

Ethnicity and Nationalism: Explorations of U.S. National
Identities Among Latinos Immigrants and Bases
For National Incorporation

BY

John A. Garcia
Department of Political Science
University of Arizona

Paper present at the *Political Demography: Ethnic, National and Religious Dimensions*
Conference, September 29-30 at London School of Economics, London, England.
Sponsored by the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism, in association
with the Economic and Social Research Council and British Academy.

Ethnicity and Nationalism: Explorations of U.S. National Identities Among Latinos Immigrants and Bases For National Incorporation

The scale of continued migration into industrialized, developed nations has raised issues of immigrants' integration/ incorporation into the receiving nations. In the case of the U.S., significant proportions of immigrants come from Latin America. Currently, domestic public opinion and public policies have portrayed immigrants as detrimental to its economic well-being and its cultural/moral fabric. The influx of immigrants has raised their permanence or distinctiveness from mainstream society, and whether these patterns challenge the model of previous waves of immigrants' integration into the American socio-political system (Huntington, 2004). This paper examines the interchanges of ethnicity and nationalism by establishing various forms of national identity. The different perspective of this paper is to examine this dynamic from the point of view of Latino immigrants and what bases affect the specific national identity selected.

The necessity of some sense of nationalism is viewed as a means by which individuals share not only territoriality, but common socio-cultural characteristics, political legitimacy of the state, and community attachment and membership (Calhoun, 1993; Eriksen, 1991). Or one can define nationalism as state creation which leads to homogenization of cultural similarity (i.e. language, national ethos, values and principles). At the same time, the influx of newcomers turns attention to the process of integrating them into the national community. This introduces the concept of ethnicity and one's national origin attachments and interactions. Ethnicity is a socially constructed concept in which cognitive dimensions of group identity are based upon shared cultural values and traditions, and positive affections toward one's country of origin (Alba, 1990). In addition, ethnicity is manifested in behavioral patterns such as ethnic enclaves, occupational and industry concentrations, ethnically dense social networks, and continued practices of ethnic group traditions.

Within this context, a growing research literature has directed their attention to the effects of transnationalism in the immigrants' country of residence. Continued and active involvement in one's country of origin is viewed as deterring the immigrant's

attachment and focus on their country of residence (Bloom, 1990). At the same time, primary interactions and contact have implications in both communities. My previous research examines the effects of transnational interactions as a basis for the political engagement in U.S. communities (Garcia, forthcoming, 2007).

Political incorporation, as an essential ingredient of developing a sense of nationalism and community membership, entails behaviors, orientations and predispositions toward the country of residence. Relevant factors for this transnational process include extent and nature of transnational interactions, attitudes about being an American, degrees of acculturation and assimilation, and attitudes toward government/state (Portes and Zhou, 1998). The influence of demographic characteristics (i.e. age, length of residence in U.S., gender, educational attainment, etc.) is part of the analytical approach to explore the multiple experiences of immigrant “living and operating in two worlds”. These introductory comments serve to delineate the scope and parameters of the central research questions and the underlying concepts. That is, the central research questions deal with the manifestation of nationalism (i.e. American national identity) and the bases on which Latino immigrants “operationalized” a sense of possible American identities. The concepts of nationalism, ethnicity, and national identity drive this discussion and formulation of specific research hypotheses.

Ethnicity and Nationalism

The concept of nationalism entails the co-residence of persons within specific geographic boundaries, shared social-cultural characteristics, existence of political legitimacy, and possible co-existence of ethnic boundaries within the state (Calhoun, 1993; Greenfield, 1992). The polity operated within this demarcated territory with a unitary administrative system and an internal state apparatus to “accommodate” participation, rights, and responsibilities. Certain beliefs and understanding are pervasive in the state and serve as the foundational principles for community, its practices, and membership. Within the American context, the liberal principles of egalitarianism, individualism, basic freedoms, and active participation (de la Garza, et. al., 199; Citrin,

et. al., 200) are part of the criteria for American nationalism. This represents a nationalistic ideology that legitimizes and establishes the prescribed social order.

While this has been the core element of nationalism, additional dimensions are present in multi-cultural societies. These dimensions include language, a uniform primary educational system, societal integration, a self-conscious sense of being a national “citizen” and ethno-cultural characteristics (Eriksen, 1990). The latter facet has been more characteristic of more homogenous and older nation-states. For example, in many European countries, nationhood was rooted in ethnicity and shared language as a condition for full membership in the political community. Opposition to linguistic variation was the key way nationalists in power attempted to make the nation fit the state (Calhoun, 1993).

More recently, increased international migration of persons from lesser developed and/or industrialized nations to more industrialized countries has accentuated the diversity of cultures, languages, and religions (Dinnerstein and Reimers, 1999). As a result, greater emphasis has been placed on the value on the cultural integrity of the nation-state (Huntington, 2004). Thus, immigrants can be seen as potential threats to the moral and cultural fabric of the nation and less inclined to conform or fit to the prevailing norms and cultural characteristics. In the U.S., defining nationalism and the characteristics of American identity has been extended beyond liberalism. It has been suggested that essential components of U.S. national integration include: a common educational curriculum; core religious-moral values; cultural uniformity; common language; conscription; consensual foreign policy; mechanisms for peaceful change; and political legitimacy. As I had noted earlier, the American identity has been based upon liberal political principles primarily.

The resurgent rise of Nativism places emphasis on certain “ethno-cultural traits as indicative of one’s national identity. These could include: multi-generational residency, being native born, speaking English, of the Christian faith; and citizenship status (Schildkraut, 2005). Deviations from these characteristics raise concerns as to the appropriateness or suitability of newcomers or immigrants as viable members of the nation-state.

Embedded into the immigration process is the concept of ethnicity and its continuation after time in the immigrant's country of residence. Under the aegis of assimilation and the process of nationalism integrating newer residents, ethnicity was seen as a short term process (Gordon, 1965). Ethnicity serves as an anchor of self-identity, the establishment and use of a social network for a variety of adaptive functions (i.e. knowledge of labor markets, housing decisions, financial assistance, cultural observations, etc.) which, over time, social mobility, inter-marriage, prevailing norms and mores minimize the relevance of the traditions and practices of ones' national origin. Yet, there are significant complexities between ethnicity and nationalism such that neither is vanishing. The persistence and bases of ethnicity not only reside in the actions and attitudes of individuals, but also their relationship to the state (Horowitz, 1985; Nielsen 1992). That is, extent of social mobility, persistence of discrimination, differential policies and status, and public categorization of persons based on their ethnicity serve to perpetuate its saliency in everyday life.

The perceived threat of continued ethnic salience and identity is that it provides an alternative social relationship that could compete for allegiance to the nation-state or pursue redefining political boundaries of the nation. For example, many republics of the former Soviet Union and Eastern European nations such as Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia represent the strong ties of ethnicity and the total disruption of political stability and foundations of the existing nation-state (Bollen and Medrano, 1998). The U.S. experience as a multi-cultural society reflects political, social, and cultural tensions (i.e. political representation, access to participation, access to the policy-making process, etc.) that fall short of revolution and sustained violence. Perhaps some conditions for a peaceful change process would include: equal access to labor and education; the right to be different; national citizenship is available to all; national symbols that can represent and be accepted by a broad spectrum; and political power that is decentralized (Eriksen, 1991; A. Smith, 1998).

In relating ethnicity and nationalism, there is a co-existing duality of principles and practice. In the U.S., minority status (i.e. racially, ethnically, immigrant, etc.) serves as the basis for public policies that implement these guiding principles (Massey, 1995). For the most part, American nationalism has been defined in terms of liberal ideology

and principles. One of the products of such nationalism is the labeling of that nationalism. That is, a national identity is a product integrating oneself with the nation-state. Thus, description of being an “American” is viewed manifestation of attachment and allegiance (Karpathakis, 1998).

Recent works on American identity (Citrin, et. al., 1994; Karpathakis, 1998; Schildkraut, 2005) seek to define and understand the bases of being American. While the foundation of American identity lies with liberal political principles, the elements of Nativism, multi-culturalism, and civic republicanism are recognized as constituting other contributing factors to an American identity (R. Smith, 1997). *Nativism* represents the relevance of cultural and ascriptive characteristics that comprise the core of nationalism. In the U.S., periods of heightened immigration has stirred the feelings of Nativism (Dinnerstein and Reimers, 1999) and who are the “true” Americans. Specific components of the nativist dimensions include such characteristics as being native born, being Christian, speaking English, being white, and a citizen. Deviation from these pertinent “traits” raises suspicion about the character and fit into the nation-state Citrin, et. al., 1990).

The *multi-cultural* dimension acknowledges the primacy of ethnicity/race as one of the preferred choices and societal actions and lifestyles reflect that reality. At the same time, the presence of multiculturalism has a context within a larger national framework which has additive benefits to the maintenance of the nation-state (R. Smith, 2004). In addition, a peaceful co-existence or alliance depicts the place of ethnicity under nationalism. Concepts such as pluralism, diversity, and acculturation reflect the dynamics of racial– ethnic identification within the context of decentralized and pluralistic governmental system. Finally, the *civic republicanism* dimension extends the liberal political principles to the roles of political community members as participants in the political processes (Schildkraut, 2005). That is, being civically engaged in community based activities, seeing the political processes as facilitating involvements, and political efficacy and trust with the political system.

By looking at American identities as having multi-dimensional bases, this raises the complexities involved with nationalism and its dynamic nature. The contemporary emphasis “ethno-cultural” or nativist criteria for confirming American identity is related

to the significant influx of immigrants over the past 10-15 years and their source countries. As a result of what it means to be truly American goes beyond social equality, self-reliance, and individualism to include belief in God, and speaking English (Citrin, et. al., 1994). The resultant analyses of American identity have concentrated upon the American public (i.e. citizens) views about national identity and its key components. These attitudes have been associated with socio-demographic characteristics of the American public (i.e. education, age, gender, language use, religious affiliation) along with basic ideology, and partisan affiliation (Schildkraut, 2005). As a result, there are factors that affect the bases for American identity and whether immigrants are able to fit in or not.

Thus, this brief review of the relationship between ethnicity and nationalism would suggest that a multiplicity of factors affect the extent of nationalistic attachment and allegiance of American residents. The focus upon national identity as symptomatic of nationalism represents attempts to understand the foundational bases for the nature of national identity(ies) adopted. The relevant questions would be- Who supports what specific national identity? How does one arrive at the national identity adopted? What is the strength of one's national identity? What are the contents of the evaluative dimensions of the accepted national identity? The reality is that there are multiple traditions that frame and construct any national identity. Therefore, the focus of this inquiry is to operationalized American identities and examines the critical foundational factors that differentiate American residents.

Specification of the Relationships of American Identities and Critical Factors

The multi-dimensionality of American identities reflects the ideological and cultural underpinnings associated with America's political and cultural history. While the extant research explores these questions by getting the viewpoints of the American citizenry, this effort "flips" the vantage points by focusing upon the immigrants' sense of American identity and their bases. There are three major strands evident from the research literature that distinguishes ways in which to characterize the basis for being American (R. Smith, 1991). The first is an undifferentiated, generic American without

any reference to national origin. The second incorporates the pluralistic understanding of American identity which can be call the hyphenated American. The third type of American national is the primacy of ethnicity reflected by national origin or a pan ethnic identity.

Then the expected relationships of the types of American national identities and contributing factors will be categorized as a) socio-demographic characteristics of Latino immigrants; b) experiential and/or exposure related factors associated with residence in the U.S.; and c) ethnically based variables that reinforce a sense of ethnicity and pan-ethnicity. As a result, the following set of relationships are proposed—

Hyp. #1 The bases for the general American identity will be influenced significantly by greater exposure to American life and traditions.

Hyp. #2 The bases for the general American identity will be positively associated with higher levels of socio-demographic status.

Hyp. #3 The support for a pluralistic American identity will be based upon greater socio-demographic status, greater exposure to American society and inculcation of liberal political ideology.

Hyp. #4 The support for a primarily Ethnic/pan-ethnic identity will be associated with denser ethnic patterns of interactions and ethnic group consciousness.

The testing of these hypotheses will utilize the recently completed Latino National Survey (LNS) with the immigrant subset as the targeted population. Our perspective reflects the presence of a multiplicity of American identities and different, and, potentially overlapping foundational bases for these identities. The persistence of ethnicity and, in the case of Latinos-pan-ethnicity represents a form of American identity. My earlier discussion of the intersection of ethnicity and U.S. nationalism posits that ethnicity is embedded within the nation-state context. The next section provides a description of the LNS and some demographic profile of the Latino immigrant sample.

Latino National Survey, 2006

The Latino National Survey represents a fifteen state probability sample in addition to the Washington D. C. metro area (including northern Virginia and adjacent

counties in Maryland). This forty minute telephone survey was conducted from mid – November, 2005 until the first week in August, 2006. All Hispanic origin adults (18 years and older) were eligible for inclusion in the survey as Geoscape (Miami , Florida) drew the state samples from all Hispanic origin households in the designated states. The respondents were screened as to their Hispanic origin or not. In addition a targeted number of 400 respondents were assigned for each of the states with the following exceptions—California (1200), Florida, Texas, and New York (800) and Illinois (600). As a result, a total of 8636 hundred interviews were completed during this time period.

Once screened and identified, the range of queries made included: areas of racial and ethnic identity; political mobilization and participation; inter-group and intra-group relations; public policy issue areas; socio-demographic background; transnational interactions; ideology and partisanship; national identities, social networks, and political orientations. Particular attention was given to the immigrant experiences in the U.S. For the purposes of this paper, the sample was selected based on place and the 6147 respondents were born outside the U.S. including Puerto Rico.

The data was made available to the research group (i.e. five other co-principal investigators) in mid –August and we are still in the process of coding several open ended items as well as final calculations of the sample weights. In addition, the United States experienced a series of sizeable pro- immigration reform marches in the spring, while the survey was being conducted. We are collected data on the communities that had demonstrations, their size, organizational profiles, etc. to explore possible period effects on the respondents’ answers. (Pre and post marches). Funding for this project was supported by: the Ford Foundation, Carnegie Foundation; Joyce, Sage, Kellogg, and National Science Foundations, and Texas A&M.

With my focus on the integration, experiences, and incorporation of immigrant into American socio-political society, the examination is directed to those Latino immigrants in the sample. A brief profile follows the description of the National Latino Survey. Of the total number of 8600 Latinos surveys, 6147 were born outside the U.S. This includes those Latinos who were born in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. While island born Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, the key factor is not being native born. Thus, my analysis and discussion focuses upon the Latino immigrant which represents almost

three-fourths of the Latino adult population in the U.S. In addition, my previous discussion about the significant influx of Latino immigrants to the U.S. adds to the salience of exploring American identities in the context of nationalism. (See table 1)

Slightly more than one half of the sample was female (55.1%) and four-fifths of the respondents conducted the interview in Spanish. Religious affiliation was overwhelmingly Catholic as 73.7% fell into that category. Educationally, slightly more than two-fifths of the sample had less than a high school; while only one-twelfth were college graduates. The household income of these respondents was more at the lower end of the income categories with a median household income in the \$25,000 to \$35,000 range. At the same time, over two-fifths of the Latino immigrant households had two or more earners contributing. On the average, our immigrant sample had lived in the U.S. for 19.13 years with a range of arriving in 2005 or 2006 to being here for 85 years.

Some other sociodemographic information about the Latino immigrant sample is the extent of naturalization. (See table 2). One third (33.2%) have become U.S. citizens with another one-half indicating that plans to seek naturalization. A significant portion is homeowners (45.3%) which are proportionately similar for the homeowner percentage for all Latinos in the U.S. (native and foreign-born). A higher than national percentage of our immigrant sample has served or had a family member served in the American military (28.4%).

Despite this nation being a multi-cultural society, the continued significance of race affects many aspects of public and private life. When these Latinos were asked to place themselves within the established U.S. racial categories, the most common response was “some other race” (SOR). Identifying oneself as white or Caucasian represented one-fourth of the sample and more than three-fifths fell into SOR category. Finally, the mean age for this group was 40.39 years with a range from 18 to 97 years of age. Overall, the geographic scope and numbers of Latinos interviewed in this fifteen state-designed sample provides a detailed and demographically rich data set. Additional information is available on the Mexicans’ states of origin (the largest Latino sub-group), extensive measures of transnational interactions, and background of spouses/partners, household size as well as extensive attitudinal and behavioral items. Yet the specific focus of this examination lies with the manifestation of American nationalism through particular

American identities. The next section operationalizes and places the Latino immigrant respondents within the range of American identities.

American Identities and Latino Immigrants

Our earlier discussion of national identity suggests that affiliation, allegiance and affective attachment develop over time among new residents to the nation. In many cases, the motivation to migrate to the U.S. reflects a desire for a better life (i.e. economically, opportunities, and more freedoms). In the case of these respondents, the most frequent response for coming to the U.S. was to seek a better life and more opportunities. In the survey instrument there were several items that tapped a sense of national identity. Consistent with the extant research, the more common form is the link to identifying oneself as an American. In the LNS, a three question battery was asked of the respondents. The range of responses for each item was to indicate the salience of feelings, positive or not. The three items asked the Latinos how strongly or not they think of themselves as an American, their own national origin ancestral group, and the pan-ethnic grouping of Latinos. These constituted three separate questions rather than a forced choice. To a large extent, the format of this battery reflects the possibilities of multiple identities and varying saliences. As a result of this battery, five American identity categories were constructed. By dividing the respondents based upon the strength of their feeling for each of these categories (very strongly and somewhat strongly vs. not strongly or not all), the results are presented in table three. The first grouping is designated as an undifferentiated *American identity* as those respondents who indicated strong or somewhat strong feelings as American fell into the high value (the variable was coded as 0,1 values). Over one-half of the sample (57.9%) indicated strongly feeling to the American identity.

The next two American identity categories represent more of an ethnically based grouping. They are the primacy of ethnicity in terms of strength of feeling for national origin or a pan-ethnic grouping. Thus, the *ethnic identity* variable was constructed by grouping those respondents who indicated strong or somewhat strong feelings about their respective national origin lineages. A very high percentage of the Latino immigrants

evidenced strong feelings about the ancestral origins (86.7% in the high group). Thus, individuals were reinforcing the salience of being Mexican or Dominican or Cuban or from the other countries of Latin America. The second of these “primordial” identities falls under the concept of pan-ethnicity. That is, group social identity extends beyond national origin boundaries to include commonalities along language, cultural traditions and practices, geographic proximities, historical similarities or overlap, and the like. At the same time, there are structural and societal contributors to the development of pan-ethnicity (Garcia, 2006). In the U.S. case, dealing with a growing population from many different nations may be group together based on a common language, region, cultures or combination of characteristics. Thus, it simplifies the host country’s understanding by enjoining a confluence of persons into a larger, diverse category. In this manner, the pan-ethnic social construction gains meaning and significance in the country of residence and, to a degree, another form of American identity. Thus, our *pan-ethnic identity* was constructed in the same manner as the previous two identities. Similar to the ethnic identity measure, an equally high percentage of Latino immigrants showed strong feeling to the pan-ethnic concept (87.8%).

The last two American identities reflect the pluralist character and history of the U.S. Historically, the diversity of the origin of its inhabitants, their cultures, languages, and traditions has been as strength and building block for a “nation of immigrants”. At the same time, a prevailing liberal political ideology, value of individualism and equality help to forge an underlying basis for being an American. A manifestation of this dynamic can be characterized as the hyphenated Americans. That is, a sense of one’s ethnicity as well as attachment and affiliation with being American. Thus, the latter two identities are defined as the hyphenated Americans—*American-ethnic identity* and *American –Pan ethnic identity*. The sample’s distribution of these last two forms of American identity is similar to the one for American identity (i.e. 53.2% and 54.3% respectively). With the description of the different forms of American identity, the next step in the analysis is to outline and identify the important factors that support or contribute to the basis for any of these identities.

Contributing Factors and Forms American Identities among Latino Immigrants

The formation of variants of American identities indicates that Latino immigrants can take several different forms from which to place themselves in the U.S. landscape. Results from table 3 demonstrate the persistence of national origin affinities; yet within the context of America life. The key focus of this research endeavor lies with the detection of bases for particular American identities. For example, the incorporation of a “generic” American identity could reflect the strength of the assimilation process and, over time, declining significance of ethnicity. On the other hand, incorporating a broader range of social identities to include being American, along with national origin and/or pan-ethnicity identity can be a way to establish a national identity. As an effort to capture the bases for the forms of American identities, I have clustered three possible sources based upon the extant literature. They are describes as sociodemographic characteristics (SES), experiential factors as a result of living in the U.S.; and indicators of ethnically dense networks, identity, and behaviors. In the case of the first, socio-demographic characteristics has been shown to affect not only current social status, but a wide range of attitudes and behaviors. The SES variables used in this analysis are: age; gender; educational attainment; country where respondent completed their education; language use; homeownership status; employment status; household income; religious affiliation; and country of origin. In the case of the latter two variables, they were operationalized as two categorical variables. That is, religious affiliation was defined as Catholic vs. non-Catholic. National origin was constructed as Mexican origin vs. other Latino country of origin. Mexicans represent the largest of the Latino sub-groups and major contributor to the migration stream.

The second cluster of contributing variables is described as experiential factors affecting Latino immigrants now in the U.S. The specific measures include the following: current state of residence; years living in the U.S.; level of political interest in American politics; naturalization status; and three scales of liberal ideology and cultural underpinnings of American identity (pluralism, civic republicanism, and ethno-cultural) . In the case of pluralism, two items served to construct this measure. Respondents were asked to indicate their extent of agreement or not to the following—blending into the

mainstream culture and maintaining their own native culture. For both items, there was a substantial percentage of Latinos expressing agreement for both questions. A four point scale was created that range from scoring high on both items (i.e. more pluralist) to persons who scored blending high and maintaining native culture low. Civic republicanism was an additive scale for items dealing with concepts of participation in American politics and the responsiveness of American political institutions. Finally, the ethno-cultural variable was constructed based upon four items “defining” what is an American? They were- being born in America, being a Christian, being White and speaking English well (range of very important to not important).

The ethnic cluster of variables represents the density of existing ethnically dense social networks, affiliations, and behaviors. In this case, the specific variables are: ethnic makeup of one’s friends and co-workers; perception of discrimination directed toward Latinos; extent of perceptions about group commonalities among other national origin members as well as part of a pan-ethnic community; view that Latinos constitute a separate race in America; one’s fate is inter-connected with other Latinos; and transnational interaction/connections. Basically, these set of variables reinforce a sense of ethnicity and distinctiveness in the U.S. The transnational variable was constructed on a range of interactions with one’s homeland (i.e. number of visits, sending remittances; member of hometown association; active in national origin politics, etc.).

The display in table 4 provides brief sketch of the constructed variables. For the ethno-cultural, out of a possible range of 1-9, the mean score of Latino immigrants was 5.62. Contemporary research on bases for American identity indicates a growing sentiment among “Americans” that cultural characteristics are an important part of the American community membership. On the other hand, a greater belief among Latino immigrants toward a pluralist view of being American is reflected by 56.9% falling in the highest category of the “incorporatism” variable. There is almost an equal distribution along the five points of the civic republicanism scale. Finally, there appears to be a limited degree of transnational interactions among these Latino immigrants with a mean of .82 over a possible range of 1-6. The more common connections were regular visits back to one’s home country and sending remittances. The delineation of these three clusters of contributing factors represents my analytical effort to understand the bases for

specific American identities among Latino immigrants. The next section is the multivariate analysis to explore the relative effects of these clusters.

Understanding Bases for American Identities of Latino Immigrants

With the demarcation of possible bases for American identities established, the next stage is to proceed with a multivariate analysis. Recalling my earlier discussion on the proposed hypotheses, I had indicated that the specific American identity assumed will be influenced differently by variables in each cluster. For example, Latino immigrants with higher socio-economic status should exhibit a greater propensity toward a “generic” American identity. On the other hand, continued contact and practices within an ethnic context would be a significant contributor of an ethnic identity. Latino immigrants who see their fit into American society as more acculturational would be more inclined to adopt a pluralist view of American identity. The analytical plan is to enter each cluster sequentially into a logistic regression equation. More specifically, the sociodemographic items represent “model 1”; then in addition to these variables, the experiential cluster is entered as model 2. Finally, model 3 represents the inclusion of the ethnicity cluster along with the previous two clusters. Changes in contribution of specific variables across the models will provide interpretation as to the bases for specific American identities. Logistic regression is used as the dependent variables (i.e. American identities) are constructed as categorical variables. Within the specification of each of the models, the independent variables that are also categorical are demarcated.

In table 5, the dependent variables are the American and America-ethnic type and the first column is the result of the socio-demographic variables into the equation. A substantial number of the variables produced several significant coefficients; yet opposite effects. Gains in educational attainment, completing one’s education in the U.S., and older age served as positive bases for this American identity. Interestingly, the ancestral variable (Mexican vs. non-Mexican) had a positive coefficient for this American identity. The interesting part is that writers such as Samuel Huntington focus upon the Mexican origin as least likely to “fit into” the American fabric. On the other hand, Spanish speakers, renters, and Latinas are negatively associated with this type of American

identity. The introduction of experiential factors does alter some of the socio-demographic variables. Age is no longer significant; the strength of the gender and place of finishing one's education variables is increased; and the effects of being Mexican origin are weakened. On the other hand, several experiential variables were significant. Scoring high on the ethno-cultural and civic republicanism measures, being interested in American politics and longer time in the U.S. have positive effects on this American identity. Conversely, the retention of resident alien or non-citizen status is negatively associated. Finally, the addition of the more ethnically related variables shows a similar pattern. Those is, the significance of the SES variables remains, but slightly lower coefficients. The significantly, positive ethnic variable was having a common ethnic status; and conversely have a more ethnically diverse social network and minimal or non-existent transnational connections contributes to this American identity. There is compelling evidence that there is an integrating dynamic among those Latino immigrants who correspond with a more "generic" American identity.

The second half of table 5 highlights an ethnic-American form of American identity. Again, several of the SES variables proved to be significant. Again age, higher levels of educational attainment, completing one's education in the U.S., and being Mexican had positive coefficients. On the other hand, speaking Spanish, being a homeowner, being Latina, and Catholic are negatively associated. Age and homeowner status are no longer significant with the introduction of experiential factors, while the other SES remain important. All three measures of pluralism, ethno-cultural, and civic republicanism, proved to be significant positively with the hyphenated identity. In addition, being political interested in American politics is important. The introduction of ethnically related variables removes the effects of educational attainment as well as reducing the effects of where one completed their education. For the ethnicity variables, the significant ones all relate to a sense of ethnic group identity – commonality as ethics and pan-ethnics and group linked fate. In addition, less transnational interactions contribute to a hyphenated American identity. It seems clear that the "processes" that affect a "generic" American identity also influences the hyphenated variant. Ethnicity has an American context, that groupness has multiple social configurations.

We proceed with our analysis in Table 6 which includes a pan-ethnic-American identity and primacy of ethnicity identities. In the case of the former, the contributing SES variables are age; educational attainment, finishing one's education in the U.S, and being Mexican have positive coefficients. On the other hand, Spanish-speakers, renters, and Latinas are also associated with this pan-ethnic-American identity. The introduction of the experiential factors again removes age as a significant variable and weakens the effects of education; country completed one's education, and being Mexican. The positive coefficients of the experiential factors are length of time in the U.S., ethno-cultural measure, and higher levels of political interest in American politics. It is also the Latino non-citizen that is inclined to take on this identity. Finally, the addition of the ethnic variables produces four more significant effects. Group identity, both ethnically and pan-ethnically as well as group linked fate have positive coefficients. Those Latinos with less transnational interactions are also associated with this type of identity. The education variables' effects are significantly reduced, especially country of completion of one's education.

The results for the more primal form of ethnic identity are found in the second half of table 6. SES variables are less present than previous analyses. That is, it is age, country of completing one's education, and English language use are all positive coefficients. In addition, being Catholic contributes to this ethnic identity. Interesting, whereas Spanish –speaking has been the key determinants for the previous forms of identity; but in this case, speaking English is important for an ethnic identity. One possible explanation lies with the embeddedness of ethnicity within the American cultural context. The inclusion of the experiential factors again removes age as significant variable, along with English language use. SES factors play a less important role as a basis for ethnic identity. On the other hand, the measures of pluralism, ethno-cultural, and civic republicanism all contribute the presence of this form of American identity. Again, higher levels of political interest also have positive effects. Finally, addition of ethnically related variables adds a SES variable into the equation—employment status. Being in the labor market may place the Latino in more contact with other Latinos and situations in which one's ethnicity is accentuated. Common pan-ethnic status is the only positive

coefficient. An inverse relationship exists such that those Latinos who perceive less discrimination toward Latinos are more likely to take an ethnic identity.

The last round of analysis is that of examining the pan-ethnic form of American identity. The same set of sociodemographic variables proved to have significant coefficients with the pan-ethnic identity – gender (positive and more males), finishing one's education in the U.S (+), English language use (+), falling in the lower categories of household income; and inversely with age. The addition of experiential factors maintained the significance of the previously mentioned SES variables except for household income. In addition, the pluralist and ethno-cultural measure provided significant and positive coefficients, as well as those more interested in American politics. The final addition of the ethnic variables removed the significance of English language use, but both youthfulness and being male remained significant. Only one ethnic variable proved to be important- a heightened sense of linked fate with other Latinos. Overall, the role of the three clusters of contributing factors had the least effects on explaining the bases for the two different forms of ethnic identity. The next section will be discussed the overall results and possible conclusions to be derived from the present analysis.

Ethnicity, Nationalism and National Identity: Examining Latino Immigrants

The initial discussion regarding the relationships between ethnicity and nationalism began in a more general mode. The focus on nation building and stability emphasized the temporal nature of ethnicity and eventual integration of its residents as attached and allegiant persons. The dynamics of nationalism clearly indicates ethnicity is not a temporal phenomenon, but continues to operate in persons' lives. The either/or dichotomy of ethnicity vs. nationalism has not been the only scenario for many nation-states. There have been "peaceful co-existence" and structural integration by political institutions to recognize and protect ethnic groups. Thus this examination of ethnicity and nationalism takes the perspective (documented by some of the extant research) that there are multiple bases for a sense of nationalism which goes beyond cultural traits and histories. Within the American context, a liberal ideology and belief system, citizen

expectation of civic engagement, and the concept of pluralism come into play in the development of U.S. nationalism. My focus also represents a departure from the extant research as it examines American nationalism from the perspective of Latino immigrants.

I have focused upon American identity as a manifestation of American nationalism or the product of attachment and affinity. As a result, the approach was to identify multiple bases of American identity and then try to understand the bases for such identity choices. I operationalized five variants of American identity based upon Latino immigrants' responses to the degree of strength with being American, a Latino, and one's national group. One form was classified as a more generic American and two more as forms of hyphenated Americans—ethnic and pan-ethnic. The last two types recognized the primacy of ethnicity and pan-ethnicity.

A series of hypotheses posited three sources that contribute to the bases for specific American identities which were clustered around the categories of socio-demographic characteristics, experiential factors by living in the U.S., and ethnically related factors reflecting networks, behaviors and group identities. Both the dependent and independent variables were operationalized and identified prior to a multivariate analysis. Since the dependent variables were categorical, the use of logistic regression was implemented. The results, discussed in the previous section, produced some mixed results. On the one hand, it is clear that sociodemographic characteristics are a key set of factors for most forms of American identity. More specifically, higher educational status, completing one's education in the U.S., speaking English, and, interestingly, being Mexican all contribute to a "generic" American identity as well as hyphenated identities. The role of age and household income becomes statistically insignificant when the other clusters are introduced into the analysis.

I constructed three measures that tap some underlying themes related to American identity—pluralism, ethno-cultural traits, and civic republicanism. The ethno-cultural dimension (seen as being American as native born, speaking English, being Christian, and being White) had a major effect on generic American and hyphenated identities. Latino immigrants, being cognizant of these characteristics can both produce pressure of conformity (to the extent possible) as well as challenging this notion of what being American entails. Interestingly, the introduction of ethnically related factors indicated

that one manifestation of ethnic persistence is contextualizing it as part of the national fabric. A sense of ethnic or pan-ethnic group affinity contributes to American identities. Also there is an integrated element as less transnational interaction and more ethnically diverse social networks influence American identity. Having lived longer in the U.S. also affects the bases for generic and hyphenated American identities.

Discernible patterns of the primal ethnic and pan-ethnic identities were more challenging. For example, Latino immigrants who finish one's education in the U.S, and speaking English contributed toward an ethnic identity, as well as being Protestant. Given the literature on minority status and group formation, the process of being more familiar with American society and institutions can serve to accent one's ethnicity. The pluralist and civic republicanism are significant contributors to an ethnic identity as well as cognizant of differential treatment directed toward Latinos. The underlying bases for a pan-ethnic identity are much less evident. Being a male, younger, finishing one's education in the U.S., speaking English, and lower household income levels are associated with a pan-ethnic identity. Again, being more assimilated within the U.S. context reinforces that emergent ethnicity or pan-ethnicity is a phenomenon that occurs in the receiving nation. In this case, the pluralist and ethno-cultural measure contributes to this identity. Finally the pan-ethnic "groupness" comes through in the form of seeing one's fate as connected to the overall status of other Latinos. One of the consistent findings is the role of greater political interest in American politics that contributes across all of the American identities analyzed.

I would characterize this initial effort as quite preliminary for several reasons. One involves the recency of the survey project. The near final version of the survey data file was not received until mid-August. The tasks of reviewing and insuring the quality and consistency of the data required a significant investment of time and effort. Operationalization and construction of the measures and creating scales require the rigor of validation and reliability. Given the number of items within each cluster, further examination of possible interaction effects among the independent variables is still necessary. One indicator is the change of regression coefficients as additional variables were added to the analysis. Added complexity was added to the discussion and analytical

interpretation with the use of five American identities. Limiting the scope to the generic and hyphenated variants would be more manageable way to initiate this research agenda.

The other preliminary nature of this effort is contrasting the multiplicity of possible American identities with more a hierarchical view of American identity. That is, once the Latino immigrants responded to each of the three identities—American, national origin, and pan-ethnic, they were asked which identity best described themselves. Overwhelmingly, both national origin and pan ethnic identities (45.9 and 39.9% respectively) were the responses compared to 8.2% that selected American. The interpretative difficulty lies in that “forced ranking” is seldom reflective of the realities of day to day life for a Latino immigrant living in the U.S. The reality could well be the presence of multiple loyalties that complement themselves more often than are in direct conflictual juxtaposition. The preliminary nature of this effort illustrates the complexities of understanding the relationship of ethnicity and nationalism and being able to theoretically and analytically capture the breadth of this phenomenon.

References

- Alba, R. 1990 Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America. New Haven; Yale University Press.
- Bloom, I. 1990 Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Bollen, K. and J. Diez Medrano 1998 "Who are the Spaniards? Nationalism and Identity in Spain" Social Forces. Vol. 77, #2 (December), 587-621.
- Calhoun, Craig 1993 "Nationalism and Ethnicity" Annual Review of Sociology. Vol. 19, pp. 211-239.
- Citrin, Jack 2001 "The End of American Identity" in One America: Political Leadership, National Identity and the Dilemmas of Diversity S. Renshon (editor). Washington D.C.; Georgetown University Press.
- _____, B. Reingold, and D. Green 1990 "American Identity and the Politics of Ethnic Change" Journal of Politics. Vol. 52(4), 1124-1154.
- _____, C. Haas, C. Muste, and B. Reingold 1994 "Is American Nationalism Changing: Implications for Foreign Policy" International Studies Quarterly Vol. 38, #1 (March), 1-31.
- _____, C. Wong, and B. Duff 2001 "The Meaning of American National Identity" in Social Identity, Inter-group Conflict and Conflict Reduction R. Ashmore, L. Jussom and D. Wilder (editors); New York, Oxford University Press.
- De la Garza, A. Falcon, and F.C. Garcia 1996 "Will the Real Americans Please Stand Up: Anglo and Mexican American Support for Core American Political Values" American Journal of Political Science. 40:335-351.
- Dinnerstein, L. and D. Reimers 1999 Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation (4th edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Eriksen, T. 1990 "Linguistic Diversity and Quest for National Identity: The Case of Mauritius" Racial and Ethnic Studies. Vol. 13, #1, 1-26.
- _____, 1991 "Ethnicity and Nationalism" Journal of Peace Research .Vol. 28, #3 (August), 263-278.
- Garcia, John A. "Latino Immigrants: Transnationalism And Patterns of Multiple Citizenship Patterns" in David Leal (editor) Latinos, Transnationalism and Immigration. New York; Palgrave- MacMillan Pub. (Forthcoming, 2007).

- _____. 2006 "Pan Ethnicity: Politically Relevant For Latino Political Engagement?" in Black and Latino/A Politics: Issues in Political Development in the United States. William T. Nelson and Jessica Perez-Monforti (editors) Miami, FL; Barnhardt & Ashe Pub.
- Gordon, M. 1965 Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origin. New York; Oxford University Press.
- Greenfield, L. 1992 Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity. Cambridge; Harvard University Press.
- Horowitz, D. 1985 Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Berkeley, CA; University of California Press.
- Huntington, S. 2004 Who are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity. New York; Simon and Schuster.
- Karpathakis, Anna 1998 "Home Society Politics and Immigrant Political Incorporation: The Case of Greek Immigrants in New York" International Migration Review. Vol. 33 #1 (Spring), 55-78.
- Massey, Douglas 1995 "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States" Population and Development Review. Vol. 21, #3 (September), 631-652.
- Nielsen, Francois 1992 The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition and Conflict. Stanford, CA; Stanford University Press.
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou 1998 "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants" Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. 530:74-96.
- Schildkraut, D. 2005 Press "One" for English: Language Policy, Public Opinion and American Identity. Princeton; Princeton University Press.
- Smith, A. 1991 National Identity. London; Penguin Books.
- Smith, Rogers 1988 "The American Creed and American Identity: the Limits of Liberal Citizenship in the U.S." Western Political Quarterly. Vol. 41, #2, 225-251.
- _____. 1997 Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U. S. History. New Haven, CT; Yale University Press.
- _____. 2004 "Identities, Interests and the Future of Political Science" Perspectives on Politics. Vol. 2, 301-312.

Table 1

Socio-demographic Characteristics of Latino
National Survey Respondents

Sociodemographic Traits	N	Percentage
Gender: Male	2763	44.9%
Female	3384	55.1
Educational Attainment:		
None	202	.3
Less than high School	2593	42.2
High School Grad	1685	27.4
Some College	880	14.3
College Grad	787	12.8
Religious Affiliation:		
Catholic	4428	73.7
Evangelical Prot.	624	9.1
Other Protestant	333	5.4
Other Denomination	330	5.3
No religious affiliation	332	5.4
Household Income:		
Less than \$15,000	1088	17.7
\$15,000-24,999	1229	20.0
\$25,000-34,999	904	14.7
\$35,000-44,999	564	9.2
\$45,000-54,999	311	5.1
\$55,000-64,999	223	3.6
Over \$65,000	755	7.4
Number of Earners w/i Household		
One		40.6
Two		43.5
Three or more		17.9
Years Living in the U.S.	Mean= 19.13	Range 0-85

Table 2

Additional Socio-demographic Characteristics of
Latino National Survey Respondents

Socio-demographic Traits	N	Percentage
Naturalization Status :		
Citizen	1873	33.2%
Non-Citizen	5676	66.8
Marital Status:		
Single	1322	21.5
Cohabitants	399	6.5
Married but Separated	293	4.8
Married	3519	57.2
Divorced	394	6.4
Widowed	220	3.6
Homeowner Status		
Renter	3119	50.7
Other	182	3.0
Homeowner	2785	45.3
Member of Union		
No	507	8.4
Yes	5491	91.5
Racial Identification		
White	1502	24.4
Black	45	.7
American Indian	92	1.5
Asian	3	.0004
Native Hawaiian	13	.02
Some other Race	3974	64.6
Self or family Member with Military Service		
No	5018	81.6
Yes	1129	28.4
Age of Respondents	Mean= 40.39	Range 18-97

Table 3

Dimensions of American Nationalism:
American Identity Types

American National Identity Types	N	Percentage
American Identity		
High	3387	57.9%
Low	2466	42.1
Ethnic Identity		
High	5327	86.7
Low	617	13.3
Latino Pan-ethnic Identity		
High	5397	87.8
Low	540	12.2
American-Ethnic Identity		
High	3071	53.2
Low	2700	46.8
American –Pan Ethnic Identity		
High	3140	54.3
Low	2633	45.7

Table 4
Constructed Measures of Underlying Bases
For Types of American Identities

Dimensions of Determining American Identities	N	Percentage
Ethno-Cultural Bases	Mean = 5.62	Range 1-9
Transnational Interactions	Mean = .87	Range 1-6
Pluralism-Assimilation		
High Pluralism	3495	56.9 %
3	1494	24.3
2	526	8.6
Assimilationist	577	9.4
Civic Republicanism		
Low	1335	21.7
2	1086	17.7
3	1421	23.1
4	1303	21.2
High	1002	16.3

¹The Ethno-cultural scale is constructed based upon responses to levels of agreement or disagreement on the components of being an American: being white; a Christian; speaking English; and being born in America.

² The transnational connection scale is an additive measure of six activities that immigrants can engage in while living in the U.S. They include: membership in hometown association; sending money regularly; extent of visitations; political involvement in country of origin, donate money to political parties, and intent to go back.

³ The Pluralism-Assimilation scale is constructed based upon two separate agree-disagree items that ask the respondent if they should blend into American culture and whether to maintain their own culture and traditions. The pluralist upper end reflects those persons who rated both alternatives as high.

⁴The civic republican scale is based upon a battery of items that tap participatory expectations and government responsiveness.

Table 5
American and Ethnic-American Identities
And Contributing Factors

Indept. Variables	American(1)	American(2)	American(3)	Ethnic-American(1)	Ethnic-American(2)	Ethnic-American(3)
SES:						
Age	.02 (.002)*	.001 (.004)	.005(.004)	.018(.002)*	.003 (.004)	.006 (.004)
Gender	-.380(.063)*	-.437(.069)*	-.438(.076)*	-.209(.061)*	-.340(.070)*	-.352(.076)*
Educational Attainment	.139 (.031)*	.092(.035)*	.094(.039)*	.093(.030)*	.061(.036)	.041 (.040)
Place Finish Education	.61 (.081)*	.233(.098)*	.146(.109)	-.585(.077)*	-.264(.094)*	-.225 (.105)*
Ancestry-Mex.	.493 (.068)*	.40 (.077)*	.346(.085)*	.424(.066)*	.297(.078)*	.424 (.066)*
Religion-Cath.	-.034 (.071)	-.06 (.079)	-.038 (.088)	-.143(.069)*	-.120(.081)*	-.108(.089)
Language Use	-.788(.093)*	-.710 (.104)*	-.768(.118)*	-.538(.085)*	-.538(.104)*	-.551 (.117)*
HH income	-.023 (.012)	-.024(.013)	-.026(.015)	-.019(.012)	-.019(.013)	-.024(.016)
Emp. Status	.001(.027)	-.018(.03)	-.004(.037)	.033(.026)	.014(.029)	.040 (.037)
Homeowner	-.245(.064)*	-.108(.071)	-.071(.079)	-.183(.062)*	-.059(.070)	-.020(.081)
U.S. Experiences:						
U.S. Residence		-.019(.067)	-.005(.074)		.004(.068)	.024 (.075)
Pluralist Dimen.		.015 (.034)	-.013(.037)		.086(.034)*	.061 (.038)*
Ethno-cultural		.116 (.018)*	.115(.020)*		.109(.018)*	.106 (.019)*
Civic Repub.		.016(.024)	.015(.026)*		.060(.024)*	.064(.026)*
Naturalized		-.648(.087)*	-.635(.097)*		-.653(.088)*	-.642 (.097)*
Yrs. In U.S.		.017(.004)*	.013(.005)*		.007 (.004)	.004(.008)
U.S. Political Interest		.283 (.044)*	.270(.050)*		.263(.045)*	.253 (.050)*
Ethnicity Dimensions:						
Common Ethnic Status			.110(.028)*			.102(.029)*
Common Pan-ethnic Status			.048(.036)			.121 (.034)*
Latino Discrim.			-.326(.199)			-.344 (.264)
Ethnic Coworkers			-.095(.045)*			-.048 (.044)
Ethnic Group Fate			.049(.03)			.070 (.030)*
Latinos as Distinct Race			.097(.066)			.003 (.038)
Transnational Interactions			-.16(.040)*			-.115 (.041)*
Ethnic Friends			-.089(.046)*			-.091(.045)*
Constant	.046 (.184)	-.409(.290)	-.935(.377)	-.211(.177)	-1.109(.282)	-1.392(.380)*
% Cases Correctly Classified	64.3%	65.5%	66.8%	62.2%	63.9%	64.9%

Table 6

Pan-Ethnic-American and Ethnic Identities
And Contributing Factors

Indept. Variables	Pan-Ethnic American(1)	Pan-Ethnic American(2)	Pan-Ethnic American(3)	Ethnic Identity (1)	Ethnic Identity(2)	Ethnic Identity (3)
SES:						
Age	.017(.002)*	-.002(.004)	.005(.004)	-.010(.003)*	-.007(.005)	-.007(.007)
Gender	-.271(.061)*	-.332(.070)*	-.355(.076)*	.139(.095)	.107(.105)	.158(.118)
Educational Attainment	.111(.030)*	.082(.032)*	.083(.039)*	.036(.046)	.039(.053)	-.016(.060)
Place Finish Education	-.555(.078)*	-.243(.094)*	-.166 (.110)	.334(.125)*	.372(.152)*	.451 (.171)*
Ancestry-Mex.	.442(.066)*	.326 (.078)*	.273(.086)*	-.005(.103)	-.214(.115)	-.133(.129)
Religion-Cath.	-.064(.070)	-.049(.081)	-.012(.089)	-.297(.102)*	-.332(.113)*	-.401(.126)*
Language Use	-.516(.086)*	-.507(.104)*	-.525(.117)*	.273(.127)*	.199(.146)	.068(.169)
HH income	-.025(.012)*	-.023(.013)	-.031(.016)	-.018(.018)	-.024(.020)	-.009(.24)
Emp. Status	.020(.026)	.001(.029)	.008 (.037)	.056(.040)	.072(.044)	.135(.053)*
Homeowner	-.212(.062)*	-.083(.070)	-.051(.081)	.034(.097)	.061(.110)	.070(.124)
U.S. Experiences:						
U.S. Residence		-.013(.068)	-.007(.075)		-.022(.103)	.135(.116)
Pluralist Dimen.		.046(.034)	.024(.037)		.292(.046)*	.226(.052)*
Ethno-cultural		.107(.018)*	.110(.020)*		.069(.027)*	.047(.03)
Civic Repub.		.030(.024)	.037(.026)		.164(.037)*	.172(.042)*
Naturalized		-.563(.084)*	-.566(.097)*		-.182(.133)	-.244(.152)
Yrs. In U.S.		.013(.004)*	.009(.005)*		-.010(.006)	-.009(.008)
U.S. Political Interest		.233(.045)*	.221(.050)*		.200(.067)*	.203(.076)*
Ethnicity Dimensions:						
Common Ethnic Status			.103(.029)*			.017(.044)
Common Pan-ethnic Status			.100(.034)*			.170(.051)*
Latino Discrim.			-.438 (.303)			-.701(.358)*
Ethnic Coworkers			-.081(.045)			.202(.072)*
Ethnic Group Fate			.088 (.029)*			.073(.043)
Latinos as Distinct Race			-.011(.038)			.008(.103)
Transnational Interactions			-.126(.041)*			.125(.067)
Ethnic Friends			-.096(.045)*			-.073(.072)
Constant	-.225(.178)	-.859(.282)	-1.258(.380)	2.158(.274)	.169(.425)	-.720 (.562)
% Cases Correctly Classified	62.8%	63.9%	64.7%	89.7%	89.8%	90.1%

Table 7

Pan-Ethnic Identity
And Contributing Factors

Indept. Variables	Pan-ethnic(1)	Pan-ethnic(2)	Pan-ethnic(3)
SES:			
Age	-.009(.004)*	-.018(.006)*	-.018(.007)*
Gender	.437(.103)*	.459(.112)*	.520(.129)*
Educational Attainment	.036(.049)	.040(.056)	.040(.065)
Place Finish Education	.282(.132)*	.195(.159)	.140(.181)
Ancestry-Mex.	.084(.112)	-.140(.122)	-.137(.139)
Religion-Cath.	-.121(.113)	-.106(.124)	.031 (.144)
Language Use	.493(.131)*	.511(.148)*	.338 (.176)
HH income	-.042(.019)*	-.035(.021)	-.03 (.025)
Emp. Status	.063(.043)	.060(.048)	.016 (.061)
Homeowner	-.105(.106)	-.005(.117)	.005 (.135)
U.S. Experiences:			
U.S. Residence		.060(.048)	-.127 (.125)
Pluralist Dimen.		.204(.049)*	.160 (.057)*
Ethno-cultural		.081(.029)*	.067 (.033)*
Civic Repub.		.057(.039)	.112 (.045)*
Naturalized		-.143(.141)	-.137(.162)
Yrs. In U.S.		.010(.007)	.014 (.008)
U.S. Political Interest		.143(.070)*	.135 (.082)
Ethnicity Dimensions:			
Common Ethnic Status			.031 (.048)
Common Pan-ethnic Status			.213 (.054)*
Latino Discrim.			-.533 (.358)
Ethnic Coworkers			.119 (.077)
Ethnic Group Fate			.100 (.046)*
Latinos as Distinct Race			-.063 (.110)
Transnational Interactions			.016 (.068)
Ethnic Friends			-.058 (.078)
Constant	2.057(.291)	.703(.452)	-.242 (.602)
% Cases Correctly Classified	91.3%	91.1%	91.7%

APPENDIX

Civic Republicanism Dimension

K3.A **BIGINT** "Government is pretty much run by just a few big interests looking out for themselves, and not for the benefit of all the people."

- 4 Strongly agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 9 DK/NA

K3.B **SAYSO** "People like me don't have any say in what the government does." *[Repeat only if necessary: Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?]*

- 4 Strongly agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 9 DK/NA

c) **COMPLIC** "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on." *[Repeat only if necessary: Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?]*

- 4 Strongly agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 9 DK/NA

d) **NOCONCT** "People are better off avoiding contact with government" *[Repeat only if necessary: Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?]*

- 4 Strongly agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 9 DK/NA

K4. **GOVTRST** How much of the time do you trust the government to do what is right – just about always, most of the time, some of the time or never?

- 4 just about always
- 3 most of the time
- 2 some of the time
- 1 never

K5. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree with the following statements, or do you have no opinion?

A. **EQLRIGHT** "No matter what a person's political beliefs are, they are entitled to the same legal rights and protections as anyone else."

- 4 Agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 5 DK/Ref

B. **SYSBLAME** "Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they have only themselves to blame."

- 4 Agree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 1 Strongly disagree
- 5 DK/Ref

American identities and Pluralist dimensions

I am going to read a list of labels describing people and I want you to tell me how strongly you identify with each.

The first is...

(ROTATE THE ORDER OF THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS)

L8. **AMERICAN** "American." [In general,] how strongly or not do you think of yourself as American?

- 4 Very strongly
- 3 Somewhat strongly
- 2 Not very strongly
- 1 Not at all
- 5 DK/NA
- 6 Refused

L9. **RIGIDENT** "(Answer to B4)", [In general,] how strongly or not do you think of yourself as (national origin descriptor)?

- 4 Very strongly
- 3 Somewhat strongly
- 2 Not very strongly
- 1 Not at all
- 5 DK/NA
- 6 Refused

L10. **LAIDENT** Finally, [In general,] how strongly or not do you think of yourself as Hispanic or Latino?

- 4 Very strongly
- 3 Somewhat strongly
- 2 Not very strongly
- 1 Not at all
- 5 DK/NA
- 6 Refused

(End Rotation)

Incorporatism dimension

G5. **BLEND** How important is it for (Answer to S4) to (READ ITEMS):

(ROTATE ITEMS)

G5.A. change so that they blend into the larger American society

- 3 very important
- 2 somewhat important
- 1 not at all important
- 4 don't know
- 5 refused

G5. **DISTINCT** B. maintain their distinct cultures?

- 3 very important
- 2 somewhat important
- 1 not at all important
- 4 don't know
- 5 refused

Ethno-cultural Dimension

L12. When you think of what it means to be fully American in the eyes of most Americans, do you think it is very important, somewhat important, or not important to:

L12.A **AMERBORN** Have been born in the United States?

- 3 Very important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 1 Not important

L12.B **AMERENGL** To speak English well

- 3 Very important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 1 Not important

L12.C **AMERWHITE** To be White?

- 3 Very important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 1 Not important

L12.D **AMERCHRS** To be Christian?

- 3 Very important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 1 Not important

Transnational Connections

M3. **TRLIVE** Have you ever returned to live (rather than just visit) there for a portion of time?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 DK/NA

M8. **TRGOBACK** Do you have plans to go back to (Answer to B4) to live permanently?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 DK
- 4 NA

M9. **TRMONEY** How often do you send money?

- 1 More than once a month
- 2 Once a month
- 3 Once every few months
- 4 Once a year
- 5 Less than once a year
- 6 Never (SKIP TO M11)
- 7 DK/NA

M11. **TRASSOC** Do you participate in the activities of a club, association or federation connected to the town or province your family came from in (Answer to B4)?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 DK/NA

If R born in the U.S. (SKIP TO M19)

If R not born in US:

M13. **TRVOTE** Before coming to the US, did you ever vote in (Answer to B4) elections?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know
- 4 NA

M14. **TRUSVOTE** Have you ever voted in (Answer to B4) elections since you've been in the US?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (SKIP TO M15)
- 3 Don't know (SKIP TO M16)
- 4 NA (SKIP TO M16)

M16. **TRDONATE** Since coming to the U.S., have you contributed money to a candidate or party in your country of origin?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 DK/Ref