Introduction

Increasing globalization has stimulated an unprecedented flow of immigrants. These newcomers—from many national origins and a wide range of cultural, religious, linguistic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds—challenge a nation’s sense of unity. Globalization threatens both the identities the original residents of the areas in which newcomers settle and those of the immigrants and their children. Integrating immigrants and the subsequent generations into the receiving society is a primary challenge of globalization; failing to do so, however, will have long term social implications. The ability to formulate an identity that allows comfortable movement between worlds will be at the very heart of achieving a truly “global soul” (Iyer 2000).

At the beginning of the new millennium, there are over 175 million immigrants and refugees worldwide. In the United States alone, 32.5 million, or approximately 10 percent of the population, are immigrants (Census 2000). This is not simply a U.S. phenomenon, however. In the year 2000, 4.2 percent of the population in the United Kingdom and 5.6 percent of the population in France, were foreign born. In other nations, the percentage of foreign-born is greater than in the United States: 11.8 in Sweden, 17.4 in Canada, and 23.6 in Australia are immigrants (MigrationInformation 2003). In almost all these contexts, this trend over the past ten years has been steadily increasing. It is important to note that these figures reflect only the first generation. If one considers the children of these immigrants—the second generation—clearly many more individuals are involved in the task of negotiating a new identity that synthesizes elements of the culture of origin with those of the receiving culture.

The ever increasing flows of individuals from myriad backgrounds provide a number of aesthetic, cognitive, social, and marketplace opportunities. The ability to code-switch—to move fluidly between languages and cultures—has obvious social advantage. Bicultural and bilingual competence enables individuals to fluidly adapt themselves to evolving situations (Titone 199?) This skill has advantages for entering numerous professions in the business, diplomatic, and social service sectors. Sommer argues that bilingualism is essential for democracy as it “depends on constructing those miraculous and precarious points of contact from mismatches among codes and people” (Sommer In press). Indeed, shortly after the
last large wave of migration at the turn of the twentieth century, Stonequist argued that the marginality of individuals caught between cultures, could lead to individuals who would play the essential role of cultural ambassadors adept at interpreting and bridging differences (Stonequist 1937). The cognitive flexibility that this multiple perspective taking requires is becoming an ever more essential trait for the global citizen (Gardner, this volume).

**Immigrant Stress.** Multiple pathways structure immigrants’ journeys into their new homes. Immigrants and refugees are motivated by a variety of factors—relief from political, religious or ethnic persecution (in the case of refugees), economic incentives; as well as the opportunity to be reunited with family members. Although for many immigrant families, migration results in substantial gains, it provides many challenges to the individuals involved. It removes individuals from many of their relationships and predictable contexts—extended families and friends, community ties, jobs, living situations, customs, and often languages. Immigrants are stripped of many of their sustaining social relationships as well as of the social roles that provide them with culturally scripted notions of how they fit into the world resulting in acculturative stress (Berry 1997; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001).

Immigrant youth face particular challenges. They often immigrate not just to new homes but also to new family structures (Suárez-Orozco, Todorova et al. 2002). In our study of four hundred immigrant youth coming from a variety of sending origins including Central America, China, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Haiti, we found that fully 85 percent of the youth in this project had been separated from one or both parents for periods of several months to several years (ibid). To compound this form of parental unavailability, many immigrant parents work long hours rendering them relatively physically absent in the lives of their children. This absence compounds the psychological unavailability that often accompanies parental anxiety and depression that often is associated with migration (Athey and Ahearn 1991). These forms of absence all too frequently leave immigrant children to their own devices long before it is developmentally ideal. Although in some cases this leads to children who internalize hyperresponsibility, in other cases it leads to depressed youth who are drawn to the lure of alternative family structures such as gangs—a particular risk for boys (Vigil 1988).

**The Second Generation.** The challenges of the first generation are considerably different from those of the second generation. The first generation is largely concerned with surviving and adjusting to the new context. These immigrants may go through a variety of normative adverse reactions following the multiple losses of migration—including anxiety and depression. The first generation is protected from these psychological sequelae by several factors, however. The dual frame of reference by which immigrants can
compare their current situation with that which was left behind often allows them to feel relatively advantaged in the new context (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 1995). Optimism is at the very heart of the immigrant experience—the possibility of a better tomorrow acts as both a tremendous motivator as well as a form of inoculation against encountered frustrations and barriers. Further, first generation immigrants are often energized by the desire to support loved ones—by sending remittances home to those left behind as well as by the desire to build the best possible life for their children. While not an easy road, it is one with a clear identity. Immigrants who arrive as adults maintain a sense of identity rooted deeply in their birthplace. Many expatriates are, of course, quite comfortable in their new homeland. Nevertheless, they tend to retain an outsider status, however, as the cultural and linguistic hurdles are simply too high to be surmounted within one generation (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001).

The path for their children—the second generation—is less straightforward offering a variety of forks to be taken. For these youth, forging a sense of identity may be their single greatest challenge. Do they feel comfortable in their homeland? Do they feel accepted by the ‘native-born’ of the host country? What relationship do they have with their parents’ country of origin? Is their sense of identity rooted “here,” “there,” everywhere, or nowhere?

The Architecture of Cultural Identity

**Stage versus Context** Erik (Erikson 1968) argued that in the developmental stage of adolescence, identity was the critical maturational task. In forming an identity, youth attempt to create a self-identity that is consistent with how others view them. Identity is less challenging when there is continuity between the various social milieus youth encounter—home, school, neighborhood, and country. In the era of globalization, however, social spaces are more discontinuous and fractured than ever before.

A number of psychologists have claimed that identity goes through a variety of permutations during adolescence as the individual experiments with different identity strategies. Some argue that all youth move steadily from a stage of ethnic or “racial unawareness,” to one of “exploration,” to a final stage of an “achieved” sense of racial or ethnic identity (Marcia, 1966). Others point out that the process of identity formation is more accurately described as “spiraling” back to revisit previous stages, each time from a different vantage point (Parham, 1989).

Identity formation, I would argue, is not simply a process by which one passes through a variety of stages on the way to achieving a stable identity. Rather it is a process that is fluid and contextually driven. If raised in Beijing and immigrating as an adult, one may ‘discover’ that one is ‘Asian’ for the first time at
age thirty. In Beijing, that same individual may never have considered her racial or ethnic identity (or if she did it would be a neighborhood identity). In the Chinatown of the host society, the identity will be one of urban mainland China origin (in contrast to Cantonese speakers from Hong Kong or Canton) but in the heartland of the host country the identity may become more complex “pan-Asian” construct. The social context is essential in which identity is foreshadowed.

**Achieved and Ascribed Identities.** The tension between the dominant culture and minority newcomers is at the heart of the ethnic and cultural identity formation drama of immigrants and their children often is (DeVos 1980). Youth are challenged to navigate between achieved identities and ascribed or imposed identities (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001). Achieved identity is the extent to which an individual achieves a sense of belonging—“I am a member of this group.” An ascribed identity is imposed either by co-ethnics—“You are a member of our group” or by members of the dominant culture—“You are a member of that group.”

For some groups the imposed ascribed identity is considerably stronger than for others. In the United States, for example, African origin identity is firmly ascribed whereas Italian origin identity can be assumed at will. The degree that ascribed origins are imposed may also evolve over time. At the turn of the twentieth century in Boston, Irish origins had significant negative implications whereas at the turn of the twenty-first century, having Irish origins merits little notice and can be implemented at will (for St. Patrick’s Day events but not necessarily in a job interview).

Phenotypic racial features have considerable implications for the ease of assimilation. Historically, immigrants coming from Europe to the United States could more easily assimilate once they lost their accents and changed their names. The ability to join the mainstream unnoticed is more challenging when one is racially marked. Question as to where one is “really from” or compliments made to Asian America in the United States for many generations on their English fluency leads to what law professor Frank H. Wu (2002) refers to as “perpetual foreigner syndrome.” The fact that many immigrants in this era of globalization originate from regions in the developing world (in Africa, Asia, and Latin America) and are entering primarily European populated post-industrial regions (Europe, North America, Australia) makes the notion of “passing” or fully assimilating unnoticed is no longer possible for most new arrivals.

**Contact with Culture of Origin** Culture provides one with shared understandings and models for making meaning of one’s experiences. Cultural beliefs present standards of behavior that are internalized over time and cultural traditions offer a soothing sense of social safety. At the heart of these shared understandings are the interpersonal networks of relations in which one is embedded.
In order to maintain a sense of affinity with one’s culture of origin, sustained contact is required. Regular visits back to the homeland—in what is described as a transnational existence—facilitates maintenance of the parental culture (Levitt 1996). Living in an ethnic enclave limits the opportunity for regular interaction with members of the mainstream culture. Ethnic communities such as Chinatown in San Francisco, Mexican barrios in Los Angeles, the Dominican neighborhood in Washington Heights in New York city, the Cuban enclave in Miami, and the like, nurture a sense of culture of origin without requiring return visits to the homeland. The strength of the effect of these ethnic neighborhoods and enclaves is determined by the density of the local ethnic population, the strength of the collective co-ethnic identity, the community’s cohesiveness, and the availability of cultural role models.

If there is little contact with the culture of origin, however, then all of the cultural lessons fall upon the shoulders of the parents to teach. Parents are, no doubt, a critical source of information in the quest to form a sense of identity. Immigration, however, undermines parents’ ability to act as guides by removing the “map of experience” necessary to competently escort children in the new culture (Hoffman 1989). Without effortless proficiency in the new cultural expectations and practices, immigrant parents are less able to provide guidance in the ways of negotiating the currents of a complex society; in addition they must also rely on their children for cultural interpretations. As a seasoned immigrant comments to a prospective migrant in the novel Accordion Crimes, “...the natural order of the world is reversed. The old learn from the children” (Proulx 1996).

The ease with which elements of the parental culture can be incorporated into the new culture, will to some extent, be affected by the “cultural distance” between the parental culture and new culture (Berry 1997). Youth growing up within dual contexts characterized by great degrees of dissimilarity between cultural beliefs and social practices, are likely to suffer from greater identity confusion than those coming from relatively similar cultural backgrounds (Arnett 2002). This would suggest that in the United States the children of rural Hmong in northern California (Portes and Rumbaut 2001) or Yemeni immigrants in the Midwest would face more challenges than the children of Canadian immigrants in New England.

**Contact with Dominant Culture.** The fact that many immigrants enter highly segregated neighborhoods with large minority populations complicates the potential for identification with mainstream culture. If there is little contact with the mainstream middleclass in any form other than media representations encountered on the television or in movies, identifying with the host culture becomes something of an abstraction.
Performing Identity. How does an individual demonstrate their ethnic affiliation? At the most basic level, the ethnic label an individual chooses signifies his chosen identity (Maestes 2000). Sociological research has used the self-selected label as a way of examining identity. Whether a second-generation person of Mexican origin calls herself Mexican or Mexican American, or Latina, or Chicana, seem to be linked to quite different patterns of incorporation and engagement in schooling (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Individuals who adopt a self-referential label that includes their parents’ country of origin, seem to do better in school than their counterparts who select a pan ethnicity (such Hispanic or Latino) or who refer only to their country of residence (such as American). The same is true with self-selected labels adhered to by persons of Caribbean origin; (Waters 1997) has demonstrated that Caribbean origin youth who call themselves Jamaican-American, for example, appear to have different perceptions of discrimination and opportunities than those who call themselves African-American.

Feelings of belonging to rather than alienation from the various cultural groups an individual may be part of also has important implications (DeVos and Suárez-Orozco 1990). Whether or not one feels affiliation with and acceptance in the groups under consideration are maybe related to one’s ability to incorporate elements of the culture into one’s sense of self. Does the individual value their culture of origin? Does he feel accepted by other members of that culture? Is he drawn to the new culture (or cultures)? Does he feel welcome and incorporated into the new culture (or cultures)? Do he wish to be incorporated into the new culture or does he find it alienating? These attitudes will have much to do with the fusion of culture that is internalized (Maestes 2000).

Participation in a series of ethnic activities as well as the dominant culture’s activities and social practices is one of the clearest ways in which cultural identity is performed (Maestes 2000). What language does the individual report feeling most comfortable using (Maestes 2000)? In what circumstances does she use the language of origin—spontaneously or under duress? What is the culture of the friends she is drawn to—largely persons of the culture of origin, largely persons from the dominant culture, or friends that are drawn from a range of origins? What religious practices does she subscribe to and to what degree—daily rituals or occasional visits with a primarily social function? What foods does she most enjoyed, particularly in social functions? What holidays does she celebrate—largely those of culture of origin, largely those of the host society, or some combination? What entertainment choices does she make? Selections made in sports participation (baseball versus basketball versus soccer, for example), radio (salsa versus rap versus pop or ethnic talk shows versus mainstream talk shows), movies and videos (country of origin versus
Hollywood versus an eclectic selection) can provide insight into relative comfort and affiliation with the points of cultural contact (Louie 2003)

**The Ethos of Reception.** The general social climate or ethos of reception plays a critical role in the adaptation of immigrants and their children (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001). Unfortunately, intolerance for newcomers is an all too common response all over the world. Discrimination against immigrants of color is particularly widespread and intense in many areas receiving large numbers of new immigrants – this is true in Europe (M. Suárez-Orozco 1996), the US and in Japan (Tsuda 2003). As today’s immigrants are more diverse than ever before in ethnicity, skin color, and religion, they are particularly subject to the pervasive social traumata of prejudice and social exclusion (Tatum 1997).

The exclusion can take a structural form (when individuals are excluded from the opportunity structure) as well as an “attitudinal” form (in the form of disparagement and public hostility). These structural barriers and the social ethos of intolerance and racism encountered by many immigrants of color intensify the stresses of immigration. Although the structural exclusion suffered by immigrants and their children is tangibly detrimental to their ability to participate in the opportunity structure, the attitudinal social exclusion also plays a toxic role. Philosopher Charles Taylor argued that “our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves” (Taylor 1994). How can youth of immigrant origin incorporate the notion that they are unwanted “aliens” who do not warrant the most basic rights of education and health care?

**The Social Mirror.** Child psychoanalyst D. W. Winicott suggests that a child’s sense of self is profoundly shaped by the reflections mirrored back to him by significant others (Winicott 1971). Indeed all human beings are dependent upon the reflection of themselves mirrored by others. “Others” include not just the mother (which was Winicott’s principal concern) but also non-parental relatives, adult caretakers, siblings, teachers, peers, employers, people on the street, and even the media (Suárez-Orozco 2000). When the reflected image is generally positive, the individual (adult or child) will be able to feel that she is worthwhile and competent. When the reflection is generally negative, it is extremely difficult to maintain an unblemished sense of self-worth.

These reflections can be accurate or inaccurate. In some cases, the reflection can be a positive distortion. In such a situation the response to the individual may be out of proportion to his actual contribution or achievements. In the most benign case, positive expectations can be an asset. In the
classic “Pygmalion in the Classroom” study, teachers who believed that certain children were brighter than others (based on the experimenter randomly assigning some children that designation, unsubstantiated in fact) they treated the children more positively and assigned them higher grades (Rosenthal and Feldman 1991). It is possible that some immigrant students, such as Asians, benefit somewhat from positive expectations of their competence as a result of being members of a “model minority”—though no doubt at a cost (Takaki 1993).

It is the negative distortions, however, that are most worrysome. What is the effect for children who receive mirroring from society that is predominantly negative and hostile? Such is the case with many immigrant and minority children. Commenting on the negative social mirror towards Muslim students after September 11th 2001, Iraqi-American Nuar Alsadir, eloquently stated, “The world shouldn’t be a funhouse in which we’re forced to stand before the distorting mirror, begging for our lives” (Alsadir 2002). W.E.B. DuBois famously articulated the challenge of what he termed “double-consciousness”—a “sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity (Du Bois 1903/1989). When the expectations are of sloth, irresponsibility, low intelligence, and even danger, the outcome can be toxic. When these reflections are received in a number of mirrors including the media, the classroom, and the street, the outcome is devastating (Adams 1990).

Research from the Harvard Immigration Project, a study of immigrant youth coming from a variety of sending countries to the United States from China, Central America, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Mexico, suggests that immigrant children are keenly aware of the prevailing ethos of hostility of the dominant culture. Four hundred children were asked to complete the sentence “Most Americans think that [Chinese, Dominicans, Central Americans, Haitians, Mexicans –depending on the child’s country of origin] are…” Disturbingly, fully 65 percent of the respondents provided a negative response to the sentence completion task. The modal response was the word “bad;” others—even more disconcerting—included: “stupid,” “useless,” “garbage,” gang members,” “lazy,” and “we don’t exist” (Suárez-Orozco 2000).

What meanings do youth construct from and how do they respond to this negative social mirror? One possible pathway is for youth to become resigned to the negative reflections leading to hopelessness and self-depreciation that may in turn result in low aspirations and self-defeating behaviors. The general affect associated with this pathway is one of depression and passivity. In this scenario, the child is likely to respond with self-doubt and shame, setting low aspirations in a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy: “They are probably right. I’ll never be able to do anything.” Other youth may mobilize to resist the mirrors and
injustices they encounter. I differentiate between two types of resistance. The first is a project infused with hope, a sense of justice, and a faith in a better tomorrow. The other form of resistance is eventually overcome by alienation leading to anomie, hopelessness, and a nihilistic view of the future. In this latter case, youth may actively resist the reflections they encounter but are unable to maintain hope for change or a better future. Without hope, the resulting anger and compensatory self-aggrandizement may lead to acting-out behaviors including the kinds of dystopic cultural practices typically associated with gang membership. For these youth, the response is “If you think I’m bad, let me show you just how bad I can be” (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

The social trajectories of youth are more promising for those who are able to actively maintain and cultivate a sense of hope for the future. Whether they are resigned, oblivious, or resistant to the reflections in the social mirror, those who are able to maintain hope are in fundamental ways partially inoculated to the toxicity they may encounter. These youth are better able to maintain pride and preserve their self-esteem. In these circumstances, energies are mobilized in the service of day-to-day coping. Some may not only focus on their own advancement but also harness their energies in the service of their communities by volunteering to help others, by acting as role models, or by actively advocating and mobilizing for social change. In this scenario, youth respond to the negative social mirror as a goad towards “I’ll show you I can make it in spite of what you think of me” (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Social Disparagement & Academic Outcomes. Children of color are particularly subject to negative expectations that have profound implications for their academic performance (Weinstein 2002). Cross-cultural data from research focused on a variety of disparaged minorities in a number of contexts all over the world, suggest that exposure to a negative social mirror adversely affect academic engagement. This research provides insight into a number of critical questions: In ethnically diverse and increasingly transnational societies, how does schooling relate to hierarchies of inequality (Freire 1995)? Does the educational system reproduce inequalities by replicating the existing social order? Or, does schooling help to overcome social inequalities by emerging as an avenue for status mobility?

What is the experience of self in cultures where patterned inequality shapes social interactions? Anthropological cross-cultural evidence from a variety of different regions suggests that the social context and ethos of reception plays an important role in immigrant adaptation. (Ogbu 1978) has argued that migrants who were incorporated against their will thorough conquest or enslavement are more likely to give up on educational avenues as a route to social mobility then are those of immigrant origin who enter a new society voluntarily. Involuntary minorities quickly perceive that there is a structural ceiling above which they
can not rise in the status hierarchy regardless of motivation, talent, and achievement. DeVos and Suárez-Orozco (1990) have demonstrated that a cultural and symbolic ethos of reception saturated with psychological disparagement and racist stereotypes have profound implications for the identity formation of minority and immigrant children as well as their schooling experiences.

In cases in which racial and ethnic inequalities are highly structured, such as for Algerians in France, Koreans in Japan, or Mexicans in California, ‘psychological disparagement’ and ‘symbolic violence’ permeate their experience. Members of these groups not only are effectively locked out of the opportunity structure (through segregated and inferior schools, and work opportunities in the least desirable sectors of the economy) but also commonly become the objects of cultural violence. The stereotypes of inferiority, sloth, and violence justify the sense that they are less deserving of full participation in the dominant society's opportunity structure. Facing such charged attitudes which assault and undermine their sense of self, minority children may come to experience the institutions of the dominant society—and most especially its schools—as alien terrain reproducing an order of inequality (DeVos & Suárez –Orozco, 1990). While all groups face structural obstacles, not all groups elicit and experience the same attitudes from the dominant culture. Some immigrant groups elicit more negative attitudes—encountering a more negative social mirror—than others do. In U.S. public opinion polls, for example, Asians are seen more favorably than Latinos (Espenshade & Belanger 1998).

In past generations, assimilationist trajectories demonstrated a correlation between length of residence in the United States and better schooling, health, and income outcomes (Gordon 1964; Suárez-Orozco and Paez 2002). While assimilation was a goal and a possibility for immigrants of European origin resulting in a generally upwardly mobile journey (Child 1943; Higham 1975), this alternative is more challenging for today’s immigrants of color. Further, increasing “segmentation” in American economy and society is shaping new patterns of immigrant adaptation (Gans 1992; Rumbaut 1997; Zhou 1997; Waters 1999; Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

Certainly, a preponderance of the evidence suggests that structural factors (such as neighborhood segregation and poverty (Massey and Denton 1993; Orfield and Yun 1999) as well as family level factors (including parental education and general socio-economic status) are significant predictors of long-term educational outcomes for children (Coleman and al. 1966). In a society powerfully structured by “the color line” (Du Bois, 1903/1986), however, race and color are significant vectors for understanding the adaptations of immigrant youth of color.
Stanford University social psychologist Claude Steele has led new theoretical and empirical work on how “identity threats,” based on group membership, can profoundly shape academic achievement. In a series of ingenious experimental studies, Steele and his colleagues have demonstrated that under the stress of a stereotype threat, performance goes down on a variety of academic tasks. For example, when high achieving African American university students are told before taking an exam that the test has proven to differentiate between blacks and whites (in favor of whites) their performance was significantly worse then when they were not told that the test they were about to take did not differentiate between groups (Steele 1997). Steele maintains that when negative stereotypes about one’s group prevail “members of these groups can fear being reduced to the stereotype” (Steele 1997, p. 614). He notes that in these situations, self-handicapping goes up. This “threat in the air” has both an immediate effect on the specific situation that evokes the stereotype threat but also a cumulative erosive effect when events that evoke the threat continually occur. He argues that stereotype threat shapes both intellectual performance and intellectual identity.

How are identity and agency implicated in educational processes and outcomes? John Ogbu and his colleagues have done seminal work in the area of immigration, minority status, and schooling in plural societies (Ogbu 1978; Ogbu 1987; Matutue-Bianchi 1991). Inspired by the work of George De Vos’ comparative studies of social stratification and status inequality (DeVos 1973; DeVos and Suárez-Orozco 1990), Ogbu argues that parental and other socioeconomic factors explain only part of the variance; when these factors are controlled for, differences become evident. On one hand, first generation immigrants tend to develop cultural models and social practices that seem to serve them well in terms of educational adaptations and outcomes. On the other hand, his “involuntary minorities” after generations of living with structural inequities and symbolic violence often tend to develop social practices and cultural models that seem to remove them from investing in schooling as the dominant strategy for status mobility.

A small number of theorists of the new immigration have begun to examine how race and color complicate the process of immigrant adaptation. Waters claims that in this “race conscious society a person becomes defined racially and identity is imposed upon them by outsiders” (Waters 1999: 6). She reports that her black immigrant informants are shocked by the level of racism against blacks in the United States. Though they arrive expecting structural obstacles (such as discrimination in housing and promotions) what they find most distressing is the level of both overt and covert prejudice and discrimination. Black immigrants tend to bring with them a number of characteristics that contribute to their relative success in the new setting. For their children, however, “over the course of one generation the
structural realities of American race relations and the American economy undermine the cultures of the West Indian immigrants and create responses among the immigrants, and especially their children, that resemble the cultural responses of African Americans to long histories of exclusion and discrimination” (Waters 1999: 6). While cross-sectional data have been used to identify this transgenerational pattern, preliminary data from our the Harvard Longitudinal Immigrant Student Adaptation Study suggest that among many immigrant youth of color, this process unfolds at a rapid pace within a few years of migration.

In response to marginalization they encounter in their ethnic homeland, for example, Japanese-Brazilians resist assimilationist cultural pressures by strengthening their Brazilian national identity. Similar trends found among Haitians in Miami (Stepick 1997), Dominicans in Providence (Bailey 2001) and Caribbean American youth in New York (López 2002) suggest that for many of today’s new arrivals, the journey is a process of race and ethnic self-discovery and self-authoring. New identities are crafted in the process of immigrant uprooting and resettlement through continuous feedback between the subjective sense of self and what is mirrored by the social milieu (Erikson, 1968; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Given that today, nearly 80 percent of the new immigrants are of color, emigrating from the “developing world”—Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia (Edmonston and Passel 1994; Fix and Passel 1994). A pattern of racialization and adversarial identity formation within the school context is deeply concerning. In our increasingly globalized world, education becomes ever more crucial for functioning (Bloom, this volume; Coatsworth this volume). Formulating identities that allow the individuals involved to move fluidly from context to context becomes critical to future functioning as a global citizen.

Identity Pathways

Identities and styles of adaptation are highly context dependent and fluid. An immigrant youth might first gravitate towards one style of adaptation and over time, as she matures and as her context changes she may be drawn into new attitudes and social behaviors.

In some cases, the identity that is forged is highly focused upon the culture of origin with co-ethnics as the primary point of reference. In some of these cases, an identity that is adversarial to the dominant culture may emerge. In yet other cases, youth of immigrant origin may embrace total assimilation and complete identification with mainstream American culture. In still other cases, a new ethnic identity, that incorporates selected aspects of both the culture of origin and mainstream American culture is forged. Yet in other cases, an adversarial to the dominant culture identity emerges. All of these identity styles, have clear implications for adaptation to the new society including the schooling experiences of immigrant youth. Within the same family,
each child may adopt his or her own style, resulting in various siblings occupying very different sectors of this identity spectrum.

Co-ethnic Identities. Some immigrant origin maintain a largely co-ethnic focus. Some may do so because they have limited opportunity to make meaningful contact with other groups in the host culture. Others may be responding to an understanding that a group with which they may have extensive contact is even more disparaged than they are as immigrants. Hence, Caribbean origin individuals may distinguish themselves from African Americans in an attempt to ward off further disparagement (Waters, 1999; Zéphir, 1996).

Other youth of immigrant origin, may develop an adversarial stance constructing identities around rejecting—after having been rejected by—the institutions of the dominant culture. Princeton sociologist Alejandro Portes observes, "As second generation youth find their aspirations for wealth and social status blocked, they may join native minorities in the inner-city, adopting an adversarial stance toward middle-class white society, and adding to the present urban pathologies" (Portes 1993).

Immigrant children who find themselves structurally marginalized and culturally disparaged are more likely to respond to the challenges to their identities by developing an adversarial style of adaptation. These children of immigrants are responding in similar ways to that of other marginalized youth in the United States—such as many inner-city poor African-Americans or Puerto Ricans (and elsewhere such as Koreans in Japan or Algerians in France.) Likewise, many of the disparaged and disenfranchised second-generation Italian-American, Irish-American, and Polish-American adolescents of previous waves of immigration demonstrated a similar profile.

Today, some youth of immigrant origin respond to marginalization and the poisoned mirror by developing adversarial identities. Among children of immigrants who gravitate towards adversarial styles, embracing aspects of the culture of the dominant group is equated with giving up one’s own ethnic identity (Fordham and Ogbu 1986). Like other disenfranchised youth, children of immigrants who develop adversarial identities tend to encounter problems in school and drop-out, and consequently face unemployment in the formal economy.

Among youth engaged in adversarial styles, speaking the standard language of the host culture and doing well in school may be interpreted as a show of hauteur and as a wish to “act White.” Navarrette, the Harvard bound grandson of Mexican immigrants, remembers the taunts from his less successful peers. Of his experience in public schools he poignantly recalls "They will call me 'Brain' as I walk through hallways in the junior high school...They will accuse me, by virtue of my academic success, of 'trying to be
white” (Navarrette 1993). When adolescents acquire cultural models that make doing well in school a symbolic act of ethnic betrayal, it becomes problematic for them to develop the behavioral and attitudinal repertoire necessary for academic success.

The children of immigrants who are not able to embrace their own culture and who have formulated their identities around rejecting aspects of the mainstream society may be drawn to gangs. For such youth, gang membership, in the absence of meaningful opportunities, becomes incorporated into their sense of identity. Gangs offer their members a sense of belonging, solidarity, protection, support, discipline, and warmth. Gangs also structure the anger many feel toward the society that violently rejected their parents and themselves. Although many second-generation youth may look towards gangs for cues about dress, language and attitude most remain on the periphery and eventually outgrow the gang mystique after working through the identity issues of adolescence. Others are drawn to the periphery—and to the epicenter of gangs—are disproportionally represented in the penal system. The gang ethos provides a sense of identity and cohesion for marginal youth during a turbulent stage of their development while they are also facing urban poverty and limited economic opportunity, ethnic minority status and discrimination; lack of training and education, and a breakdown in the social institutions of school and family (Vigil 1988).

While many adversarial youth may limit their enactment of delinquent behaviors within their immediate neighborhood, for others an adversarial stance may lead to extreme nationalism or radicalism. Again, the social mirror plays a critical role in this radicalized stance. Algerian born Kamel Daoudi, was raised in France and arrested on suspicion of being part of an al Qaeda plot to blow up the American embassy in Paris. In essay sent to TV network France 2 Daoudi wrote: …I became aware of the abominable social treatment given al those potential “myselves” who have been conditioned to become subcitizens just good for paying pension for the real French…There are only two choices left for me, either to sink into a deep depression, and I did for about six months…or to react by taking part in the universal struggle against the overwhelming unjust cynicism” (Sciolino 2002).

Clearly, adversarial styles quite severely compromise the future opportunities of immigrant origin youth who are already at risk of school failure because of poverty, inequality, and discrimination.

**Ethnic Flight.** The children of immigrants who shed their cultures structure their identities most strongly around the dominant, mainstream culture (Berry 1997). Taking ethnic flight, these youth may feel most comfortable spending time with peers from the mainstream culture rather than with their less acculturated peers. For these youth, learning to speak standard English not only serves an instrumental function of communicating; but also becomes an important symbolic act of identifying with the dominant
culture. Among these youth, success in school may be seen not only as a route for individualistic self-advancement, but also as a way to symbolically and psychologically move away from the world of the family and the ethnic group.

Often this identification with the mainstream culture results in weakening of the ties to members of one’s own ethnic group. These young people all too frequently are alienated from their less acculturated peers; having little in common with them even feeling they are somewhat superior to them. While they may gain access into privileged positions within mainstream culture, they must still deal with issues of marginalization and exclusion.

Even when immigrant origin youth do not feel haughty towards their ethnic peers, they may find their peer group unforgiving of any behaviors that could be interpreted as ‘ethnic betrayal.’ It is not necessary for the child of an immigrant to consciously decide to distance himself from his culture. Among some ethnic groups, merely being a good student will result in peer sanctions. Accusations of ‘acting white,’ or of being a ‘coconut,’ a ‘banana’ or an ‘Oreo’ (brown, yellow, or black on the outside and white on the inside) are frequent (Fordham and Ogbu, 1986).

In an earlier era of scholarship, this style of adaptation was termed “passing” (DeVos 1992). While there were gains for the children of immigrants who ‘disappeared’ into the mainstream culture, there were also hidden costs—primarily in terms of unresolved shame, doubt, and self-hatred. While “passing” may have been a common style of adaptation among those who phenotypically “looked” like the mainstream, it is not easily available to today’s immigrants of color who visibly look like the “other.” Further, while ethnic flight is a form of adaptation that can be adaptive in terms of “making-it” by the mainstream society’s standards, it frequently comes at a significant social and emotional cost.

Transcultural Identities. In between the co-ethnic and ethnic flight the gravitational fields, we find the large majority of children of immigrants. The task of immigration for these children is the crafting a transcultural identity. These youth must creatively fuse aspects of two or more cultures—the parental tradition and the new culture or cultures. In so doing, they synthesize an identity that does not require them to choose between cultures—but rather allows them to develop an identity that incorporates traits of both cultures all the while fusing additive elements (Falicov 2002).

For Latinos, this state is what Ed Morales refers to as “living in Spanglish.” He defines “the root of Spanglish [as] a very universal state of being. It is displacement from one place, home, to another place, home, in which one feels at home in both places, yet at home in neither place. . . Spanglish is the state of belonging to at least two identities at the same time, and not being confused or hurt by it” (Morales 2007,
Such is the identity challenge of youth of immigrant origin—their developmental task requires crafting new cultural formations out of two systems that are at once their own and foreign. These children achieve bicultural and bilingual competencies that become an integral part of their sense of self.

Among youth engaged in bicultural styles, the culturally constructed social strictures and patterns of social control of their immigrant parents and elders maintain a degree of legitimacy. Learning standard English and doing well in school are viewed as competencies that do not compromise their sense of who they are. These youth network, with similar ease, among members of their own ethnic group as well as with students, teachers, employers, colleagues, and friends of other backgrounds. A number of studies in the past two decades have demonstrated a link between racial and ethnic identity pathways and academic outcomes (Gibson 1988; Ogbu and Herbert 1998). These studies suggest that those who forge transcultural identities are more successful academically.

Many who successfully “make it” clearly perceive and appreciate the sacrifices loved ones have made to enable them to thrive in a new country. Rather than wishing to distance themselves from parents, these youth come to experience success as a way to “pay back” their parents for their sacrifices. At times, they experience a form of “survivor guilt” as a result of the deprivation their parents and other family members have suffered in order to move to the new land. Among many such adolescents, success in school serves not only the instrumental function of achieving self-advancement and independence, but also perhaps even more importantly, the expressive function of making the parental sacrifices worthwhile through the son and daughter’s “becoming a somebody.” For such youth, “making it,” for such youth, may involve restitution by “giving back” to parents, siblings, peers, and other less fortunate members of the community.

We view the transcultural identities as the most adaptive of the three styles. It blends the preservation of the affective ties of the home culture with the acquisition of instrumental competencies required to cope successfully in the mainstream culture. This identity style not only serves the individual well but also benefits the society at large. It is precisely such transcultural individuals whom Stonequist identified as being best suited to become the “creative agents” who might “contribute to the solution of the conflict of races and cultures” (Stonequist 1937:15).

Transcultural identities are most adaptive in this era of globalism and multiculturalism. By acquiring competencies that enable them to operate within more than one cultural code, immigrant youth are at an advantage. The unilinear assimilationist model which results in styles of adaptation we term ethnic flight is no longer feasible. Today’s immigrants are not unambivalently invited to join the mainstream society. The rapid abandonment of the home culture implied in ethnic flight almost always results in the
collapse of the parental voice of authority. Furthermore, lack of group connectedness results in anomie and alienation. The key to a successful adaptation involves acquiring competencies that are relevant to the global economy while maintaining the social networks and connectedness essential to the human condition. Those who are at ease in multiple social and cultural contexts will be most successful and will be able to achieve higher levels of maturity and happiness.

**Gendered Differences.** An emerging body of literature reveals that boys from disparaged minority backgrounds seem to be particularly at risk of being marginalized beginning in the educational system (Gibson 1988; Brandon 1991; Waters 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Lee 2002; Qin-Hilliard 2004; Waters 1996). Consistent with this literature, data from the Harvard Immigration Project suggest that immigrant boys tend to demonstrate lower academic achievement (as measured by report card outcomes) and encounter more challenges in school than immigrant girls. The boys report feeling less support from teachers and staff and are likely to perceive school as a negative, hostile, and racist environment (Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard 2004; Qin-Hilliard 2003).

A critical difference between boys and girls is in the realm of social relationships. Research with non-immigrant youth has consistently found that teacher/student support as well as student/student support is critical for the academic achievement of both boys and girls (Roeser, Eccles et al. 1998). Relationships within schools provide several forms of support critical to academic outcomes including: access to knowledge about academic subjects, college, the labor market, and how bureaucracies operate; as well as advocacy; role modeling; and advice (Stanton-Salazar 2001). He found that although Mexican-American adolescent boys were equally likely to report family cohesiveness and supportive parental relationships as did girls, they reported that their school based relationships were less supportive (Stanton-Salazar 2001). Likewise, data from the Harvard Immigration Project reveal that immigrant origin boys were more likely than girls to report they had no one to turn to for specific functions, including: no one to help with homework (24 percent of boys versus 15 percent of girls); no one to tell their problems to (17 percent of boys versus 5 percent of girls); no one they trust to keep their secrets (15 percent of boys versus 8 percent of girls); and no one to turn to if they needed to borrow money (7 percent of boys versus 2 percent of girls). In addition, we found that girls were more likely to name supportive relationships specifically with adults in their schools than were boys (49 percent of girls had at least one supportive adult relationship in school versus 37 percent of boys) (Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard in press).

These findings suggest that gender differences in the quality of relationships in and out of school may help to explain the gender differences in academic outcomes. If boys are not receiving as much...
support (e.g., for school-related as well as non-school related difficulties) and guidance in and out of school, and are more likely to experience overt acts of hostility and low expectations from their teachers, they may find it much more difficult to achieve academically than girls (Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard in press).

Several factors may contribute to this pattern. The negative social mirror that boys of color encounter appears to be significantly more distorted than that encountered by girls. Boys are of color are consistently viewed by members of the mainstream society they encounter as more threatening than are girls. Another factor that may help to explain boys' poorer school performance is peer pressure. Many researchers have noted that peer pressure to reject school is quite strong among boys (Gibson, 1993; Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Waters, 1996). Furthermore, behaviors that gain boys' respect with their peers often bring boys in conflict with their teachers. Some researchers point out that immigrant boys from certain ethnic backgrounds are more pressured by their peers to reject school when compared to immigrant girls (Gibson, 1993; Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Waters, 1996). Gendered differences in family responsibilities at home may also play a role in explaining differences in academic outcomes between girls and boys. Research findings consistently suggest that compared with their brothers, immigrant girls have many more responsibilities at home (Waters 1996; Olsen 1997; Valenzuela 1999; Lee 2001; Sarroub 2001). While these factors may account for this gendered pattern of academic engagement, more research is required to unpack the source of this trend.

Educating the Global Citizen

Globalization is contributing significantly to a world that is increasingly multicultural. On one hand, there is much to celebrate in this process while recognizing that diversification presents real challenges to both the individuals entering a new space as well as those living in receiving spaces. A primary danger of diversification, on the other hand, is an increase in intolerance and the accompanying violence this may engender. Diversity, however, presents a tremendous opportunity for individuals and cultural to search for commonalities of human experience that can be uniting.

Is there such a thing as a global identity? In recent decades, American youth culture has come to dominate the cultural scene among adolescents living in urban centers in Europe, Latin America, and Asia (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). This pattern, seems in large part to be driven by the global media including movies, television, music videos and recordings, and the Internet as well as global marketing of such brands as Coca Cola, McDonald’s and Nikes (Arnett 2002). Whether or not this
attraction to global brands translates into internalized cultural practices remains to be seen. Watson’s (this volume) discussion in this volume of the ways in which families interact with McDonald’s in China provides a glimpse into the possibility that the engagement in use of global symbols may not be as closely related to cultural change as some have hypothesized. The cultural contact may be more superficial than pervasive.

Psychologist Jeffrey Jensen Arnett, however, argues that globalization has clear implications for identity development among youth. He maintains that “most people in the world now develop a bicultural identity” which incorporates elements of the local culture with an awareness of a relation to the global culture (Arnett 2002, p. 777). As a result, he and others maintain that identity confusion may be increasing among youth (Nsamenang 2002)). For many, however, the identity is less bicultural than a “complex hybrid” (Arnett 2000, 778) or transcultural (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001). Indeed, ethnic identity options may be involve more than simply two cultures. For those who remain in the land of birth with a legacy of colonalization, the challenge is to reconcile indigenous traditions with the imported practices and globalized culture (Nsamenang, 2002). In the words of Henry Louis Gates, Jr. “Today the ideal of wholeness has largely been retired. And cultural multiplicity is no longer seen as the problem but as a solution—a solution that confines identity itself. Double consciousness, once a disorder, is now a cure. Indeed the only complaint we moderns has is that Du Bois was too cautious in his accounting. He’d conjured ‘two souls, tow thoughts, tow unreconciled strivings.” Just two Dr. Du Bois? Keep counting” (Gates 2003, p. 31)

The cultural challenges of globalization affect immigrants and native born youth in different ways. For the children of immigrants the task is to braid together into a flexible sense of self, elements of the parent culture, the new culture they are navigating along with an emerging globalized youth culture. For those in the host society, the challenge is to broaden the cultural horizon to incorporate the changing perspectives, habits, and potentials of its diverse newcomers.

Many may struggle to manage the inconsistencies and ambivalences of multiple cultural menus (Nsamenang, 2002). On one hand the challenge may be particularly extreme when there is significant “cultural distance” between the country of origin and the host country (Berry 1997). For many children of immigrants, the diminished ties to any one cultural context “may result in an acute sense of alienation and impermanence as they grow up with a lack of cultural certainty, a lack of clear guidelines for how life is to be lived and how to interpret experience” (Arnett 2002: 778). On the other hand, harnessing the innate optimism of immigrant youth while providing adequate cultural interpreters, educational opportunities and a reasonably welcoming reception in the new culture, allows immigrant youth to quickly become successful members of their new society.
Developing a sense of belonging to a global culture has clear potential benefits. “[B]ecause the global culture crosses so many cultural and national boundaries, in order to unify people across these boundaries, the values of the global culture necessarily emphasize tolerating and even celebrating differences. This means that the values of the global culture are defined in part by what they are not: They are not dogmatic: they are not exclusionary, they do not condone suppression of people or groups who have a point of view or a way of life that is different from the majority.” (Arnett 2001, p. 279).

As educators, we have a responsibility to place the tolerance—and even celebration—of cultural differences at the very core of our educational agenda. Such an “end” could serve to provide a core meaningful educational narrative that “envisions a future…constructs ideals…prescribes rules of conduct, provides a source of authority, and above all gives a sense of continuity of purpose” (Postman 1995). Tolerance must be fostered not only in those who already reside in the receiving context but also among the widely diverse newcomers who are sharing the new social space. We must allow newcomers to retain a sense of pride in their cultures of origin while facilitating their entrance into the new milieu. Preparing our youth to successfully navigate in our multicultural world is essential to preparing them to be global citizens. Surely the implications for a more tolerant world are obvious.
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