely related to educational success frames and positively associated entrepreneurial success frames, at least in Spain. The belief that some form of racism exists in the host society is consistently inversely related to educational success frames across all three countries, while it is less predictive of entrepreneurial success frames. By

comparison, the general sense that foreigners are disadvantaged in the host societies is a relatively ambiguous predictor of success frames: a strong sense of inequality can promote educational success frames while a moderate sense can simultaneously depress educational and entrepreneurial success frames; in some cases, it is not a significant predictor at all. The distinction between discrimination against foreigners and people of color is therefore, significant given how they operate differentially. In general, perceptions of economic inequality has minimal effect on success frames (and in some cases, even encourages educational ambitions) whereas perceptions of racism depresses educational ambitions while promoting entrepreneurial ones. Finally, sense of belonging in the host society is consistently associated with educational success frames across the three countries.

Exploring Perceptions of Opportunity and Integration in the Host Societies: Chinese Youth in their Own Words

Feeling like the Perpetual Outsider: Chinese Youth in Spain and Italy

In my interviews with Chinese youth and their parents living in Madrid, Spain and Milan, Italy, it became apparent that Chinese youth, even among those born and raised in the destination countries, felt that they were apart from – rather than a part of – their host societies. Gianna, in her early 30s and who was born and raised in Milan, discusses the unequal treatment that she is met with as a person of color in Italy. Working as a translator and cultural mediator on behalf of Chinese families in schools and hospitals, she is better than most of the other respondents at articulating the kind of discrimination that she encounters on an almost daily basis, albeit subtle: “It the kind of racism that’s like “I’m not racist but... say, the Pakistani guy downstairs is like such and such.” Or, you know the famous film, *Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner?* It’s the same

thing. So the life here is simple as long as if you live with your people, the people who know you. But the people who don't know you, you know?" She then goes on to poignantly describe her desire to "lose" her Chinese face in order to blend into Italian society, particularly after returning from a trip to China where she felt like her looks did not single her out from the rest of the crowd:

"When I was in China, I was the same as all the other Chinese people – at least, in terms of how I looked. But when I came back to Europe, immediately, I felt like losing my face... because I didn't look like anyone around me. I am a Chinese person. I personally can't see for myself because I can't see my own face, and my friends wouldn't feel this way because these are my friends. But the first Italian person that I encountered, when that person looked at me, I felt this sudden sense of loss, like, it's over. I'm back to where I was before, a place where I can never lose this face. This face will forever be with me, will forever be something I can't lose. I can never hide myself; I can never hide my face."

After a brief stint in China, her return to Milan revived the sense of frustration and sadness from being marginalized in her adopted homeland, where she is judged for her appearance according to prevailing stereotypes and prejudices about the Chinese. This is even before she has the chance to open her mouth to speak perfect Italian.

Likewise, Xiao Yao, an 18 year old student in vocational school who came to Italy as a toddler, expresses similar sentiments about feeling perpetually marginalized. Even though she has many Italian friends at school, she feels that in her daily interactions with the locals, she "feels like a fish out of the water" because she looks Chinese. She elaborates: "When I'm in a room or on the streets, there are times when I've definitely felt like an outsider.... If I were an Italian, I wouldn't have this treatment."

Beyond street-level prejudice, which is unpleasant but relatively less consequential, some of the Chinese respondents discussed various forms of institutionalized discrimination. Cheng Gong, who arrived in Milan in late adolescence and is currently a restaurateur, recounts a recent

incident in which he got into a car accident with an Italian driver. Even though he insisted that the other driver was entirely responsible for the car crash, the insurance company's assessment put both drivers at fault. He thought about taking the issue to court but the lawyer whom he consulted with advised him to settle out of court because as a foreigner, his chances of winning the case were very slim. Taking his attorney's advice, he did settle out of court but was adamant that if he were Italian, he would have taken the case to court immediately. Based on defeating experiences such as this one, he says: "When you live in another country, you always have this feeling that cannot be described – a feeling of never belonging."

A few Chinese respondents felt that they have been the target of explicit racism. Dario, who is born in Italy but moved to Spain as a young child and currently studying part-time for his electrician degree, says that he was teased and bullied a lot for being Chinese: "When I was younger, I'd be called names for being Chinese and I'd go fight whoever called me names." While he acknowledges that such explicit racism might have gradually subsided since he was a child, he still thinks that racism is rampant in Spanish society. Other respondents do not perceive hostility from native Italians or Spaniards; instead, they believe Italian and Spanish societies to be generally open-minded and welcoming. Nevertheless, in spite of having friendly relations with the natives, they still note that there is a cultural rift. Mrs. Xie, the mother of one of the respondents, is currently working as a hairdresser with her own salon in Madrid, even though she practiced as a doctor in China. Here, she describes her typical interactions with native Spaniards, which are cordial yet perfunctory:

I think Spaniards are generally fairly open-minded and easygoing people. In terms of discrimination, I don't feel like I've been personally discriminated against. At this hair salon, I feel that my customers, including many Spaniards, have respected me. As for other Spaniards who I would see often, we would say hello to each other if we see each other but not have any sort of deep conversations.

Experiences of prejudice and discrimination early on in childhood and adolescence linger in the minds of the Chinese respondents, leading to their self-perception as ‘outsiders’ within their host societies. These early experiences can be exceptional and therefore, seemingly innocuous. For instance, Silvia, a second-generation Chinese-Italian working as a nurse, clearly remembered an incident involving herself and her brother when she was eight and he was six years old. Walking down a street together, an Italian mother told her child not to look at them because they are Chinese. When she recounted this to her father, he could not explain to her what happened.

Other respondents told anecdotes from their days in the classroom, when they were taunted for not speaking proper Italian or Spanish. Alessandra, who moved to Italy during early adolescence, recalled feeling alienated at school because of the language barrier: “During my first year here, I couldn’t understand what people at school were saying. And, with kids, they would tease me by purposefully saying things in Italian to my face that they knew I wouldn’t understand. At that time, I couldn’t respond. But the feeling I had – it was a very difficult and sad feeling.” This gave her the impression that Italians were close-minded.

Beyond classroom bullying, the Chinese respondents experienced other forms of discrimination at schooling, including differential treatment by the teachers. Lian Mei, who is in her early 30s, is currently studying for her doctoral degree in educational studies at the University of Turin. That she has achieved such stellar academic achievements is certainly exceptional given her humble origins and less-than-encouraging experiences at school. With parents who have less than a middle school education, they did not expect her to excel in her studies. Likewise, the teachers dampened their expectations and gave far less attention to their Chinese students, including her:

In Italy, the teachers tell us that we don’t have to go to university and instead, that we just need to go and work. They told me that it’s better for me to work than to

go to university because it would be so difficult for me.... When we're in middle school, the teachers don't care if we're actually learning. On exams, they just let us pass because they know we're not going to continue our studies after middle school, so they might as well just let us graduate. And when we hand in assignments, the teachers don't bother with correcting our grammar.

Perhaps the teachers thought they were doing a favor for their struggling Chinese students, many of whom indeed had little time to devote to school work given their commitment to work at their family-owned businesses. However, despite such well-thought intentions, they were doing their Chinese students more harm than good. In Lian Mei's words:

I think they're telling us different things. When an Italian student makes a mistake, the teachers would fix it.... I've worked as a tutor at a school. There was a Chinese student who was 10 years old. I told the teacher that he was making repeated grammatical mistakes, and the teacher replied by saying that I shouldn't bother with fixing them because he's a Chinese student. I was really bothered by that. Just because he's Chinese, he should still be able to learn and to learn from his mistakes so we should tell him. He's still young. He can slowly improve and correct his mistakes. But the teacher says that he's Chinese, so it doesn't matter.

Lack of guidance by the teachers reinforces Chinese students' relatively low educational aspirations; even among more ambitious students, their teachers' low expectations for them translate into poor teaching, which means they do not receive sufficient support and attention to progress into more advanced levels of study. Lian Mei was able to overcome these pitfalls due to a series of fortuitous circumstances. After finishing middle school, she started to work full-time at an apparel manufacturing. Her parents were indifferent about her career plans but she became increasingly dissatisfied with the prospect of working in the factory for the rest of her life. Her Peruvian friend, who went on to the university preparatory track, encouraged her to continue with her studies; with fortitude and tremendous tenacity, she finished secondary school by taking night classes after working full shifts at the factory during the day.

Discrimination is not only felt in school but also in the labor market. Many of the respondents express their frustrations with finding a job in mainstream companies because they

perceive discrimination against them. Xiao Yao, an 18-year-old student who hopes to work for an Italian retailer after she graduates from secondary school, discusses the difficulty she encountered while trying to get a sales job at Italian retailers, despite having good grades and a lot of sales experience working at a Chinese-owned clothing store. She would prefer to work in an Italian retailer rather than one that is Chinese owned because the pay is higher and the work hours are shorter. When asked why it has been so difficult, she responds:

You have to send them your curriculum vitae and most of the time, they don't choose you. The possibilities are very low.... I've tried many times and I've never heard back. You need to have some connection with the person working at the shop to get a higher chance of getting hired. But if you go to a Chinese shop, all you need to do is ask if they need anyone to work there, and many times, they hire you.

When I followed up with the obvious question of whether she thinks that Italian companies are not hiring her because she is Chinese, she confirms that she has this suspicion.

Likewise, other Chinese respondents who feel discouraged about finding a job in the mainstream labor market have decided to therefore, fall back on working for Chinese businesses, which are often owned by their family or other acquaintances in the close-knit community.

Mario, a 21 year old who moved to Italy as a young child, now works as a waiter in a Chinese-owned Italian restaurant, after finishing compulsory secondary school. When I asked him the hypothetical question, "If you and a native Italian both applied for the same job with exactly the same credentials, who do you think would get the job?", he responds: "Oh, in that case, then definitely the native Italian." When asked why this would be the case, he replies: "How should I say it? At the end of the day, he comes from the same country as the guy who's hiring. Of course they get special preference. Plus, Italians are a little bit racist." Even though he has not applied to work for an Italian employer, the perception that such discrimination exists is so strong that it precludes him from even trying. Similarly, Liu Xia, an exceptional respondent who is currently a

university student at one of the best universities in Madrid, and Gianna, the cultural mediator in Milan, agreed that even with their university qualifications, their chances of getting hired by an Italian corporation are slim. As Gianna explains why Italians employers are reluctant to hire Chinese employees, she believes that it is rooted in Italians' sense of distrust:

I'm basically Italian. I went to liceo. I had a real powerful Western education; I also had a real good Chinese education. I have a lot of Italian friends. My best friend is Italian.... But, if an Italian person here doesn't know me – Gianna as a person – then he will always look at me as just a Chinese person – someone who wants to take something from him.

This sense of mistrust has been fuelled by growing animosity between the Chinese and native entrepreneurs, who view the Chinese as a serious threat to their businesses. Lana, a 19-year-old born in Madrid, grew up helping out in her mother's hair salon. She is studying tourism and hopes to own a travel agency someday. She discusses Spaniards' increasing envy towards the Chinese's economic successes.

I think they do envy us, especially the economic recession. A lot of Spaniards think that Chinese people have a lot of connections because we open up so many stores and we sell things at cheaper prices. In turn, Spaniard-owned stores don't get a lot of business. As they see Chinese people opening up more and more stores, and getting more and more rich, I think they do get jealous. To them, it's like we're stealing their money by stealing their business.

These sentiments are echoed by Dai Yi, a waiter in his early 30s who immigrated to Milan as a young adult. When asked whether he thinks Italians are envious of the Chinese and their business success, his response was resoundingly affirmative; "Of course, they're envious. They look around and always complain why the Chinese owns all the shops – they'd say that the Chinese have bought all of Italy!" He elaborates on what many Chinese people see as a vendetta on the part of Italians towards their burgeoning prosperity: "Sometimes, when you keep your shop a bit later, these Italians – a few, not all – would complain and ask for an inspection, even if you keep

the place perfectly clean. This is how they express their envy towards Chinese businesses doing well. They need to do some damage.” When asked about the growing tensions between the Chinese and Italians, he says:

I would say that the relationship is not too good, particularly because the Italian economy is bad right now. If you work at a restaurant, then perhaps the native Italians don’t have much to say but for some other kinds of businesses – say, massage parlors where there are some sexual activities going on – then they blame the Chinese for bringing these sorts of businesses. A couple of years ago, before these massage parlors became so popular, Italians would say that the Chinese are hard-working but now, they think we are amoral people for bringing these kinds of businesses over to Italy.

As the Chinese have become a scapegoat during the economic recession, rising tensions between the groups have led to more opportunities for open conflict, which to the extreme, can intensify into wide-scale clashes such as the mass protests by the Chinese community in Milan in April 2007, as previously mentioned. Group tensions are exacerbated by common misperceptions on both ends. For instance, Gianna mentions how some of her Italian acquaintances have asked whether Chinese businesses succeed because they are supported by the Chinese mafia – an allegation that she quickly denies in order to rectify the Chinese’s image in Italian society.

As native-owned businesses are failing and the rift between the two groups widens, Italian and Spanish owners are even more reluctant to hire the Chinese. In the absence of opportunities in the mainstream labor market, Chinese youth turn to relatively thriving Chinese-owned businesses for work and their own prospects of self-entrepreneurship, which makes attaining higher educational credentials an increasingly futile endeavor. Although some of the respondents reported experiences of explicit discrimination (especially in relation to native Spaniards’ and Italians’ envy towards the Chinese’s business success), many of the respondents neither experienced blatant discrimination nor did they feel a strong sense of prejudice against

them. A substantial number of respondents even reported having many native Italian or Spanish friends. That said, even among the most integrated, they would mention a perpetual feeling of marginalization that is analogous to an invisible cloak between themselves and the natives. To paraphrase the sentiment of many respondents, even if they spoke perfect Italian or Spanish and fully adopted the host society's way of life, they would always be considered as outsiders because of their Chinese faces. If immigrants and ethnic minorities are accepted in these new destination societies, they remain apart from – rather than a part of – them.

Inheriting the American Dream: Chinese Youth in the U.S.

Generally, regardless of the nationality group, the immigrant second-generation reports significant levels of perceived discrimination and prejudice. (On average, over forty percent of the immigrant second-generation, with the exception of Russian Jews, report having experienced some incidence of discrimination, compared to just 14 percent of native Whites – see: Kasinitz et al. 2008: 311) In many ways, for immigrants and their descendants, learning how to navigate differences in a historically multicultural society like the U.S. is integral to the assimilation process. Although most groups perceive discrimination in one form or another, there are significant differences in their experiences. Whereas darker-skinned minorities are more likely to report experiences of discrimination in their interactions with the police and employers, Chinese respondents tend to feel discriminated at school. Moreover, there are clearly different interpretations of what discrimination means. By discrimination, most of them refer to a form of positive stereotyping that they perceive from their teachers and peers. Tom, aged 32 and born in the U.S., discussed how teachers expected Asians to excel in class, particularly in math, even if they were not actually predisposed to academics. In his own words: “[The teachers] put pressure

on you to be better. It's good in a way because you have to keep up with their expected standards but in a negative way, it's more just perception again. They believe all Asians are these geniuses or whizzes at technical stuff." Similarly, Aaron, who was aged 20, U.S-born and currently a college student, discussed the mental mindset that Chinese parents instil in their children – "to do well in school" – which in turn gets misinterpreted by others groups as a genetic or cultural disposition towards academic achievement – i.e. "Because they're Chinese, they get good grades". In many cases, such stereotypes are positively reinforced after the youngsters leave school and enter the labor market. Jeremy, who works as a full-time IT consultant, said that there have been instances when he felt that he has benefitted from being Chinese: "'Cause I'm in the computer field, it [i.e. being Chinese] helps a lot. Automatically, people think that since you're Asian – especially in the computer field – you should be good at computers and so it's easier to get a job. So that's one way it's benefitted me." Despite receiving a premium on the job market for being Chinese, he is still on the receiving end of racist remarks and disparagement: "People call you names but that doesn't really bug me much 'cause it's just people's ignorance which hinders them."

Some respondents mention the potential pitfalls of exceedingly high expectations for Asian Americans' academic achievements, including their seeming overrepresentation on U.S. college campuses. Lily, aged 19 and born in the U.S., mentioned that her parents warned her about Affirmative Action programs working against Asian minorities: "They've heard of Affirmative Action issues and they're well informed about cases where there might be some sort of discrimination against Chinese... They pointed out people who are Chinese who were hurt by it, like in terms of getting into college, where if there's a huge representation of Asians, it might

play against other Asians.” That said, her parents convinced her that despite these potential, individual talent and effort will prevail.

In the opinion of many of the Chinese respondents, discrimination is almost a prerequisite to achieving success. Given how they believe that higher education is the singular ticket to attaining upward mobility in U.S. society, the discrimination that they will encounter at school and at work is nearly inevitable in their attempts to be successful. As their parents often tell them, they should expect to encounter discrimination but it should not deter them from trying to become successful; if anything, their anticipation of discrimination should motivate them to work and try harder, particularly in school. Jared, aged 20 and a college student, said that his parents – especially his father who has a Master’s degree – cautioned him about bearing the brunt of prejudice: “My dad said that I might come across racism and that it might be tougher out there because we’re minorities. Some people might not like us for who we are. I just accepted that fact.” Likewise, Cynthia, aged 24 and attended an Ivy League college, recalled that her parents warned her about the limitations that she will face as a Chinese person in U.S. society: “I think they were definitely a little on the paranoid side. Coming fresh as immigrants, they definitely felt that there was a lot of discrimination against Chinese people because of our appearance – like we look different. And then they just had this theory that white people would stick to other white people over Asian people so we had to be better than them.”

Other Chinese respondents recalled the overly dire warning that their parents issued about the discrimination that they will encounter in U.S. society, which they felt were counter-productive to them assimilating and feeling like they belong. Ruby recalls how her parents expected minorities, like themselves, to be the target of prejudice, which they should respond to by remaining quiet and working hard:

“When I was younger, my parents told me, ‘Don’t start trouble with white people. Or don’t start trouble with other groups. Stay away from them. If they push, you just avoid them.’ And I don’t like this. They’re trying to teach us to have a passive attitude when there’s aggression toward you. When I was a kid, I actually listened to them but now I get older, I just realize how it affected me later on in life. It sounds like they’re afraid. They are just passive and they try to make the kids passive too.”

For some Chinese respondents, their dreams of having a career that is not academically-oriented – such as becoming an actor or athlete – were deferred by their parents, who were well-aware of the boundaries which limit the success of Asian minorities. John, aged 20 and a college student, talked about how his high-school educated father would temper his wild ambitions of becoming a manager for a sports team: “I told my dad when I was young that I wanted to be general manager of the Knicks or the Giants or things like that. And he would say, ‘That’s not possible for us because we’re Chinese.’ But I don’t see it that way. It might well be but I will break it. I don’t care.” Even as an adult, he holds on to these dreams, although he still encounters his fair share of naysayers. One of his Chinese co-workers responded to his dreams by telling him that “Since you’re Chinese, it’s going to stop you. You’re going to have to work harder as it is.” As a point of comparison, the parents of equally high-achieving Russian Jews reassured their children that they would not be subjected to the kind of discrimination they would have faced in Russia. Whereas Chinese parents reinforced the importance of education as a sure bet for success, Russian Jews completely took for granted that they would attain an advanced degree – it was an implicit expectation.

In summary, the Chinese respondents openly acknowledge the prejudice and discrimination that they face in U.S. society as minorities. However, they also point out the ways in which certain stereotypes about them can inadvertently lead to positive consequences, at least in terms of individual educational attainment. Even though the stereotypes that they face as

model minorities represent the burden of unrealistic expectations and can lead to social isolation, they can positively reinforce academic and career ambitions. Chinese-American youth mostly discuss discrimination in terms of differential treatment based on perceptions of them being smart, particularly in the math or sciences. For instance, they would mention kids who would bully or tease them for being smart, or copy off of their homework, or teachers who put them in the hardest math class because they were Chinese. This phenomenon, which has been widely documented in the literature on the Asian-American second-generation, has been dubbed by the sociologist Jennifer Lee as the “stereotype promise” – the promise of being viewed through the lens of a positive stereotype that leads one to perform in such a way that confirms the positive stereotype, thereby enhancing performance (Lee 2012). In this way, the type of discrimination experienced by the Chinese (and other upwardly mobile groups) leads less to discouragement and more to increased efforts to overcome racial stereotypes.

Conclusion

In the previous chapter, I examine the dissimilar levels of educational expectations of Chinese youth in the U.S. versus in Spain and Italy – the former which is higher-than-average and the latter which is lower-than-average among the Chinese vis-à-vis other groups. I argue that this disparity across the Atlantic is partially due to different framings of achievement – namely, the differential valuation of education versus entrepreneurship in the different contexts of the host societies. The purpose of this present chapter is to better understand how these different success frames are adopted, which I argue is partially due to varying perceptions of blocked mobility and unequal opportunity in the host societies. Ultimately, perceptions about the host societies’ opportunity structures – particularly the belief that higher education is a meritocratic system

which equalizes the playing field for all immigrant and ethnic minority groups – shape youth’s career ambitions.

Results from the quantitative analysis show that perceptions of opportunity and sense of belonging partially explain why Chinese youth in Spain and Italy are less likely than youth from other ethno-immigrant groups to adopt an educational success frame. By contrast, Chinese youth in the U.S. are not significantly more likely to adopt an educational success frame because educational expectations are almost unilaterally high across all groups and thus, perceptions of opportunity and sense of belonging play a minimal role. Across all three countries, individual measures of perceived opportunity and integration largely operate as expected. The beliefs that minorities, regardless of their educational background, face discrimination and that some degree of racism exists in the host society are inversely associated with educational success frames. Conversely, the general sense that foreigners are disadvantaged in the host societies is a relatively ambiguous predictor of success frames: in some contexts, a moderate sense of inequality is negatively related to educational success frames, while a strong sense is positively associated. Possessing a sense of belonging in the host society via self-identification is consistently predictive of having educational ambitions.

These findings are corroborated by the in-depth interviews with Chinese youth living in the three countries. In Spain and Italy, Chinese youth report feeling like perpetual outsiders – or, as one respondent puts it, “a fish out of the water”. Faced with relatively recent yet rapidly growing immigrant populations, native Spaniards and Italians are more forthright in expressing their prejudices and even dislikes towards foreigners. In this way, a number of the respondents reported encountering discrimination in myriad facets of their everyday life. Beyond ordinary instances of street-level prejudice, they also mentioned more insidious and institutionalized

forms of discrimination. In addition to feeling that they are shut out from the mainstream economy, some of the respondents recounted the persistently negative stereotypes that they encountered in the classroom as Chinese students, particularly by unsupportive teachers. Since many Chinese students spend long hours after school helping out at their family businesses, teachers often assume that they have no interest in pursuing higher education. As a result, not only do they dispense less attention on their Chinese students, teachers' expectations and standards for them are commensurately low. According to some accounts, they were assigned with less homework and their test requirements were lower, in comparison to their non-Chinese peers. Ironically, these teachers thought that they were doing their Chinese students a favor.

By comparison, the Chinese-American interviewees also addressed the stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination that they perceived and encountered in U.S. society. For immigrant youth across all ethnicities, assimilation entails learning how to navigate racial boundaries and color lines which abound in the U.S. cultural landscape. However, while they are well aware of the myriad inequalities against minorities, they believe that these obstacles are surmountable through higher education. Moreover, the stereotypes and prejudices about Chinese students in the classroom largely work as positive reinforcement. Teachers and their peers presume their academic prowess, particularly in the math and sciences. While Chinese-American youth often express annoyance towards these stereotypes, these high expectations lend to more opportunities (such as placement in AP classes) and in turn, a greater sense of confidence about their academic abilities.

What the respondents describe in their diametrically opposite experiences across the Atlantic are well-documented phenomena – “stereotype threat” and its converse, “stereotype promise” – in the literature on the educational experiences of minority youth. The concept of

“stereotype threat,” coined by Claude Steele and Joshua Aronson (1995), refers to the risk of negative stereotypes about individual students’ identity (e.g. race, ethnicity, gender) in hindering their educational outcomes. The concept originally served to explain the black-white achievement gap in standardized test scores and other measures of academic performance. In addition to contributing to test anxiety, classroom culture – particularly teachers’ own prejudices and stereotypes about students – can potentially exacerbate or mitigate the negative consequences of stereotype threat, in both subtle and blatant ways. In the case of Chinese students in Spain and Italy, their ethnic group’s public image as entrepreneurs leads educators to presume that they have no intentions to excel in their studies and to pursue higher education. In turn, they lend minimal support and guidance to their Chinese students, and even discourage them from advancing in their studies. Chinese students themselves internalize these cultural messages from the classroom and the public sphere at large and then, react to them in negative and even self-damaging ways, as reflected in their educational ambitions.

Whereas Chinese students in Spain and Italy are subjected to “stereotype threat,” images of the academically-oriented ‘model minorities’ avail their counterparts in the U.S. Dubbed “stereotype promise,” by Jennifer Lee (2012), Asian American students benefit from these positive stereotypes in the classroom – wherein teachers assume that they are smart, hard-working and high-achieving, particularly as alleged “math and science whizzes” – which affected the way that their teachers treated them, the grades they received, and their likelihood of being placed into the most competitive academic tracks, regardless of their actual ability. Such confidence in turn, enhances Chinese students’ academic performance and more importantly, reinforces their high educational ambitions.

Having examined the role of perceived opportunity – or the lack thereof – on educational and entrepreneurial expectations, the following chapter will turn the spotlight from the youths to their parents. Specifically, the following chapter will explore the ways in which parental expectations, engagement and experiences influence the ambitions of the immigrant second-generation across the different contexts of the host societies.

CHAPTER 5. “TIGER PARENTING” AND ITS INFLUENCE ON YOUTH’S SUCCESS FRAMES: THE ROLE OF PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS, EXPERIENCES AND ENGAGEMENT

Introduction

In the constellation of external influences on youth’s educational and career ambitions – including teachers, peers, siblings, various community mentors – parents are most likely to assume the spotlight. Educators, policymakers and even parents themselves focus on how their involvement in their children’s schooling can enable them to get better grades, to enter into the most prestigious colleges and to graduate with honors. Given the undue attention paid to the role of parental involvement on educational outcomes, this chapter will examine its role in explaining ethnic variations in educational experiences and outcomes across national contexts. Specifically, how do differences in parental involvement – if there are, in fact, significant differences – between Chinese parents in the U.S. versus Southern Europe account for their children’s vastly different ambitions? Recall that Chinese youth in the U.S. tend to have higher-than-average levels of educational attainment and college ambitions, compared to their non-Chinese peers, whereas Chinese youth in Southern Europe have much lower levels of educational attainment, displacing their educational ambitions with entrepreneurial ambitions.

This chapter is organized in the following manner. First, the literature review will provide an overview of existing research on two interrelated questions: does parental involvement significantly influence their children’s educational experiences and outcomes and if so, do significant ethno-racial variations exist in the style of parental involvement as well as the level of

parental engagement across different host societies? For the latter question, three subfields of research are particularly relevant: differences in the organization of parent-school partnerships across the host societies' educational systems; ethno-racial differences in parental involvement in their children's schooling; and, specialized research on parental involvement and academic achievement among Asians, the focal group of interest. After a description of the data and method, descriptive and multivariate regression results that namely address the question of whether parental involvement – captured by their expectations, engagement and experiences as related to their children's schooling – significantly predict youth's educational and career expectations are presented. Then, interview findings based on in-depth interviews with youth respondents and in some cases, parental respondents which corroborate the quantitative results are presented. A brief discussion and conclusion follow.

Literature Review

I. Does parental involvement significantly influence children's learning engagement and achievement?

With the support of academics and educational policymakers, parental involvement has vaulted into prominence as a main determinant for improving educational outcomes for all children. Over time, parents and educators have come to believe that the perfect educational model involves the equal division of responsibility of educating children between schools and families: teachers provide formal instruction and implement school curriculum, whereas parents should extend the learning process from school to home by keeping abreast with their children's progress at school and reinforcing study habits. Parents thus, should conduct activities – with the guidance of educators – that will benefit their children's academic success (Epstein 1996).

However, a cursory review of the literatures shows that there is a lack of consistent evidence that parental involvement is a significant and strong predictor of academic achievement. To be sure, there are numerous studies which claim a significant relationship between parenting and children's educational outcomes (e.g. Baumrind 1967; British Psychological society 1986; Dornbusch and Wood 1989; Epstein et al. 2009; Lam 1997) In an encyclopedic entry on the role of parental involvement, Sheldon (2002) unabashedly says that "research on the effects of parental involvement has shown a consistent, positive relationship between parents' engagement in their children's education and student outcomes. Studies have also shown that parental involvement is associated with student outcomes such as lower dropout and truancy rates. Whether or not parental involvement can improve student outcomes is no longer in question." (p.1844)

The field is abundant with a plethora of theories as to why parental involvement matter, even though the actual association between parenting and educational outcomes is in itself not well-established. For instance, Grolnick and colleagues (1994, 1997) argue that parental involvement is based on how parent-child interactions affect students' educational outcomes. According to their theory, parental involvement affects student achievement because these interactions affect the youths' motivation, their sense of competence and confidence to succeed in school. Likewise, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995, 1997) argue that given parental involvement is a function of parents' beliefs about parental roles and responsibilities, their involvement is a signal to their children for the importance of schooling for achieving success in life. Consequently, when parents get involved, their children acquire knowledge, skills and an increased sense of confidence at school. Perhaps most influential in this field is the work of Epstein (1995, 2001) who laid the groundwork for the study of parent-school-community

partnerships. Repeatedly, she has argued that school, family, and community are important “spheres of influence” on children’s development and their educational progress. According to this theory, schools should take a leading role in promoting overlap between these spheres by implementing activities across various types of involvement including: parenting, communicating, volunteering, continuous learning at home, decision-making and collaborating with the community. Student achievement is in principle, maximized when parents are engaged in all these types of involvement. Beyond the U.S. context – where the majority of research is focused – researchers have examined whether there is an association between parental involvement and academic achievement in other countries. Gonzales-Pienda et al. (2002) explored the influence of parental involvement on achievement for a sample of Spanish adolescents in Spain. Even accounting for student aptitude, they find that parental involvement – measured in the form of interest and encouragement – is a significant predictor of achievement, albeit mediated by youth’s sense of self-esteem.

A subset of studies has studied the influence of parenting styles on academic achievement, providing some reason to suspect that parents may differ in the strategies that they employ to address underachievement. For instance, Cheung and Pomerantz (2012) find that the children of parents who practiced disciplinarian styles of childrearing are more motivated to do well in school. Likewise, Julian et al. (1994) find that there are significant variations in parenting styles among two-parent families, including cultural variations whereby minority parents (e.g. blacks, Asian, and Hispanics) place greater emphasis on academic achievement on their children as well as practice a stricter, more controlling parenting style. Some researchers argue that more than family structure and socioeconomic background, parenting styles are more integral to youth’s academic achievements; in other words, familial processes (including parental behaviors

and engagement) matter more than familial status (e.g. Dornbusch and Wood 1989). However, it is important to keep in mind that parenting styles predict educational outcomes as much as they are a function of them. Parents whose children tend to have poorer achievement are more likely to operate in “crisis” rather than “maintenance” mode, reacting to their children’s poor grades or behavior problems at school rather than promoting positive academic habits at home (Robinson and Harris 2014).

Despite the bevy of studies which attest to the central role of parental influence on educational outcomes, extant research still has yet to fully ascertain either the significance or the proximity of the association. There is substantial disagreement over the immediacy of the influence of parental involvement on academic performance, as well as which aspects of parental involvement are associated with improvement on children’s schooling (e.g. Domina 2005, Zellman and Waterman 1998). A possible reason for the lack of consensus in this area of research is namely definitional: different measures have been used to capture the concept of parental involvement across studies. Despite its intuitive meaning, the operational use of parental involvement has neither been clear nor consistent. Parental involvement has been defined in practice as representing many different parenting behaviors and practices. Some researchers adopt a more comprehensive approach – for instance, Hoge et al. (1997) consider educational expectations, interest in their children’s studies, and participation in activities at home and school as measures of parental involvement. By contrast, other researchers apply a narrow operationalization of the concept. Consider a study by Hango (2007) which emphasizes the relational aspect of the time that parents spend with their children, claiming that parental involvement is mainly a form of social capital that buffers against the detrimental effects of growing up in a poor household. Inconsistent findings are thus, in large part, due to differences

in how parental involvement is defined and measured. Other potential reasons for the lack of clarity in the role of parental involvement on achievement include small sample sizes (e.g. Dearing et al. 2006), as well as different age cohorts for children – elementary school (e.g. Schulting et al. 2005) versus high school (e.g. McNeal 1999) – which lead to less generalizable results.

Given these discrepancies and limitations, research in this area has been quite fragmented for quite some time. A number of recent studies have sought to provide an empirical basis to this area of study, in an attempt to redress the considerable discrepancies and lack of clarity in the field. In a meta-analysis conducted to synthesize the quantitative literature about the relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement, Fan and Chen (2001) find that while the association is statistically significant, its magnitude is decidedly small to moderate. Further analysis reveals that among different measures of parental involvement, parental expectations and aspirations is the strongest predictor of academic achievement, whereas parental supervision (e.g. rules about doing homework, home environment conducive to studying) is surprisingly the most weakly correlated. Robinson and Harris (2014) similarly find that parental ambition is the strongest predictor of youth's educational outcomes and even more interestingly, that there is minimal variation in parental ambition across racial and ethnic groups. Moreover, they argue that the evidence generally does not generally suggest a clear positive connection between parental involvement and academic outcomes. When examining the distinct association between different measures of parental involvement and academic achievement, they find that the vast majority of measures were either not significantly or even negatively associated with achievement. The greater share of measures of parental involvement that negatively rather than positively predicts

educational outcomes casts doubt on the promotion of parental involvement as a panacea for poor achievement.

Nevertheless, despite contradictory evidence, there is the mass appeal of parental involvement among educators and policymakers as a general remedy for improving educational outcomes. Throughout the educational process – from preschool to even college – parents' contribution of time and effort are presumed to be greatly beneficial in helping schools meet educational goals. In the U.S., parental involvement often plays a central role in the discourse on school reform – most tellingly, over a dozen states have declared one month a year as parental involvement, even offering free parental involvement pledge cards to mark its importance in the educational process (Robinson and Harris 2014). The ways in which parental involvement has been incorporated into educational policies in the U.S. and abroad – for the purposes of this study, specifically in Spain – is discussed in the following section. Moreover, the broader question of whether culture matters in parental involvement is also examined.

II. Are there ethno-racial differences in parental involvement?

Vast differences in educational achievement and attainment by race and ethnicity, particularly in the U.S. educational system, have prompted researchers and policymakers to seek explanations. Family background is often cited as an explanation and subsequently, parental involvement is purported to be a solution for redressing the ethno-racial gap in achievement (Comer 1992; Epstein 1985). As mentioned above, encouraging parents to become involved in their children's academic lives has been an important component of school reform efforts to enhance the achievement of school children in recent decades. The No Children Left Behind Act in the U.S.

and the Ley de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo in Spain are examples of major school reform legislations that incorporate parental involvement into their objectives.

Systematic research on ethno-racial differences in parental involvement is largely based on the U.S. (Desforges and Abouchaar 2003). In the U.S., the superior academic success of some groups – Asians – is often held in stark contrast with the supposed ‘under-performance’ of other groups – Hispanics and blacks – as spotlighted in the media, public opinion and academic research. Much of these disparities are attributed to different styles of childrearing. For instance, as alleged “Tiger Parents,” Asian parents practice the sort of strict and authoritarian childrearing style that produce straight-A students, whereas Hispanic (especially Mexican) and black parents are assumed to be disinterested in their schooling of their children (Bol and Berry 2005; DeCastro-Ambrosetti and Cho 2005). Cultural theories about disparities in educational investment by parents are often invoked.

Most notable is John Ogbu’s theory of voluntary versus involuntary migration, which he argues determines the way different ethno-racial groups interact with the opportunity structures of the host societies (Ogbu 1978; Ogbu and Simons 1998). Voluntary minorities are groups who willing migrate to the host society (e.g. the U.S.) to seek better opportunities, whether in terms of employment or greater political freedom. In their eyes, education is seen as a primary mechanism for realizing the opportunities that led them to migrate to a new country; in principle, they also attempt to overcome experiences of discrimination and other limitations through academic success because they perceive these societal barriers as temporary and thus, surmountable. In contrast, involuntary minorities are groups who have been historically enslaved, colonized or conquered in their host societies. Relative to other groups, involuntary minorities experience greater and more persistent forms of discrimination which hinders their upward mobility. Despite

the elimination of formal racism, vestiges of past discriminatory practices in various institutions, including the educational system and the labor market, remain in effect. Given their group's overall experience with the inefficacy of higher education, they are less inclined to invest into education as a means for achieving upward mobility. According to this classification, Asian Americans are considered voluntary migrants whereas Hispanics and blacks are considered involuntary migrants (Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi 1986).

Other culturally-contingent theories about ethno-racial differences in parental involvement focus on the kinds of parental motivations that ultimately dictate the quantity and quality of parental involvement and expectations regarding their children's schooling. Familial obligations originating from cultural expectations influence the interaction of educational expectations and investments between parents and children. For instance, depending on the availability of alternative channels for upward mobility – such as familial entrepreneurship – parental expectations and engagement vis-à-vis their children's education may vary accordingly; among families with their own business, parents and their children can choose to invest their time, money and effort into higher education versus on-the-ground work experience in the shops. In his study on Korean-American households with family-owned businesses in New York City (2006), Kim finds that immigrant entrepreneurship serves numerous functions for intergenerational mobility. On the one hand, under the right circumstances, small business ownership offered a stepping-stone to intergenerational mobility, providing the requisite resources that facilitate immigrant children's academic success. On the other hand, in some circumstances, obligations to help out in a family business – as expressed in the form of parental pressures – can lead to personal sacrifice on the part of the children of entrepreneurs, constraining their ability to attain higher education.

In addition to expectations about inheriting the family business, marriage is another detour from the pursuit of higher education. In more traditional cultures, parents expect children to marry relatively younger – this is particularly true for daughters, whose chastity and thus marriageability are better protected at younger ages, but also the case for sons, whose parents believe that marriage will motivate them to mature and take responsibility for providing for their own families. In a study by Lindo (2000) about differences in educational attainment between Spanish and Turkish immigrant youth in the Netherlands, he argues that compared to Spanish families, Turkish families adhere to stricter rules and expectations that may deter children from their academic pursuits. Many of the study's respondents were subjected to strong social pressure to marry before they turn 18 years old. In the parents' eyes, marriage is the best safeguard for their children against the dangers of adolescence in Dutch society. Whereas marriage signals a period of children's full independence from their parents in Spanish families, it is not the case in Turkish families. For daughters, marriage merely represents the transference of guardianship from her parents to her husband and his parents; for sons, they are still dependent on his family elders and with few exceptions, they should transition into full-time employment rather than continue with their schooling upon marriage. For both sons and daughters, then, early marriage seriously interferes with the educational plans of certain immigrant groups.

In general, based on cultural theories, cross-ethnic discrepancies in the association between parental practices and educational outcomes are rooted in different meanings of socialization practices across cultural contexts. In more traditional cultures, hierarchical parent-child relationships are likely to prevail and therefore, strict parenting is effective for promoting youth well-being and optimal academic adjustment. Conversely, in societies characterized by horizontal collectivism, egalitarian relations between parents and children are more effective in

supporting positive youth outcomes (Rudy and Grusec 2001). In a rare study based outside the U.S. that examines the role of parental involvement in adolescent adjustment in Spain, the authors find that given that modern Spanish culture is characterized by egalitarian parent-child relations, strict and authoritarian parenting styles are largely ineffective (Martinez and Garcia 2007).

In spite of the popularity of culturally-based narratives about race and parental involvement, there are alternative theories that focus on beyond culture. The segmented assimilation model, proposed by Portes and his colleagues, is a notable example of a structurally-based theory (Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In their framework, immigrant groups possess different resources and subsequently, are met with different contexts of reception in the host society which in turn, predicts their pattern of assimilation. Salient factors in the reception context include the political relations between the sending and receiving countries, the values and prejudices against the sending country and its members, as well as the size, structure and resources of a group's co-ethnic community (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). According to this framework, immigrant groups who are positively received – such as Asians in the U.S. – more easily assimilate into the societal mainstream and possess the resources to realize educational opportunities among the second-generation, whereas immigrant groups who are negatively received – such as Mexicans – are met with more barriers to assimilation and thus, less inclined to develop strong academic orientations.

Whether culturally- or structurally-based, the aforementioned theories address alleged ethno-racial differences in parental involvement and childrearing styles. However, there is considerable debate on whether there are significant group differences to begin with. A cursory survey of the existing body of research shows that there is in fact, mixed evidence. For example,

in their meta-analysis, Fan and Chen (2001) find that based on their review of a half dozen research papers and reports, they found that various measures of parental involvement significantly mediate the ethno-racial differences in academic performance. Once parental involvement is accounted for, ethnicity apparently has a relatively minor effect on achievement. Other studies find a significant yet indirect effect of parental involvement on youth achievement. In a study on students in Spain, Gonzales-Pienda et al. (2002) find that parental involvement, as rated by the students themselves, influenced their academic achievement but the relationship was mediated by more proximate factors such as student motivation and personal attributes.

Other studies argue that despite the widespread assumption that racial differences in parental involvement and interest exist, empirical evidence suggests that they are neither as significant nor substantial as often presumed. For one, tremendous intra-group variations exist both in the nature and frequency of help that parents provide. This is in large part due to differences in economic resources. That said, the remainder of the variation is also attributed to differential trust and confidence in the educational system as well as varying levels of parental knowledge about schooling, both of which in turn are integral to parents' involvement practices. For instance, it is common for Asian and Hispanic parents to feel that respect is shown to teachers by not interfering with in their classroom operations, which can be viewed by educators as indifference or lack of involvement in their children's schooling (Yan and Lin 2005).

Along similar lines, while immigrant and minority parents are likely to be involved in their children's schooling at home (e.g. rules about doing homework, regular discussions about what happened at school), they tend to be much less involved at their children's school (e.g. PTA membership, regular meetings with teachers). As such, given that home-based forms of parental involvement are less conspicuous, educators have the added impression that immigrant and

minority parents are disinterested in their children's educational progress (Robinson and Harris 2014). Most importantly, numerous studies have found that parental educational ambitions are unilaterally high across all racial and ethnic groups; contradicting the resistance model proposed by Ogbu and his colleagues, black and Hispanic parents view education as a facilitator, rather than a hindrance, to overcoming societal barriers (Suizzo et al. 2007). Likewise, in Fan and Chen's (2001) meta-analysis of existing studies on ethnicity and parental involvement, they find that parental ambition is consistently the strongest predictor of youth's educational outcomes among various measures of parental engagement.

Whether there are actual ethno-racial differences in parenting styles and parental involvement in children's schooling and whether such differences in parenting significantly explains group disparities in academic outcomes are both debatable issues in the existing literature. In the following section, I provide a discussion on how the experiences of one particular minority group of interest – Asians which include Chinese – resonate with the different sides of these debates. Note that the discussion contains some overt generalizations, although we do acknowledge the wide diversity within the group as well as across individual families which make it difficult to speak in terms of a unified immigrant experience.

III. Research on parental involvement and academic achievement among Asians

Research on the parental styles and childrearing practices of the Chinese have largely been couched in terms of the broader assimilation experiences of Asians in the U.S. Much of the literature focuses on providing an explanation for the relatively superior academic outcomes of Asian American youth, whereby parenting is allegedly one of main reasons for their model minority status. The concept of the "model minority," which credits Asian parents for raising

high-achieving children and “successfully” assimilating them into mainstream American society, is often unfairly held against comparatively less educated groups (such as blacks and Hispanics) whose parents allegedly do not invest in their children’s schooling (Robinson and Harris 2014).

According to recent research conducted by Lee and Zhou (2014), they find that Asian immigrant group in the U.S. – particularly the Chinese – tend to define success narrowly vis-à-vis academic success and invest the appropriate resources in achieving it. Early on in their lives, their parents communicate the utmost importance of school for future life opportunities by providing clear examples of undesirable outcomes for not taking school seriously (Robinson and Harris 2014). One of the downsides of perpetuating these narrow definitions of success is the marginalization of less academically-inclined youth who feel like failures and under-achievers and correspondingly, “don’t feel really Chinese”. Rejected from their ethnic communities, they become the “black sheep” of their families because they have not met what they perceive to be the expected levels of achievement. Moreover, the claim that certain groups are more successful than others because of their allegedly inherent cultural traits implies that those who do not meet those expectations have no one to blame but themselves (Lee and Zhou 2013; Louie 2004).

One reason why Asian parents can effectively inculcate their children with strong academic orientations is their ability to send the message that high achievement is more than just about academic success; rather, it is a reflection of self-worth (Chao 1994; Ho 1984). Asian children are often raised to honor their parents and family by succeeding in school. Family obligation and respect are conveyed by striving to be “A-plus” students. While most parents, regardless of their racial and ethnic backgrounds, have high educational expectations, researchers argue that Asian parents are unique in the sense that for them, educational expectations are intrinsically intertwined with cultural values of filial piety and ancestral honor (Bempechat et al.

1996; Kim and Chun 1994). As such, the benchmark for parenting among Asian groups is whether parents effectively convey the importance of schooling to their children, rather than actual levels of parental involvement in their schooling. In Robinson and Harris's study (2014), they find *no* evidence of Tiger parents' childrearing practices (i.e. strict and authoritarian style of parenting whereby parents pay extremely close attention to their children's experiences and problems at school, as well as monitor their behavior) among Asian parents; instead, they merely have very high expectations for their children to succeed in school.

While the bulk of research on parental involvement and educational outcomes focus on the U.S. context, an increasing number of studies focus their attention beyond the U.S. – most notably, research on parenting trends in the immigrants' sending countries, including China. In a comparative study on parenting in the U.S. versus China, Cheung and Pomerantz (2011) find that, when using quantitative metrics, Chinese parents display more involvement in their children's studies than American (mostly of European descent) parents. However, when considering the qualitative aspects of their parenting, Chinese parents appear to display greater control over their children's work habits and are more likely to emphasize their academic failures than successes, whereas American parents display support for their children to develop autonomously. In performing what the researchers dub "controlled motivation," Chinese parents raise their children based on the Chinese notion of *guan* which entails meanings of "to love" and "to govern" with an emphasis on ensuring children meet certain standards, particularly academic ones (Cheung and Pomerantz 2012).

Given these supposed cultural difference in parenting styles and childrearing practices, the lingering question is whether they significantly affect youth's educational outcomes. Just as there is substantial debate over whether parental involvement plays a significant and substantial

role in academic achievement, there is the question of whether racial and ethnic differences exist in parental involvement. While some studies find that there is a significant association (e.g. Cheung and Pomerantz 2011, 2012), other studies do not find evidence for the positive influence of authoritative parenting on academic outcomes (Chao 2001; Quoss and Zhao 1995). Moreover, there is the question of how the parenting styles of certain immigrant groups interact with the prevailing norms of the host society regarding childrearing practices (Martinez and Garcia 2007). The analysis of this study, presented below, will examine the degree to which parental involvement varies between the Chinese and non-Chinese families and moreover, the degree which such differences – if they in fact, exist – account for differences in Chinese versus non-Chinese youth’s educational and career ambitions in two different educational contexts.

Analysis and Findings

Key Variables

The outcomes of interest are youth and parent’s university expectations. The predictors of interest are national origin, in addition to parental involvement as measured by parental expectations, engagement and experiences.

Youth’s Educational Expectations. Educational expectations represent the highest level of education that youth respondents realistically expect to attain. The survey instruments for CILS, ILSEG and ITAGEN measure educational expectations in closed ordinal categories.⁶ I recoded the ordinal variables into two binary variables: expectations to attend university and expectations to stop schooling after completion of high school in the U.S. or basic secondary schooling in Spain and Italy (which is roughly the equivalent of grade 10 or 11 in the U.S. educational system).

Parental Involvement Predictors: Expectations, Engagement and Experience. In Chapter 5, the main mechanisms of interest are related to parental involvement, which can be further categorized into the following groups: educational expectations, engagement and experiences in the host society. These survey items are available in CILS and ILSEG, not ITAGEN.

- Parental educational expectations is quite straightforwardly measured by parents' expectation for their children to attend university versus not.
- Parental engagement represents parents' behaviors and activities that promote their children's good study habits and motivation to do well in school. Measures of parental engagement in both ILSEG and CILS include regularly discussing what happens at school with child, regularly helping child with homework, regularly discussing educational plans with child, and regularly meeting with teachers. There are several measures of parental engagement that are only available in CILS and not ILSEG that include: rules for child to keep a certain GPA, rules about doing homework, parent belonging to the PTA, and parent regularly volunteering at school.
- Parents' experiences include perceived and experienced inclusion and exclusion in the host society – including sense of belonging, level of co-ethnic support and self-reported incidents of discrimination – which may influence children's educational and career decisions. Parental experiences are measured by the following items in both ILSEG and CILS (unless otherwise stated). To gauge real and perceived marginalization, self-reported incidences of discrimination, having the same opportunities as the native population (in ILSEG only), feelings of poor service and feelings of being unwelcomed in public places due to one's race or ethnicity (both of which are only in CILS) are included into the analysis. As for their perceived experiences with the school system,

attitudinal measures include worries about bad influences at school, belief that the child should be educated according to host society's customs, and satisfaction with the education that the child receives. In terms of co-ethnic social support, measures include receiving regular help from the co-ethnic community, keeping in touch with co-ethnics, having the child know about their parental homeland, and regularly obtaining information about opportunities from co-ethnics (only in CILS). Finally, in CILS, there is also an item about whether or not parents are saving money for their child's post-secondary graduation.

In the regression analyses, indices for the parental predictors based on the items described above are created to permit more robust results. Parental engagement is measured using an index of parental involvement (i.e. Cronbach's alphas are 0.65 for ILSEG and 0.64 for CILS). Parental experience is measured using an index of perceived discrimination (i.e. Cronbach's alphas are 0.49 for ILSEG and 0.48 for CILS) and an index of the strength of co-ethnic ties (i.e. Cronbach's alphas are 0.56 for ILSEG and 0.68 for CILS).

Descriptive Results

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 present the cross-tabulations for the key predictor and outcome variables that are included into analysis by the parents' national origins for the ILSEG and CILS data, respectively. Turning first to the youth outcomes, there are stark contrasts when comparing Chinese youth in the U.S. versus those in Spain, in relation to youth from other ethno-national origin groups (among those whose parents were included in the parental sample). The overwhelming majority of Chinese youth in the U.S. has university expectations (95%) and

possesses an educational success frame (76%), while only a minority of Chinese in Spain has university expectations (17%) and possesses an educational success frame (33%). By comparison, only 2 percent of Chinese youth in the U.S. adopt an entrepreneurial success frame, in comparison to 35 percent of their counterparts in Spain.

As for parental educational expectation, which is both outcome and predictor depending on the analytical model, Chinese parents in the U.S. tend to, on average, have very high educational expectations for their children – 86 percent expect them to attain at least a BA while no Chinese parent expect their child to just complete high school. (By and large, parents of other groups have similarly high university expectations, with Filipino parents having the highest expectations, on average.) By contrast, Chinese parents in Spain have very modest educational expectations for their children: while approximately half of the sample expects their children to attend university, less than a quarter of Chinese parents (21%) expect their children to do so. While only one-tenth of the sample expects their children to complete high school or less, more than a half of Chinese parents have these low expectations, with about one-quarter expecting their children to discontinue upon completion of basic secondary schooling.

As for parental engagement, contrary to expectations, Chinese parents in the U.S. are not more engaged with their children's academics than their non-Chinese counterparts; in fact, by numerous measures, they actually appear to be less engaged. For instance, they are far less inclined to discuss what happens at school with their children (i.e. about one-quarter always do versus three-quarters of the sample), less likely to help with homework (i.e. 8% of Chinese parents versus 22% of the sample average), and less likely to meet with teachers (i.e. 37% vs. 78%). Note that the only measure for which Chinese parents do not deviate heavily from other parents is the discussion of post-high school plans; even though they are less likely to always

have these discussions compared to non-Chinese parents, they are prone to have them at least, sometimes. Surprisingly, similar patterns hold up among Chinese parents in Spain: like their U.S. counterparts, they are less likely to always or sometimes discuss what happens at school with their children (i.e. 24% of Chinese parents vs. 65% of the sample always do), less likely to help with homework (8% vs. 17% always do), and less likely to meet with teachers (21% vs. 60% always do). And, without the exception of being equally likely as other groups to discuss post-high school plans with their children as is the case with the Chinese in the U.S., Chinese parents in Spain are not likely to regularly have those discussions with their children (i.e. 59% vs. 89% always or sometimes do). Turning to measures of parental engagement that are not available in ILSEG, Chinese parents tend to score lower on all of them compared to non-Chinese parents: on average, they are less likely to have rules about homework or maintaining a certain GPA, to belong to a PTA, and to volunteer at school. In general, Chinese parents on both sides of the Atlantic display particularly low levels of school-based engagement (e.g. attend parent-teacher meetings, volunteer at school, belong to PTA).

In terms of parental experiences, Chinese parents generally do not report experiencing high levels of perceived discrimination in U.S. society. The proportion who report experiencing at least one incidence of discrimination due to their race or nationality is more or less the same as the sample average (i.e. just about one-third). Moreover, the majority of Chinese parents reported having never experienced poor service at a store or restaurant as well as having never felt unwelcomed in public places, compared to the minority of the sample average for both measures. By contrast, the majority of Chinese parents at least, sometimes – if not, often – perceive discrimination in Spanish society due to their race or nationality, versus about one-quarter of the

rest of the sample who reported similar levels of perceived discrimination. (Measures about receiving poor service and feeling unwelcomed in public places were not available in ILSEG.)

Another aspect of parental experiences is their perceptions of their host society's educational system. Chinese parents in the U.S. (51% vs. 47% of the sample average) and Spain (36% vs. 31% of the sample average) are slightly more likely than other groups to be very worried about the negative influences that their children might receive at school. Interestingly, on average, parents in the U.S. are much more worried about peer influence than parents in Spain. An interesting point of departure between parents in Spain and the U.S. is how receptive they are to their children being educated by their host society's customs: whereas the vast majority of immigrant parents in the U.S. (including the Chinese) want their children to be educated by their own or both countries' customs, the majority of immigrant parents in Spain agree that their children should be educated by Spanish customs. (That said, compared to other groups, Chinese parents in Spain are slightly less likely to agree with this statement.) As for satisfaction with their children's education, Chinese parents are generally very or fairly satisfied, as is the rest of the sample. By comparison, Chinese parents in Spain are also generally satisfied, although they are more likely to report some degree of dissatisfaction compared to other groups (i.e. one-third of Chinese parents vs. just one-tenth of the sample).

A final aspect of parental experience is their relationship with their co-ethnics. Chinese parents in the U.S. are slightly less likely than the rest of the sample to regularly keep in touch with their co-ethnics (30 percent versus 49 percent) and to receive help from them (14 percent versus 27 percent). By comparison, the Chinese in Spain are much more likely to report maintaining close ties with their co-ethnics: 30 percent regularly receive help from co-ethnics (versus 10 percent of the sample) and 2 percent very regularly keep in touch with their co-ethnics

Table 5.1. Descriptive statistics of analytical sample by focal outcomes and predictors across ethno-national origin groups in Spain

	Ethno-national origin group									Sample Average
	China	Colombia	Morocco	Ecuador	Peru	South Asia	South & Central America	Africa & Middle East	Europe & North America	
Youth Outcomes										
University Expectations	17.4	30.4	25.5	19.0	22.8	28.9	27.5	30.2	30.7	24.8
Entrepreneurial Success Frame	35.3	7.9	19.5	8.2	10.0	18.6	8.9	7.7	9.4	11.4
Educational Success Frame	33.8	48.1	59.8	43.4	55.7	61.0	44.9	58.2	50.5	48.5
Parental Predictors										
Parental Expectations (Outcome & Predictor)										
University or higher	21.1	55.1	44.9	43.7	52.6	46.5	48.3	52.7	48.8	46.3
Compulsory Secondary Schooling or lower	35.5	3.9	8.5	8.7	5.2	5.1	8.7	9.1	7.6	9.0
Parental Engagement										
Chats with child about school (always)	23.4	68.8	61.4	67.5	66.1	48.0	68.9	72.7	78.1	65.5
Chats with child about school (sometimes)	27.3	23.4	31.3	25.6	28.7	41.0	23.1	20.0	18.6	25.7
Helps child with homework (always)	7.8	18.0	16.1	14.2	20.9	25.0	17.3	20.0	19.1	16.9
Helps child with homework (sometimes)	31.2	32.8	25.9	35.9	35.7	36.0	39.8	34.6	30.0	34.4
Discusses post-grad plans with child (always)	20.8	65.6	48.6	60.0	59.5	52.5	55.5	67.3	68.3	57.4
Discusses post-grad plans with child (sometimes)	37.7	28.9	35.8	30.5	34.5	31.7	33.2	20.0	26.1	31.3
Meets with teachers (always)	20.8	75.0	54.0	62.3	67.2	51.5	63.9	54.6	63.3	60.4
Meets with teachers (sometimes)	26.0	18.0	27.0	24.1	19.0	28.7	21.4	29.1	14.8	22.4
Parental Experiences										
Feels discriminated against in host society (always)	9.1	11.2	5.1	4.7	2.6	4.0	4.1	7.3	2.4	4.9
Feels discriminated against in host society (sometimes)	48.1	28.8	15.3	22.9	18.4	24.2	21.3	21.8	17.1	22.4
Same opportunities between natives and immigrants (strongly agree)	29.9	38.6	36.8	29.3	29.8	48.5	38.4	21.8	32.8	34.0
Same opportunities between natives and immigrants (agree)	37.7	52.8	55.2	59.7	63.2	48.5	56.4	65.5	60.2	56.9
Worried about influences at school (strongly agree)	36.4	40.3	26.0	32.6	32.2	20.8	29.6	21.8	30.8	30.8
Worried about influences at school (agree)	41.6	40.3	43.9	48.7	39.1	47.5	50.7	47.3	44.1	46.3
Child should be educated by Spanish customs (strongly agree)	15.6	26.4	17.7	16.6	17.2	27.7	23.0	12.5	21.2	19.8
Child should be educated by Spanish customs (agree)	53.3	61.2	57.1	68.6	65.5	58.4	64.4	66.1	62.0	63.7
Satisfied with Spanish educational system (strongly agree)	27.3	34.1	36.6	33.1	23.0	45.0	36.9	32.1	31.3	33.8
Satisfied with Spanish educational system (agree)	41.6	58.1	52.3	53.5	57.5	44.0	51.7	67.9	56.7	53.4
Receive help from co-ethnics (strongly agree)	28.6	9.4	12.8	7.5	13.2	20.0	7.3	5.5	2.5	9.6
Receive help from co-ethnics (agree)	50.7	50.8	51.2	52.1	45.6	55.0	53.7	52.7	49.8	51.6
Keep in touch with co-ethnics (strongly agree)	27.3	15.0	21.7	13.9	10.5	25.0	12.0	18.2	11.8	15.3
Keep in touch with co-ethnics (agree)	54.6	48.8	53.7	64.4	58.8	53.0	56.1	54.6	52.5	57.2
Child should know about their homeland (strongly agree)	40.3	44.1	49.4	42.7	37.7	43.0	40.2	54.6	48.1	43.6
Child should know about their homeland (agree)	49.4	51.2	46.6	55.2	58.8	45.0	54.8	41.8	47.1	51.9

Source: ILSEG (2008)

Table 5.2. Descriptive statistics of analytical sample by focal outcomes and predictors across ethno-national origin groups in the U.S.

	Ethno-national origin group											Sample Average
	China	Phillippines	Vietnam	Ecuador	Mexican	Nicaragua	Laos	Other Asia	South & Central America	Caribbean	Other Countries	
Youth Outcomes												
University Expectations	94.7	85.4	79.3	88.0	65.6	83.8	52.2	71.4	83.3	85.3	84.5	79.1
Entrepreneurial Success Frame	2.8	0.3	2.1	0.0	3.5	0.5	3.4	0.9	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.2
Educational Success Frame	76.3	82.7	77.1	76.8	71.3	81.7	79.5	79.8	75.1	80.2	76.7	77.9
Parental Predictors												
Parental Expectations (Outcome & Predictor)												
University or higher	86.5	93.3	86.7	74.1	55.1	74.2	71.7	46.6	70.4	77.7	82.4	74.7
High school or lower	0.0	2.0	1.6	1.6	9.3	2.0	10.9	19.5	1.7	3.6	3.9	4.6
Parental Engagement												
Chats with child about school (always)	27.0	68.8	43.4	92.5	77.5	88.3	47.8	86.8	94.1	84.0	83.7	75.9
Chats with child about school (sometimes)	51.4	27.5	38.2	6.8	16.4	10.7	34.8	9.9	5.1	12.9	14.4	18.4
Helps child with homework (always)	18.9	17.1	9.3	13.0	14.6	18.7	11.4	7.6	18.4	13.3	18.3	14.4
Helps child with homework (sometimes)	70.3	53.7	77.7	31.5	52.9	34.0	75.0	66.4	14.6	41.8	32.7	47.5
Discusses post-grad plans with child (always)	32.4	67.6	45.0	90.7	73.8	88.8	50.5	71.9	92.5	88.8	80.8	74.9
Discusses post-grad plans with child (sometimes)	54.1	29.0	40.2	8.3	19.2	8.7	28.8	21.5	6.3	9.8	14.4	19.2
Meets with teachers	37.8	76.8	60.6	86.0	74.2	82.5	81.5	87.5	88.2	90.1	68.6	79.0
Rules about keeping GPA	63.6	72.6	64.2	87.7	84.7	87.9	57.2	83.0	94.9	96.0	81.1	78.2
Rules about doing homework	76.3	91.2	88.0	95.1	90.5	97.1	85.9	93.4	98.7	98.6	89.3	92.7
Belongs to PTA	37.8	76.8	60.6	86.0	74.2	82.5	81.5	87.5	88.2	90.1	68.6	79.0
Volunteers at child's school	21.6	57.8	16.9	60.9	27.1	38.5	43.5	18.3	49.2	58.7	57.8	44.0
Parental Experiences												
Feels discriminated against in host society	33.3	40.2	27.4	29.5	29.6	29.6	42.9	17.1	25.8	37.7	34.7	31.9
Receive poor service in stores and restaurants (sometimes/often)	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.9	2.6	4.9	2.2	2.6	2.6	10.4	6.1	3.5
Receive poor service in stores and restaurants (never)	68.4	71.2	85.5	21.7	73.8	4.9	73.1	83.8	11.5	9.5	27.3	46.2
Feels unwelcomed in public places (sometimes/often)	5.3	2.0	0.0	2.6	3.0	4.9	0.6	0.0	1.7	7.7	5.1	2.7
Feels unwelcomed in public places (never)	71.1	77.9	80.0	21.7	76.2	4.4	88.0	87.2	11.2	10.4	28.3	48.4
Worried about influences at school (strongly agree)	51.4	33.4	71.1	46.0	42.8	38.1	80.9	53.8	38.7	36.6	34.0	46.7
Worried about influences at school (agree)	18.9	23.6	19.1	15.1	15.3	8.8	14.2	21.9	17.0	16.1	16.5	16.9
Child should be educated own ethnicity's customs	44.4	20.1	75.8	28.1	38.0	29.1	67.4	70.8	38.6	35.8	26.3	40.2
Child should be educated by US customs	13.9	12.2	3.3	33.6	44.7	41.4	1.1	10.8	40.3	25.2	38.4	25.6
Child should be educated by both customs	41.7	67.8	20.9	38.3	17.3	29.6	31.5	18.3	21.2	39.0	35.4	34.2
Satisfied with US educational system (strongly agree)	48.7	57.7	63.6	51.4	52.1	46.3	49.7	53.8	36.1	57.0	48.1	52.1
Satisfied with US educational system (agree)	48.7	38.7	32.0	37.7	40.6	43.4	46.4	39.5	46.6	37.2	36.5	39.8
Receive help from co-ethnics (strongly agree)	13.9	31.6	13.3	56.5	16.9	13.3	14.2	38.8	13.8	28.4	38.2	27.2
Receive help from co-ethnics (agree)	47.2	36.1	63.9	28.8	31.7	22.7	54.1	40.5	28.1	31.2	20.2	36.0
Keep in touch with co-ethnics (strongly agree)	29.7	50.8	64.3	67.6	45.9	44.7	36.4	69.2	24.4	42.2	36.7	49.2
Keep in touch with co-ethnics (agree)	27.0	25.0	30.5	18.1	31.8	20.4	51.6	16.2	23.5	27.1	22.2	26.6
Child should know about their homeland (strongly agree)	70.3	74.4	81.9	85.8	78.6	93.2	53.3	84.6	73.1	76.0	69.2	77.8
Child should know about their homeland (agree)	18.9	21.1	14.9	9.1	13.8	4.4	42.9	12.8	17.2	16.4	21.3	16.6
Share information about opportunities with neighbors (strongly agree)	8.1	18.9	5.3	7.3	9.0	6.9	1.6	33.9	1.7	4.9	10.8	9.3
Share information about opportunities with neighbors (agree)	16.2	39.3	12.6	54.3	47.0	38.6	26.1	39.8	52.7	46.6	42.2	40.7
Save money for child's education	52.6	69.3	28.9	40.7	23.1	28.2	19.9	35.5	28.3	27.6	47.1	36.5

Source: CILS (1992)

(versus 15 percent of the sample). As for the importance of transnational ties, Chinese parents in the U.S. are slightly less likely than other groups to think that it is very important for their children to know about their parental homeland (70 percent versus 78 percent). (The knowledge of parental homeland measure is not available in ILSEG.)

As a side note, in terms of parental investment into their children's education, Chinese parents are much more likely than most other groups (except Filipinos) to have money set aside for their children's college tuition. (This measure is not available ILSEG. However, based on interviews with Chinese youth respondents and their parents in Spain and Italy, none have put away money for their child's tuition should they attend university.) See Tables F and G in the Appendix for the cross-tabulations of the parental and youth control variables by ethno-national origins.

Regression Results

I. Youth University Expectations

In the first set of analytical models, youth respondents' university expectation is the focal outcome. Looking first at the results for ILSEG (see Table 5.3), even in the baseline model, only two groups significantly more likely than the Chinese to expect to attend university in Spain: Colombians and youth from other European countries and North America. (Keep into consideration that these results apply to the subset of youth whose parents agree to participate in the parental sample, which is why there are slight discrepancies compared to results for *all* youth's university expectation which is also an analytical outcome in previous chapters.) Once parental and youth control variables are included into the next model, these significant differences disappear altogether. As for the predictors of parental involvement, only one has

significant effects on youth's university expectations – the significance of parental university expectations is sustained even in the full model, which accounts for all of the predictors of parental involvement in tandem. On average, youth whose parents expect them to attend university have a net advantage of about 14 percent to have university expectations. Note that actual measures of parental involvement in their children's schooling appear to have negligible effect on their youth's university expectations.

Turning to the CILS results (see Table 5.4), in the baseline model, several groups are significantly less likely than the Chinese to expect to attend university, including Vietnamese, Mexican, Laotian and other Asian youth. The addition of the parental and youth control variables fully accounts for the net disadvantage among Vietnamese and other Asian youth but also renders significant coefficients for several groups that had insignificant results in the unadjusted model including Ecuador, Nicaragua, South America, Caribbean and other countries. This suggests that if the Chinese and these latter groups had similar socio-demographic profiles at the youth and parental levels, the Chinese youth would be significantly more likely to have university expectations. As for the subsequent analytical models that account for parental involvement, only the model which includes parental educational expectations provides a certain degree of explanation for the Chinese advantage in youth's university expectations although none of the coefficients are rendered non-significant. Parents who expects their children to receive a bachelor's degree have a net probability of nearly 10 percent higher than those who expect them to just graduate from high school to have children who also expects to attend university.

Table 5.3. Logistic regression of youth's university expectations by parental expectations, engagement and experiences in Spain

	YOUTH'S UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS																	
	M1: National Origins			M2: Youth + Parental			M3: Parental Expectations			M4: Parental Engagement			M5: Parental Experiences			M6: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)																		
Colombia	0.729*	0.372	0.134	0.690	0.442	0.114	0.394	0.461	0.063	0.703	0.456	0.116	0.820	0.454	0.135	0.671	0.483	0.106
Morocco	0.484	0.366	0.089	0.464	0.430	0.077	0.178	0.444	0.028	0.496	0.439	0.082	0.544	0.440	0.089	0.408	0.459	0.065
Ecuador	0.111	0.337	0.020	-0.006	0.398	-0.001	-0.248	0.417	-0.040	-0.010	0.410	-0.002	0.061	0.407	0.010	-0.081	0.436	-0.013
Peru	0.339	0.388	0.062	0.117	0.446	0.019	-0.235	0.462	-0.038	0.135	0.456	0.022	0.187	0.458	0.031	-0.006	0.482	-0.001
South Asia	0.657	0.394	0.121	0.170	0.460	0.028	-0.138	0.474	-0.022	0.207	0.468	0.034	0.312	0.472	0.051	0.138	0.490	0.022
South & Central America	0.591	0.340	0.109	0.346	0.395	0.057	0.054	0.414	0.009	0.334	0.409	0.055	0.344	0.408	0.056	0.176	0.437	0.028
Africa & Middle East	0.720	0.436	0.133	0.700	0.519	0.116	0.420	0.537	0.067	0.574	0.535	0.095	0.683	0.534	0.112	0.329	0.565	0.052
Europe & North America	0.744*	0.352	0.137	0.706	0.406	0.117	0.485	0.423	0.078	0.648	0.417	0.107	0.729	0.421	0.120	0.580	0.445	0.092
Parental Expectations (ref: ESO)																		
Secondary schooling	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.411	0.433	-0.066	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.331	0.452	-0.052
Vocational school	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.378	0.372	-0.060	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.215	0.390	-0.034
Some university	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.364	0.404	0.058	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.446	0.435	0.070
University or higher	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.694*	0.351	0.111	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.873*	0.375	0.138
Parental Involvement Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.012	0.127	0.002	--	--	--	-0.153	0.139	-0.024
Parental Experiences																		
Perceived Discrimination Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				-0.030	0.122	-0.005	-0.147	0.126	-0.023
Strength of Co-ethnic Ties (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				-0.073	0.147	-0.012	-0.114	0.155	-0.018
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		
Constant	-1.558			6.750			5.568			6.388			6.594			5.509		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.018			0.135			0.179			0.133			0.135			0.180		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-911.834			-686.585			-659.531			-677.333			-655.838			-620.295		
N	1282																	

^a "Control" variables include the following socio-demographic and economic variables. For parents, their gender, age, length of residence in Spain., Spanish citizenship, Knowledge of Spanish index, level of education (i.e. middle school or less, high school, university or higher), self-employment status. For youths, their gender, age, nativity status (i.e. birthplace and, for those not born in Spain, their age at arrival), course level (i.e. ESO levels 1, 2 or 3), number of siblings, whether or not they reside with both parents, city of residence (i.e. Madrid vs. Barcelona), and, whether their home language is Spanish or not. The coefficients for the control variables are not shown.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Source: 2008 ILSEG - Madrid and Barcelona Surveys

Table 5.4. Logistic regression of youth's university expectations by parental expectations, engagement and experiences in the U.S.

YOUTH'S UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS																		
	M1: National Origins			M2: Youth + Parental Controls			M3: Parental Expectations			M4: Parental Engagement			M5: Parental Experiences			M6: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)																		
Philippines	-1.125	0.742	-0.173	-1.434	0.767	-0.210	-1.369	0.767	-0.198	-1.590*	0.791	-0.262	-1.493*	0.776	-0.213	-1.496	0.798	-0.232
Vietnam	-1.549*	0.743	-0.239	-1.103	0.763	-0.162	-1.077	0.763	-0.155	-1.097	0.774	-0.181	-1.104	0.770	-0.157	-0.973	0.779	-0.151
Ecuador	-0.896	0.743	-0.138	-2.411**	0.886	-0.353	-2.252*	0.887	-0.325	-2.936**	1.003	-0.483	-2.967**	0.957	-0.423	-3.864***	1.214	-0.600
Mexican	-2.242**	0.736	-0.346	-1.713*	0.760	-0.251	-1.496*	0.761	-0.216	-1.672*	0.779	-0.275	-1.667*	0.770	-0.237	-1.223	0.794	-0.190
Nicaragua	-1.245	0.751	-0.192	-2.391**	0.885	-0.350	-2.247*	0.887	-0.324	-3.052**	0.999	-0.502	-2.908**	0.955	-0.414	-4.105***	1.217	-0.638
Laos	-2.802***	0.741	-0.432	-2.154**	0.762	-0.316	-2.091**	0.762	-0.303	-2.119**	0.777	-0.349	-2.240**	0.770	-0.319	-2.130**	0.785	-0.331
Other Asia	-1.974**	0.754	-0.304	-1.367	0.780	-0.200	-1.104	0.784	-0.159	-1.632*	0.802	-0.269	-1.321	0.794	-0.188	-1.080	0.830	-0.168
South & Central America	-1.286	0.747	-0.198	-2.555**	0.874	-0.374	-2.374**	0.876	-0.343	-3.172***	0.981	-0.522	-2.952**	0.947	-0.420	-3.968***	1.204	-0.616
Caribbean	-1.135	0.751	-0.175	-2.304**	0.890	-0.337	-2.217*	0.892	-0.320	-3.061**	1.011	-0.504	-2.823**	0.959	-0.402	-4.164***	1.224	-0.647
Other Countries	-1.197	0.776	-0.184	-2.434**	0.876	-0.356	-2.344**	0.877	-0.338	-2.939**	0.962	-0.484	-2.792**	0.918	-0.398	-3.884***	1.102	-0.603
Parental Expectations (ref: high school or less)																		
Vocational school / 2 year college	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.088	0.240	0.013	--	--	--				0.094	0.312	0.015
Bachelor's degree or higher	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.640**	0.232	0.092	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.797**	0.305	0.124
Parental Involvement Index (Range: 0-3)											0.049	0.051	0.008					
Parental Experiences																		
Perceived Discrimination Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				0.371**	0.140	0.053	0.584***	0.177	0.091
Strength of Co-ethnic Ties (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				0.093	0.112	0.013	0.023	0.144	0.004
"Control" variables included in the model?		No		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
Constant		2.890		5.865		5.196		5.196		5.970		5.573		5.190		5.190		
Nagelkerke R ²		0.094		0.185		0.194		0.194		0.173		0.192		0.214		0.214		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq		-1165.432		-1033.870		-1010.781		-1010.781		-693.887		-929.529		-602.536		-602.536		
N		2421																

^a "Control" variables include the following socio-demographic and economic variables. For parents, their gender, age, length of residence in the U.S., U.S. citizenship, Knowledge of English index, level of education (i.e. middle school or less, high school, university or higher), self-employment status. For youths, their gender, age, nativity status (i.e. birthplace and, for those not born in the U.S., their age at arrival), course level (i.e. 8th vs. 9th grade), number of siblings, whether or not they reside with both parents, city of residence (i.e. San Diego vs. Ft. Lauderdale), and, whether their home language is English or not. The coefficients for the control variables are not shown.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Source: 1992 CILS Parental and Youth Surveys

The other models that include measures of parental engagement and experiences (i.e. Models 4 and 5) offer minimal explanation for these group disparities in youth's educational expectations. Among the measures of parental engagement and experiences, only the parent's perceived discrimination index is significant – in Model 5, a one unit increase on the perceived discrimination index increases the net probability of youth's university expectations by 5 percent. In the full model, the differences between the Chinese and other groups which have significant coefficients in the control model (i.e. Model 2) have been significantly exacerbated – for example, the net probability for Nicaraguans to have university expectations compared to the Chinese decreases by 3 to 6 percent between the control and full model. Among the parental involvement predictors, both parental university expectations and perceived discrimination remain positively predictive of youth's university expectations; whereas parental expectations partially accounted for the discrepancy between the Chinese and other groups, perceived discrimination seemed to exacerbate the differences. This suggests that Chinese youth's higher-than-average levels of university expectations is partially explained by their parents' commensurately high levels of university expectations for them, but that their parents' relatively lower levels of perceived discrimination buffers against the groups disparities.

II. Parental University Expectations for Youth

In this set of analytical models, the focus shifts from the youth to their parents with parental university expectations for their children as the focal outcome of interest. Based on the ILSEG results, parents from all of the other groups are more likely than the Chinese in Spain to expect their children to attend university in the baseline model (see Table 5.5). In the baseline model, parents from all of the other groups are more likely than the Chinese to expect their children to

attend university. The significance of these coefficients remain significant even adjusting for differences in socio-demographic profiles; in fact, the differences between Chinese and non-Chinese parents in their university expectations appear to be exacerbated in Model 2 which suggest that dissimilarities in their profiles might actually obfuscate the degree of disparity in university expectations between Chinese and non-Chinese parents.

As for measures of parental involvement, both parent engagement and experiences are significant predictors of their university expectations. Parental engagement is a particularly strong predictor – for every one unit increase in the parental involvement index, parents are 13 percent more likely to have university expectations for their children (see Model 3). As for parental expectations, every one unit increase in the perceived discrimination index increases parental university expectations by a net probability of 9 percent while every one unit increase in the strength of co-ethnic ties index increases parental university expectations by a net probability of 6 percent (see Model 4). In the full model, the aggregate effect of parental involvement and experiences fully explains the differences in university expectations between the Chinese and some groups (e.g. South Asian, European/North American), while it substantially decreases the magnitude of the differences for other groups – for example, the net advantage of Moroccan parents compared to Chinese parents decreases from 38 to 26 percent between the control model (Model 2) and the full model (Model 5). Parental involvement remains the strongest predictor of their university expectations, although their degree of perceived discrimination and the strength of their co-ethnic ties are still significant positive predictors of their university expectations as well.

Turning to the CILS results (see Table 5.6), in the baseline model, parents from several other groups – including Mexicans, Other Asians and South and Central Americans – are

significantly less likely than Chinese parents to have university expectations for their children. The inclusion of control variables appears to only exacerbate these differences for these groups in Model 2. Likewise, the addition of measures of parental involvement further exacerbates these differences – for example, among South and Central Americans, the net probability of *not* expecting their child to attend university compared to Chinese parents goes from 16 to 37 percent once parental involvement is accounted for (i.e. Model 1 versus Model 3). This suggests that if Chinese parents were as actively engaged in their children's studies as much as parents from these other groups that the differences in their level of university expectations would be even higher. For every one unit of increase on the parental involvement index, the net probability of parents having university expectations increases by 5 per cent. By contrast, the strength of co-ethnic ties in the subsequent model does partially explain Chinese parents' significantly higher levels of university expectations as compared to Mexican parents, and even fully explains the difference against South/Central American parents. (Note that the other measure of parental experiences – perceived discrimination in the U.S. – is not a significant predictor.) For every one unit increase on the strength of co-ethnic ties index, the net advantage of parental university expectations increases by 4 percent. In the full model, the significance of the parental involvement index trumps the strength of co-ethnic ties index which is rendered non-significant. However, these measures of parental involvement offer minimal explanation for group differences – even in the adjusted model, Mexican and other Asian parents are about 30 and 40 percent, respectively, less likely than the Chinese to have university expectations for their child.

Table 5.5. Logistic regression of parental expectation by parental engagement and experiences in Spain

	PARENT'S UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS FOR CHILD														
	M1: National Origins			M2: Youth + Parental Controls			M3: Parental Engagement			M4: Parental Experiences			M5: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)															
Colombia	1.510***	0.334	0.369	1.771***	0.416	0.390	1.378***	0.429	0.296	1.522***	0.421	0.332	1.133**	0.435	0.241
Morocco	1.131***	0.321	0.277	1.723***	0.394	0.379	1.464***	0.405	0.315	1.441***	0.399	0.314	1.221**	0.412	0.260
Ecuador	1.053***	0.296	0.258	1.372***	0.369	0.302	0.987**	0.382	0.212	1.172**	0.372	0.255	0.800*	0.386	0.170
Peru	1.426***	0.338	0.349	1.707***	0.411	0.376	1.271**	0.422	0.273	1.446***	0.416	0.315	1.028*	0.428	0.219
South Asia	1.163***	0.346	0.285	1.312***	0.419	0.289	1.030*	0.433	0.222	1.007*	0.427	0.219	0.721	0.441	0.153
South & Central America	1.228***	0.302	0.300	1.454***	0.372	0.320	1.066**	0.385	0.229	1.158**	0.378	0.252	0.787*	0.391	0.168
Africa & Middle East	1.379***	0.392	0.337	1.791***	0.484	0.394	1.482**	0.498	0.319	1.822***	0.501	0.397	1.535**	0.518	0.326
Europe & North America	1.247***	0.314	0.305	1.305***	0.380	0.287	0.981**	0.392	0.211	0.958**	0.388	0.209	0.655	0.400	0.139
Parental Involvement Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.622***	0.112	0.134	--	--	--	0.656***	0.119	0.140
Parental Experiences															
Perceived Discrimination Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.397***	0.106	0.086	0.349***	0.109	0.074
Strength of Co-ethnic Ties (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.286*	0.128	0.062	0.356**	0.132	0.076
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		
Constant	-1.305			3.795			2.442			2.618			1.251		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.023			0.154			0.182			0.166			0.194		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-1155.668			-879.577			-851.458			-838.229			-811.391		
N	1324														

^a 'Control' variables include the following socio-demographic and economic variables. For parents, their gender, age, length of residence in Spain, Spanish citizenship, Knowledge of Spanish index, level of education (i.e. middle school or less, high school, university or higher), self-employment status. For youths, their gender, age, nativity status (i.e. birthplace and, for those not born in Spain, their age at arrival), course level (i.e. ESO levels 1, 2 or 3), number of siblings, whether or not they reside with both parents, city of residence (i.e. Madrid vs. Barcelona), and, whether their home language is Spanish or not. The coefficients for the control variables are not shown.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Source: 2008 ILSEG - Madrid and Barcelona Surveys

Table 5.6. Logistic regression of parental expectation by parental engagement and experiences in the U.S.

	PARENT'S UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS FOR CHILD														
	M1: National Origins			M2: Youth + Parental Controls			M3: Parental Engagement			M4: Parental Experiences			M5: Full Model		
	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME	Coeff.	S.D.	AME
National Origins (ref: China)															
Philippines	0.873	0.489	0.154	-0.483	0.673	-0.077	-0.896	0.716	-0.138	-0.426	0.689	-0.066	-0.876	0.733	-0.130
Vietnam	0.170	0.482	0.030	-0.026	0.659	-0.004	-0.296	0.679	-0.045	-0.062	0.668	-0.009	-0.333	0.687	-0.049
Ecuador	-0.627	0.460	-0.110	-1.220	0.758	-0.194	-2.180*	0.887	-0.335	-0.929	0.802	-0.143	-1.789	0.999	-0.265
Mexican	-1.509***	0.458	-0.266	-1.724***	0.646	-0.274	-2.204***	0.681	-0.338	-1.594*	0.658	-0.245	-2.068**	0.694	-0.307
Nicaragua	-0.601	0.473	-0.106	-0.914	0.761	-0.145	-1.772*	0.891	-0.272	-0.368	0.806	-0.057	-1.133	1.007	-0.168
Laos	-0.780	0.473	-0.137	-0.619	0.655	-0.098	-1.238	0.681	-0.190	-0.487	0.663	-0.075	-1.228	0.689	-0.182
Other Asia	-1.856***	0.481	-0.327	-2.001**	0.667	-0.318	-2.715***	0.706	-0.417	-2.136**	0.681	-0.329	-2.752***	0.726	-0.408
South & Central America	-0.910*	0.466	-0.160	-1.563*	0.750	-0.249	-2.378**	0.885	-0.365	-1.056	0.797	-0.162	-1.728	1.012	-0.256
Caribbean	-0.453	0.473	-0.080	-0.846	0.764	-0.135	-1.809*	0.901	-0.278	-0.320	0.810	-0.049	-1.199	1.020	-0.178
Other Countries	-0.251	0.510	-0.044	-1.115	0.776	-0.177	-1.185	0.931	-0.182	-0.782	0.817	-0.120	-0.749	1.055	-0.111
Parental Involvement Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.320***	0.053	0.049	--	--	--	0.304***	0.058	0.045
Parental Experiences															
Perceived Discrimination Index (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.005	0.131	0.001	0.277	0.176	0.041
Strength of Co-ethnic Ties (Range: 0-3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.254**	0.106	0.039	0.199	0.145	0.030
"Control" variables included in the model?	No			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		
Constant	1.674			3.172			1.201			2.841			1.034		
Nagelkerke R ²	0.127			0.245			0.290			0.255			0.300		
-2 Log Likelihood Chi-Sq	-1288.059			-1107.250			-655.266			-990.765			-584.647		
N	2436														

^a 'Control' variables include the following socio-demographic and economic variables. For parents, their gender, age, length of residence in the U.S., U.S. citizenship, Knowledge of English index, level of education (i.e. middle school or less, high school, university or higher), self-employment status. For youths, their gender, age, nativity status (i.e. birthplace and, for those not born in the U.S., their age at arrival), course level (i.e. 8th vs. 9th grade), number of siblings, whether or not they reside with both parents, city of residence (i.e. San Diego vs. Ft. Lauderdale), and, whether their home language is English or not. The coefficients for the control variables are not shown.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Source: 1992 CILS Parental and Youth Surveys

Exploring the Role of Parental Involvement on Educational Expectations: Chinese Youth and Parents in Their Own Words

“An Emphasis on Education”: Chinese Parents’ Well-ingrained Expectations for their Children’s Academic Excellence in the U.S.

Among the Chinese youth respondents interviewed in the ISGMNY study, many identified a culturally-distinct style of parenting that they were met with when growing up. Allegedly rooted in Asian culture, Chinese youth felt that they were raised differently than their native American counterparts: Chinese parents raised their children to fulfill their parents’ definition of success, which is tantamount to academic excellence, and adhered to strict rules about studying and obeying their parents’ expectations. Cecilia, who is a college student at a design school, describes the main difference between Chinese and American style parenting as such: “I think the Chinese style of raising children is more firm and strict in the way that they train their children. And I think Americans raise their children with more of an open mind.” For Janine, who just entered college as an undergraduate student, she and her other Chinese friends were raised in the following way: “I think we’re just really grounded in a work ethic, like all the way. A lot of my friends are raised with just studying in mind and everything else is kind of discouraged.” By comparison, her parents are a bit more lenient but school still takes precedence above all other pursuits: “My dad still insists that I have to keep studying, keep ahead with the books. He’s already told me that everything else is a distraction. But by the same token, I have had a lot of privileges, like being able to go out and not have a curfew.” She thoughtfully analyzes her own situation by suggesting that her parents have implicitly conveyed their high educational expectations to her so that they did not need to enforce strict rules about doing

homework and going out; instead, studying hard had been “ a kind of ingrained philosophy... [that involved] more abstract concepts than actual rules like curfews”.

For many Chinese youth, the pursuit of academic excellence often comes at the expense of self-expression and exploration of self-identity, which are formative experiences during adolescence. Immigrant children are particularly prone to feel a sense of obligation and filial piety towards their parents, whose decision to move to the U.S. in the first place was filled with the hopes of improving their children’s life chances required great sacrifice. Jason, a college-educated twentysomething, remarked that growing up, he felt he was raised differently from his American friends: “I know for the Asian culture, we’re brought up to be very quiet, very reserved. I see this in a lot of Asians. We’re not very opinionated. We hardly speak. We don’t voice ourselves. I think we need to have opinions, have a voice. It’s better for our culture.” As for how this kind of childrearing affected his personal development, he felt that he became “very quiet and not opinionated” and was taught to “always hold his feelings back”. In retrospect, he wished that he and his parents had “more open channels of communication so that they knew what [he] was feeling”.

Strict parenting can lead to low self-esteem among some Chinese youth. A few respondents talked about how they rebelled against their parents’ unreasonably stern rules and unrealistic educational expectations. Rick, a college student at a middle-tiered university, felt that his parents’ ultra-strict parenting alienated him from his non-Chinese peers:

“My parents really stressed the education part. Back when I was growing up, [it was] no fun – just do your homework before you go out. Blah, blah, blah. They really didn’t encourage extracurricular activities or going out. They were like, ‘You got to get straight As. You got to get those high grades. My friends’ parents encouraged them to play sports and do other things. My friends that were white got to play ball. Their parents didn’t really care about their grades, as long as they passed.”

Because he was raised so starkly different from his peers, he often got into arguments with his parents, defying their authority and disobeying their rules. He recalls:

“My parents would also ways insist that I do my homework and then go have fun. But by the time I would finish my work, it would be too late and they won’t let me leave the house. So I said, ‘You know what? I’m going to go have my fun and leave my work until later.’ So we got into a lot of arguments. They would nag and say, ‘How come you’re not doing your homework? You’re watching too much TV. You’re playing too many video games.’ Blah, blah, blah. And then I would just it in their face, when I get an A. Things like that.”

Even among Chinese youth who do gain entry into college and more importantly, get into a top-tiered university, yet another point of contention between parents and youth is which field of study to major in. For many Chinese parents, the ultimate American dream is to for their child to work in a prestigious and lucrative profession – namely, medicine, law, engineering and accounting. With this goal in mind, parents often put undue pressure on their children to choose certain classes in high school and to pursue certain majors in college – that is, practical majors that offer job security. Yet, strong parental input favoring a particular career can present problems for Chinese youth whose interests or talents are at odds with parental choices. Jeannie, who attended a prestigious private liberal arts college, felt acute disappointment from her parents for neither pursuing one of their ‘desirable’ professions nor getting into an Ivy League school. She says, “Even though my father never spoke to me about schoolwork or anything like that, there is always the implicit in most Chinese households that you will either go to Harvard or Yale.... And once you go to college, you’re either going to be a lawyer or a doctor.”

Other parents are more subtle in conveying their desires to their children, outwardly encouraging them to ‘do what they like’ while they tried to nudge them into pursuing certain majors of study. Andy, a graduate of an Ivy League college, recalls how his parents – who he

considered ‘atypical’ to other Chinese parents – would encourage him to study what he liked in college even though the expectation that he will graduate from university was ironclad. He says:

“My mother has always stressed education as number one. That’s a priority. But what you do with that is largely to your own design. That said, she has hinted, ‘Oh, I think you’d be a good lawyer because you’re articulate, you can write well, you can argue. But I’m not saying anything.’ She thought that would be a good match but then I expressed that I thought it over and I don’t want to do it. So she said, ‘Okay, that’s fine. You don’t have to do that. I’m not forcing you to do anything.’ They never made me become an engineer or a doctor and they never pushed me in that direction, which I am grateful for.”

Family expectations – even among extended family – intertwined with co-ethnic community norms to impact Chinese youth’s school-related choices. The competitive atmosphere makes ‘average’ Chinese students, even those who went to college but just not top-tiered institutions, feel inadequate. Jeremy, who studied finance at one of New York City’s business colleges, reported that his aunts looked down on him for not getting into an Ivy League school:

“They would tell me, ‘You don’t always have to live up to the standard of what Asian people do about going to Ivy League schools.’ But I think they’re lying. I think they’re just trying to make me feel better because both my aunts went to Barnard, and they would always talk about people whose son went from Stuyvesant to Columbia... [When] my older aunt says, “Whatever you make a living in, it’s fine, at least it’s honest work.” I know she’s saying, “I’m not so sure you can succeed to those standards that we have made for you.”

The academic achievement of the Chinese second-generation is a social currency within the co-ethnic community. Relatives, not just parents, feel entitled to bragging rights over their brood’s accomplishments. Andy describes the academic competition between him and his cousins that his extended family subjects them to:

“Among the cousins, there’s – I don’t know how seriously my cousins take it – a sort of competition. For instance, my dad’s eldest brother, his eldest son went to the same high school as Bill Gates. Wound up going to Harvard and is now going to Wharton for his MBA and so is considered the scion of our family. But a good deal of my other cousins didn’t stack up in that way, in that level of success. As for me, I ended up getting my Eagle Scout and going to Cornell and in some ways, that brings a

certain.... Anyway, I don't like to dwell on that. I don't want to nurture any sort of complexes about that."

Moreover, he talks about how his aunt, who is childless, has made him and his cousins into her 'project,' nearly bribing them to outdo each other at school. He says:

"When I was going to college, she actually wanted to come with me to Ithaca and help me set up my dorm. In exchange for her support – including paying for my flights back home – she expected me to get her a ticket for my graduation. Things like that. She expects to have some say in what we did when we were growing up, as far as school went and things like that."

However, despite strong parental and familial input about college choice and major of study, many of the Chinese respondents reported the generally laissez-faire approach of their parents in terms of their actual involvement in their children's day-to-day schooling routine. Few respondents recall their parents closely supervising them while doing homework, shuttling them around to attend various extracurriculars or tutoring classes, or other types of "Tiger parenting" activities. Even less common is school-based forms of parental involvement, such as regular parent-teacher meetings or participation in the PTA. Growing up, Chris did not recall his parents having much contact with the teachers when he was in elementary school – or as he described, "they just always stayed away from school". However, his parents were strict disciplinarians and kept him in line – even with corporal punishment – if he received poor grades or got in trouble at school: "[With] my dad, there was always fear. If I got in trouble, he would kick my butt, literally. And it really bothered me that in school I used to get in trouble a lot. Little things – throwing paper, having little arguments, just that kind of stuff – and the teachers would call my home and he would just go crazy and beat me up."

While Chris' case is more extreme than most of the experiences of the other respondents, his example highlights the strict and reactionary parenting – which is paradoxically lacking in concrete engagement with and constant supervision over their children's schooling – that is

commonplace in many Chinese households. Rarely then, based on these respondents' testimony, do Chinese parents "over-parent" by becoming overly involved in their children's schooling, selecting their activities, or providing disproportionate assistance for homework and school projects. If anything, they err on the side of "under-parenting" although they hold exceptionally high educational expectations and academic standards for their children.

Finally, parental perceptions and interpretation about discrimination in U.S. society influence their own as well as their children's perception about the importance of schooling. While many believe that higher education provides a buffer against discrimination in the mainstream labor market, there are some respondents whose parents warn them that the academic prowess of Asian-Americans might make them into scapegoats. As Janine, a 19-year-old undergraduate at an Ivy League university whose parents are both PhD holders, responds when asked whether her parents ever warned her about not having enough opportunities: "No, if anything they would talk about affirmative action and reverse discrimination.... They're well-informed about cases where there is some sort of discrimination against Chinese people. They would point out Chinese people who are hurt by Affirmative Action – like, in terms of getting into college, where there's a huge representation of Asians and so, that might play against other Asians." Whether parents perceive a glass ceiling or reverse discrimination, they still largely believe that education is the best equalizer – a deeply entrenched belief that they attempt to instill in their children.

“It Doesn’t Matter to Us, Whether They Go to University or Not”: Chinese Parents’ Low Educational Expecations for their Children in Spain and Italy

Based on the interviews that I conducted in Spain and Italy, the parent respondents were generally quite laissez-faire in their attitudes about their children’s educational prospects. Unlike their American counterparts, Chinese parents across the Atlantic are indifferent to whether or not their children attend university, let alone which university they go to or which major they choose to study. Even the parents of university-attending youth respondents largely left the decision on their children in matters relating to schooling. The Quans, owners of a small grocery store in Madrid, has a son who is attending a fairly prestigious university in Spain. When asked about his son’s schooling, they admit to being very proud of his achievements although they were minimally involved throughout his academic career. Mr. Quan says: “Growing up, I had wanted him to try and keep up with his studies but I had no big dreams for him to go to university or anything like that. He definitely exceeded our expectations. His mom and I don’t know much about schooling in Spain. He’s done well in school not because we’ve pushed him but because of his own hard work.” Their son, Liu Xia, confirms his parents’ support in his decision to apply and attend university, even though they never pressured him to pursue advanced education beyond secondary school. If anything, there was the implicit arrangement set up by his parents that he should take over the grocery store had he not went to university.

Likewise, Mr. Zhang, who is a restaurateur in Milan and an active leader of the Chinese community in the city, echoes a similar sentiment to the Quan’s regarding their children’s schooling. With his daughter in university but a son who stopped after secondary school, he notes that many Chinese youth do not intend to pursue higher education – including his son – because they end up working at and eventually taking over their parents’ business. As for his

own perspective on schooling, he says: “It doesn’t matter to me and my wife, whether they go to university or not. I’d like them to be outstanding but it all depends on the situation. If they want to go to university, they should go ahead. Otherwise, it doesn’t matter to me.”

Nearly all of the youth respondents worked during afterschool hours or the weekend, mainly for the family-owned businesses. The few youth respondents who are college-educated became very adept at managing their time between schoolwork and helping out at their family business – the latter which their parents saw as a commitment that they were expected to fulfill, if not consider as a priority. Gianna, a first-generation college graduate from her family, describes how she struggled to balance between her duties at home and school, although her parents supported her decision to pursue her studies:

“My parents supported my decision to keep studying. Out of hundreds of Chinese youth in the same situation as me, I was the only one who went to *liceo* (i.e. advanced secondary schooling). At the time, when my parents had the restaurant and the other shop, they really needed our help. When I decided to keep going with school, they supported my decision and gave me that opportunity. But at the same time, I was expected to help out a lot at home because I’m the oldest sibling. When I was in high school, I spent half of my time at school and the other half of my time working at my family’s business. In the morning, I would go to school. After lunch, I would have some time to study. But in the afternoons and evenings, I’d be working. I’d come home and study again from 11 to 1 at night.”

When asked about her drive to work so hard at school, despite her familial obligations, she says that she wanted to change her life and she knew that school would be crucial for lifting her above the undesirable destiny of her compatriots in Italy. Even though her parents were relatively supportive of her decision to stay in school, they were unable to be involved in her schooling. Ultimately, she had to rely on her own effort, talent and sheer will to make it to university. When she told her parents that she planned to enter the university preparatory track during secondary school, her parents’ reaction was described as such:

“My dad said that whichever level of school I can go up to, then I should go ahead. If I want to go to university, then he’ll give me that opportunity. He can’t help me with

homework. He also doesn't know how the Italian educational system works – what are the requirements to get into university, he doesn't know. He told me that I'll have to fully rely on myself. If I have that ability, though, then he thinks that I should go ahead."

Self-reliance is the overarching theme for the minority of Chinese youth. Unlike their U.S. counterparts, who are compelled by their parents to go to college, university-bound Chinese youth in Spain and Italy are merely encouraged by parents who allow them to pursue their university ambitions rather than to pressure them to drop out and work for the family business. Lian Mei, a graduate student studying education, returned to night school after dropping out of secondary schooling at the age of 14 because at the time, she felt obliged to help out her family financially by pursuing full-time work as a seamstress. However, upon realizing her dire prospects if she were to stay working at the factory, she decided to enroll in night school which eventually led her to pursue an undergraduate then graduate degree. When asked how her parents felt about her decision to go to night school, she replied: "They didn't really have an opinion. They felt that if I can balance working full-time during the day and then go to school at night, then I should go ahead. But, if one day, I feel too tired from doing this, then I quit school. That's fine too. It's my choice, my freedom."

Peer influence turns out to be more predictive of university ambitions than parental expectations. In Lian Mei's case, her friends' decision to pursue university offset her parents' nonchalance about her educational ambitions, in part due to their lack of knowledge about the Italian school system as well as their lack of expectations for her to attend university. When asked about why many Chinese youth drop out after middle school, she replies: "Young people are left so confused. They don't have the motivation to go to university. More young people just look to their friends. If their friends are not going to university, then they don't see a reason to go either. If my friends don't tell me to go to university and my teachers don't explain why I need to

go, then there's no reason for me to go." In the absence of adequate information about higher education from parents and educators, Chinese youth – mainly the ones who at least, toyed with ambitions of going to university – rely on their friends for how to navigate the school system.

Some of the Chinese youth respondents, who were relatively high achievers and aspired for university, mentioned being met with cautious support from their parents in their academic pursuits. Proud of their achievement yet pragmatic about the utility of a college degree, some Chinese parents do not fully encourage their children's educational ambitions. Xiao Yao, an 18-year-old who is about to graduate from *liceo*, has achieved high grades and even received a scholarship. Her father has advised her to basically find a job, rather than pursue a career. She says: "My father is a realist. He says to find a job in the Chinese restaurant as a waitress and that's it. My mother is a bit more supportive but mostly listens to him." When probed as to why her father feels this way, she replies: "I think for my parents, as long as I can earn money, that's all that matters. They don't really care about whether I have a career or not." While her parents acknowledge that she is a very good student and even her father frequently brags about her achievements in front of co-ethnics, they wanted her to be realistic about her life prospect; in their opinion, higher education was a risk with no guaranteed payoff: "They've heard that many students with a university degree still can't find jobs that correspond with their level of education. We are not such a confident family. We try to take the safer path. We don't like to take risks." To appease her parents, she is currently seeking work as a waitress in case she does not enter into her university of choice or cannot afford the tuition. Although against her father's advice to find work at a Chinese-owned restaurant, she is hoping to join the waiting staff of a mainstream Italian-owned restaurant where the staff works fewer hours and receive better pay compared to those in a Chinese-owned restaurant.

A few Chinese parents are even more vehemently against their children from pursuing academics – no matter how good are their grades or how much they want to go to university. Rosario, who dreams of going to design school, is instead relegated to working full-time at her parents' bakery without pay. When asked why she is willing to push aside her dreams at her parents' decision, she replies: "I should do this. They raised me. It's my duty to help them." Narratives of filial duty and obligation appear repeatedly in Chinese youth's accounts of their schooling decisions. Like their U.S. counterparts, some Chinese parents in Spain and Italy also express strong inputs about their children's educational choices, even what they study. However, whereas Chinese American parents want their children to attend prestigious universities and to earn professional degrees (such as law or medicine), Chinese parents across the Atlantic want their children to go to trade schools and to earn practical degrees. Dario is currently a student at a vocational college studying to become an electrician; it was not his decision to earn an electrician degree but it was at his parents' behest. When asked why his mother wanted him to become an electrician, he explains: "She told me to study becoming an electrician so I just followed what she said. But I actually don't like it. When I asked her why I should do this, she said that it's good for my future so that's why I took the courses." With minimal interest in becoming an electrician, Dario says that he will appease his parents by earning the electrician degree but he does not intend to actually become an electrician. Instead, he will try to pursue a career based on his own interests, such as the culinary arts.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to examine whether differential levels and styles of parental involvement contribute to dissimilar educational and career ambitions among immigrant youth

across ethno-national origin groups – in particular, the divergent ambitions between Chinese youth in the U.S. and their counterparts in Southern Italy vis-à-vis their non-Chinese peers. Parental involvement is a multi-faceted concept that encompasses several forms of behavior including their university expectations, engagement with their children's schooling at home and school, and their experiences with the host society which in turn, shape their attitudes about the importance of schooling.

The quantitative analyses address this issue by measuring the degree to which parental involvement explains differences between Chinese and non-Chinese youth across two outcomes: youth's university expectations and parental expectations. To predict youth's university expectations, the most consistently significant predictor is parental educational expectations. (Obviously, where parental expectation is the focal outcome, parental expectation is not included as a predictor.) Youth whose parents expect them to attend university are very likely to themselves to have university expectations in both the U.S. and Spain. Moreover, the relatively high university expectations among Chinese parents in the U.S. versus their relatively low expectations in Spain account for disparities in their children's university expectations.

Turning to various forms of parental engagement with regards to their children's schooling, they are perhaps less important than expected. That said, the relative insignificance of parental engagement – whether home or school-based – in my findings does align with the findings in Robinson and Harris' (2014) book, which also reveal the ineffectiveness of parents' active participation in their children's studies, contrary to popular wisdom. That said, a very possible reason why parental involvement matters less than expect is some degree of reverse causality. For instance, parents tend to be more involved with their children's schooling –

particularly in terms of helping them with homework and meeting their teachers regularly – when they are under-performing not over-performing at school.

Parental experiences in their host societies, including perceptions of discrimination and the accessibility of the co-ethnic as a resource, are similarly only modest determinants of youth ambitions, particularly in Spain. In the U.S., there is evidence of the positive role of selective acculturation in promoting immigrant youth's scholarly pursuits – that is, parents who maintain strong ties in their co-ethnic communities have a conduit for sharing information that help their children make the right decisions about school. As for the relationship between parental expectations and experiences, once more the former acts as a mediator for the latter in influencing youth's ambitions.

Supplementary interview data corroborates much of the quantitative findings. In general, the interviews highlight the dissimilarities in the level and style of parental involvement between the Chinese in the U.S. and those in Spain and Italy. For one, Chinese parents in the U.S. generally expect their children to earn at least a college degree, regardless of their own educational background. Based on the testimony of Chinese-American youth, their parents also have strong input on which university they attend – preferably a prestigious Ivy League school – and in which major of study to earn a degree, with a strong preference for the sciences and finance. Contrary to expectations, Chinese-American parents are not heavily involved in the daily minutiae of their children's schooling lives; most of the respondents do not recall parents who monitored them closely while they did their homework or met with teachers regularly to discuss their children's progress. That said, Chinese parents and the greater co-ethnic community at large convey a strong message about the importance of schooling – filial obligation and duty

are tied to second-generation academic achievement, which is expected in return for their immigrant parents' great sacrifices.

By comparison, Chinese parents in Spain and Italy do not expect their children to attend university. A minority has aspirations for their children to graduate with college degrees but it is merely a hope rather than an expectation. The parents of the few Chinese youth who have pursued advanced studies are generally proud of their children's accomplishments but they would emphasize that they never pressured them to do well in school. From the youth's perspective, they feel fortunate that they have parents who supported to their decision to attend university, rather than compel them to stay working in the family business or ethnic enclave. That said, while they pursued their studies, they were still expected to fulfill their filial obligations by helping out in their family's businesses afterschool and on weekends, as well as to taking care of their siblings. Some Chinese parents saw higher education as a risky endeavor for their children to partake in, given high rates of unemployment among the college-educated in Southern Europe. In their opinion, a job as a storekeeper or waitress is a much 'safer bet' as a means of livelihood in the current economic climate. As for parental engagement in their children's schooling, it is practically non-existent within the Chinese community in Spain and Italy. The youth respondents discuss the sizeable linguistic and cultural rifts between their parents and educators, as well as common misunderstandings. On the one hand, Chinese parents know very little about the Spanish or Italian school systems, nor can they invest time into being involved in their children's schooling as they work extremely long hours. On the other hand, Italian and Spanish educators bear myriad misunderstandings about their Chinese students. Many assume that all Chinese students take no interest in school and plan to eventually work in their family businesses. As a result of these overt generalizations, teachers provide minimal guidance

and support for Chinese students who want to excel in their studies and attend university.

Consequently, academically-inclined youth often turn to their peers as role models – instead of their parents and teachers – for how to navigate the school system.

Based on these results, it appears that immigrant parents' norms, values and expectations can adapt to the opportunity structures of the host society. In countries, such as the U.S., staunch beliefs about the importance of higher education as a vehicle for mobility mean that immigrant parents rigorously inculcate their children with those same beliefs. By contrast, in countries, such as Spain and Italy, where there appears to be viable options to upward mobility other than higher education, immigrant parents relax their educational expectations on their children or even encourage them to pursue alternate careers. The calibration of ambitions according to the architecture of opportunity structures in the host society is an important lesson passed on from immigrant parents to their children.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, I investigated the educational ambitions of immigrant minority youth and their divergences across ethno-national origin groups – particularly the Chinese versus other groups – as well as across host societies. As presented at the outset of the introductory chapter, the vast majority of Chinese-American youth aspire to have, and to actualize, their high educational ambitions; by contrast, much smaller proportions of Chinese youth in Spain and Italy have such lofty educational ambitions. To examine these divergences, I probe into the dynamic and interactive influences of cultural and structural factors. I find that culturally-grounded understandings of success – that is, success is achieved by entrepreneurial versus academic endeavors – are strongly predictive of educational ambitions.

In turn, in the following chapter, I examine whether the formation of these “success frames” is shaped by youth’s perceptions of blocked opportunity and their sense of belonging in the host societies. I find that there is a significantly sizeable relationship between perceptions of opportunity (blocked and open) and forms of ambition. Across the host societies, discrimination is acknowledged to exist in varying degrees; however, depending on the degree of confidence placed in higher education as a means for overcoming such barriers, immigrant youth develop alternating success frames. Where entrepreneurial opportunities are abundant in a given ethnic community, immigrant youth are likely to forego educational opportunities for entrepreneurial ones. (Case in point: Chinese youth in Spain and Italy.)

Finally, although racial and ethnic variations in parental styles and involvement are often explanations invoked for differences in youth’s educational ambitions and attainment, I find

uneven evidence for these popular claims. The results from my analysis suggest that the majority of Chinese parents – whether in the U.S. or Southern Europe – do not subscribe to the hyper-involved, over-attached form of “tiger” parenting that is popularly described. They are generally not more engaged in their children’s schooling than non-Chinese parents. That said, the only exception – and consistently strong predictor of youth’s educational ambition – is parental expectations, which the majority Chinese parents in the U.S. visibly share while their counterparts in Southern Europe do not.

With this brief summary of the preceding chapters in mind, I will conclude with a broad discussion about the general themes, implications, limitations and directions for future research vis-à-vis this present study.

Overarching Themes

There are several overarching themes which span the entirety of this study. For instance, one of the implications of Chapter 3, which explores the role of success frames in educational ambitions, is the broader structural factors which shape the formation of those success frames. The following chapter explored this potential linkage between cultural success frames and broader societal structures. Altogether, both chapters highlight how perceptions about the opportunity structures – including the perceptions of blocked mobility against immigrant and ethnic minorities, as well as conversely, their sense of belonging – contribute to the decision to adopt an entrepreneurial over an educational success frame, or vice versa. A key factor to the adoption of one success frame over another is the perceived instrumentality of higher education versus entrepreneurship in overcoming anticipated discrimination in the labor market. This proposition is derived from Sue and Okazaki’s theory of “relative functionalism” (1990) and Xie

and Goyette's theory of "strategic adaptation" (2003), which argue that Asian American students are supposedly motivated to seek higher educational credentials to protect themselves against anticipated discrimination in the labor market. Based on the findings of Chapter 4, it appears that while discrimination motivates Chinese youth to pursue higher educational credentials in the U.S., it conversely motivates their counterparts in Southern Europe to pursue entrepreneurship, because the latter is perceived as a more effective vehicle for upward mobility. The takeaway point, then, is that discrimination is an impetus for formulating ambitions but depending on the context of the host society's opportunity structure, discrimination can veer them towards alternative channels of mobility.

Another interesting theme which emerged from the empirical chapters is the contradictory impact of perceived racism versus nativism on educational ambitions. The results in Chapter 4 suggest that whereas the belief that discrimination against foreigners (i.e. nativism) has null or even positive effects on educational expectations, discrimination based on skin color or other phenotypical attributes (i.e. racism) has a unilaterally negative impact. While the distinction has not been adequately addressed in the current literature on discrimination, a few scholars have tackled the issue. For instance, Galindo and Vigil (2006) define nativism as "dividing insiders, who belong to the nation, from outsiders, who are in it but not of it," whereas racism is more concerned with distinctions between the "civilian and barbarian than with boundaries of the nation-states" and with maintaining a lower societal status for those groups considered to be inferior (p. 426). The results of this study appear to highlight the significance of this oft-neglected distinction between nativism and racism, which is not merely a theoretical distinction but one that carries significant weight on assimilative outcomes – in this case, immigrant minority youth's educational ambitions. Although the chapter did not explicitly

analyze the differential impact of nativism versus racism on minority youth, the results imply the dissimilar functions of distinct forms of discrimination, which in turn can influence ambitions and outcomes in diametrically opposite ways, whether positive or negative. It is, therefore, important to recognize the nuanced qualities of discrimination rather than make overtly generalized assumptions.

Finally, a key theme of this study is the “American Dream” in comparative perspective. Is there a Spanish or Italian equivalent to the American Dream? Findings from Chapter 4 show that many immigrant youth, including the Chinese, in Spain and Italy have lofty aspirations and a strong drive for success and prosperity in their adopted homelands. Like their U.S. counterparts, they too believe that individual effort and hard work are crucial ingredients for upward mobility. However, the main difference lies in their confidence in higher education as a meritocratic system which equalizes the playing field for all groups. Whereas Chinese youth in the U.S. – often forewarned by their parents – perceive a college degree as preemptive security against anticipated discrimination in the labor market, their counterparts in Spain and Italy view the educational system as equally inaccessible as the mainstream labor market. Instead, with the Chinese increasingly successful with their own businesses, ethnic entrepreneurship is seen as a more viable option for evading perceived discrimination in the mainstream and achieving upward mobility. Moreover, the prevalence of starkly opposing stereotypes – the Chinese as ‘school whizzes’ in the U.S. versus “savvy business owner” in Southern Europe – reinforce different models of success across the Atlantic. By and large, regardless of where they are, immigrant parents and youth hold dear to their dreams of integration and upward mobility; what is different are the tried-and-tested strategies for achieving those dreams depending on the opportunity structures of their host societies.

Implications

There are several implications for the broader study of education and immigrant mobility that can be gleaned from this study's findings. First, the strong "entrepreneurial" success frame that is fostered within the Chinese community in Spain and Italy expands our current understanding about the role of immigrant entrepreneurship in intergenerational mobility. Previous theories, which were mostly developed from the experiences of immigrants in the U.S., distinguished between three functions of immigrant entrepreneurship for intergenerational mobility: springboard, safety net and mobility trap (Kim 2006). However, given the widespread conviction among Chinese immigrant parents and youth about the instrumentality of entrepreneurship, rather than education, as the primary vehicle for socioeconomic adaptation in Spain and Italy, immigrant entrepreneurship can potentially serve a fourth type of function: "mobility elevator".

In the case of the "mobility elevator," the family business or the goal of having their own business functions beyond the role of a "safety net" for immigrant offspring who fall of the academic tracks and instead, becomes the primary vehicle for upward mobility for the second-generation who can bypass higher education. Rather than rely on the family business to accrue the requisite resources for immigrant parents to invest in their children's university education – that is, the family business as a "springboard" that launches the second-generation into the mainstream labor market – immigrant families devise an alternative strategy that is centered on the family business. In large part, this happens in receiving societies, such as Spain and Italy, where higher education is perceived to be less instrumental in their opportunity structures and indeed, this is affirmed by the reality of large swaths of university-educated youth who are currently unemployed in these countries. A recent headline for an article in the New York Times – "Spain's Chinese Immigrants Thrive in Tough Economy" – is telling about the stark difference

in experience between native Spaniards and the Chinese community since the recession hit the Spanish economy (Bilefsky 2013). The article describes how Chinese immigrants have managed not only to weather a tough economy but even to thrive, as they are taking advantage of the cheap prices of Spain's distressed properties after its housing bubble to start their own businesses. According to the most recent estimates from the National Federation of Self-Employed Workers, of the almost 9,000 foreigners who started businesses in 2012, over 30 percent were Chinese. These recent trends certainly attest to the growing and sustained economic success of the Chinese community's long-term entrepreneurial strategy in economically depressed countries, such as Spain and Italy.

Another implication of this study is the generalizability of cultural stereotypes and their possible migration across host societies. Given that Chinese-American students are touted as 'model minorities,' an interesting question that arises is whether these stereotypes will traverse across the Atlantic someday so that Chinese students in Spain and Italy will become touted as 'math and science whizzes' as well. Currently, the prevailing stereotypes about the Chinese in Southern Europe are based on portrayals of the first generation immigrants – whose prolific entrepreneurial activities have captured widespread public attention – as business savvy, cunning and even stingy. Exacerbated by the fact that Chinese-owned businesses have thrived despite the economic downturn, Chinese immigrants have increasingly posed an economic threat to native Italians and Spaniards and in some ways, made into scapegoats. Educators who have internalized this image of the savvy Chinese entrepreneur presume that Chinese students will follow in their parents' footsteps by not pursuing advanced studies.

If the Chinese can overcome these stereotypes, it will depend on the presence of exceptional Chinese youth who break into the mainstream economy as rising middle-class

professionals. Some of the respondents, including Gianna, the cultural mediator and Silvia, who alleges that she is the first Chinese nurse in Milan, have taken great strides to break free from expectations to enter into the family business and pursue their own dreams. With them acting as role models, perhaps greater proportions of the younger cohorts will also be inspired to study hard and go to college, thereby transcending the current stereotypes about the Chinese in Southern Europe and appropriating the model minority stereotypes of Chinese-Americans.

An additional implication of this study is the disentanglement of the different bases of prejudice and discrimination in the European context. Scholars often contend that Europeans conceive of group differences in cultural terms, in comparison to Americans' alleged adherence to more biological notions of difference. However, this comparative claim is rarely subjected to empirical inquiry. In spite of the undue attention given to the rise of nativism and xenophobia in Europe, the results from this study suggest that race is becoming an increasingly salient axis of differentiation and exclusion in Southern Europe. Recall that the results show that in both Spain and Italy, perceived discrimination by skin color is a negative predictor of educational expectations. Likewise, recent research by sociologist Ann Morning (2013) has produced similar evidence. In her study of Italian college students, she finds that Italians' perceptions of immigrants, despite powerful discourses about color-blindness, is deeply grounded in the belief of innate genetic and biological differences and the visibility of phenotypical distinctions between natives and foreigners of color. It appears then, that a version of the racial landscape of the U.S. has been transplanted in the Southern European context, potentially altering the course of immigrant integration in significant ways.

There are also some interesting implications derived from this study's findings regarding parenting and youth outcomes. For one, the results from Chapter 5 point to the utmost

importance of parental expectation, evidentially above parental engagement, in shaping youth ambitions. Parental expectations thus play a primary role in inculcating values about the importance of schooling amongst children; in other words, what parents say matter just as much as, if not more than, what they do. That said, high parental expectations which in turn, lead to youth's formation of educational ambitions is a necessary but not sufficient condition for actual educational achievement. Given the limits of the survey data, only expectations rather than actual levels of educational attainment are measured in the analysis. Nevertheless, the qualitative findings (as do numerous studies in the existing literature) show that educational expectation is a strong predictor of actual levels of attainment.

On a related note, the utmost importance of parental expectations potentially undermines the supposed effectiveness of “Tiger parenting” that is allegedly commonly practiced within Chinese families which performs academically-oriented children. As a form of authoritarian parenting, “tiger parenting” is a harsh, authoritarian-style of parenting whereby parents have strict rules regarding their children's study habits as well as monitoring their activities and behaviors closely. However, as findings from Chapter 5 show, Chinese parents on both sides of the Atlantic are no more likely – if anything, they are less likely – to hover over their children's lives, setting strict rules about doing homework or being heavily involved in their classrooms. Certainly, Chinese youth report experiencing instances of authoritarian parenting but the disciplinary measures enforced are neither specific to schools per se nor even intended to promote academic excellence. On the one hand, Chinese-American parents might set curfews for their children but not explicate concrete rules about doing homework and keeping a certain GPA, although they certainly set general expectations about graduating from college as a bare minimum. In fact, based on the CILS data, most other immigrant groups report significantly

higher levels of parental engagement in their children's schooling, including enforcing rules about keeping a certain GPA and doing homework.

Moreover, Chinese-American parents report some of the lowest levels of involvement in their children's school as volunteers and only infrequently meeting with teachers. On the other hand, Chinese parents in Spain might also set strict rules for their children but these are rules that are unrelated to study habits or in some cases, adversarial to youth's pursuit of higher education, such as obligations to attend to the family business. "Tiger parenting," therefore, is not intrinsic to exclusively Chinese parents but immigrant parents from all backgrounds. Furthermore, even when it is practiced, "tiger parenting" is not exclusively practiced to produce superior academic outcomes but, as is the case with Chinese parents in Southern Europe, it is meant to compel youth to adhere ulterior parental ambitions, including family entrepreneurship.

Finally, the findings – particularly the interview findings – allude to the interactions between parental expectations and broader messages surrounding the role of education and opportunity structures in the host society. In the U.S., where a college degree is almost universally seen as a vehicle for upward mobility, immigrant parents – the Chinese, in particular – reinforce the notion of the American Dream by commanding their children to excel in school, holding them against the achievements of their co-ethnic peers who serve as role models. Even though they do not actively engage in their children's schooling, they repeatedly convey their high educational expectations to their children. In large part, this is due to their deeply entrenched belief about American society that higher education is the great equalizer. By comparison, in Southern Europe, where there is a substantially weaker narrative about schooling – especially among the immigrant community – parental encouragement takes a much more passive form. Chinese parents are either agnostic about their children's educational attainment or

in some cases, they expect them to discontinue schooling in order to fulfill familial obligation. Chinese youth in Spain and Italy need to convince their parents that school is a worthwhile endeavor since the financial payoff for a university degree is not so obvious in the Spanish and Italian labor markets for immigrant offspring.

Limitations

One of the strength of this study's methodology is its leverage of comparable cross-national data in the study of second-generation immigrant adaptation, an area of study in which global data are still lacking. That said, there are notable issues and limitations with the methodology. First, and perhaps most glaringly, the outcomes of interest in all of the analyses are measures of ambitions rather than actual levels of educational attainment. This is the relic of analyzing data which samples young adults during their school-age years rather than their entry into the labor market. Reassuringly, though, longitudinal datasets with subsequent waves that follow respondents into early adulthood (e.g. Wave III of U.S. CILS) largely show that educational ambitions – particularly when youth are asked about their realistic expectations – during adolescence are strong predictors of subsequent levels of educational attainment. Moreover, in an effort to corroborate the findings of the primary datasets, the ISGMNY study was also analyzed; its findings also show that youth who held high levels of educational ambitions (e.g. Russians and Chinese youth) generally attained commensurate levels of education. It appears that in the absence of comparable large-scale and cross-national data of the immigrant second-generation at working ages, ambition is the most reasonable proxy measure of actual attainment.

Second, the principle drawback of the regressions is the cross-sectional nature of the data, thereby rendering it difficult to draw causal inferences. Therefore, in the interpretation of the

results, take heed that perceptions and attitudes of discrimination do not necessarily lead to the development of certain success frames versus others; instead, the analysis demonstrates that a complex or syndrome of perceptions and attitudes ‘hang together’ to represent coherent views of opportunities in the host society and how to best access them. Future analyses should leverage the longitudinal data that are available for CILS and ILSEG in order to establish a stronger case for testing causal relationships.

Third, although the datasets are comparable, they are not identical with regards to their survey design. For one, there is a substantial time lapse between when CILS was conducted (the first wave was collected in 1992-3) versus when ILSEG and ITAGEN were conducted (the first waves of data were collected in 2008 and 2005-6, respectively). Even though the age range of the youth respondents across all three surveys are similar, there are possible period effects that affect the analysis. Moreover, compared to the substantial number of Chinese respondents in ILSEG and ITAGEN (i.e. over 250 cases), CILS has a relatively smaller Chinese sample, with less than a hundred respondents. Given the small Ns in the cells, regression results for the CILS data are more likely to generate non-significant results. However, because the Chinese is the primary group of interest in the comparisons, for theoretical reasons, it is the most logical to choose it as the reference group. In addition, the parental survey is only available in CILS and ILSEG, but not ITAGEN. As a result, Chapter 5 which examined the role of parental expectations on youths’ formulation of ambitions is unfortunately limited to a two-way comparison between the United States and Spain without Italy, at least in the quantitative analyses. To partially rectify this limitation in the quantitative analysis, the interview findings drew heavily upon the Chinese respondents living in Italy and their experiences regarding parental expectations and involvement.

Finally, in several instances, the empirical analyses yielded inexplicable discrepancies in substantive terms. For instance, in Chapter 3 on success frames, there were sizeable disparities in the results based on the Spanish (ILSEG) and Italian (ITAGEN) data, even though theoretically the main contrast in the empirical results should be between the U.S. and the Southern European countries rather than between Italy and Spain. As an example, immigrant youth across all nationalities (including the Chinese) in Spain generally had lower levels of educational expectations than their counterparts in Italy. Nothing in the existing literature suggests that levels of educational aspirations and achievement are higher in Italy compared to Spain. As another example, whereas the inclusion of the indicators of the success frames *fully* explained the difference in levels of university expectations between Chinese and non-Chinese youth in Spain, the indicators only partially explained the Chinese and some nationality groups in Italy. In some of the regression models, the ‘control’ variables accounted for more of the variation between the Chinese and some groups in Italy than the indicators of the success frames. Why the success frames appear to be more powerful predictors of educational expectations in Spain than in Italy is unclear. It could potentially be due to actual differences in the perceptions of opportunity and the utility of higher education among Chinese youth versus non-Chinese youth. Or, alternatively it might have resulted from methodological differences in the design of the studies – for example, ILSEG includes only respondents from Barcelona and Madrid, whereas ITAGEN is nationally-representative. The interview findings provide some insight – although not definitive – into these discrepancies. Given the high degree of similarity in the interview responses between Chinese youth living in Madrid and Milan regarding their levels of educational expectations and the pervasiveness of the “entrepreneurial” success frame, it appears that

national differences in the quantitative results are perhaps due more to survey design than stark contrasts in the contexts of reception.

Future Research

This present study points to myriad directions for future research. For one, it would be interesting to better understand how parental expectations play a significant role in shaping their children's ambitions. Recall that in Chapter 5 which focused on the role of parental involvement, the quantitative results showed that parental expectations for their children's educational levels were much stronger predictors of youth's own expected level of education, in comparison to the barely significant influence of parental engagement and experiences. Certainly, expectations are intertwined with engagement and experiences; it is merely for heuristic purposes that they are treated as independent predictors of youth's ambitions. In fact, parental expectations are the channels through which parental engagement and experiences are enacted, as suggested in the quantitative results which show the mediating "effects" of parental expectations. Nevertheless, the question remains as to why the significance of parental engagement and experiences disappears once parental expectations are considered in the analytical models. In other words, why what parents *say* seem to matter more than what they *do* in shaping their children's ambitions merits further investigation.

Another topic for future research is the subtle distinction between aspired and actual entrepreneurship among immigrant parents. In Chapter 3 on success frames, parental self-employment was – contrary to expectations – not consistently a significant negative predictor of university expectations among the Chinese. Given the high rates of parental self-employment among the Chinese in Spain and Italy, I had predicted that parental self-employment would

explain much of the variation in university expectations between Chinese and non-Chinese youth. Yet, the quantitative findings did not necessarily produce strong evidence to support my hypothesis. Interviews with Chinese youth in Italy and Spain seem to suggest that regardless of whether their parents are currently business owners, the vast majority have aspirations to own a business eventually (see, for example, the case of Mario). In turn, this self-employment mentality among parents, whether or not they are actually business owners, is transferred to their children. In other words, *aspired* self-employment among Chinese immigrant parents appears to be an equally strong determinant of their children's educational expectations as their *actual* self-employment status, as the interview findings suggest. Further research should investigate whether this is generalizable in other contexts as well as replicated in quantitative analysis, provided that measures of both actual and aspired self-employment were available.

Lastly, given that the existing literature (including this present study) only scratches the surface in terms of understanding the effect of parental influences on youth outcome, it would be fruitful to study the full spectrum of outcomes among minority youth – including exceptional cases. One case worth delving deeper into is high-achieving students who have received minimal support from their parents, as represented by the few high-achieving Chinese respondents in Spain and Italy. Despite the absence of parental encouragement to pursue higher education, they managed to attain undergraduate and even graduate degrees. According to their own experiences, neither parents nor teachers provided much guidance in their pursuit for advanced levels of study – parents either prefer that they work in the family business than study or are completely indifferent to their educational plans, while teachers assume that Chinese youth are not academically-inclined and thus allocate minimal time and energy to them in the classroom. Instead, high-achieving peers play a paramount role in helping Chinese youth in navigating the

path to the higher educational system. Further research should investigate the mechanics through which peer influences affect youths decisions related to higher education and under which circumstances peer influences matter more than parents' and teacher'. Ultimately, high-achieving Chinese youth in Spain and Italy is a potentially fruitful case study for how certain types of individuals are able to attain educational success against all odds.

Final Thoughts

Findings and analyses of this dissertation have elicited myriad implications and directions for future research. That said, at the very core of this dissertation is the empirical puzzle – that is, the drastically divergent educational experiences and outcomes of Chinese youth in the U.S. versus in Southern Europe – as presented in the introductory chapter. In solving this empirical puzzle, the findings undermine popular yet outdated culturally-essentialist explanations about the alleged values that are intrinsic to a particular group. As this study's findings imply, if shared norms about the utmost value of education that are supposedly inherent in Chinese culture explain the educational success of Chinese-Americans, then why are their counterparts in Spain and Italy – who, in theory, would also possess the same cultural orientations – not equally driven in their academic pursuits? Clearly, such essentialist and reductionist arguments are wholly inadequate.

That is not to say that culture has no role in explaining youth's educational ambitions and achievement. Rather, a structurally-grounded approach to cultural explanations – such as the concept of success frames – provides more robust accounts in understanding intra- and inter-group differences in educational outcomes. As the empirical findings show, across the three countries, perceived barriers to upward mobility appear to at least, partially shape how success is framed in cultural terms. The particular experience of Chinese youth living across the Atlantic in

different receiving contexts highlights the dynamic influence of perceptions of blocked mobility on educational ambitions, whether amplifying them in the U.S. or suppressing them in Southern Europe. It is therefore important to recognize that the meanings that immigrant youth give to their ambitions and actions – including the attainment of higher education – is dually enabled and constrained by their perceptions of opportunities and barriers embedded within their host societies.

As for using the Chinese to exemplify the mechanics of how all these different factors interact to produce seemingly contradictory outcomes, they are certainly a strategic case study for understanding the significant differences in the contexts of reception of old versus new immigrant destination countries. As the most populous nationality in the world, the Chinese have immigrated to the far-flung reaches of the globe, albeit with longer histories of immigration in some countries than others. Only time will tell how well they assimilate into the different countries and via which channels – whether higher education or otherwise – they gain mobility in the different opportunity structures. What is fairly certain, however, is that the Chinese – like almost all immigrant groups – are seeking to achieve success for themselves and their descendants in their adopted countries.

APPENDIX

Table A. Descriptive Statistics of ILSEG Analytical Sample by Socio-demographic and Economic Characteristics (Spain)

	Ethno-national origin group													Sample Average
	China	Philippines	Colombia	Dominican Republic	South & Other Asia	Morocco	Romania	Ecuador	Peru	Bolivia	South & Central America	Africa & Middle East	Europe & North America	
% by ethno-national origin group	4.2	2.6	8.5	5.5	3.8	9.3	5.2	28.3	6.7	4.8	10.7	2.9	7.7	100.0
Ns by ethno-national origin group	269	165	543	348	240	593	329	1,803	429	309	682	182	488	6,380
Socio-demographic & Economic Characteristics														
Nativity and age at arrival														
Born in Spain	16.7	42.1	0.6	6.9	13.4	28.1	1.5	0.5	8.9	0.3	6.5	26.9	20.9	9.2
Foreign-born and arrived before age 6	2.6	5.5	19.2	6.9	9.2	22.7	7.0	12.4	8.2	7.4	12.3	14.3	16.4	12.5
Foreign-born and arrived between ages 6 and 10	42.8	25.6	49.6	41.6	48.5	30.7	45.1	64.2	44.2	43.7	44.2	35.2	38.2	47.9
Foreign-born and arrived after age 10	37.9	26.8	30.6	44.5	28.9	18.5	46.3	22.9	38.8	48.5	37.0	23.6	24.4	30.5
Male	53.9	46.7	54.3	42.5	60.0	50.1	45.0	54.1	49.7	40.5	52.9	51.1	49.4	51.1
Mean age in years (S.D.)	14.0 (1.2)	13.5 (1.3)	13.9 (1.2)	14.1 (1.3)	13.5 (1.2)	13.8 (1.2)	14.1 (1.1)	14.0 (1.2)	13.8 (1.2)	13.8 (1.2)	13.8 (1.2)	14.2 (1.4)	14.0 (1.2)	13.9 (1.2)
Basic Secondary Education (ESO) Academic Year														
Year 1	23.6	24.7	19.4	20.6	38.1	28.8	16.1	20.3	19.7	22.4	23.2	23.4	13.4	21.7
Year 2	44.9	41.4	49.6	41.5	35.6	40.8	47.8	46.3	40.8	45.7	41.2	45.7	45.4	44.2
Year 3	31.6	34.0	31.0	37.9	26.4	30.5	36.1	33.4	39.6	31.9	35.6	30.9	41.2	34.1
Lives with both parents	92.6	85.2	49.1	48.5	85.0	86.8	81.3	66.6	68.0	58.1	61.6	65.3	69.8	68.4
Mother's highest level of schooling														
Secondary school incomplete or less	53.4	14.6	29.5	37.8	47.0	57.3	10.0	29.3	20.5	30.6	23.7	31.7	14.7	29.6
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	36.1	26.0	36.6	30.3	25.8	27.7	40.9	34.8	33.2	31.1	30.5	32.5	20.0	32.0
Post-secondary schooling completed	10.5	59.4	34.0	31.9	27.3	15.0	49.1	35.9	46.3	38.4	45.8	35.8	65.3	38.4
Father's highest level of schooling														
Secondary school incomplete or less	50.8	24.2	35.0	37.8	43.8	57.2	15.8	36.3	20.4	34.0	25.4	28.6	19.5	33.3
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	35.6	26.4	31.6	28.3	28.1	22.3	32.7	32.1	34.8	31.6	29.6	25.9	24.6	30.1
Post-secondary schooling completed	13.6	49.5	33.4	33.9	28.1	20.5	51.5	31.6	44.7	34.5	45.0	45.5	56.0	36.6
Number of siblings														
None	12.7	7.3	14.6	6.1	3.3	3.4	29.7	9.1	12.2	11.3	12.7	5.7	23.5	11.5
One	39.8	31.3	24.9	14.8	17.9	9.2	42.0	25.7	27.3	22.9	30.6	20.0	40.5	26.2
Two	26.6	32.7	30.9	27.0	17.5	20.8	12.2	28.6	29.4	21.8	28.5	26.9	15.0	25.4
Three or more	20.9	28.7	29.6	52.1	61.3	66.7	16.1	36.7	31.0	44.0	28.3	47.4	21.0	36.9
Attends private school	63.9	31.5	42.4	55.8	76.3	57.3	20.1	45.3	50.6	57.9	55.7	37.9	39.1	48.4
City of residence														
Madrid	33.5	24.9	58.4	47.4	7.9	40.1	84.8	55.7	49.4	40.1	39.2	61.5	58.4	49.4
Barcelona	66.5	75.2	41.6	52.6	92.1	59.9	15.2	44.3	50.6	59.9	60.9	38.5	41.6	50.6
Non-Spanish language spoken at home	14.5	16.4	33.2	23.3	12.1	21.3	39.2	26.6	33.8	33.3	25.2	15.9	36.3	26.9

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

Table B. Descriptive Statistics of ITAGEN Analytical Sample by Socio-demographic and Economic Characteristics (ITALY)

	Ethno-national origin group														Sample Average
	China	Philippines	Colombia	Dominican Republic	South Asia	Morocco	Romania	Albania	Macedonia	Europe & North America	Africa & Middle East	Other Asia	South & Central America	Native Italian	
% by ethno-national origin group	4.0	1.7	0.3	0.3	3.3	3.9	3.7	6.8	1.7	7.3	4.9	0.6	4.8	56.7	100.0
Ns by ethno-national origin group	646	270	55	49	545	641	604	1106	282	1192	799	90	780	9236	16295
Socio-demographic & Economic Characteristics															
Nativity and age at arrival															
Born in Italy	19.4	58.9	18.2	28.6	9.7	31.2	4.6	9.4	18.8	33.1	52.2	38.9	18.2	100.0	65.3
Foreign-born and arrived before age 6	12.1	5.6	34.6	12.2	26.8	33.4	16.1	45.1	44.3	21.2	18.0	23.3	24.5	0.0	12.0
Foreign-born and arrived between ages 6 and 10	30.3	21.5	36.4	28.6	33.4	21.2	42.6	32.4	25.5	23.7	15.9	17.8	36.1	0.0	13.0
Foreign-born and arrived after age 10	38.2	14.1	10.9	30.6	30.1	14.2	36.8	13.1	11.4	22.0	13.9	20.0	21.2	0.0	9.8
Male	51.4	48.2	54.6	53.1	62.6	51.6	56.3	54.4	58.2	52.1	52.7	36.7	53.1	50.9	52.1
Mean age in years (S.D.)	13.2 (1.5)	12.5 (1.2)	12.3 (1.1)	12.4 (1.1)	12.7 (1.2)	12.6 (1.3)	13.0 (1.1)	12.5 (1.1)	12.7 (1.2)	12.5 (1.1)	12.4 (1.2)	12.4 (1.2)	12.4 (1.1)	12.1 (0.9)	12.3 (1.1)
Lower Secondary School - Academic Year															
Year 1	35.8	34.8	38.2	36.7	31.4	35.9	31.8	32.3	34.8	34.6	32.3	36.7	35.8	31.9	32.8
Year 2	32.4	35.6	36.4	28.6	36.0	35.9	33.8	35.9	33.7	33.1	36.6	30.0	33.3	34.0	34.2
Year 3	31.9	29.6	25.5	34.7	32.7	28.2	34.4	31.8	31.6	32.4	31.2	33.3	30.9	34.1	33.0
Lives with both parents	95.8	91.1	72.7	59.2	98.0	91.6	84.3	96.1	98.2	85.0	93.0	95.6	76.8	94.9	92.7
Mother's highest level of schooling															
Secondary school incomplete or less	62.5	12.4	24.4	22.6	44.5	63.5	12.4	32.1	67.1	23.7	41.6	22.4	22.7	39.5	37.9
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	28.6	44.1	34.2	45.2	35.6	20.3	61.0	46.0	26.2	48.9	31.2	53.7	41.8	36.5	38.0
Post-secondary schooling completed	8.9	43.5	41.5	32.3	19.9	16.3	26.6	22.0	6.7	27.5	27.3	23.9	35.5	24.1	24.1
Father's highest level of schooling															
Secondary school incomplete or less	57.3	20.3	31.4	16.7	39.7	59.2	15.2	34.4	48.0	30.2	34.9	26.2	23.5	40.5	38.6
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	30.6	38.6	34.3	41.7	30.6	22.2	57.5	43.1	42.5	42.1	29.0	42.6	39.0	35.6	36.5
Post-secondary schooling completed	12.1	41.2	34.3	41.7	29.7	18.6	27.4	22.5	9.5	27.8	36.1	31.2	37.5	23.9	25.0
Number of siblings															
None	10.8	20.0	20.0	8.2	2.9	2.7	31.0	5.9	1.8	19.8	6.9	13.3	14.5	14.1	13.2
One	52.2	41.9	40.0	24.5	31.9	17.6	44.7	55.6	39.0	46.6	24.2	48.9	34.2	53.7	47.8
Two	27.7	24.1	20.0	32.7	30.3	26.8	13.6	26.9	35.8	18.1	31.0	26.7	27.3	21.9	23.4
Three or more	9.3	14.1	20.0	34.7	34.9	52.9	10.8	11.7	23.4	15.5	37.9	11.1	24.0	10.3	15.7
Region of residence															
Northern	37.8	63.3	76.4	69.4	81.5	61.9	51.7	45.9	42.9	57.7	59.8	63.3	76.0	49.5	53.2
Central	34.7	27.8	16.4	26.5	13.2	19.0	44.2	23.7	47.9	25.7	15.9	17.8	19.1	25.8	25.5
Southern	27.6	8.9	7.3	4.1	5.3	19.0	4.1	30.4	9.2	16.6	24.3	18.9	4.9	24.7	21.3
Non-Italian language spoken at home	95.4	98.9	96.4	95.9	99.3	98.3	97.0	97.5	96.8	94.0	94.9	100.0	98.6	1.5	42.8

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

Table C. Descriptive Statistics of CILS Analytical Sample by Socio-demographic and Economic Characteristics (U.S.)

	Ethno-national origin group											Sample Average
	China	Philippines	Colombia	Dominican Republic	Vietnam	Cuba	Mexico	Other Asia	South & Central America	West Indies	Other countries	
% by ethno-national origin group	1.4	15.6	4.3	2.0	7.0	23.3	14.4	7.7	13.5	8.6	2.4	100.0
Ns by ethno-national origin group	72	819	227	105	370	1226	755	403	709	450	126	5262
Socio-demographic & Economic Characteristics												
Nativity and age at arrival												
Born in the U.S.	50.0	54.8	53.7	66.7	15.7	70.9	60.4	16.6	27.1	48.3	73.8	50.0
Foreign-born and arrived before age 6	12.5	18.9	22.0	20.0	42.7	21.6	16.7	45.9	30.5	24.7	8.7	24.9
Foreign-born and arrived between ages 6 and 10	26.4	16.2	24.2	12.4	25.4	7.4	14.0	27.3	40.3	25.4	17.5	19.8
Foreign-born and arrived after age 10	11.1	10.0	0.0	1.0	16.2	0.0	8.9	10.2	2.1	1.6	0.0	5.3
Male	54.2	49.7	48.0	40.0	51.9	52.6	51.5	47.2	47.5	36.0	50.0	48.9
Mean age in years (S.D.)	14.2 (0.7)	14.1 (0.8)	14.2 (0.8)	14.3 (0.9)	14.3 (1.0)	14.1 (0.8)	14.2 (0.9)	14.4 (0.9)	14.4 (0.9)	14.3 (0.9)	14.2 (0.8)	14.2 (0.9)
Grade level												
8th grade	54.2	45.8	58.6	52.4	48.9	57.4	62.3	51.4	50.8	56.4	44.4	53.9
9th grade	45.8	54.2	41.4	47.6	51.1	42.6	37.8	48.6	49.2	43.6	55.6	46.1
Lives with both parents	76.4	79.4	58.6	45.7	73.5	58.8	59.5	73.2	61.4	44.0	65.9	63.5
Mother's highest level of schooling												
Secondary school incomplete or less	35.4	20.7	30.3	47.4	68.1	28.8	72.6	66.1	29.3	35.3	19.2	39.7
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	35.4	41.0	50.2	32.6	23.1	50.2	22.9	26.0	45.3	43.1	49.2	39.6
Post-secondary schooling completed	29.2	38.4	19.4	20.0	8.8	21.1	4.4	8.0	25.4	21.6	31.7	20.7
Father's highest level of schooling												
Secondary school incomplete or less	35.4	15.2	34.1	46.3	59.7	38.4	65.1	54.6	28.4	47.5	26.7	40.1
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	27.7	55.0	41.2	31.6	24.7	35.9	28.0	28.0	37.1	34.9	33.3	36.6
Post-secondary schooling completed	36.9	29.8	24.6	22.1	15.6	25.7	7.0	17.4	34.5	17.7	40.0	23.4
Number of siblings												
None	23.6	11.1	23.8	18.1	11.9	24.2	14.0	14.1	15.0	15.6	17.5	16.8
One	40.3	32.4	37.0	29.5	19.2	45.2	21.2	19.1	39.1	27.3	43.7	32.8
Two	20.8	35.8	27.8	38.1	20.5	23.8	26.5	23.8	27.2	27.6	23.8	27.0
Three or more	15.3	20.8	11.5	14.3	48.4	6.8	38.3	42.9	18.8	29.6	15.1	23.4
City of residence												
Miami/Fort Lauderdale	31.9	1.3	98.2	95.2	2.2	99.8	3.7	6.0	91.8	95.6	95.2	54.0
San Diego	68.1	98.7	1.8	4.8	97.8	0.2	96.3	94.0	8.2	4.4	4.8	46.0
Non-English language spoken at home	9.7	17.5	1.3	2.9	1.4	0.8	2.4	6.7	2.0	32.9	32.5	8.0

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

Table D. Descriptive Statistics of ISGMNY Analytical Sample by Socio-demographic and Economic Characteristics (NYC Metro Area)

	Ethno-national origin group								Sample Average
	China	Puerto Rico	Dominican Republic	West Indies	Colombia, Ecuador, Peru	Russia	Native Blacks	Native Whites	
% by ethno-national origin group	17.8	12.7	12.5	11.9	11.8	9.1	12.3	12.0	100.0
Ns by ethno-national origin group	607	433	428	407	402	309	421	408	3415
Socio-demographic & Economic Characteristics									
Nativity and age at arrival									
Born in the U.S.	42.2	100.0	62.5	54.6	58.6	12.3	100.0	100.0	66.9
Foreign-born and arrived before age 6	20.1	0.0	14.5	14.8	18.5	13.0	0.0	0.0	10.5
Foreign-born and arrived between ages 7 and 12	37.6	0.0	23.0	30.6	22.9	47.7	0.0	0.0	20.2
Foreign-born and arrived after age 12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
Male	54.4	40.2	41.1	47.7	50.8	51.8	39.4	43.9	46.4
Mean age in years (S.D.)	22.5 (3.9)	24.1 (4.4)	23.7 (3.9)	23.4 (4.2)	24.0 (3.9)	22.4 (3.9)	25.5 (4.4)	25.7 (4.1)	23.9 (4.2)
Attended private high school	17.8	27.5	33.4	29.5	34.1	1.9	24.7	47.8	27.3
Lives with both parents	87.8	54.3	59.6	52.7	68.8	82.2	42.5	72.7	65.7
Mother's highest level of schooling									
Secondary school incomplete or less	36.2	27.0	39.7	19.9	25.1	6.8	13.1	3.4	22.8
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	49.3	63.7	54.0	58.0	62.7	30.4	67.9	56.4	55.8
Post-secondary schooling completed	14.5	9.2	6.3	22.1	12.2	62.8	19.0	40.2	21.4
Father's highest level of schooling									
Secondary school incomplete or less	39.4	36.7	47.9	41.3	32.1	15.5	39.7	13.7	34.3
Secondary school completed and/or some post-secondary schooling	42.2	55.9	41.6	43.3	53.0	33.0	47.7	41.9	45.1
Post-secondary schooling completed	18.5	7.4	10.5	15.5	14.9	51.5	12.6	44.4	20.6
Number of siblings									
None	15.5	12.5	6.6	11.7	10.3	31.8	15.7	10.8	13.9
One	39.7	25.7	24.2	26.6	36.5	53.6	23.6	46.1	34.1
Two	30.2	29.6	31.2	25.9	25.3	9.1	22.1	23.5	25.5
Three or more	14.7	32.2	38.0	35.8	28.0	5.5	38.6	19.6	26.6
Non-English language spoken at home	3.0	18.5	1.9	84.0	2.0	3.2	86.0	88.2	34.8

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

Table E. Frequency distribution of self-employment status of second-generation immigrants by national origins in the ISGMNY study

National Origin	Respondent has ever been self- employed
China	6.1
Puerto Rico	9.0
Dominican Republic	11.4
West Indies	10.2
Colombia, Ecuador, Peru	10.4
Russia	15.0
Native Blacks	12.8
Native Whites	10.1
<i>Sample Average</i>	<i>10.3</i>

Table F. Descriptive statistics of the sample parental and youth control variables across ethno-national origin groups in Spain (ILSEG)

	Ethno-national origin group									Sample Average
	China	Colombia	Morocco	Ecuador	Peru	South Asia	South & Central America	Africa & Middle East	Europe & North America	
Parental Controls										
Male (Father)	50.7	22.5	52.3	27.8	33.9	49.0	27.5	43.6	26.4	32.9
Age (in Years)	40.8	41.4	44.0	39.7	41.2	43.5	40.3	41.1	40.2	41.0
Years of Residence in Spain	9.1	9.0	13.5	9.2	9.5	11.8	8.7	12.8	8.8	10.3
Has Spanish nationality	7.9	49.2	25.4	44.5	47.4	39.6	40.5	40.0	16.1	36.8
Knowledge of Spanish	2.5	3.8	2.9	3.7	3.8	2.8	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.5
Highest Level of Education	35.1	34.7	65.3	40.4	32.8	43.1	35.5	58.9	20.1	39.0
Middle school or less	55.8	39.4	27.2	37.0	40.5	25.5	36.1	23.2	55.5	38.2
High school or vocational school	3.9	11.0	4.6	13.4	15.5	17.7	14.8	14.3	11.5	12.4
Some university	5.2	15.0	2.9	9.3	11.2	13.7	13.7	3.6	12.9	10.4
University (B.A. +)	89.6	52.7	83.5	67.5	71.6	90.2	68.4	76.8	78.1	72.5
Married	16.4	2.2	2.0	1.6	1.9	2.7	3.1	2.2	3.9	3.0
Self-employed										
Youth Controls										
Male	37.7	53.5	51.7	51.1	51.3	49.0	47.5	40.0	41.4	48.4
Age	14.0	13.9	13.8	14.0	13.8	13.5	13.9	14.1	14.1	13.9
Immigrant generation										
Born in Spain	19.5	0.8	30.1	0.6	12.2	26.0	4.9	29.1	8.7	9.5
Foreign-born, < 6 years	2.6	17.8	26.0	10.1	8.7	7.0	11.9	14.6	14.5	12.7
Foreign-born, 6-10years	46.8	60.5	27.2	67.9	42.6	39.0	46.5	34.6	46.9	50.9
Foreign-born, > 10 years	31.2	20.9	16.8	21.5	36.5	28.0	36.6	21.8	30.0	26.9
Lives in Madrid (not Barcelona)	39.0	66.7	44.3	58.8	48.7	17.0	43.8	63.6	75.5	53.0
Grade level (ESO)										
1st	17.8	15.2	22.3	18.4	21.8	30.9	20.5	21.6	17.3	19.9
2nd	48.0	51.2	46.4	46.3	41.8	43.3	41.9	47.1	44.1	45.1
3rd	34.3	33.6	31.3	35.3	36.4	25.8	37.6	31.4	38.6	35.0
Lives with both parents	97.3	50.8	89.4	69.0	69.0	87.9	64.1	67.3	73.9	71.6
Number of siblings										
None	10.5	9.2	1.8	9.7	4.9	5.8	11.5	5.7	23.5	10.2
One	32.8	28.6	8.0	26.2	32.4	28.7	27.8	18.9	42.6	27.3
Two	40.3	37.0	22.7	31.2	31.4	21.8	23.6	30.2	15.9	27.2
Three +	16.4	25.2	67.5	32.9	31.4	43.7	37.1	45.3	18.0	35.3
Speak Spanish at home	23.4	30.2	21.3	26.0	38.3	11.0	27.8	20.0	33.2	26.7
Attends public (not private) school	77.9	83.0	92.5	84.0	78.3	68.0	79.1	87.3	86.1	82.6

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

Table G. Descriptive statistics of the sample by parental and youth control variables across ethno-national groups in the U.S. (CILS)

	Ethno-national origin group											Sample Average
	China	Phillippines	Vietnam	Ecuador	Mexican	Nicaragua	Laos	Other Asia	South & Central America	Caribbean	Other Countries	
Parental Controls												
Male (Father)	47.4	38.8	63.1	33.8	28.6	29.4	53.2	50.4	32.2	22.3	33.0	37.7
Age (in Years)	52.4	46.8	48.3	46.3	43.9	45.0	50.1	49.6	46.9	46.7	46.9	46.8
Years of Residence in the US	17.3	19.5	13.5	24.9	20.2	12.3	12.9	15.0	19.9	19.1	23.4	18.6
Has US citizenship	57.9	85.2	57.8	68.1	23.7	16.0	18.3	20.7	54.6	58.2	81.7	51.2
Knowledge of English	5.7	10.5	5.4	8.3	5.7	6.4	3.5	3.9	7.9	9.2	10.8	7.3
Higest Level of Education	21.6	1.4	37.8	3.4	48.3	5.3	64.5	67.5	2.5	6.7	3.9	21.2
Middle school or less	24.3	14.1	40.6	35.2	29.8	20.4	17.7	9.2	28.5	39.7	26.2	27.3
High school or vocational school	21.6	37.3	14.1	40.9	19.2	41.8	14.0	9.2	49.8	37.5	35.9	31.2
University (B.A. +)	32.4	47.2	7.6	20.5	2.7	32.5	3.8	14.2	19.3	16.1	34.0	20.3
Married	94.7	93.0	82.7	80.1	76.3	75.7	76.9	73.6	81.2	57.3	63.5	78.3
Self-employed	13.2	6.4	14.5	19.6	10.2	13.6	0.5	7.5	16.7	7.3	7.8	11.3
Youth Controls												
Male	52.6	50.8	53.0	63.4	49.9	46.1	49.5	43.0	46.4	40.6	41.8	50.3
Age	14.1	14.1	14.3	14.0	14.1	14.4	14.5	14.4	14.1	14.2	14.1	14.2
Immigrant generation												
Born in the US	44.7	57.8	14.9	70.1	60.5	6.4	2.7	19.8	54.8	50.9	74.8	44.9
Foreign-born, < 6 years	18.4	16.5	46.2	20.3	17.6	34.8	56.5	42.2	20.9	25.9	13.6	27.4
Foreign-born, 6-10years	18.4	17.6	23.7	9.6	15.2	58.3	28.0	33.1	22.6	22.8	11.7	22.3
Foreign-born, > 10 years	18.4	8.1	15.3	0.0	6.7	0.5	12.9	5.0	1.7	0.5	0.0	5.4
Lives in Miami (not San Diego)	7.9	0.3	0.4	99.5	2.4	98.5	0.0	6.6	91.2	98.7	70.9	45.9
9th grade (not 8th grade)	42.1	50.6	47.4	39.5	37.4	42.7	46.8	45.5	37.7	40.6	51.5	43.2
Lives with both parents	76.3	84.6	74.7	70.4	72.0	65.7	74.2	72.7	66.1	49.6	62.1	70.6
Number of siblings												
None	23.7	10.6	10.0	23.1	11.6	14.2	11.8	10.7	22.6	13.8	17.5	15.0
One	36.8	35.8	19.7	46.2	21.9	35.8	10.8	24.0	39.8	33.9	40.8	31.9
Two	13.2	33.8	19.3	22.1	30.7	28.9	21.0	27.3	28.5	27.2	24.3	26.5
Three +	26.3	19.8	51.0	8.6	35.9	21.1	56.5	38.0	9.2	25.0	17.5	26.6
Speak English at home	10.5	19.3	0.8	1.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	10.7	3.8	22.8	35.9	8.0
Attends public (not private) school	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.8	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	1.0	4.9

^a Cell values are % unless otherwise stated

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth-Darnell, James W. and Downey, Douglas B. 1998. "Assessing the oppositional culture explanation for racial/ethnic differences in school performance." *American Sociological Review* 63(4): 536-553.
- Alba, Richard. 2005. "Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1): 20-49.
- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Albright, Karen and Dalton Conley. 2004. "Introduction: American Educational Policy in Historical Perspective." In Karen Albright and Dalton Conley, eds. *After the bell: Family background, public policy and educational success*, pp. 1-22. New York: Routledge.
- Alonso-Borrego, César, Nuno Garoupa, Marcelo Perera, and Pablo Vázquez. 2008. "Immigration and Crime in Spain, 1999-2006." *Working Paper in Immigration Series*, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.
- Altozano, Manuel. 2002. "Quiero Ser Limpiador." *El Pais*, 3 July 2002.
- Andall, Jacqueline. 2002. "Second-generation attitude? African-Italians in Milan." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(3): 389-407.

- Angel-Ajani, Asale. 2000. "Italy's Racial Cauldron: Immigration, Criminalization and the Cultural Politics of Race." *Cultural Dynamics* 12(3): 3331-352.
- Anthias, Floya and Gabriella Lazaridis. 1999. "Introduction." In Floya Anthias and Gabriella Lazaridis, eds., *Into the Margins: Migration and Exclusion in Southern Europe*, pp. 1-12. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Bail, Christopher A. 2008. "The Configuration of Symbolic Boundaries against Immigrants in Europe," *American Sociological Review*, 73(1): 37-59.
- Barban, Nicola and Michael J. White. 2011. "Immigrants' Children's Transition to Secondary School in Italy." *International Migration Review* 45(3): 702-726.
- Barker, Martin. 1981. *The New Racism*. London: Junction Books.
- Barringer, Herbert R., David T. Takeuchi, and Peter Xenos. 1990. "Education, Occupational Prestige, and Income of Asian Americans." *Sociology of Education* 63(1): 27-43.
- Barth, Frederik. 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1967. "Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 75: 43-88.
- Beltrán Antolín, Joaquín. 2002. "The family business. Work, social and family networks in the Chinese community." *Ofrim / Supplements* 6: 129-153.
- Beltrán Antolín, Joaquín. 2005. "Chinese entrepreneurship in Spain: the Seeds of Chinatown." In *Asian Migrants and European Labour Markets: Patterns and Processes of Immigrant*

- Labour Market Insertion in Europe?*, edited by Ernst Spaan, Felicitas Hillmann, and A.L. van Naerssen. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Bempechat, Janine, Michael J. Nakkula, John T. Wu, and Herbert P. Ginsburg, 1996.
- “Attributions as predictors of mathematics achievement: A comparative study.” *Journal of Research & Development in Education* 29(2): 53-59.
- Berger, Eugenia Hepworth. 1981. *Parents as partners in education: The school and home working together*. St. Louis, Missouri: Mosby.
- Berti, Fabio. 2000. *Esclusione e Integrazione: Uno Studio su due Comunita di Immigrati*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Bilefsky, Dan. 2013. “Spain’s Chinese Immigrants Thrive in Tough Economy.” *New York Times*, 2 January 2013. Accessed on 3 January 2013: < <http://nyti.ms/Ucehd5> >
- Bol, Linda and Robert Quinlyn Berry. 2005. "Secondary Mathematics Teachers' Perceptions of the Achievement Gap." *The High School Journal* 88(4): 32-45
- Booth, Alan and Judith Dunn. 1996. *Family-School Links: How Do They Affect Educational Outcomes?* New York: Routledge.
- British Psychological Society. 1986. “Achievement in the primary school: Evidence to the Education, Science and Arts Committee of the House of Commons.” *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society* 39: 121-125.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Buxarrais, M. R., Martinez, M., Puig, J. M., and Trilla, J. 1994. "Moral education in the Spanish educational system." *Journal of Moral Education* 23(1): 39-59.
- Cachon, Lorenzo. 2009. *La España Inmigrante*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Calavita, Kitty. 2005. *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrasco, Silvia. 2005. "Interculturalidad e inclusión: principios para evaluar la acogida del alumnado extranjero." *Aula de Innovación Educativa* 147: 64-68.
- Carrasco, Cristina, and Albert Andreu Recio. 2001. "Time, work and gender in Spain." *Time and Society* 10(2): 277-301.
- CESNUR and University of Turin. 2010. *Survey on Integration of Immigrants in Turin*.
- Ceccagno, Antonella. 2007. "The Chinese in Italy at a Crossroads: The Economic Crisis." In Mette Thunø, ed., *Beyond Chinatown: New Chinese Migration and the Global Expansion of China*, pp.115-136. Copenhagen: NIAS Press.
- Chao, Ruth K. 2001. "Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans." *Child Development* 72(6): 1832-1843.
- Chao, Ruth K. 1994. "Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training." *Child Development* 65(4): 1111-1119.

- Chen, Chuangshen and Harold W. Stevenson. 1995. "Motivation and mathematics achievement: A comparative study of Asian-American, Caucasian-American and East Asian high school students." *Child Development* 66: 1215-1234.
- Cheung, Cecilia and Eva M. Pomerantz. 2012. "Why does parents' involvement in children's learning enhance children's achievement? The role of parent-oriented motivation." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 104: 820-832
- Cho, Grace and Debra DeCastro-Ambrosetti. 2005. "Is Ignorance Bliss? Pre-service Teachers' Attitudes Toward Multicultural Education." *The High School Journal* 89(2): 24-28.
- Chou, Rosalind S. and Joe R. Feagin. 2010. *The Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Christiansen, Flemming. 2003. *Chinatown, Europe: An Exploration of Overseas Chinese Identity in the 1990s*. London: Routledge.
- Chua, Amy. 2010. *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Coleman, James S. Ernest Campbell, Carol Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander Mood, Frederick D. Weinfeld, and Robert York. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Cologna, Daniele. 2005. "Chinese immigrant entrepreneurs in Italy: Strengths and weaknesses of an ethnic enclave economy." In *Asian Migrants and European Labour Markets: Patterns and Processes of Immigrant Labour Market Insertion in Europe?*, edited by Ernst Spaan, Felicitas Hillmann, and A.L. van Naerssen. London: Taylor and Francis.

- Colombo, Enzo. 2010. "Changing citizenship: Everyday representations of membership, belonging and identification among Italian senior secondary school students." *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education* 1: 129-153.
- Comer, James. 1992. *Raising Black Children*. New York: New American Library.
- Crul, Maurice and Jeroen Doomernik. 2003. "The second generation in The Netherlands. Divergent trends between and polarization within the two groups." *International Migration Review* 37(4): 1039-1064.
- Daly, Faïçal and Rohit Barot. 1999. "Economic Migration and Social Exclusion: The Case of Tunisians in Italy in the 1980s and 1990s." In Floya Anthias and Gabriella Lazaridis, eds., *Into the Margins: Migration and Exclusion in Southern Europe*, pp. 35-54. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Di Castro, Angelo Andrea and Marika Vicziany. 2009. "*Chinese Dragons in Prato: Italian-Chinese Relations in a Small European Town*." In Graeme Johanson, Russell Smyth, and Rebecca French, eds. *Living Outside the Walls: The Chinese in Prato*, pp. 174-191. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Davies, Don. 1992. *Parent Involvement in the Public Schools: Proposals, Issues, Opportunities*. Research for Better Schools.
- Dearing, Eric, Holly Kreider, Sandra Simpkins, and Heather B. Weiss. 2006. "Family involvement in school and low-income children's literacy performance: Longitudinal associations between and within families." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 98: 653-664.

- Desforges, Charles, and Alberto Abouchaar. 2003. *The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A review of literature*. London: DfES Publications.
- Domina, Thurston. 2005. "Leveling the Home Advantage: Assessing the Effectiveness of Parental Involvement in Elementary School." *Sociology of Education* 78 (3): 233-249.
- Dornbusch, Sanford M. and Kenneth D. Wood. 1989. "Family processes and educational achievement." In William J. Weston, ed. *Education and the American Family – A Research Syntheses*, pp 66-95. New York: New York University Press.
- Epstein, Joyce L. 2009. *School, Family and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Epstein, Joyce L. 2005. "Attainable goals? The spirit and letter of the No Child Left Behind Act on parental involvement." *Sociology of Education* 78(2): 179-182.
- Epstein, Joyce L. 2001. *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Epstein, Joyce L. 1985. "After the Bus Arrives: Resegregation in Desegregated Schools." *Journal of Social Issues* 41: 23–4.
- Fan, Xitao and Michael Chen. 2001. "Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Educational Psychology Review* 13(1): 1-22.
- Fordham, Signithia and John U. Ogbu. 1986. "Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White.'" *The Urban Review* 18(3): 176-206.

Galindo, René and Jami Vigil. 2006. "Are Anti-Immigrant Statements Racist or Nativist? What Difference Does It Make?" *Latino Studies* 4(4): 419-447.

Generalitat de Catalunya. 2010. "Les persones de nacionalitat xinesa a Catalunya." *La immigració en xifres*, no. 7.

Gian, Antonio Stella. 2001. "Altivole, Un Abitante su Sette e Immigrato" *Corriere della Sera*, 19 March 2001.

Gibson, Margaret A. and Silvia Carrasco. 2009. "The education of immigrant youth: Some lesson from the U.S. and Spain." *Theory into Practice* 48(4): 249-257.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano with Stacey H. Yap. 1994. "Chinese American Families" in *Minority Families in the United States: A Multicultural Perspective* ed. Ronald L. Taylor. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. London: Harper and Row.

Goldsmith, Rosie. 2007. "Italy struggles with Chinese migrants." *BBC News* (2 August 2007). Accessed on 4 October 2012: < <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/6926181.stm> >

Gonzales-Pienda, Julio A., Jose Nunez, Soledad Gonzalez-Pumariega, Luis Alvarez, Cristina Roces and Marta Garcia. 2002. "A structural equation model of parental involvement, motivational and aptitudinal characteristics, and academic achievement." *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(3): 257-287.

- Grolnick, Wendy S., Corina Benjet, Carolyn O. Kurowski, and Nicholas H. Apostoleris. 1997. "Predictors of Parent Involvement in Children's Schooling." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 89: 538-548.
- Grolnick, Wendy S. and Maria L. Slowiaczek. 1994. "Parents' Involvement in Children's Schooling: A Multidimensional Conceptualization and Motivational Model." *Child Development* 65:237-252.
- Guest, Kenneth J. and Ke Liang. 2012. *Immigration, Education, and Opportunity Among Chinese Americans of Fuzhounese Descent*. Asian American Asian Research Institute – Lecture, October 2012, New York City. Unpublished conference paper.
- Gutiérrez-Domènech, Maria. 2010. "Parental employment and time with children in Spain." *Review of Economics of the Household* 8(3) 371-391.
- Hango, Darcy. 2007. "Parental investment in childhood and educational qualifications: can greater parental involvement mediate the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage?" *Social Science Research* 36(4):1371-1390.
- Harris, Angel L. 2009. "Oppositional Culture Theory." In Deborah Carr, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Life Course and Human Development*, pp. 329-333. Detroit: Macmillan.
- Harris, Angel L. 2011. *Kids Don't want to Fail: Oppositional Culture and the Black-White Achievement Gap*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Hiatt-Michael, Diana B. 2005. "Global Overview of Family-School Involvement." In Diana B. Hiatt-Michael, ed., *Promising Practices for Family Involvement in Schooling Across the Continents*, pp. 1-11. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

- Hiatt-Michael, Diana B. 2001. *Preparing Teachers To Work with Parents*. ERIC Digest.
- Hiatt-Michael, Diana B. 1994. "Parent involvement in American public schools: An historical perspective 1642–1994." *The School Community Journal* 4(2): 27-38.
- Hirschmann, Charles and Morrison G. Wong. 1986. "The Extraordinary Educational Attainment of Asian Americans: A Search for Historical Evidence and Explanations." *Social Forces* 65(1): 1-27.
- Ho, David. 1989. "Continuity and variation in Chinese patterns of socialization." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51(1): 149-163.
- Hoeffel, Elizabeth M., Sonya Rastogi, Myoung Ouk Kim, and Hasan Shahid. 2012. "The Asian Population: 2010" *2010 Census Briefs*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Hoge, Dean R., Edna K. Smit, and John T. Crist. 1997. "Four family process factors predicting academic achievement for sixth and seventh grade." *Educational Research Quarterly* 21(2): 27–42.
- Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen V. and Howard M. Sandlar. 1997. "Why Do Parents Become Involved in Their Children's Education?" *Review of Educational Research* 67:3-42.
- Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen V. and Howard M. Sandlar. 1995. "Parent Involvement in Children's Education: Why Does It Make a Difference?" *Teachers College Record* 97:310-331.
- Jencks, Christopher. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Hyun, Jane. 2005. *Breaking the Bamboo Ceiling: Career Strategies for Asians*. New York: Harper Business.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística. 2010. *Evolution of the foreign population in Spain since 1998*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (National Statistics Institute of Spain). 2012. *Statistical Yearbook on Foreigners 2012*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

ISTAT (National Institute of Statistics of Italy). 2012. *Annual Report: Situation of the Nation*. Rome: ISTAT.

Johanson, Graeme, Russell Smyth and Rebecca French, eds. 2009. *Living Outside the Walls: The Chinese in Prato*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Julian, Teresa W., Patrick C. McKenry, and Mary W. McKelvey. 1994. "Cultural variations in parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American parents." *Family Relations* 43(1): 30-37.

Kao, Grace. 1995. "Asian-Americans as Model Minorities? A Look at Their Academic Performance." *American Journal of Education* 103:121-159.

Kao, Grace and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly* 76: 1-19.

Kasinitz, Phillip, Mary Waters, John H. Mollenkopf, and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage.

- Kastoryano, Riva. 2002. *Negotiating Identities. States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kibria, Nazli. 2002. *Becoming Asian American: Second-Generation Chinese and Korean American Identities*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.
- Kim, Dae Young. 2006. "Stepping-stone to intergenerational mobility? The springboard, safety net, or mobility trap functions of Korean immigrant entrepreneurship for the second generation." *International Migration Review* 40(4): 927-962.
- Kim, Uichol and Maria BJ Chun. 1994. "Educational "success" of Asian Americans: An indigenous perspective." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 15(3): 329-339.
- King, Russell and Isabel Rodriguez-Melguizo. 1999. "Recent Immigration to Spain: The Case of Moroccans in Catalonia." In Floya Anthias and Gabriella Lazaridis, eds., *Into the Margins: Migration and Exclusion in Southern Europe*, pp. 55-82. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Laczko, Frank. 2003. "Europe Attracts More Migrants from China." *Migration Information Source*.
- Landale, Nancy S., R.S. Oropesa and Daniel Llanes. 1998. "Schooling, Work and Idleness among Mexican and non-Latino White Adolescents." *Social Science Research* 27: 457-280.
- Lam, Shui Fong. 1997. *How the family influences children's academic achievement*. New York: Garland.

- Lamont, Michèle and Virag Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences" *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28:167-95
- Lee, Jennifer. 2012. "Stereotype Promise." *Russell Sage Foundation Review*, 5 January 2012. Accessed on 4 February 2014. << [<http://www.russellsage.org/blog/j-lee/stereotype-promise>>](http://www.russellsage.org/blog/j-lee/stereotype-promise)
- Lee, Jennifer. 2012. "Tiger Kids and the Success Frame." *The Society Pages* (18 April 2012).
- Lee, Jennifer, and Min Zhou. 2013. "Frames of Achievement and Opportunity Horizons: Second-Generation Chinese, Vietnamese, and Mexicans in Los Angeles." Pp. 206-231 in *Immigration, Poverty, and Socioeconomic Inequality*, eds. David Card and Steven Raphael. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lee, Jennifer and Min Zhou. 2014. "The Success Frame and Achievement Paradox: The Costs and Consequences for Asian Americans." *Race and Social Problems* 6(1): 38-55.
- Lee, Stacy J. 2009. *Unraveling the 'Model Minority' Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth, 2nd Edition*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lentin, Alana. 2004. *Racism And Anti-Racism In Europe*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan
- Li, Guofang and Lihshing Wang, eds. 2008. *Model Minority Myth Revisited: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Demystifying Asian American Educational Experiences*. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

- Linver, Miriam R., Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Natasha Cabrera. 2004. "The home observation for measurement of the environment (HOME) inventory: The derivation of conceptually designed subscales." *Parenting* 4(2): 99-114.
- Loo, Chalsa M. and Rolison, Garry. 1986. "Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university." *Journal of Higher Education* 57: 58-77.
- Louie, Vivian. 2012. *Keeping the Immigrant Bargain: The Costs and Rewards of Success in America*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Louie, Vivian. 2004. *Compelled to Excel: Education and Opportunity among Chinese Americans*. Palo Alto: Stanford.
- Ma, Suzanne. 2012. "For Spain, an economic lifeline from China." *Business Week* (23 February 2012). Accessed on 12 November 2013: < <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-02-23/for-spain-an-economic-lifeline-from-china>>
- Maher, Vanessa. 1996. "Immigration and Social Identities." In David Forgacs and Robert Lumley, eds., *Italian Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, pp. 160–177. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martínez, Isabel and José Fernando García. 2007. "Impact of parenting styles on adolescents' self-esteem and internalization of values in Spain." *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 10(2): 338-348.
- Martínez González, Raquel Amaya. 1996. "Parent involvement in schools in Spain: A case study." In Don Davies and Vivian Johnson, eds., *Crossing Boundaries. Multi-National*

- Action Research on Family-School Collaboration*, pp.103-144. Boston: Centre on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning.
- Martínez González, Raquel Amaya. 1998. "The challenge of Parenting Education: New Demands for Schools in Spain. Childhood Education. Infancy through Early Adolescence." *International Perspectives on School-Family-Community Partnerships* 74(6): 351-354.
- McCabe, Kristen. 2012. "Chinese Immigrants in the United States." *Migration Information Source* (January). Accessed on 12 November 2012:
<<http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=876#20>>
- McNeal, Ralph B., Jr. 1999. "Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out." *Social Forces* 78(1): 117–144.
- Minello, Alessandra and Nicola Barban. 2011. "The Educational Aspirations of Children of Immigrants in Italy." *Dondena Working Papers* no. 46.
- Modood, Tariq. 2011. "Capitals, Ethnic Identity and Educational Qualifications." In Richard Alba and Mary Waters, eds., *The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth in a Comparative Perspective*, pp.185-206. New York: New York University Press.
- Morning, Ann. 2013. *Race and Razza: Concepts of Difference in the U.S. and Italy*. Center for Migration and Development Colloquium Series, 20 November 2013. Princeton, NJ.
- Nieto, Gladys. 2001. *Las asociaciones chino-españolas en la construcción de una comunidad imaginada*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Social Anthropology, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

- Nieto, Gladys. 2003. "The Chinese in Spain." *International Migration* 43(1): 215-237.
- O'Connor, Carla. 1999. "Race, class, and gender in America: Narratives of opportunity among low-income African American youth." *Sociology of Education* 72: 137-157.
- Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ogbu, John and Matute-Bianchi, Maria. 1986. "Understanding Sociocultural Factors: Knowledge, Identity, and School Adjustment." In Carlos E. Cortes, ed., *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students*. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination & Assessment Center.
- Ogbu, John U., and Herbert D. Simons. 1998. "Voluntary and involuntary minorities: a cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 29(2): 155-188.
- Peach, Ceri and Günther Glebe. 1995. "Muslim minorities in Western Europe." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18(1): 26-45.
- Peraita, Carlos and Margarita Pastor. 2000. "The primary school dropout in Spain: the influence of family background and labor market conditions." *Education Economics* 8(2):157-168.
- Petrongolo, Barbara and Maria J. San Segundo. 2002. "Staying-on at school at 16: the impact of labor market conditions in Spain." *Economics of Education Review* 21(4): 353-365.
- Pieke, Frank N. 2002. *Recent Trends in Chinese Migration to Europe: Fujianese Migration in Perspective*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.

- Pieke, Frank N., Pál Nyíri, Mette Thunø, and Antonella Ceccagno. 2003. *Transnational Chinese: Fujianese Migrants in Europe*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Pincus, Fred. 2008. "Reverse Discrimination." In Richard Schaefer, ed., *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity and Society*, pp.1160-1162. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Portes, Alejandro, Rosa Aparicio, William Haller and Erik Vickstrom. 2010. "Moving ahead in Madrid: Aspirations and Expectations in the Spanish Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 44(4): 767-801.
- Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1): 74-96
- Portes, Alejandro, Robert Nash Parker, and Jose A. Cobas. 1980. "Assimilation or consciousness: Perceptions of US society among recent Latin American immigrants to the United States." *Social Forces* 59(1): 200-224.
- Powell, Brian, Regina Werum and Lala Carr Steelman. 2004. "Macro Causes, Micro Effects: Linking public policy, family structure and educational outcomes." In Karen Albright and Dalton Conley, eds. *After the bell: Family background, public policy and educational success*, pp.111-144. New York: Routledge.
- Pullman, J.D. 1987. *History of Education in America*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.

- Raijman, Rebeca and Marta Tienda. 2000. "Pathways to Business Ownership Among Immigrants to Chicago: A Comparative Ethnic Perspective." *International Migration Review* 34 (3): 681-705.
- Ravn, Birte. 2005. "The Cultural Context of Parental Participation and Scandinavian/Western European Issues." In Diana B. Hiatt-Michael, ed., *Promising Practices for Family Involvement in Schooling Across the Continents*, pp. 13-30. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Robinson, Keith and Angel L. Harris. 2014. *The Broken Compass: Parental Involvement with Children's Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenthal, Elisabeth and Elisabetta Povoledo. 2007. "Milan dispute mirrors tensions involving many Chinese communities." *New York Times*, 26 April 2007. Accessed on 13 September 2013: <<<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/26/world/europe/26iht-italy.4.5457480.html>>>
- Roth, Wendy D. 2012. *Race Migrations: Latinos and the Cultural Transformation of Race*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rudy, Duane, and Joan E. Grusec. 2001. "Correlates of authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist cultures and implications for understanding the transmission of values." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 32(2): 202-212.
- Quoss, Bernita and Wen Zhao. 1995. "Parenting styles and children's satisfaction with parenting in China and the United States." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 26(2): 265-280.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Sakamoto, Arthur, Kimberly A. Goyette, and ChangHwan Kim. 2009. "Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:255-276.
- Sanchirico, Andrew. 1991. "The importance of small-business ownership in Chinese American Educational Achievement." *Sociology of Education* 64(4): 293-304.
- Schneider, Barbara and Yongsook Lee. 1990. "A model for academic success: the school and home environment of East Asian students." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 21: 358-377.
- Schulting, Amy, Patrick Malone and Kenneth Dodge. 2005. "The effect of school-based kindergarten transition policies and practices on child academic outcomes." *Developmental Psychology* 41(6): 860-871
- Sheldon, Steven B. 2002. "Parental Involvement in education." In James E. Guthrie, ed., *Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 5 (2nd edition)*, pp.1844-1847. New York: Macmillan.
- Skeldon, Ronald. 2011. "China: An Emerging Destination for Economic Migration." *Migration Information Source* (May 2011).
- Small, Mario L., David Harding, and Michele Lamont. 2010. "Reconsidering Culture and Poverty." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 629(1): 6-27.
- Smith, Justin E. H. 2014. "Does Immigration Mean 'France Is Over'?" *New York Times*, 5 January 2014. Accessed on 13 February 2014:
<<<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/01/05/does-immigration-mean-france-is-over>>>

- Smith, Robert C. 2006. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Pierangelo Peri, Rui J. P. de Figueiredo Jr., and Thomas Piazza. 2000. *The Outsider: Prejudice and Politics in Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Song, Miri. 1999. *Helping out: Children's labor in ethnic businesses*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Steele, Claude M and Joshua Aronson. 1995. "Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69(5): 797-811.
- Sue, Stanley and Sumie Okazaki. 1990. "Asian-American educational achievements: a phenomenon in search of an education." *American Psychologist* 45: 913-920.
- Suizzo, Marie-Anne, and Laura M. Stapleton. 2007. "Home-based Parental Involvement in Young Children's Education: Examining the effects of maternal education across US ethnic groups." *Educational Psychology* 27(4): 533-556.
- Takagi, Dana Y. 1990. "From Discrimination to Affirmative Action: Facts in the Asian American Admissions Controversy," *Social Problems* 37(4): 578-592
- Tarantino, Matteo and Simone Tosoni. 2009. "The Battle of Milan: Social representations of the April 12th riots by two Italian Chinese communities." In Graeme Johanson, Russell Smyth and Rebecca French, eds., *Living outside the walls: The Chinese in Prato*, pp.202-219. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Teese, Ricahrd, Petter Aasen, Simon Field, and Beatriz Pont. 2006. *Equity in Spanish education: An OECD thematic review*. Paris: OECD.
- Terrazas, Aaron Matteo and Bhavna Devani. 2008. "Chinese Immigrants in the United States." *Migration Information Source*.
- Thunø, Mette .1999. "Moving Stones from China to Europe: The Dynamics of Emigration from Zhejiang to Europe." In *Internal and International Migration: Chinese Perspectives* eds. Frank N. Pieke and Hein Mallee, 159-180. Richmond: Curzon Press.
- Total, Michele. 2002. "Fortress Italy: Racial Politics and the New Immigration Amendment in Italy." *Fordham International Law Journal* 26(5): 1438-1504.
- Tracey, Terrence J., and Sedlacek, William E. 1987. "Prediction of college graduation using noncognitive variables by race." *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance* 19: 177-84
- Triandafyllidou, Anna. 2001. *Immigrants and National Identity in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Tyson, Karolyn ,William Darity, Jr. and Domini R. Castellino. 2005. "‘It’s not a Black thing’": Understanding the burden of acting White and other dilemmas of high achievement." *American Sociological Review* 70(4): 582–605.
- Waters, Mary C. 1994. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Xie, Yu and Kimberly Goyette. 2003. "Social Mobility and the Educational Choices of Asian Americans." *Social Science Research* 32:467-98.

- Yan, Wenfan, and Qiuyun Lin. 2005. "Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast across racial and ethnic groups." *The Journal of Educational Research* 99 (2): 116-127.
- Zapata-Barrero, Ricard. 2013. "Managing Diversity in Spain: New Dimensions, New Challenges." Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.
- Zellman, Gail and Waterman Jill M. 1998. "Understanding the impact of parent school involvement on children's educational outcomes." *The Journal of Educational Research* 91(6): 370-380.
- Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zhou, Min. 2009. *Contemporary Chinese America: Immigration, Ethnicity, and Community Transformation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zhou, Min and Carl L. Bankston III. 1994. "Social Capital and the Adaptation of the Second Generation: The Case of Vietnamese Youth in New Orleans East." *International Migration Review* 28 (4): 775-799.
- Zufiaurre, Benjamin. 2006. "Social inclusion and multicultural perspectives in Spain: Three case studies in northern Spain." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 9(4): 409-424