PRC Working Paper Series

2004-2005

No. 04-05-07

Who is Hispanic?
Hispanic Ethnic Identity Among African Americans, Asian Americans, and Whites

Kate H. Choi
Arthur Sakamoto

WHO IS HISPANIC? HISPANIC ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG AFRICAN AMERICANS, ASIAN AMERICANS, AND WHITES

Kate H. Choi
Department of Sociology
1 University Station A1700
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712-0118
email: katechoi@prc.utexas.edu
phone: (512) 471-0141
fax: (512) 471-1748

Arthur Sakamoto
Department of Sociology
1 University Station A1700
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712-0118
email: sakamoto@mail.la.utexas.edu
telephone/voice mail: (512) 232-6338
fax: (512) 471-1748

October 21, 2004

Running Head: Who Is Hispanic?

Word Count: 10,500

Direct correspondence to Arthur Sakamoto (e-mail: sakamoto@mail.la.utexas.edu) at the address given above. We thank the Population Research Center at the University of Texas for excellent computer and research support.

WHO IS HISPANIC? HISPANIC ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG AFRICAN AMERICANS, ASIAN AMERICANS, AND WHITES

ABSTRACT

Hispanics are now the largest minority group in America and their presence is likely to continue to expand. Little is known, however, about the sources of Hispanic ethnic identity. We investigate the role of racial identification on Hispanic ethnicity using data from the Current Population Surveys from 1994 to 2002. Despite a considerable history of Asian presence in Latin America, our results indicate that persons of Asian racial origins are substantially less likely than whites to identify as Hispanic even after controlling for Latin American nativity, parental Latin American nativity, and other demographic characteristics. By contrast, persons of African racial origins are usually similar to whites in their propensities to identify as Hispanic. These results may be interpreted in terms of differences in the social stratification of these racial groups and in terms of relevant social psychological processes---including the looking-glass self, the presentational self, and segmented assimilation theory---that are involved in development and maintenance of ethnic identity in modern America.

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Hispanics are now the largest minority group in America having recently overtaken African Americans in population size. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, there were 35.3 million Hispanics who constituted 12.5% of the total American population (U.S. Census Bureau 2001). Bernstein (2004) recently reported that the Hispanic population had grown to 39.9 million or 13.0% of the total population by 2003. According to a population projection by the U.S. Census Bureau, the Hispanic population is predicted to be over 100 million or about one-quarter of the total population by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau 2004).

As is always stated in the official statistical reports, Hispanics may be of any race. They constitute an ethnic group that is based on a cultural heritage or a social identity associated with Latin American countries. Persons who are African and Asian in terms of their racial identification may officially identify as Hispanic when they have cultural origins with Latin America. In principle, the population counts and projections mentioned above include not only whites but also persons of other races.

In practice, however, African and Asian Hispanics are relatively tiny groups and are typically ignored as such. The 2000 Census reports that only 2.0% of Hispanics are African American and only .3% of Hispanics are Asian American (U.S. Census Bureau 2001). Given that most of the remainder is probably white by U.S. Census definitions, the stipulation that Hispanics may be of any race appears to be almost a trivial technicality.[1] For example, a special report on the Hispanic population issued by the U.S. Census Bureau does not even mention African or Asian Hispanics (U.S. Census Bureau 2001).

---

[1] As noted below, a large proportion of Hispanics do not identify as white or any other officially designated racial category but instead report that they are "some other race." Furthermore, as stated by Hirschman, Alba and Farley (2000, p. 382), "Although Hispanic origin and race officially are independent classifications, the popular assumption is that virtually everyone can be fit into one, and only one, of these

Little is known about the sources of Hispanic ethnic identity. In this paper, our general research objective is to increase our understanding of the demographic factors that predict Hispanic ethnicity. We are especially interested in the fundamental issue of ascertaining the impact of racial identity on Hispanic ethnicity. The specific hypothesis that we focus on is whether there is a net effect of race. Given the tiny proportion of Hispanics who are African or Asian, we seek to ascertain whether whites are more likely than Africans or Asians to identify as Hispanic net of other demographic characteristics.

Persons of African and Asian racial origins are comparatively small groups in Latin American countries. If the small number of Hispanics in the U.S. who are African or Asian simply reflects the small number of such persons who immigrated here from Latin America, then there would be no net effect of race on Hispanic identity. On the other hand, if persons of African or Asian racial origins are less likely to identify as Hispanic in the U.S. despite having a Latin American cultural heritage, then race would have a net effect on the Hispanic ethnicity. In this latter case, African or Asian racial origins would be suppressing identification with one's Hispanic origins.

Although understanding the net effect of race on Hispanic ethnicity is important in and of itself, we note that this issue has implications for population projections about the racial and ethnic composition of the U.S. in the future. First, if persons of African and Asian racial origins are less likely to maintain their Latin American cultural heritage, then projections of the Hispanic population should accordingly attenuate the growth of these groups. Second, if non-whites are substantially less likely to identify as Hispanic, then this pattern would contribute to the tendency to view white Hispanics as a separate racial group which could eventually emerge in the future as new racial category. In the 2000 Census, 47.9% of Hispanics reported that they were white but fully 42.2% of Hispanics reported that they were "some other race" (i.e., other than any of the officially recognized 2000 Census racial categories including white, African-American/black, Asian, Pacific Islander, or Native-American/Native-Alaskan). This high

---

categories" [i.e., "non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, non-Hispanic Asians, non-Hispanic Indians, and Hispanics"].

proportion of Hispanics who view themselves as "some other race" is consistent with the view that non-African and non-Asian Hispanics are beginning to view themselves as a separate racial group. To the extent this idea becomes prevalent in the population at large, then there would be a feedback effect that would further reduce the likelihood of persons of African and Asian racial origins to identify as Hispanic given the tendencies for their phenotypic appearances to differ. In sum, the relationship between racial identification and Hispanic ethnicity is an important issue that merits a systematic investigation.

Africans in Latin America

The oldest documented case of the involuntary migration of Africans to America dates back to 1518 while the last slave cargo arrived at the Southern coast of Cuba in 1873 (Moreno 1981). Researchers estimate that, during that time interval, over 15 million Black Africans were coercively brought to America (Urbanski 1972). Of these, 10 million were sent to Latin American countries and 5 million were sent to the U.S. (Urbanski 1972). It is estimated that 65% of these slaves were assigned to the production of sugar and another 15% were assigned to produce other export-oriented crops such as coffee and tobacco (Urbanski 1972).

As time passed, the economic, political, and social supports for slavery waned in Latin American countries. Economically, the decreasing demand for sugar in Europe, the diminishing comparative advantage rendered by slavery over hiring subsistence-wage workers (i.e., "peons"), and the increasing need to industrialize reduced the viability of slavery (Urbanski 1972). Politically, the spread of Enlightenment political ideals advocating equality for all human beings, and moral pressures from European countries (such as the Pope's criticism of slavery in 1839) turned many against slavery (Urbanski 1972). Socially, the increasing proportion of bi/multiracial individuals, especially the growth of the *afromestizos* population (i.e., bi/multiracial persons who are part African) blurred the racial boundary between slaves and non-slaves (Urbanski 1972). Various Latin American countries thus abolished slavery beginning with the start of the 19th century.

The abolition of slavery did not, however, substantially improve the living conditions of the

former slaves (Urbanski 1972). As subsistence-wage workers (i.e., "peons"), former slaves were forced to work with very little pay under similar duress (Urbanski 1972). In contrast to the U.S., economic growth among Latin American countries was more limited. The lives of most Afro-Latinos thus continued to be economically deprived and socially marginal.

In contrast to North America with its predominant "one-drop rule" and consequently strong demarcation between whites and blacks, Latin American countries typically recognize numerous "in-between" or bi/multiracial categories for persons who are of mixed African descent. These categories denote various shades of phenotypic "color," perceived ancestry, and social status (Yelvington 1997). Despite the variety of racial classification schemes, however, *whiteness* is still accorded higher status in Latin American societies (Yelvington 1997). Consequently, even dark skinned Afro-Latin Americans will sometimes attempt to distinguish themselves from others with racial terms such as *indio oscuro* (i.e., dark Indian) or *zambo* which would seem to signify a more a more distinctive ethnic identity.

Historically, the *limpieza de sangre* (i.e., purity of blood) principle was widely utilized to determine racial origins as well as legal and social status (Yelvington 1997). Elaborate systems measuring the degree of whiteness were established by the Spaniards and *criollos* (i.e., Spaniards born in Latin America). According to Moerner, there were 16 rules involved in determining the racial categories of bi/multiracial individuals during the 18th century in Mexico (Moerner 1967). For instance, the offspring of a Spaniard and a *mestizo* (i.e., persons of mixed or multiracial background) is regarded as a *cuarteron mestizo* (i.e., one-fourth mixed) whereas the offspring of a Spaniard and a *cuarteron mestizo* is regarded as a *quinteron* (i.e., one-fifth mixed). This system, referred to as *sociedad de castas* (i.e., caste society), inflicted blatant social and legal discrimination based on racial traits and ancestry (Yelvington 1997). In sum, different rights and freedoms were provided to individuals depending on the degree of *whiteness* they were deemed to possessed (Yelvington 1997).

Asians in Latin America

Asian migration to Latin America commenced during the 16th century after the colonization of the

Philippines by the Spanish Vice-Kingdom of Mexico (Wilson 2004). Sea routes were established between Acapulco and Manila for the purpose of carrying out the Chinese trade between these two regions, which yielded immense profits for Spain (Wilson 2004). However, migrants from Asia did not reach substantial numbers until the 19th century when East Asian countries experienced high levels of turmoil resulting from civil unrest, natural disasters, and economic pressures from imperialist forces (Wilson 2004). These factors brought about the dislocation of some populations, which in turn, resulted in massive migrations (Wilson 2004).

Asian migrants during this period can be broadly classified into two groups. One group had the intent of settling in the more modern and industrialized U.S., but they were turned away or unsuccessfully exiled (Martinez 1981; Takenaka 2004). Individuals pertaining to this group immigrated with the intent of selling their labor. The other group, such as the Japanese in Chiapas (i.e., Mexico), emigrated with the specific purpose of colonizing and developing certain sectors of the Latin American economy (Martinez 1981).

Conversely, host countries in Latin America typically welcomed the migration of Asians for the purpose of obtaining cheap labor and foreign investment (Martinez 1981). For instance, in Cuba, Asian migrants replaced slave labor as indentured laborers in sugar plantations (Martinez 1981). In Panama, the "coolies" constituted a cheap labor force for the construction of the Inter-Oceanic railroad and subsequently, the construction of the Panama Canal (Mon 1981). An example of the colonizing group includes the Japanese who migrated to the Chiapas region of Mexico. They utilized Mexico's favorable foreign migration policies by populating a sparse region (as was intended by the Mexican government) bringing "seed" capital to the country, and developing crops for exportation (Ota 1981).

Chinese Immigration to Latin America

Chinese arrived in Latin America amidst the Acapulco-Manila trade during the mid 16th century (Wilson 2004). They exchanged luxury goods (such as porcelain, silk, and tea) for silver (Wilson 2004). It is estimated that the first immigration of the Chinese to Latin America occurred during the 17th century

at the height of this trade. The first clearly documented case of Chinese immigration to Latin America is evident in 1635 when Spanish barbers petitioned the government to move Chinese barbers to the outskirts of the city on the pretext of unfair competition (Wilson 2004).

A large number of Chinese began immigrating to Latin America with the coolie trade (Wilson 2004). Records show that amidst labor shortages generated with the emancipation of slaves, 132,435 coolies entered Cuba and 100,000 were imported to Peru between 1849 and 1874 (Wilson 2004). In addition, Chinese contract laborers were sent to Brazil, Panama, Ecuador, and Chile in lesser numbers to work in plantation and various construction sites (Wilson 2004). For the most part, these recruit laborers were predominantly male and virtually served as low-wage slaves in Latin America (Masterson 2004).

The second big wave of Chinese immigration to Latin America took place as a consequence of the Chinese Exclusion Acts of 1882 and 1892 in the U.S. (Wilson 2004). By 1910, 13, 203 Chinese immigrants had migrated to Mexico (Masterson 2004). A substantial portion of these migrants settled in Sonora and Baja California to escape the xenophobic and hostile sociopolitical environment in the U.S. and to take advantage of the economic opportunities associated with the promotion of foreign investment in bordering lands by the Diaz regime (Wilson 2004). As entrepreneurs in small businesses, they became major players of these regional economies. However, this prominence soon made Chinese immigrants the target to the xenophobic attitudes of the Mexican Revolution when Anti-Chinese laws were established (Masterson 2004). The enactment of these laws forced these individuals to re-migrate to other Latin American countries or to the U.S. (Wilson 2004).

Japanese in Latin America

Japanese have been present in Latin America in significant numbers since the end of the 19th century (Wilson 2004). Japanese settled in Mexico (1892), Peru (1899), Chile (1903), Cuba (1907), Argentina (1907), Brazil (1908), Panama (1915), Bolivia (1916), Colombia (1921), Uruguay (1930), Paraguay (1930), and Venezuela (1931) (Wilson 2004). There are currently more Japanese immigrants and the descendants of these immigrants (i.e., *nikkei*) in Latin America than in the U.S. and Canada

combined (Wilson 2004).

Like most Asian immigrants to Latin America, Japanese immigrants went to fill the labor shortages that occurred as a result of the abolition of slavery in 1888 and the increase in demand for export oriented agricultural crops. In the case of Brazil, approximately 190,000 Japanese immigrants entered its labor force prior to 1908 to work on the coffee plantation and later moved on to rice cultivation (Wilson 2004). In contrast to their Chinese counterparts, the Japanese typically migrated with their wives and children. Those male immigrants that had migrated without a wife often married Japanese women through the "picture bride" system that was also practiced in the U.S. (Wilson 2004). The immigration of Japanese to Latin America dwindled by World War II. Although it picked up again and burgeoned briefly in the early 1960's, it never reached the levels prior to World War II (Masterson 2004; Wilson 2004).

Koreans in Latin America

A Korean migration stream to Latin America is more recent than the immigration of the Chinese or the Japanese (Wilson 2004). The first documented cases of Korean immigration to Latin America were North Korean prisoners of war who migrated to Chile in 1953 through the Red Cross or to Argentina in 1956 (Wilson 2004). However, the majority of Koreans settled in Latin America after the late 1960's (Wilson 2004). Many others migrated from South Korea in the 1980's and established small garment shops, textile mills, import-export businesses, and other small firms (Wilson 2004).

In sum, both Africans and Asians have long and extensive histories in Latin America. From a demographic point of view, they are comparatively small groups in Latin America. Nonetheless, Africans and Asians in Latin America do have a significant demographic and historical presence in Latin America that is at least as substantial as it is in the U.S. For this reason, there is no obvious reason why African and Asian persons with a Latin American cultural heritage should be less likely than whites to identify as Hispanic.

SOME THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON ETHNIC IDENTITY

Social Psychological Aspects of the Sources of Ethnicity

The Looking-Glass Self

In our investigation of the sources of Hispanic identity, we use the idea of the looking-glass self that was originally proposed by Cooley ([1902] 1983). According to his theory, one's self-conception is influenced by how one believes that one is seen by others. The self is therefore, to some extent at least, a social product. While there is undoubtedly variation in the degree of impressionability across individuals, we would expect that consistent messages received over a longer period of time would tend to have significant effects on one's self-conception.

In terms of social interaction relating to racial and ethnic identity, African Americans and Asian Americans are usually viewed in the U.S. as non-Hispanic. When interacting with others, the primary expectation that African Americans encounter is that they are non-Hispanic because African Hispanics are such a tiny proportion of the total African American population. In addition, non-Hispanic African Americans and African American issues are deeply embedded in U.S. history, culture and politics (e.g., slavery, the Civil War, the Civil Rights Movement, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., affirmative action, residential segregation, police brutality) whereas Hispanic African American issues or individuals are unknown. Hispanic African Americans are generally not physically distinguishable from non-Hispanic African Americans which further reduces the development of any consciousness about Hispanic African Americans as a separate group.

In terms of absolute numbers or relative frequencies, Hispanics are even more rare among Asian Americans than they are among African Americans. In contrast to African Americans, most Asian Americans are foreign born (i.e., born in Asia), are at least somewhat familiar with a foreign (i.e., Asian) language, and are accordingly often assumed to be recent immigrants from Asia. Consciousness about Asian Americans as having a legitimate place *qua Americans* in U.S. history and culture---that they are not simply recent newcomers from Asia---seems to have been developing in recent years (e.g. Okihiro 1994). However, in this developing awareness of Asian Americans as being more than simply Asians, the

concept of an Asian Hispanic is still absent. In our own personal experiences, most Americans (including even white Hispanic Americans) are typically surprised---if not sometimes even amused---to learn that an Asian American can also be Hispanic and fluent in Spanish.

In sum, African and Asian Hispanics typically encounter the expectation that they are non-Hispanic when they interact with others in the U.S. Due to their physical appearances which usually are an obvious indicator of their non-white racial status, African and Asian Americans are generally assumed to be non-Hispanic. Their racial status is immediately perceived and widely recognized to others whereas non-white Hispanics remain an unknown or at best, a tiny, curious group. For this reason, we hypothesize that, due to the looking-glass aspect of the self, African and Asian Americans of Latin American origin will be less likely than whites of Latin American origin to identify as Hispanic even after taking into account Latin American nativity and parental Latin American nativity.

Other Images of the Looking-Glass Self

Some individuals are "mixed" in the sense of having parents who are of different races or ethnicities. For example, some persons have one parent who was born in Latin America while the other parent is non-Hispanic and was born in the U.S. Such a person's Latin American cultural heritage would be most significant in regard to the influences of the parent who was born in Latin America.

In general, however, we hypothesize that, in these cases of a "mixed" Hispanic heritage, individuals will be more likely to identify as Hispanic when their father (rather than their mother) is of Latin American nativity. The last name of most children derives from their father's last name. Children of "mixed" Hispanic heritage are therefore more likely to have a Latin American (i.e., Spanish-origin) last name when their father (rather than their mother) is from Latin America. Last names are generally seen as being an overtly perceived (albeit often imperfect) indicator of ethnic background. The looking-glass nature of the self suggests that having a Spanish-origin last name will increase the probability that the individual will identify as Hispanic due to repeated social encounters with that expectation. Thus, in terms of identifying as Hispanic, having a father who was born Latin America will have a larger net effect

than having a mother who was born in Latin America.

Another factor is the level of consciousness about Hispanics in the local area of one's residence. If there is more of a substantial ethnic community in one's state, then there is likely to be more consciousness or recognition of that ethnic group in that particular state (e.g., Native Hawaiians in Hawaii, Amish in Pennsylvania, Athabascans in Alaska, Osage in Oklahoma). Social interaction with others in one's local area will thus be more likely to involve the expectation or recognition of one's ethnic identity to the extent that there are a substantial number of other persons in the area who share that ethnic identity. Xie and Goyette (1997) report results that are, net of other factors, consistent with this general hypothesis in the case of the racial identification of bi-racial Asian American children. For our analysis, we predict that the probability of identifying as Hispanic, net of other factors, will be larger in states that have a large Hispanic population.

The Presentational Self

Another social psychological perspective that we consider is the presentational self that is associated with the dramaturgical approach of Goffman (1959). Whereas the key insight of the looking-self is that the views of others affect one's view of oneself, the main implication of the presentational self is essentially the reverse: that individuals seek to influence the views of others about oneself by strategically revealing only those aspects of oneself that the individual wishes to have known. Generally speaking, one's positive aspects tend to be emphasized and exaggerated while one's negative aspects are omitted or hidden. The psychological processes generating such presentational behavior may occur with varying degrees of consciousness ranging from the subliminal to the cognitively deliberate. The particular content of the presentation of oneself will vary depending upon which aspects of oneself are deemed to be most positive or useful to reveal for a given social interaction.[2]

---

[2] Variation by the type of social interaction may be substantial as is suggested by the popular slang phrase "two-faced."

The presentational self does not specifically address the issue of ethnicity. This perspective does suggest, however, that the identification with a particular ethnicity can be considered in the context of the expected or potential costs and benefits for the individual who engages in such presentation of one's self.[3] For example, qualitative studies of the old second-generation, native-born Japanese Americans (i.e., Nisei) in California during the early part of the twentieth century suggest that they were remarkably "un-Japanese." They understood very little Japanese, were largely unaware of Japanese culture, showed little interest in Japan, and typically never traveled there despite having parents who were Japanese immigrants (i.e., Issei) as well as Japanese citizens by both American and Japanese law (Ichihashi 1932; Kitano 1976; Kitano and Daniels 1995; Hosokawa 1992; Wilson and Hosokawa 1980). Instead, the Nisei excelled in traditional American institutions of their era such as high schools, social clubs, sports leagues, various community organizations, and later in the U.S. Army (Crost 1994). This "hyper-assimilation" can be understood in the context of the strong anti-Japanese sentiments in California during that time period so that the costs of being ethnically Japanese were potentially very high. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, these costs were further raised with the prospect of internment, at which time Japanese Americans in California often further removed any remaining vestiges of their Japanese ethnicity by physically destroying their Japanese possessions such as samurai swords, Japanese pottery, *ningyo* dolls, etc.

In contemporary America with its increasingly "multicultural" ethos 40 years after the passage of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, the potential direct costs of being a racial minority are presumably less than they were a century ago (Sakamoto, Wu and Tzeng 2000). Nonetheless, for whites, the cost of being seen as Hispanic may still include being subjected to the stereotypes associated with an ethnic group that has below-average socioeconomic attainments. As argued by Thurow (1975), "statistical discrimination" is the process by which individuals who are members of a particular demographic group

---

[3] This interpretation of the presentational self is consistent with the exchange behaviorism of Homans (1950).

that has below-average attainments must work harder in order not to be defined by their group average. That is, an individual of that group must be careful to put forth more work effort in order to demonstrate that she or he is not also below average. Even after exerting the extra effort, however, other persons who do not observe the greater work might still define that individual as being below average.

On the other hand, whites may actually obtain some benefits from identifying as Hispanic. First, as discussed by Waters (1990), identifying with a particular ethnic group may be psychologically gratifying for whites particularly when they may selectively engage in what they consider to be the more appealing aspects of that ethnicity. For many whites in America, ethnicity may be becoming an "ethnic option" that "adds spice to an otherwise bland post-industrial existence" (Coleman and Rainwater 1978, p. 111) and "gives a sense of heritage and roots to a highly mobile population" (Waters 1990, p. 7). As noted by Waters (1990, p. 7) "if people no longer perceive a threat to their individual life chances from ethnic discrimination, their ethnic identity can be used at will and discarded when its psychological and social purpose is fulfilled." In addition, a second source of potential benefit for whites to identify as Hispanic is the possibility of increases in educational or employment opportunities that may sometimes derive from affirmative action policies.

As we argued above, Hispanic ethnicity among African and Asian Americans is generally an unfamiliar concept in the U.S.[4] The cost of presenting one's Hispanic ethnicity for these non-white groups is therefore to deal with the consequent disbelief, and possibly ridicule or resistance. In terms of the psychological benefit of the "added spice to an otherwise bland post-industrial existence," African and Asian Americans already have a strong minority identity as non-whites so the marginal benefit of overlaying that identity with another minority identity is probably minimal. For African Americans, there is no benefit in terms of affirmative action because African Americans are already included that policy. Although Asian Americans are usually not covered by affirmative action, they may benefit, as Asians,

[4] This unfamiliarity is undoubtedly greater for Hispanic Asian Americans who are a substantially smaller demographic group than Hispanic African Americans.

from the positive stereotype of being the so-called "model minority" (Min 1995) that might be jeopardized if they adopted a Hispanic ethnicity which is a group with lower average socioeconomic status. Furthermore, in identifying as Hispanic, Asian Americans would quite possibly face resistance in that they would be accused of falsely making the claim in order to become eligible for affirmative action considerations.

In sum, the presentational self as discussed by Goffman (1959) does not logically imply any specific hypotheses regarding one's identification with a particular ethnicity. Using that general framework and considering the various costs and benefits that are probably involved in contemporary American society, however, we argue that whites benefit from identifying as Hispanic due to the psychological reward of being a minority and the potential social reward of being eligible for affirmative action. On the other hand, these rewards are offset to some degree because whites who identify as Hispanic become subject to the stereotypes and the "statistical discrimination" that is associated with being a member of a group that has lower average levels of socioeconomic attainments.

For African Americans, there is no particular psychological advantage in the "ethnic option" of identifying as Hispanic because they already have a strong minority identity. Furthermore, there is no immediate benefit in terms of affirmative action because that policy already applies to African Americans. For Asian Americans, we argue that the presentational self implies that they will be less likely to identify as Hispanic because doing so would disrupt the already positive stereotype of being the "model minority" and because Hispanic Asian Americans are almost a totally unknown concept to most Americans (which essentially nullifies the possibility of Asian Americans obtaining affirmative action as a Hispanic).

Segmented Assimilation: Ethnic Identity Among African and Asian American Immigrants

Waters (1999) provides a qualitative study of African American immigrants from the West Indies. Her research finds that, despite the fact that West Indian immigrants strongly identified themselves as black, a substantial portion attempted to distance themselves from the traditional African

American community by simultaneously identifying themselves as West Indians, Jamaicans, or "immigrants." According to Waters, the need for this differentiation stems from their belief that assimilation into "Black America" suggests or provokes downward social mobility.

This ethnic identification pattern can also be observed among second generation immigrants and immigrant children who migrated to the U.S. at an early age from the West Indies. Waters (1994) observed that 58% of the 83 subjects interviewed stressed their ethnicity or identified themselves as "immigrants" so as to distinguish themselves from the traditional African American community. The need to emphasize their ethnicity was particularly salient among interviewees of middle-class backgrounds (Waters 1994). These findings may be interpreted as suggesting that West Indians promoted their ethnic identity so as to reduce their chances of experiencing the discrimination, negative stereotypes, or the downward social mobility that are often associated with being a member of the traditional African American population.

The results of Waters (1994, 1999) are consistent with recent discussions of the segmented assimilation theory. According to the latter, inner-city African Americans live in highly segregated, low-income neighborhoods where schools are under-funded and middle-class economic opportunities are few. In this context, inner-city African American youth are said to have developed an "oppositional culture" and "adversarial outlooks" (Hirschman 2001; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993). This sub-culture discourages educational achievement, and is therefore seen as reducing adolescents' chances for upward social mobility. Segmented assimilation theory predicts that the selective retention of the immigrants' culture of origin can have a protective effect for second-generation children. Water's (1994, 1999) findings indicating that West Indians distance themselves from traditional "Black America" is consistent with the basic assumption of segmented assimilation theory which is that immigrant parents strategically foster the acculturation and identity of their children so as to enhance their chances for upward social mobility in the context of a highly unequal contemporary American labor market.

In regard to the issue of ethnic identity, we view the segmented assimilation approach of Waters

as being consistent with the more general process of the presentational self discussed above. Waters' (1999) findings suggest that, in the opinions of these West Indies immigrants, being an ethnic or "immigrant" African American is preferable to being a conventional African American in terms of social status or socioeconomic opportunity in the U.S. Fostering a West Indies or "immigrant" ethnic identity in oneself or one's offspring is therefore consistent with the presentational view of the self according to which (as was considered earlier) one strategically presents oneself to others so as to maximize the likelihood of future positive benefits (or minimize costs and disadvantages).

Unfortunately, we do not know of any study of Hispanic African Americans that is similar to Waters (1994). We deduce from the results of her segmented assimilation approach, however, the general conclusion that the net effect of the presentational self is to substantially increase the likelihood that African Americans will identify as Hispanic. This deduction is based on the consistent finding in her work that presenting oneself as an "immigrant" African American is preferable to being a viewed as a conventional African American.

As was mentioned above, Asian Americans differ from African Americans in that the former are mostly foreign-born and are seen as being foreign "Asians" in the U.S. Accordingly, the segmented assimilation literature on Asian Americans argues that immigrant Asian Americans seek to maintain aspects of their traditional Asian heritage (Zhou and Bankston 1998) so as to avoid developing "lower class" attitudes and behaviors. Given the positive stereotype of the "model minority" Asian immigrant, we interpret the segmented assimilation view to also predict that Asian Americans will be less likely to identify as Hispanic due to the positive benefits of being seen as "Asian" relative to being associated with the inner city "oppositional culture" that is sometimes said to apply to Hispanics (Portes and Zhou 1993).

A summary of this section, in regard to the implications for Hispanic identity for each racial group, is shown in Table 1. For Asians Americans, the consistent expectation is that they will be less likely to identify as Hispanic. This conclusion seems reasonable from the point of view of the looking-glass self, the presentational self, or the segmented assimilation literature. For African Americans, the

propensity to identify as Hispanic, net of other observed demographic variables, is expected to be small or zero. While the prediction of the looking-glass self is to reduce Hispanic ethnicity, this negative influence is counterbalanced by the positive effect suggested by the segmented assimilation literature.

For whites, only our discussion of the presentational self directly related Hispanic ethnicity to their social psychology and socioeconomic opportunities. Due to the countervailing influences of statistical discrimination, affirmative action, and the "ethnic option," whites are not predicted to have a high propensity to identify as Hispanic net of their measured demographic variables. In conclusion, Table 1 shows that Asian Americans are the only group that is expected to have a notably reduced propensity to identify as Hispanic net of their measured demographic variables.

DATA AND METHODS

Data

For this analysis, we use data from the Current Population Survey (CPS). Since 1994, the CPS has included information on the race of the respondent (including African American, Asian American, or white), the Hispanic ethnic identity of the respondent (yes or no), the country where the respondent was born, the country where the respondent's parents were born, and other demographic variables such as gender, age, and schooling. We use the CPS data from 1994 to 2002. Pooling together these 9 years substantially increases the sample size which is critical when studying tiny minority populations such as Hispanic Asian Americans. It also allows us to investigate whether there has been any time trend in the odds of identifying as a Hispanic.

The variables indicating place of birth are particularly important for our study because, as was discussed above, Hispanics refer to an ethnic group defined in terms of persons who identify as having a Latin American cultural heritage or origin. Persons who were born in Latin America can be expected to be more likely to identify as having such a heritage. An additional effect is expected to be evident for parental nativity. Persons whose parents were born in Latin America can be expected to be more likely to

identify as Hispanic because having Latin-American-born parents increases the extent of Latin American cultural influences during the respondent's socialization. These place-of-birth variables from the CPS thus provide critically important information that increases the extent to which our analysis can improve our understanding of the sources of Hispanic ethnic identity.[5]

Methods

The dependent variable for our study is dichotomous and is coded 1 for persons who identify as being Hispanic, 0 otherwise. We use the logistic regression model that is estimated separately for whites and then again for African and Asian Americans. African Americans and Asian Americans are pooled together in the same logistic regression due to their smaller sample sizes.[6] In this regression model, however, we include a dichotomous independent variable to distinguish Asian Americans. Interaction terms between Asian American and the place of birth variables are also included.

The other independent variables are highest level of schooling completed (high school, some college, college graduate, master's degree, Ph.D./professional degree, versus less than high school as the reference category); age grouped into 10-year categories (25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64, versus greater than 64 as the reference category); region of residence (California, Southwest [i.e., Arizona, New Mexico, Texas], versus other as the reference category); metropolitan residence, versus non-metropolitan residence as the reference category; place of birth (Latin America, Asia, Other, versus U.S. native-born as the reference category); gender (female versus male as the reference category); and year of the survey

[5] The CPS is the preferred data set for this analysis because parental place of birth is unavailable in other major demographic data sets.

[6] We attempted to estimate the model separately for African Americans and for Asian Americans but had to abandon this approach due to estimation problems associated with the small sample sizes.

(coded in terms of the actual year from 1994 to 2002). Of these independent variables, we hypothesize that the largest net effects will be evident for Latin American place of birth and having both parents born in Latin America.[7]

Also included in the model are four independent variables indicating parents' place of birth including: mother-Latin America and father-Latin America; mother-Latin America and father-U.S.; mother-U.S. and father-Latin America; mother-U.S. and father-U.S., versus the reference category of mother or father (or both) born outside of Latin America and the U.S. Net of the effects of the other independent variables in the model, we hypothesize that the persons with the greatest odds of identifying as Hispanic are those for whom both parents were born in Latin America while persons with the lowest odds of identifying as Hispanic are those for whom both parents are U.S. born. Those predicted to be intermediate in their odds are mother-U.S. and father-Latin America, and mother-Latin America and father-U.S. Between these latter two, those with Latin American paternity are predicted to have the greatest odds of identifying as Hispanic due to the greater chances of having a Spanish last name.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2. We followed the recommendation of Winship and Radbill (1994) who suggest that sampling weights be used in descriptive statistics but not in the estimation of regression models when the sampling weights are not a function of the dependent variable.

---

[7] Although for convenience we use the term "Latin America," strictly speaking, we are actually referring to only those Latin American countries where Spanish (or Portuguese) is the official language. Thus, in our data analysis, we define the following countries as being indicated by the "Latin America" dummy variable: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Puerto Rico, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The latter case applies to our analysis in which the covariates may be treated as fixed. In sum, sampling weights were applied only in the calculations for Table 2.

Table 2 shows that the sample size is 739,897 for whites, 85,516 for African Americans, and 32,630 for Asian Americans. About 14% of whites identify as Hispanic. Among African Americans, Hispanic self-identification is about 4% while among Asian Americans it is about 2%. About 8% of whites have parents who were both born in Latin America while the corresponding figure is 2% for African Americans and only 1% for Asian Americans.

Table 2 also shows, as is well known, that Asian Americans tend to have high levels of educational attainment while African Americans tend to have low levels of educational attainment. Most Asian Americans were born in Asia while whites are much more likely to have been born in Latin America than either Asian Americans or African Americans. African Americans are less likely to reside in California while over one-third of Asian Americans live there. African Americans and Asian Americans have higher percentages than whites in the younger age intervals.

Logistic Regression Results for Whites

Table 3 shows the results for the logistic regression models. In the model for whites, the largest net effect is having both parents born in Latin America. The coefficient of 3.58 is huge and implies that, net of other variables, having both parents born in Latin America increases the odds of identifying as Hispanic by 3,487%.[8] The coefficient for having a mother born in Latin America and a father born in the U.S. is also very large (i.e., 2.58) which implies a net effect of 1,220% on the odds of identifying as Hispanic. As predicted, the net effect is even larger when the father is born in Latin America and the mother is born in the U.S. (i.e., a coefficient of 2.81 implying a net effect of 1,561%). The bottom row of Table 3 shows the F test-statistic for the null hypothesis that the coefficient for having a mother born in Latin America (and a father born in the U.S.) is equal to the coefficient for having a father born in Latin America (and a mother born in the U.S.). The large F test-statistic indicates that this null hypothesis may

[8] This interpretation derives from exp(3.58) = 35.87.

be rejected at any conventional level of significance. This finding is consistent with the interpretation of the looking-glass as discussed above according to which Latin paternity has a larger net effect due to the visibility of a Spanish last name.

These net effects of parents' place of birth are relative to the reference category which refers to persons whose parents are born outside of Latin America and at least one of them is born outside of the U.S. as well. Among persons for whom both parents are U.S. born (i.e., the typical case, as shown in Table 2, for whites and African Americans but not Asian Americans) the coefficient in Table 3 is -.96 for whites. This coefficient implies that the odds of identifying as Hispanic are reduced by 62% when both of one's parents are U.S. born (compared to having at least one parent born outside of the U.S. and Latin America)[9]. This latter result suggests that there are significant Hispanic communities outside of Spanish-speaking Latin America and the U.S. and that persons from these communities do immigrate to the U.S.

Regarding the respondent's place of birth, the coefficient for being born in Latin America is very large (i.e., 1.99) though not as large as that for having parents (or only one parent) born in Latin America. This coefficient of 1.99 implies that the net effect of being born in Latin America is an increase of 632% in the odds of identifying as Hispanic. In this case of the respondent's place of birth, this effect is relative to the reference category that refers to persons who are U.S. born. Although this effect is extremely large, it nonetheless indicates that parental Latin American birth has a larger net effect than the respondent's Latin American birth on identifying as Hispanic.

Other notable results from Table 3 for whites include the extremely large net effects of residence in California or the Southwest. To some extent, as discussed above in regard to the looking-glass self, these effects may reflect the much greater social consciousness of Hispanics in California and the Southwest due to their large demographic presence in those places. Table 3 also indicates that, relative to elderly whites, younger whites are much more likely to identify as Hispanic. This result may reflect the greater consciousness of and positive attitudes towards minority membership among younger persons

[9] This result derives from exp(-.96) = .38 and 1 - .38 = .62.

who have grown up in the post-Civil Right era. Similarly, the coefficient for year suggests temporal change of about a 5% annual increase in the odds of identifying as Hispanic, net of the other variables in the model. On other hand, persons with higher levels of educational attainment are substantially less likely to identify as Hispanic (relative to persons who do not have a high school degree). This result is unanticipated, and we speculate that it may derive from greater intermarriage among more highly educated Hispanics whose children are more likely to have (relative to less educated Hispanics) one non-Hispanic parent (Trejo 2003).[10]

Logistic Regression Results for African and Asian Americans

Table 3 also shows the results for the logistic regression for African and Asian Americans. The model is the same as the specification for whites except that a dummy variable is included for Asian Americans, and interaction terms are added for: (1) Asian American and mother-Latin America-father-Latin America; and (2) Asian American and mother-Latin America and father-U.S.[11] Although the magnitudes differ to some degree, many of the estimated coefficients for the African and Asian American model show some of the same general patterns as was the case for whites.

As is also evident among whites, the coefficient for having both parents born in Latin America is extraordinarily large for African Americans (i.e., 3.21 implying an increase in the odds ratio of identifying as Hispanic by 2,378%). The African American coefficients for having one parent born in Latin America are extremely large as well. As predicted, the net effect is greater for having a Latin father (i.e., a coefficient of 1.50 for mother-Latin America and father-U.S. versus a coefficient of 2.20 for

---

[10] Although our data do not indicate parental education per se, it is well known that, among all major racial and ethnic groups, more highly educated persons tend to have more highly educated parents (e.g., Mare and Winship 1988).

[11] We investigated a few other interaction terms for Asian Americans but their coefficients were not statistically significant and so they were dropped from the model.

mother-U.S. and father-Latin America). As in the regression for whites, the coefficient for having both parents being U.S. born is highly negative for African Americans (i.e., -2.96).

For Asian Americans, the relevant interaction terms need to be taken into account in order to assess some of these effects. In particular, the net effect of having both parents born in Latin America is 3.21 + .62 which is 3.83. The net effect of having both parents born in Latin America is, in other words, significantly greater for Asian Americans than for African Americans. In the case of having just one parent born in Latin America, the interaction terms were not statistically significant and were therefore deleted from the model. The net effect of having one parent born in Latin America thus does not differ between Asian Americans and African Americans.

In regard to having born parents born in the U.S., the net effect for Asian Americans is –2.96 plus 3.21 which is .25. Relative to having a parent born outside of the U.S. and Latin America, having both parents being U.S. born therefore actually increases Hispanic identity in for Asian Americans (i.e., a 28% increase in the odds) while it is greatly decreased for African Americans. This positive net increase for Asian Americans is unexpected, but it can be interpreted as indicating that third (and higher) generation Asian Americans are more likely to identify as Hispanic than are second generation Asian Americans whose parents were born in Asia (or elsewhere outside of the U.S. and Latin America).[12] This finding may derive from some intermarriage between Hispanics and third and higher generation Asian Americans. In addition, we speculate that it may in part derive from third and higher generation Filipino Americans being slightly more likely to identify as Hispanic than second generation Filipino Americans.[13]

---

[12] This interpretation assumes that persons who have U.S.-born parents are also themselves U.S.-born (i.e., are third or higher generation) which is the typical pattern since most native-born Americans give birth to their children in the U.S. rather than overseas.

[13] We cannot directly test this hypothesis with the CPS because it does not identify the various Asian ethnicities. We also cannot test it with the Public Use Microdata Sample of the U.S. Census which does not include information on parents' places of birth. Our analysis of the latter data set does indicate,

Net Racial Effects on Hispanic Ethnic Identification

Estimating the regression separately for whites and non-whites permits the effects of the independent variables to vary by these two racial categories, but then the results do not directly indicate how African Americans and Asian Americans differ from whites in their overall propensities to identify as Hispanic. In other words, the results in Table 3 do not immediately show the net racial effect (relative to whites) on Hispanic identity. In regard to the contrast between Asian Americans and African Americans, the interaction terms referred to above should not be construed as indicating the net racial difference between these two groups because the "main effect" (i.e., the coefficient for the Asian American dummy variable) is highly negative (i.e., -1.40) as well as statistically significant at any conventional level.

In order to obtain an estimate of a net racial effect, the model needs to be re-formulated to refer to the estimated probability rather than the logit. In particular, the predicted probability of identifying as Hispanic is obtained by inserting the estimated coefficients (given in Table 3) into the probability equation for the logistic regression model (Powers and Xie 2000, p. 49) evaluated at some particular set of values on the independent variables. For Asian Americans, the "main effect" and the interaction effects from the non-white regression are also used. In this way, we obtain a particular estimated probability of identifying as Hispanic for each of the three racial categories (i.e., African Americans, Asian Americans, and whites). The net racial effects refer to the differences between these three probabilities.

The results for whites are shown in Table 4. As is shown in that table, we used 14 different sets of values on the independent variables in evaluating the probability. For example, set 1 refers to a male high school graduate, 35 to 44 years of age, living in a metropolitan area outside of California and the

---

however, that native-born Filipino Americans have some propensity to identify as Hispanic. This propensity presumably reflects the long Spanish colonial heritage of the Philippines and the prevalence of Spanish names among Filipino Americans.

Southwest in 1998, who was born in the U.S. and whose parents where born in the U.S. As shown in the bottom row of Table 4, the estimated probability that a white with these characteristics identifies as Hispanic is 2%.

Set 9 refers to the same characteristics as set 1 except that set 9 specifies that the respondent's mother was born in Latin America while the respondent's father was born in the U.S. For set 9, Table 4 shows that the estimated probability increases substantially to 41%. If the respondent's mother was born in the U.S. while the respondent's father was born in Latin America (i.e., set 10), then the probability is increased slightly more to 47%. If both parents were born in Latin America (i.e., set 8), then the probability increases to 66%. Among all of the 14 sets, the highest probability is obtained (i.e., 93%) when both parents as well as the respondent were born in Latin America (i.e., set 11). In sum, the probability of whites identifying as Hispanic goes from 2% when the respondent and his parents were born in the U.S. to 93% when the respondent and his parents were born in Latin America.

Table 5 shows the predicted probabilities of Hispanic identification for African Americans and Asian Americans based on the same 14 sets of values on the independent variables. In the case of Asian Americans, the coefficient for the Asian American dummy variable and the relevant interaction terms are also included in the calculation of the probability. For set 1 (i.e., a male high school graduate, 35 to 44 years of age, living in a metropolitan area outside of California and the Southwest in 1998, who was born in the U.S. and whose parents where born in the U.S.), Table 5 shows that the probability of identifying as Hispanic is less than 1% for African Americans and 3% for Asian Americans. For set 9 (i.e., a Latin American-born mother and a U.S.-born father) the probability increases to 31% for African Americans but only 10% for Asian Americans. For set 8 (i.e., both parents born in Latin America) the probability is 71% for African Americans and 38% for Asian Americans. The highest probabilities are obtained for set 11 (i.e., the respondent as well as his parents are Latin American-born) in which case the probability is 88% for African Americans and 76% for Asian Americans.

The net racial effects are given by the differences between these estimated probabilities for each

racial group (which, as we have just seen, vary by the set of independent variables that are used in calculating the probability); that is, the net racial effects refer to the differences (for a particular set of values on the independent variables) between the bottom rows of Tables 4 and 5. We have calculated these net racial differences and listed them in Table 6. For most of the sets, the differences between whites and African Americans are small. For example, for set 1 (both parents U.S.-born) the net racial effect as shown in Table 6 is 1.49%. This indicates that, given the characteristics of set 1, whites' probability of identifying as Hispanic is only 1.49% points higher than that for African Americans. The only case where the net racial effect (in terms of whites versus African Americans) is somewhat notable is set 9 (i.e., mother Latin American-born and father U.S.-born) which is 10.60%. All of the other sets have racial contrasts that are relatively insignificant in regard to whites versus African Americans.

There are substantial net effects of race, however, in regard to the contrast between whites and Asian Americans. For set 11 (i.e., the respondent as well as his parents are Latin American-born), the contrast between whites and Asian Americans is 17.74%. For set 8 (i.e., the respondent is U.S.-born but both parents are Latin American-born), the net racial effect is 28.11%. For set 9 (i.e., a Latin American-born mother and a U.S.-born father) it is 31.32% while for set 10 (i.e., a U.S.-born mother and a Latin American-born father) it is 28.93%. These racial contrasts are sizeable because they refer to absolute differences (in terms of percentage points) in the probabilities of identifying as Hispanic. They indicate that, net of other demographic characteristics, whites are substantially more likely than Asian Americans to identify as Hispanic.

Because whites and African Americans are similar in their propensities to identify as Hispanic, and because whites tend to be more likely than Asian Americans to identify as Hispanic, it follows that African Americans are also more likely than Asian Americans to identify as Hispanic. This conclusion is evident in the last column of Table 6 which shows the net racial effects (for different sets of values on the independent variables) in regard to the contrast between African Americans and Asian Americans. As expected, African Americans tend to be more likely than Asian Americans to identify as Hispanic at least

in regard to those sets of values that involve various patterns of nativity. For example, for set 10 (i.e., a U.S.-born mother and a Latin American-born father) the probability that African Americans identify as Hispanic is 29.00% greater than for Asian Americans.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing results indicate that, among the independent variables investigated in this study, patterns of nativity have the largest net effects on the chances of identifying as Hispanic. In terms of predicting whether one identifies as Hispanic, the key indicators are whether one was born in Latin America and whether one's parents were born in Latin America. For all of the three racial groups that we considered, the chances of identifying as Hispanic are tiny unless one was born in Latin America or one has a parent who was born in Latin America (i.e., sets 1-5, 7). For each of the racial groups, the chances of identifying as Hispanic increase substantially for persons who were born in Latin America and/or have a parent who was born in Latin America (i.e., sets 6, 8-14).[14]

For whites, there are also important net effects of residing in California or the Southwest. We suggested that this result may in part derive from a looking-glass self process by which there is greater consciousness of Hispanics in those regions. However, an additional factor, that we are unable to directly test with these data, is that whites who have Latin American grandparents may be more likely to reside in these regions due to its historical ties and geographic proximity to Latin America. That is, our models do

[14] The only exception to this pattern is the case when, for African Americans and Asian Americans, their parents are both U.S.-born but the respondent is Latin American-born (i.e., set 14). For these groups, this pattern is especially unusual and may reflect having parents who were temporarily visiting in Latin America but do not have any family connections there. For whites, set 14 yields a probability of 13.01% which, although not trivial, is notably much lower than when a Latin-American-born respondent has at least one Latin-American-born parent (i.e., sets 11-13) suggesting that a "visiting" situation may also be to some extent applicable to whites as well for set 14.

not control for the Latin American nativity of one's grandparents which may perhaps increase one's chances of identifying as Hispanic even when one and one's parents are U.S.-born. This issue should be a topic for future research, but we suggest that, although it is worthy of further investigation, it does not necessarily explain our regional effects because the latter are not statistically significant for African Americans and Asian Americans. Our historical discussion demonstrated that these groups also have been present in Latin America for many generations so it is not obvious why the failure to control for grandparents' nativity would constitute significant omitted variable bias for whites but not for African Americans and Asian Americans.

The issue of whether Hispanics are better considered to be a racial or an ethnic group is complex both in terms of sociology and politics. To the extent that our results relate to this issue, they might be interpreted to indicate that Hispanic identity does seem to generally follow an ethnic pattern that reflects a cultural or socialization connection with Latin America. For all three of the racial categories---which tend to be mutually distinctive in terms of phenotypic appearances---the chances of identifying as Hispanic are very high when one and one's parents were born in Latin America (i.e., set 11 is 76% for Asian Americans, 88% for African Americans, and 93% for whites). When one is U.S.-born but both of one's parents are Latin American-born then Hispanic identity declines significantly (i.e., set 8 is 38% for Asian Americans, 71% for African Americans, and 66% for whites). When neither one nor one's parent's are Latin American born, then the chances of identifying as Hispanic drop precipitously (i.e., set 1 is 3% for Asian Americans, .5% for African Americans, and 2% for whites). Given the typical pattern of a nuclear family in the U.S. where grandparents do not have any major influence in the socialization of their grandchildren, this pattern of nativity effects on Hispanic identity seems consistent with it deriving from the extent to which one has a cultural or socialization connection with Latin America.

Nonetheless, our results also indicate that, at the same time, there is a net racial effect on the propensity to identify as Hispanic (after controlling for nativity and other demographic factors). In particular, although nativity does clearly affect the chances that Asian Americans identify as Hispanic,

Asian Americans are still less likely than African Americans and whites (for a given set of other demographic characteristics) to identify as Hispanic (as summarized in Table 6). In other words, as discussed above, African Americans and whites tend to be more likely than Asian Americans to identify as Hispanic. The differences between African Americans and whites in this regard are, on the other hand, relatively minor.

We have interpreted these results as reflecting the net outcome of the interplay of three different social psychological processes involved in ethnic identity in contemporary America. In terms of the looking-glass self, African Americans and Asian Americans are, for the most part, similarly expected to be non-Hispanic (as summarized in Table 1). In terms of the potential advantages of the presentational self, however, Asian Americans benefit from the "model minority" image while the prospective advantages of

obtaining affirmative action benefits as a Hispanic are unlikely. Therefore, in terms of the presentational self, Asian Americans seek to avoid Hispanic identity while for African Americans there is no particular positive or negative benefit. In terms of segmented assimilation theory, Asian Americans again seek to avoid Hispanic identity which might foster assimilating into the "oppositional culture" that is said to be also associated with inner-city Hispanics. African Americans are already substantially exposed to this "oppositional culture" so in their case accepting a Hispanic identity is actually beneficial in that it ameliorates the association with the negative stereotypes and disadvantages of lower-class African American communities. In sum, the social psychological processes involved in Hispanic ethnic identity are consistently negative for Asian Americans while for African Americans these processes have countervailing influences that result in no substantial overall difference between them and whites in the propensity to identify as Hispanic.

In terms of the future growth of the Hispanic population, our results do indicate that Asian Americans have lower propensities to identify as Hispanic, but because the differences are not dramatic and because Asian Americans are such a tiny proportion of the Hispanic population, the reduced rates of

Hispanic identification among Asian Americans are unlikely to substantially affect population projections of Hispanics. Regarding the issue of future changes to the official U.S. Census Bureau classification scheme for race and ethnicity (according to which Hispanics are defined as an ethnic group rather than as a racial group), our results indicate that African Americans and Asian Americans with Latin American nativity (or parental Latin American nativity) do significantly identify as Hispanic. Future proposals to classify Hispanic identity as being mutually exclusive with regard to African Americans and Asian Americans will need to address the reality that many persons of the latter racial groups do also identify as Hispanic when their nativity relates to Latin America.

REFERENCES

Bernstein, Robert. 2004. "Hispanics and Asian Americans Increasing Faster Than Overall Population." Viewed on the internet on June 21, 2004 at **www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/race/001839.html**.

Cooley, Charles H. 1983 [1902]. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Crost, Lyn. 1994. *Honor By Fire: Japanese Americans at War in Europe and the Pacific*. Novato, CA: Presidio.

De la Fuente, Alejandro. "Myths of Racial Democracy: Cuba 1900-1912". 1999. *Latin American Research Review* 34:39-73.

Farley, Reynolds. 1996. *The New American Reality: Who We Are, How We Got Here, Where We Are Going*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Feijoo, Samuel. 1984. "African Influence in Latin America: Oral and Written Literature". Pp. 145-169 in *Africa in Latin America,* edited by Manuel Moreno Fraginals. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hirschman, Charles, Richard Alba and Reynolds Farley. 2000. "The Meaning and Measurement of Race in the U.S. Census: Glimpses into the Future." *Demography* 37:381-393.

Hirschman, Charles. 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented Assimilation Hypothesis." *Demography* 38:317-336.

Homans, George C. 1950. *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Irwin, Graham. 1977. *Africans Abroad: A Documentary History of the Black Diaspora in Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean during the Age of Slavery.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Masterson, Daniel and Sayaka Funada Classes. 2004. *The Japanese in America*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Mare, Robert D. and Christopher Winship. 1988. "Ethnic and Racial Patterns of Educational Attainment and School Enrollment." Pp. 173-203 in *Divided Opportunities: Minorities, Poverty, and Social Policy* edited by G. D. Sandefur and M. Tienda. Plenum Press: New York.

Min, Pyong G. 1995. "An Overview of Asian Americans." Pp. 10-57 in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* edited by P. G. Min. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martinez Montiel, L. 1981. "Introduction." Pp. 1-12 in *Asiatic Migration in Latin America,* edited by Luz M. Martinez Montiel. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Mon Pinzon, R. A. 1981. "A Century of Chinese Immigration to Panama." Pp. 21-37 in *Asiatic Migration in Latin America,* edited by Luz M. Martinez Montiel. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Moreno Fraginals, M. 1981. "Cultural contributions and Deculturation". Pp. 5-22 in *Africa in Latin America,* edited by Luz M. Martinez Montiel. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Morner, Magnus. 1967. *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Ota, Mishima, M. 1981. "The First Stage of Japanese Migration to Mexico 1890-1923" . Pp. 81-112 in *Africa in Latin America,* edited by Luz M. Martinez Montiel. New York: Holmes and Meier

Publishers.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530:74-96.

Powers, Daniel A. and Yu Xie. 2000. *Statistical Methods for Categorical Data Analysis.* New York: Academic Press.

Sagrera, Martin. 1974. *Los Racismos en America "Latina": Sus colonialismos externos e internos.* 1974. Buenos Aires: Editorial Astrea de Rodolfo Depalma y Hnos.

Takenaka, Ayumi. 2004. "The Japanese in Peru: History of Immigration, Settlement, and Racialization**."** *Latin American Perspectives. 31(3):* 77-98.

Trejo, Stephen J. 2003. "Intergenerational Progress of Mexican-Origin Workers in the U.S. Labor Market." *Journal of Human Resources* 38:467-489.

Urbanski, Edmund. 1972. *Hispanomerica, sus Razas y Civilizaciones.* New York: Eliseo Torres and Sons.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2001. "Census 2000 Brief: The Hispanic Population." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau 2004. "Interim Projections by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin**."** Viewed on the internet on June 21, 2004 at www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/.

Winship, Christopher and Larry Radbill. 1994. "Sampling Weights and Regression Analysis." *Sociological Methods and Research* 23:230-257.

Yelvington, Kevin. 1997. "Patterns of Ethnicity, Class, and Nationalism". Pp. 209-237 in *Understanding Contemporary Latin America* edited by Richard Hillman. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Yeung, King-To and John T. Martin. 2003. "The Looking Glass Self: An Empirical Test and Elaboration." *Social Forces* 81:843-879.

Waters, Mary. 1994. " Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second Generation Black immigrants in New York

City". *International Migration Review*, Vol. 28, No. 4, Special Issue: The New Second Generation. (Winter, 1994), pp. 795-820.

_____ 1999. *Black identities: West Indian immigrant dreams and American Realities.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Zhou, Min and Carl L. Bankston III. 1998. *Growing Up American: The Adaptation of Vietnamese Adolescents in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. The Predicted Net Effect of Race on Hispanic Ethnic Identity

Social Psychological Process	White	Blacks	Asians
Looking-Glass Self	no prediction	negative	negative
The Presentational Self	positive or negative	zero	negative
Segmented Assimilation	no prediction	positive	negative
Total Expected Net Effect	small or zero	small or zero	negative

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics by Race, 1994-2002 Current Population Surveys

	Whites (N= 739,897)		Blacks (N= 85,516)		Asian Pacific Islander (N= 32,630)	
Variable	Mean	Standard Error	Mean	Standard Error	Mean	Standard Error
Parents' Place of Birth Indicator Variables						
Mother Latin; Father Latin	8.09%	27.27%	1.97%	13.89%	1.11%	10.47%
Mother Latin; Father US	0.54%	7.32%	0.18%	4.24%	0.04%	2.10%
Mother US; Father Latin	0.67%	8.17%	0.16%	3.93%	0.05%	2.17%
Mother US; Father US	79.69%	40.23%	89.07%	31.20%	8.79%	28.31%
Respondent's Place of Birth						
Latin America	6.94%	25.41%	1.79%	13.27%	1.01%	10.00%
Asia	0.22%	4.70%	0.14%	3.73%	64.91%	47.73%
	4.30%	20.29%	7.30%	26.01%	8.16%	27.38%
Highest Level of Education						
High School	33.54%	47.21%	35.50%	47.85%	22.36%	41.67%
Some College	24.99%	43.29%	25.91%	43.81%	19.65%	39.73%
Bachelors	16.76%	37.35%	10.47%	30.61%	28.68%	45.23%
Masters	5.80%	23.37%	3.35%	17.99%	9.21%	28.92%
Ph.D.	2.64%	16.03%	0.95%	9.70%	5.52%	22.84%
Region of Residence						
California	11.30%	31.66%	6.60%	24.82%	38.39%	48.63%
Southwest	9.44%	29.24%	7.37%	26.13%	6.57%	24.77%
Metropolitan Residence						
Metro	78.50%	41.09%	86.71%	33.95%	95.80%	20.07%
Age						
25 to 34	22.10%	41.49%	27.27%	44.54%	29.58%	45.64%
35 to 44	24.86%	43.22%	28.04%	44.92%	27.60%	44.70%
45 to 54	19.94%	39.96%	19.33%	39.49%	20.31%	40.23%
55 to 64	13.37%	34.04%	11.58%	32.00%	11.18%	31.51%
Gender						
Female	51.77%	49.97%	55.78%	49.67%	52.40%	49.94%
Hispanic Ethnicity	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No	639, 854	86.48%	82, 474	96.44%	31, 928	97.85%
Yes	100, 043	13.52%	3, 042	3.56%	702	2.15%

Note: Statistics are computed using weighted data.

Table 3. Results of Logistic Regression Models of Hispanic Identification by Race

	Whites			Blacks and Asians		
	(N= 739,897)			(N= 118,146)		
Variable	Estimate		S.E.	Estimate		S.E.
Intercept	-103.9	***	4.5742	26.4498		17.8577
Highest Level of Education Completed						
High School	-0.9585	***	0.0171	-0.1613	*	0.066
Some College	-1.28	***	0.0184	-0.1638	*	0.0706
College	-1.9196	***	0.0227	-0.6876	***	0.0854
Master	-1.9736	***	0.0349	-1.1395	***	0.1518
Ph.D.	-1.9797	***	0.0478	-0.6279	**	0.1807
Respondent's Age						
25 to 34	1.9412	***	0.0218	0.681	***	0.0891
35 to 44	1.6215	***	0.0219	0.48	***	0.0903
45 to 54	1.319	***	0.0232	0.3338	**	0.0957
55 to 64	0.974	***	0.0255	0.2168	*	0.1063
Respondents' Region of Residence						
California	2.0528	***	0.0181	0.1236		0.0833
Southwest	3.0029	***	0.0148	0.049		0.1333
Metro	0.3459	***	0.0165	0.2795	*	0.1105
Asian						
Asian	-		-	-1.3971	***	0.1013
Respondents' Place of Birth						
Latin America	1.9936	***	0.0278	1.072	***	0.1044
Asia	-1.672	*	0.0349	-0.8544	***	0.1153
Other	-0.2513	***	0.1094	0.0715		0.0944
Parents' Place of Birth						
Mother Latin; Father Latin	3.5847	***	0.0286	3.2102	***	0.121
Mother Latin; Father US	2.5785	***	0.0453	1.5003	***	0.1887
Mother US; Father Latin	2.8127	***	0.0407	2.2007	***	0.1749
Mother US; Father US	-0.956	***	0.0217	-2.9571	***	0.1067
Interaction between Race and Mother's birth and father's birth						
Asian*MLFL	-		-	0.6227	***	0.1562
Asian*MUFU	-		-	3.2053	***	0.1534
Female	0.0274	*	0.0121	0.0297		0.0483

Year	0.0502	***	0.0023	-0.0147	0.0089
Test of Equality	Whites			Blacks and Asians	
Mother US Father Latin = Mother US Father Latin	18.771	***		9.4839	**

Note: *p<.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001 (All tests are two tailed.)

Table 4. Predicted Probabilities of Hispanic Identification given Values on Independent Variables, Whites

	Education Differentials					Place of birth		Parents' Place of Birth			Respondents and parents born in Latin America		
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Parents' Place of Birth													
Mother Latin; Father Latin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mother Latin; Father US	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Mother US; Father Latin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mother US; Father US	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Respondent's Place of Birth													
Latin America	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Asia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Respondent's Region of Residence													
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highest Level of Education Completed													
High School	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Some College	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
College	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ph.D.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Respondent's Age													
25 to 34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35 to 44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
45 to 54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 to 64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Metropolitan													
Metro	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gender													
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Year													
Year	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998
Logit	-3.89	-4.21	-4.85	-4.91	-4.91	-1.90	-4.14	0.65	-0.36	-0.12	2.64	1.63	1.87
Probability	2.00%	1.46%	0.78%	0.73%	0.73%	13.01%	1.57%	65.70%	41.10%	47.00%	93.34%	83.62%	86.65%

Table 5. Predicted Probabilities of Hispanic Identification given Values on Independent Variables, Blacks and Asians

	Education Differentials					Place of birth		Parents' Place of Birth			Respondent and parent born in Latin America		
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Parents' Place of Birth													
Mother Latin; Father Latin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mother Latin; Father US	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Mother US; Father Latin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mother US; Father US	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Respondent''s Place of Birth													
Latin America	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Asia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region of Residence													
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highest Level of Education													
High School	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Some College	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
College	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ph.D.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age													
25 to 34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35 to 44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
45 to 54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 to 64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Metropolitan Residence													
Metro	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gender													
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Year													
Year	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998	1998
Logit (Blacks)	-5.28	-5.28	-5.81	-6.26	-5.75	-4.21	-5.21	0.89	-0.82	-0.12	1.96	0.25	0.95
Logit (Asians)	-3.47	-3.47	-4.00	-4.45	-3.94	-2.40	-3.40	0.11	-2.22	-1.52	1.19	-1.15	-0.45
Predicted probability (Blacks)	0.51%	0.51%	0.30%	0.19%	0.32%	1.47%	0.54%	70.84%	30.53%	46.96%	87.65%	56.21%	72.11%
Predicted probability (Asians)	3.09%	3.08%	1.83%	1.17%	1.94%	8.94%	3.32%	32.66%	7.55%	11.61%	40.40%	13.90%	17.83%

Table 6. Racial Differences in the Probability of Hispanic Identification given Values on Independent Variables

Specification		Whites vs. Blacks	Whites vs. Asians	Blacks vs. Asians
	Respondent's Place of Birth			
11	Latin America	5.69%	52.93%	47.24%
	Parents' Place of Birth			
8	Mother Latin; Father Latin	-5.14%	33.05%	38.18%
9	Mother Latin; Father US	10.57%	33.55%	22.98%
10	Mother US; Father Latin	0.05%	35.39%	35.34%
	Highest Level of Education Completed			
1	High School	1.50%	-1.09%	-2.58%
2	Some College	0.96%	-1.62%	-2.58%
3	College	0.48%	-1.05%	-1.53%
4	Master	0.54%	-0.43%	-0.97%
5	Ph.D.	0.41%	-1.21%	-1.62%

Note: Specification references correspond to those used in Tables 4 and 5.