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SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES:
Group stereotypes, Interpersonal interaction, Collective action

MICRO LEVEL (self-definition, academic performance)
Studying immigration:

• From the perspective of the immigrant
• Social psychological processes
• Group differences
  - Ethnicity
  - Generation
GENERATION as a category of analysis that can be approached from a variety of perspectives
The “lost generation”
• Comparison of groups across time

• The Baby Boom generation (1946-1964)
• Generation X (1965-1979)
• Generation Y (Millenials, 1980-2000)
• Central concept in demography and immigration studies

1\textsuperscript{st} generation: born in another country

2\textsuperscript{nd} generation: born in this country to parents who were born elsewhere
SOCIIOLOGICAL STUDIES OF IMMIGRANT GENERATION

• Models of assimilation (e.g., straight-line, segmented)
• The new second generation (e.g. *Inheriting the City, Legacies*)
• Model’s analysis of West Indian immigrants
A social psychological analysis of generation:

• Comparisons between immigrants who are the same age but a different immigrant generation

• Do their situations, experiences, thoughts and behaviors differ?
What differs between immigrant generations?

• Ethnic identification

• Public and private regard

• Susceptibility to stereotype threat
“Identity is no museum piece sitting stock-still in a display case, but rather the endlessly astonishing synthesis of the contradictions of every day life.”

Eduardo Galeano (1991)
Generational differences in ethnic and national identity
First vs. Second Generation: Identification as West Indian vs. as African American

First (1.76)    Second (2.61)

1               5

Definitely West Indian              Definitely African American
Importance of American identity for Black and Latino immigrants

1. Not at all important
2. Very important

Black 1\textsuperscript{st} (3.16)
Black 2\textsuperscript{nd} (3.99)

Lat. 1\textsuperscript{st} (3.46)
Lat. 2\textsuperscript{nd} (4.08)
Bicultural identification and acceptance by others

- *Dominican and Mexican immigrants in the United States*
- *Too Latino for Americans?*
- *Too American for Latinos?*
### Generational shifts in identity comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Gen.</th>
<th>2nd Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Latino for Americans</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too American for Latinos</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Latino = Dominican and Mexican immigrants

(Wiley, 2008)
### Generational shifts in identity comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>1st Gen.</th>
<th>2nd Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Latino for Americans</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too American for Latinos</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Latino = Dominican and Mexican immigrants

*p=.014

(Wiley, 2008)
Feeling too Latino is correlated with:

- Perceiving less favorable evaluation of one’s ethnic group by Americans
- Less liking for Americans
- Weaker belief in the legitimacy of one’s ethnic group status in the country
- Weaker belief in meritocracy
Public and private regard for one’s ethnic group
THEORIES OF REFLECTED APPRAISAL

- The “looking glass self” (Cooley, 1902)
- Social mirroring (Winnicott, 1971; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- Double consciousness (DuBois)
How is own regard for one’s ethnic group related to the views of others?

- Study of Asian, Black and White students (Crocker et al., 1994)

- Follow-up study with 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants (Wiley, Perkins, & Deaux, 2008)
Correlation of CSE private and public regard:
Crocker et al. 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r = $</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
Study 1

• First- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean immigrants
• Comparison with Black sample in Crocker et al. (1994)
• Relationship between private and public regard (Collective Self-esteem scale)
Generational differences in Perceived Public Regard

\( t (270) = 4.52, \ p < .001 \)  

(Wiley, Perkins, & Deaux, 2008)
Correlation: private regard x public regard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Crocker et al., 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; gen. WI students</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deaux et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; gen. WI students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Crocker et al., 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} gen. WI students</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deaux et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} gen. WI students</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Study 2

• First- and second-generation immigrants from 4 ethnic groups: Black, Asian, Latino, and White

• Comparison of public and private regard (CSE)
Correlations between Public and Private CSE in 4 ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} Generation</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** \( p<.01; \) \* \( p<.05 \)

Correlations between Public and Private CSE in 4 ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Generation</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01; *p<.05

A follow-up study of Black and Latino immigrants shows...

- Perceived regard from *White Americans* drops from 1\textsuperscript{st} to 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation (not from own or other ethnic groups)

- In 1\textsuperscript{st} generation self-esteem is linked to ingroup regard; in 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation it’s linked to perceived regard from White Americans

- “Double trouble”
Stereotype threat and academic task performance
Economic outcomes of 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation West Indian immigrants in the U.S.

- 1\textsuperscript{st} generation do much better than native-born African Americans

- 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation do only slightly better than native-born African Americans
Why the difference?
(Model, 2008)

• Selective migration in 1\textsuperscript{st} generation
• Dilution of talent in 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation
But if....

• age is the same
• and if neither generation chose to immigrate
• and if both groups are children of 1st generation parents....
A social psychological analysis of generational differences:

- Shifts in ethnic identification
- Changes in evaluations by others
- Susceptibility to stereotype threat
First vs. Second Generation: Identification as West Indian vs. as African American

First (1.76)  Second (2.61)

1  5

Definitely West Indian  Definitely African American
Metastereotypes of African Americans and West Indians held by 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation West Indians

Interaction $F = 4.16$, $p < .05$
Stereotype threat:

Negative group stereotypes can undermine the performance of group members in domains where the stereotype applies
Generation and Stereotype Threat

• 1\textsuperscript{st} generation West Indians will be protected from/insensitive to stereotype threat effects

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation West Indians will be more susceptible to stereotype threat effects
Experimental procedures: Stereotype threat (ST) study

• Test consisting of GRE English items described as diagnostic or non-diagnostic (manipulation of ST)
• Participants: 1st or 2nd generation WI
• Experimenters: Black or White
• Outcome was % correct
Stereotype threat: Performance (%) correct for 1st and 2nd gen. West Indians

Deaux et al., SPQ, 2007
Stereotype threat: Performance (%) correct for 1st and 2nd gen. West Indians

Deaux et al., SPQ, 2007
Performance with white vs. black testers: 1st vs. 2nd generation

![Bar chart comparing performance of 1st and 2nd generation white and black testers.](chart-image)
What did we learn from this study?

• Generation (a difference of ~12 years in U.S.) makes a difference in performance of West Indian immigrants

• Some relationship with strength of WI identity

• 1st and 2nd generation respond to different features in their environment
Generational differences:

- Ethnic identity shifts
- Acceptance of identity by others may become more problematic
- Perceived evaluation by others may decrease (depending on ethnic group)
- Social comparisons to White Americans increase
- ST effects for black immigrants
WHY DO THE GENERATIONS DIFFER? Some speculations

- Parental experiences that influence child’s expectations
- Different experiences with discrimination
- Headwinds (Walton & Spencer, 2009) and Tailwinds
- Reference groups and Group identification
THEORETICAL MODEL OF DEVELOPMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE WHEN EVENT EXPERIENCED</th>
<th>FOCUS OF IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Childhood</td>
<td>• Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entry to adulthood</td>
<td>• Identities and life choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mature adulthood</td>
<td>• Behavior and opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stewart, 2003)
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