

The Kid Paradox:

Context of Reception and Adolescent Resilience in the Age of Mass Deportations

Patricia Fernández-Kelly
Princeton University

Paper presented at the Conference on
Children of Immigrants in New Places of Settlement
American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Cambridge, MA
April 19-21, 2017

ABSTRACT

An entire generation constituted by immigrant children and children of immigrants in the United States has now come off age during a period characterized by a nearly unprecedented number of deportations. Specialized and journalistic reports suggest that experiences of hostility and marginalization prevent immigrants and their offspring to make steady progress in American society. An unfavorable context of reception often leads to devalued identities, self-segregation, and disconnection from educational and employment opportunities. In an age of mass deportations, how do youngsters and their families cope with fear, uncertainty, and diminished options? Are there institutional means that can protect them from downward mobility?

On the basis of exploratory research in Central New Jersey, I investigate the extent to which institutional context—including schools, community support networks, enriching programs, college-preparedness initiatives, and other like vehicles—can enable children of immigrants, many of them undocumented, to make progress despite daunting barriers in their enveloping milieus.

Introduction

On February 16, 2017, not long after the installation of Donald J. Trump as the 45th president of the United States, the *Los Angeles Times* ran an articleⁱ noting a dilemma the new leader faces with respect to a large number of youngsters brought into the country at an early age by undocumented parents. The day before he had delivered a rambling news conference in the East Room of the White House during which he had said, “DACAⁱⁱ is a very, very difficult

subject for me . . . It's one of the most difficult subjects I have because you have these incredible kids.” That statement, characteristic of his cryptic use of English, suggested Trump held a soft spot toward children who have grown up in the United States, and are in all significant ways American, but whose legal status prevents them from attaining full citizenship. Trump, the article noted, is caught between two camps: his supporters expect deportations and the undoing of the fragile protections put in place by the Obama administration. On the other hand, targeting 750,000 young people under DACA status for repatriation may carry significant costs—many would see such actions as evidence of superlative cruelty that would further mar the already tarnished image of the new president. The answer to that predicament appears to be in the hands of the appointed Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, a vocal critic of deportation relief and a man known for his extreme anti-immigration views; under his direction, the Justice Department will set its sights on the gradual erosion of protections rather than a frontal attack on those shielded by DACA.

In other words, beyond the specter of arrest, confinement and repatriation looms an equally menacing phantom: life under permanent fear; absence of comfort or belonging, and the realization that conditions will continue to deteriorate for millions of unauthorized people living in the U.S. Like the proverbial frog immersed in a pot of slowly warming broth, children of immigrants and immigrant children may expect scalding and many will eventually succumb when the soup reaches its boiling point.

In that dispiriting landscape, the relevant question for researchers is not whether draconian measures implemented against undocumented kids and their parents will affect them negatively—they will, judging by the best available evidence—but whether variations at the local level will lead to different adaptive mechanisms and, in turn, disparate outcomes in terms

of educational and social mobility.ⁱⁱⁱ With that in mind, I am currently conducting exploratory research of a comparative nature in two Central New Jersey cities: Princeton and Trenton; the two locations may be seen as points in a continuum of tolerance/hostility towards immigrants without regular status. Those locations lay bare in stark detail experiences diluted in metropolitan centers with larger populations, more complex government structures, and longer experience as points of reception for new arrivals. By investigating the circumstances surrounding samples of immigrant children and children of immigrants in the two sites, I hope to pinpoint the varying effects of context of reception.

Princeton, a wealthy university town, organically connected to New York, is home or workplace to an estimated 10,000 immigrants from Guatemala and Mexico most of whom are undocumented and all of whom live locally or in nearby areas. Mexicans from the remote southern state of Oaxaca began arriving in the 1980s and soon after became visible in construction sites, landscaping companies, hotels and restaurants. Many have created small businesses which operate legally despite the undocumented status of their owners.^{iv} Guatemalans arrived in the 1990s and have since become the largest minority group in the city. They too have taken up jobs in the services sector. Nassau Street, Princeton's central artery features a large collection of places of commerce, including jewelry stores, and expensive restaurants, all of which employ undocumented immigrants.

In consideration to the growing number of foreign-born residents in its territory, the municipal government has explicitly defined Princeton as a *welcoming city*, and instituted policies meant to create hospitable conditions for all residents, including those without legal status. Government agencies—including the police department—in cooperation with grassroots organizations have put in place programs to foster a climate of tolerance and help immigrants

gain access to necessary services. Soon after the 2016 presidential election, hundreds of yard signs bearing messages of hospitality in English, Spanish, and Arabic sprung up like mushrooms throughout Princeton. Teachers and administrators in the local high school have stretched out their job definitions to ensure the safety of students without papers. Citizens have banded together to shelter residents facing hostile circumstances.

By contrast, Trenton presents a case of rising vulnerability for a fast-growing population formed mainly by Ecuadorians, Colombians, Peruvians, Mexicans and Guatemalans. Forty percent of Trenton's 85,000 residents are Hispanic and most of them are recent arrivals of indeterminate legal status. African Americans constitute nearly 50 percent and Whites only 13 percent of the total population. The Chambersburg residential district—formerly inhabited by people of Moravian and German background and more recently by the descendants of immigrants from Southern Italy—is now solidly Hispanic and dotted with small stores bearing Spanish names.

By contrast to Princeton, Trenton is an impoverished city buffeted by the effects of deindustrialization and the long-term absence of meaningful investment. In the 1960s the city's motto, "*What Trenton makes, the World Takes,*" reflected pride in a gritty industrial identity. Now, decrepit buildings dappled with graffiti, boarded-up structures, and empty lots bear witness to urban decline. Although the city holds rank as New Jersey's capital—and its downtown bears the imprint of government buildings—the governor's mansion, Drumthwacket, is not located there but in Princeton—just another sign that Trenton is not a favored residential choice for those with money and status.

Until the 2013 opening of a Hilton hotel in Trenton, the city had been without a site to hold conventions or attract visitors for more than three decades. Four years later, in 2016, that

new hotel disappeared as well for lack of demand for its services. The absence of business vitality is compounded by political dysfunction. Two of the city's former mayors currently languish in prison. Five years ago, an episode of *This American Life*—the well-known radio program—featured Trenton as a place where the lack of regulatory capacity had turned city streets into wild terrains where impoverished youngsters—mostly African Americans but also Hispanics—run amok fulfilling dreams of rebellion and violence.^v Not surprisingly, it is in Trenton that crimes associated with gang activity are often covered by the local press.

Although located in close proximity, Princeton and Trenton represent two separate environments with varying political climates and distinct embedded resources that differ in terms of quantity and quality. They are ideal spaces to assess disparities in the effects of context of reception on the lives of children of immigrants.^{vi} How do immigrant youngsters perceive and act upon educational and employment opportunities? How do they imagine their place in the larger society and their future as citizens or outcasts?^{vii} Conversely, how do local organizations, government officials, educators, clinicians, and employers perceive and relate to immigrant youngsters?^{viii} What is the role of activism and advocacy in providing necessary services and support for parents and their children? Are there experiential differences between children of immigrants born in the United States and those born abroad?^{ix} These are the main questions anchoring my exploratory research.

Anticipated Scenarios

I expect that children of immigrants in the selected locations will exhibit a spectrum of patterned responses reflecting contextual variations. Most are of Mexican or Central American origin, born abroad or in the United States; many are undocumented or the sons and daughters of

parents, at least one of whom has no legal status. All are likely to know, directly or indirectly, individuals who have been detained and deported.^x Despite such similarities in experience, I foresee outcome variations with some children exhibiting lowered aspirations, diminished interest in school, and feelings of exclusion, and others displaying greater optimism, more confidence in education, and hopes of progress.^{xi} I suspect that such differences will be related to: (a) the extent to which youngsters have been directly affected by perceptions of hostility against immigrants, diminished opportunity, and dread of deportation; and (b) the extent to which they possess or lack strong social connections, viable community resources, and institutional supports. In other words, I foresee that, despite shared circumstances, children of immigrants will respond differently and in predictable ways to dissimilarities in context depending on the social and organizational assets available to them.^{xii}

Justification

The attitudes displayed by the Donald J. Trump administration towards immigrants and refugees in general, and DACA youngsters in particular, are but the latest and most extreme in a sequel of growing hostility towards undocumented Americans. A watershed of sorts occurred in 1996 with the implementation of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act which instituted new penalties for unauthorized workers, and made it harder for them to regularize their status. In 2001, after the Jihadist assault on Washington and New York, the situation further worsened with the creation of the Department of Homeland Security which, de facto, transformed immigration from a labor management problem into a national security concern, thus tagging all immigrants as potential terrorists. After the passage of the PATRIOT Act in 2001, deportations surged to an all-time high of 438,000 in 2013, that is, close to a 15-fold

increase from the roughly 29,000 per year between 1975 and 1995.^{xiii} Despite continued calls for immigration reform on the part of president Obama, his administration will go down in history as a epoch of unprecedented hostility against immigrants—an epoch marked by the largest number of deportations in more than a century.^{xiv}

As a result of such developments, children of immigrants born between 1997 and 2003,^{xv} and currently residing in the United States, have seen their whole lives unfold over a period of heightened suspicion and hostility.^{xvi} The shadow of deportation, cast by programs like ‘Secure Communities,’^{xvii} and related anxieties over uncertain legal status, is severely affecting the perceptions and expectations of both documented and undocumented children.^{xviii} This is particularly troubling because those most affected tend to be Hispanics who already represent more than 17 percent of the country’s total population^{xix} and are the fastest growing minority in the nation.^{xx}

To improve understanding about the conditions surrounding immigrant youths, especially those classified as Hispanics, is critically important from a theoretical and policy-related points of view.

Theoretical Approach

Over the past two decades several major studies have deepened knowledge about the adaptation of the fastest growing segment of America’s youth population, ages 24 or under.^{xxi} Approximately one-fourth of the country’s youngsters in that age bracket are immigrant children or children of immigrants. Even more recently, a few scholars have focused on the large-scale displacement of settled immigrants and new arrivals from traditional areas of concentration in the West and Southwest toward new destinations in the Midwest, East, and South.^{xxii} A new

literature has emerged to document early experiences related to that phenomenon, including Douglas S. Massey's *New Faces in New Places* and Fran Ansley and Joh Shefner's *Global Connections, Local Receptions*,^{xxiii} and *New Destinations*, edited by Victor Zuñiga and Rubén Hernández León.^{xxiv} Despite such auspicious beginnings, little knowledge exists about specific effects of variations in context of reception on assimilation processes in new areas of destination. Even less is known about how draconian immigration policies and fears of deportation affect the lives of young people, their families, and their communities.^{xxv}

Preliminary interviews with undocumented students in Trenton High School and Princeton High School reveal several trends: First, kids worry about their future after leaving high-school but, even more acutely, they fret about the wellbeing and safety of their parents and other relatives. Teachers report frequent absences on the part of students concerned that their mothers or fathers will be arrested while they are in school. Some have seen parents led away in handcuffs by immigration agents. Experiences of humiliation and trauma are not unknown to them. Second, those students are fluent in English and have a halting command of their ancestral language. They thus reflect processes of rapid cultural incorporation; young people quickly assimilating to normative standards but with few alternatives to become fully integrated into American society. Third, students attending Trenton schools are more likely than those in Princeton to report routine racial slurs and verbal abuse. In other words, the experience of the population under consideration is shaped by a combination of (a) distress resulting from actual or perceived mistreatment; (b) accelerated cultural assimilation; and (c) blocked channels to achieve economic and political inclusion.

To further understand how this constellation of factors might affect immigrant children, I further discuss existing theoretical approaches below.

Culture: How does it matter?:

Culture is often invoked as a decisive element enabling some immigrant groups to gain rapid social and economic mobility while others experience failure in areas of destination. Samuel Huntington^{xxvi} famously argued that immigrants, especially those from Mexico, threaten to divide the nation into two Americas, one populated by the descendants of Europeans espousing protestant traditions and fluent in English and one formed by Spanish-speaking people whose culture is deemed incompatible with normative linguistic and institutional practices.

Similar perceptions are widely held outside academia where native populations struggle with diminishing opportunities in employment even as they witness the arrival of new immigrants, many of whom are undocumented and phenotypically distinct. In such environments, culture becomes a coded term encapsulating anxieties over racial contamination and perceived competition over resources. Huntington's views have not found confirmation from research; all immigrants—including Mexicans who constitute the largest number of undocumented people in the U.S.—eagerly seek to learn English; their children speak that language fluently and rapidly forget the tongue of their parents. Similarly, second-generation immigrants think of themselves primarily as Americans and that propensity is even stronger among those with limited levels of education and skills. A yearning to *belong* is a main feature of the recent immigrant experience.

An interest in culture is also central to the work of scholars focusing on the resilience of immigrants, their capacity to create viable social networks that protect them from racial discrimination, and their tendency to benefit from instructional and service programs focusing on ethnic identity, and achievement. Fernández-Kelly,^{xxvii} for example, identified mechanisms present in schools and households that shield youngsters from downward mobility. On the basis

of ethnographic research she found that the two decisive factors enabling children from stigmatized groups to prosper are: (a) the capacity of parents to curtail children's contact with people outside their immediate family; and (b) the availability of school programs constructively focused on ethnic identity and college preparation. Such findings suggest that culture *in real time* is more than values, conventions, and traditions—it also encompasses adaptation strategies that modulate social interactions and expand a sense of agency among youngsters. To paraphrase Richard Alba and Victor Nee,^{xxviii} assimilation is what happens to people while they are doing other things. In my exploratory, I extend those ideas by pinpointing the mechanisms that enable youngsters to survive and advance in environments shaped by macro-level factors but also by practices at the local level. I think of culture not as a rigid store of norms and values distinguishing individuals and the groups to which they belong but as a way of life and repertory of ideational and behavioral instruments that enables them to cope with environmental contingencies.^{xxix}

Structural Perspectives

In addition to cultural approaches, researchers in immigration have also explored factors related to institutional arrangements and the intergenerational transmission of knowledge and information. For example, research by Edward Telles and Vilma Ortiz^{xxx} shows that limited mobility in education and employment best describes the trajectory of Mexicans in the United States. Mexican immigrants and their children experience high rates of isolation and social stagnation not because they avoid assimilation but because they face numerous barriers for advance. This is especially true for undocumented children and children born in the U.S. but whose parents reside illegally in this country. Past waves of immigrants from Europe were able to improve their position, culturally and economically, by gradually pushing their way into more

privileged “White” segments of society. By contrast, Hispanic immigrants—whose roots are also European—risk becoming a distinct “race” with consistently worse outcomes than their White counterparts. Taking stock of such findings, I further investigate the extent to which children of immigrants see themselves in racial terms or as full Americans. Identity has proven to be a decisive element facilitating or impeding social and economic efficacy. I therefore explore the role of self-definition and self-valuation in coping strategies relied upon by youngsters to live out their days.

A different structural perspective proposed by Philip Kasinitz and his colleagues,^{xxxix} focuses on what they call the “second-generation advantage.” After conducting research in New York they found that benefits accrue to children of immigrants by virtue of a shared existence in two societies and two cultures. Young people expand employment prospects by using their social networks and tapping institutions previously established to promote native minorities. Kids who live at the intersection of two social and cultural environments literally double their assets and more easily achieve upward mobility. My study presents an ideal opportunity to investigate second-generation advantages, this time by shedding light on the experience of youngsters growing up in destinations affected by stringent immigration policies.

A third structural perspective is proposed by Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, under the label of “Segmented Assimilation.”^{xxxix} In that view, immigrants and their children do not automatically amalgamate to an imagined mainstream America but to sectors of the society they have direct contact with. Their behaviors, aspirations, and cultural preferences are shaped through daily interaction with preexisting populations in schools, churches, community organizations, and places of employment. Youngsters who by dint of planning or accident attend better schools, and interact with larger, more diverse populations will fare better than those who

spend most of their lives in isolated, ethnically uniform environments. Social class and race are implicated in that process giving rise to distinct and divergent assimilative paths. Segmented assimilation offers a viable conceptual framework to investigate variations in processes of immigrant adaptation.

Essential to my objectives is a final set of theoretical considerations related to what Portes and his colleagues describe as “context of reception.”^{xxxiii} In that view, assimilation is not solely the result of individual aspirations but the effect of two variables: (a) the level of human capital that immigrants possess upon arrival in a particular destination and (b) the level of toleration and economic opportunity available to them in the receiving areas. Immigrants with little or no formal education tend to face greater difficulties as they seek pathways to progress but even they receive benefits when a modicum of acceptance and incentives in education and employment are available to them and their children. I use earlier work on context of reception to inform my study. Especially significant will be to gain a fuller understanding of the way in which the application of immigration policies varies in my two research sites and how those variations relate to responses among children of immigrants.

Methodology

I see this exploratory project as an opportunity for methodological innovation.^{xxxiv} Over 18 months of research, the study deploys a series of qualitative procedures whose purpose is to obtain fine grain detail about the way in which children of immigrants and immigrant children in mid- and late adolescence live their lives out on a routine basis.^{xxxv} Taking a cue from recent, state-of-the-art research, I utilize textual analysis, social media, photographic and filmic means, smart phone apps and other technical resources to facilitate observation in an unobtrusive, non-

speculative way.^{xxxvi} Preparation for the study has already begun with a series of interviews with youngsters, their parents and other members of their families and communities, including teachers, school principals, clinicians, community organizers, service providers, government officials, and representatives of other relevant groups. By triangulating data received from various but related sources, I will compose a rich and variegated portrayal of the assimilative patterns found among children of immigrants and immigrant children in Princeton and Trenton.

Towards that objective, I am interacting with children through contacts in schools, learning centers, and community organizations. By early 2018, I hope to complete 100 interviews with a sample evenly divided between the two research sites. To be included in the study, youngsters must be foreign-born—undocumented or partially documented—or born in the United States to one or two undocumented parents. In addition, and with the assistance of student collaborators, approximately 30 more interviews will be completed with parents and other household members, educators, public officials, and civil servants, including police officers.

By contrast to survey questionnaires whose objective is to obtain large amounts of data through the use of multiple choice or short answer questions, qualitative interview schedules depend on a succinct but calibrated number of questions and call for longer answers. In this case, three main themes guide the construction of my interview schedules: (1) Household/Family Composition, Income Generating Sources and Migration History; (2) Educational and Employment Related Aspirations and Expectations; and (3) Perceptions Regarding Context of Reception.

Under the first category I seek demographic information—the who, where, when, and how elements of life—including age, place and order of birth, national background, family

composition, number of working adults and types of jobs they hold, etc. Questions of this kind rapidly create profiles that may be compared with larger, statistical accounts to ensure that the individual being interviewed possesses characteristics consistent with those of the larger universe under investigation. In this case, I am looking at a highly homogeneous population formed by children of immigrants in a specific age bracket and with a similar Hispanic background. Most of those interviewed have antecedents in Mexico and Guatemala but I will not exclude individuals of a different national origin. In other words both the study samples and the larger universe to which they belong exhibit little demographic variation.

As part of the second category of questions I am asking interviewees about their feelings regarding quality of life, including questions regarding hopes and yearnings but also youngsters' realistic assessment of their future in education and employment. Taking a cue from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS) ^{xxxvii} I will collect information about what kids wish their future lives will include as workers but also what they expect given perceived facilitators and barriers for success.

I deepen that subject under the third category of questions which will broach familiarity with discrimination; ideas about race and ethnicity; and responses to immigration policy, especially fear of deportation. It is at this point, that I will inquire about direct and indirect contact with the authorities regarding immigration status both at the personal level and regarding family members, friends, and acquaintances.

Very Early Findings

Although my study is barely getting off the ground, some intriguing findings are emerging. Conditions surrounding undocumented or partially undocumented youngsters in Princeton and

Trenton vary significantly in some ways but not in others. Greater concerns are expressed by students attending Trenton High School but those in Princeton are not free of anxiety. That is partly because, in the Princeton case, Hispanic students often face high levels of internal segregation. They are likely to interact with other Hispanic students and are often tracked in courses attended by African American peers who tend to come from less affluent families than those who are White. In other words, the school's structure and its internal divisions are having an impact on the composition of the social networks available to Hispanic students and, therefore, creating varying stocks of information.

Under those conditions, interaction with kids who face similar obstacles, in an environment perceived as White, rich and distant, appears to exacerbate anxieties. In Trenton, where most students attending the main high-school are members of minority groups, internal segregation is of a different sort. Separation in terms of race exists but class distinctions are less acute. This may be leading to an unexpected outcome: a greater capacity on the part of undocumented youngsters in Trenton to develop stronger identities and more positive self-valuation than those in Princeton.

On the other hand, the availability of multiple resources of high quality in Princeton, including the emergence of citizen networks and local government programs aiming to provide support to young immigrants and their families, may be forming a more auspicious environment for them to advance, socially as well as educationally. For example, the absence of government funding for DACA students to receive financial aid for a college education is leading community organizations and foundations to consider and implement measures to offer support in lieu of public funding. Such local backing may present a countervailing influence to stagnant or declining fortunes among qualified students without regular immigration status.

There are major differences regarding the approaches of police departments in the two locations selected for study. In Princeton, the Office of the Mayor, in collaboration with the Human Services Commission, and the Police Department, has created a climate of acceptance for immigrants and their children. A community ID card first issued by a grassroots organization to help residents lacking other forms of representation is now available at the county level and recognized by police departments, banks, clinics, hospitals, schools, and many places of commerce.^{xxxviii} That community ID card is also offered in Trenton but under less favorable conditions. Tensions between immigrants and police officers prevail in that city. In addition, recent raids on the part of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents make it more likely for youngsters to be angry, anxious, and lacking in trust. Early observations suggest that many are leaving school, abandoning hopes for a college education, and working in marginal occupations that provide meagre revenues and no opportunities for mobility.

Contrary to common perceptions, in both Trenton and Princeton, immigrant youngsters tend to be part of families that live modestly but are not poor. Many reside with parents who own small businesses whose services are in demand. Others are part of a thriving informal economy not reflected in official data about immigrant incomes. As a result, such families are able to provide their children with more resources than expected. Similarly, in the two locations, immigrant children tend to be part of social networks whose members share a common experience and are therefore practiced at offering and receiving support. The exchange of favors and information often provide youngsters without full legal status with effective ways to navigate employment and social terrains. To understand under what conditions *immigrant social capital* improves or negatively affects children's options is one of the goals of my study.

Finally, the uncommon hostility towards immigrants and refugees that characterized the recent presidential campaign has had an unanticipated consequence relevant to my study—the emergence of citizen networks dedicated to create means to shelter and support immigrant children and their families. Not long ago, progressive voices were clamoring for immigration reform. Now they are also demanding protection for undocumented Americans regardless of whether the nation can fix its broken immigration laws or not. In other words, the current political situation is *normalizing* undocumented status at the local level to an extent not seen before. While immigrants are being targeted for draconian treatment at the federal and state levels, people at the local level are banding together to offer protection and solidarity to immigrant families. That may yet create the proper microclimate to forestall social and economic decline among youngsters. It is in that surprising contradiction that the “kid paradox” may yet find its roots.

Endnotes

ⁱ Bennett, Brian and Michael A. Memoli (2017). “The White House has found ways to end protection for ‘Dreamers’ while shielding Trump from blowback.” *Los Angeles Times*. February 16. <http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-daca-20170216-story.html>

ⁱⁱ Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), an executive order signed by president Barack Obama in 2012 to enable U.S. residents brought into the country at an early age by undocumented parents to obtain work permits and drivers’ licenses. DACA status must be renewed every two years and therefore represents a tenuous protection.

ⁱⁱⁱ See Nestor Rodriguez and Jacqueline Hagan (2015). “US Policies to Restrict Immigration,” *In Migration in an Era of Restriction* (David Leal and Nestor Rodriguez, Editors). Springer.

^{iv} As testimony to the divided character of the Mexican State, the Internal Revenue Service gladly provides identification numbers to business legally formed by undocumented immigrant even as the Department of Homeland Security seeks in earnest to deport them.

^v “What Kind of Country.” This American Life (March 2, 2012). <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/459/what-kind-of-country>

^{vi} See Jacqueline M. Hagan (2008) *Migration Miracle: Faith, Hope, and Meaning on the Undocumented Journey*. Harvard University Press; Jacqueline Hagan, David Leal, and Nestor Rodriguez (2015) “Deporting Social Capital: Implications for Immigrant Communities in the United States.” *Migration Studies* (March 11); and Katharine M. Donato and Blake Sisk (2015) “Children’s Migration from Mexico and Central America to the United States: Evidence from the Mexican and Latin American Migration Projects.” *Journal of Migration and Human Security* <http://jmhs.cmsny.org/index.php/jmhs/article/view/43>

vii See Kay Deaux (2011). “An Immigrant Frame for American Identity.” *Applied Developmental Science*, 15(2): 70-72; and Shaun Wiley and Kay Deaux (2011). “The Bicultural Identity Performance of Immigrants.” In Assaad E. Azzi, Xenia Chrysoschoou, Bert Klandermans, and Bernd Simon (Editors), *Identity and Participation in Culturally Diverse Societies: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*: 49-68. Blackwell/Wiley.

viii Irene Bloemraad, et al (Forthcoming). “Staying out of Trouble” and Doing what is “Right:” Citizenship Acts, Citizenship Ideals, and the Effects of Legal Status on Second-Generation Youth.” *American Behavioral Scientist*.

ix For useful compendia of main issues relating to mixed parent households see Alicia Adsera and Marta Tienda (Editors) (2012). “Migrant Youth and Children of Migrants in a Globalized World.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Volume 643. SAGE Publications; Ron Haskins and Marta Tienda (Editors) (2011). “Immigrant Youth.” *The Future of Children*, Volume 21(Spring); and Hirokazu Yoshikawa (2011). *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and their Young Children*. Russell Sage Foundation.

x See Sarah Bohn, Magnus Lofstrom, and Steven Raphael (Forthcoming) “Do E-Verify Mandates Improve Labor Market Outcomes of Low-Skilled Native and Legal Immigrant Workers?” *Southern Economic Journal*; and Steven Raphael (2013). “International Migration, Sex Ratios, and the Socioeconomic Outcomes of Non-Migrant Women.” *Demography* 50(3): 971-991.

xi For a discussion of social frames affecting perceptions of success/failure, see Jennifer Lee and Min Zhou (2014) “the Success Frame and Achievement Paradox: The Costs and Consequences for Asian Americans.” *Race and Social Problems*, Volume 6(1): 38-55).

xii Relevant to these ends is research conducted by Fernández-Kelly on factors enabling children in vulnerable groups to achieve high levels of schooling, and employment. See Patricia Fernández-Kelly (2008) “The Back Pocket Map: Social Class and Cultural Capital as Transferable Assets in the Advancement of Second-Generation Immigrants.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol 620 (November): 12-36.

xiii David B. Grusky, Charles Varner and Marybeth Mattingly (2015) “Editor’s Note.” *Pathways: A Magazine of Poverty, Inequality, and Social Policy*. Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality.

xiv Chardy, Alfonso (2016). “Record number of deportations took place on Obama’s watch.” *The Miami Herald* (December 25, 2016). <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/immigration/article122715474.html>

xv I expect to interview samples of young people 14-18 years old.

xvi Mary C. Waters and Philip Kasinitz (2015) “The War on Crime and the War on Immigrants: Racial and Legal Exclusion in 21st Century United States.” In Nancy Foner and Patrick Simon (Editors), *Fear, Anxiety and National Identity: Immigration and Belonging in North America and Europe*. Russell Sage Foundation. See also Joanna Derby (2012). “The Burden of Deportation on Children in Mexican Immigrant Families.” *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74: 829-845.

xvii The Secure Communities Program, first implemented in 2008, was an enforcement tool that linked people booked into local jails, even for small infractions, with federal immigration authorities. As more immigrants detained for traffic or immigration violations were detained by local officials and turned over to immigration authorities, the program elicited growing alarm and resentment. Secure Communities was ended in 2014, under the Barack Obama Administration.

xviii Long-term stress may have sensible effects on immigrant health. See Noreen Goldman (2015). “Will the Latino Mortality Advantage Endure?” (Unpublished Manuscript). Princeton University, Office of Population Research. An emerging literature now exists on the probable effects of fear of deportation among immigrant children. See, for example, Wendy Cervantes and Yali Lincroft (2010). “The Impact of Immigration Enforcement on Child Welfare.” <http://www.firstfocus.net/library/reports/the-impact-of-immigration-enforcement-on-child-welfare>; Lori Davis and

Lawrence J. Siegel. (2000). Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Children and Adolescents: A Review and Analysis.” *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 3, 135-154; and Ajay Chaudry, Randolph Capps, Juan Pedroza, Rosa Maria Castañeda, Robert Santos., and Molly M. Scott (2010). “Facing our Future: Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement. Urban Institute http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412020_FacingOurFuture_final.pdf.

^{xix} Immigrants as a whole constitute the fastest growing segment of America’s youth population, ages 24 or under. Approximately one-fourth of the country’s youngsters in that age bracket are foreign born or have at least one foreign born parent. On July 1st, 2015, the U.S. Census Bureau officially reported that more than half of babies younger than 1 year in the nation were racial or ethnic minorities, and most of those were of Mexican descent.

^{xx} Pew Research Center (2016). “It’s official: Minority babies are the majority among the nation’s infants, but only just.” June 23. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/06/23/its-official-minority-babies-are-the-majority-among-the-nations-infants-but-only-just/>

^{xxi} See, for example, Patricia Gándara and Russell W. Rumberger (2009). “Immigration, Language, and Education: How does Language Policy Structure Opportunity?” *Teachers College Record*, Volume 111, Number 3(March): 750-782; Elena L. Grigorenko and Ruby Takanishi (Editors) (2012). *Immigration, Diversity, and Education*. Routledge; Jens Manuel Krogstad, Ana Gonzalez-Barrera, and Mark Hugo Lopez (2014). “children 12 and under are fastest growing group of unaccompanied minors at U.S. border.” Pew Research Center Fact Tank; Pew Research Center (2013). “Second-Generation Americans: A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants.” Washington, DC; and Evelyn Hu-Dehart and Cynthia Garcia Coll (2010). “the Immigrant Paradox in Children’s Education and Behavior: Evidence from New Research.” Center for the Study of Human Development, Brown University.

^{xxii} National Council of La Raza (2015). *Latinos in New Spaces: Emerging Trends and Implications for Federal Education Policy*. Washington, DC. Heather A. Smith and Owen J. Furuseth (Editors) (2006). *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of Place*. Ashgate Publishing Company; Daniel D. Arreola (Editor) (2004). *Hispanic Spaces, Latino Places: Community and Cultural Diversity in Contemporary America*. University of Texas Press.

^{xxiii} Douglas S. Massey (Editor) (2010). *New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; Fran Ansley and Jon Shefner (2009). *Global Connections and Local Receptions: New Latino Immigration to the Southeastern United States*. University of Tennessee Press.

^{xxiv} Russell Sage Foundation Press.

^{xxv} Census data show that the adult immigrant population in new places of settlement is largely formed by individuals with low levels of formal education and limited skills. Children in mid-adolescence have spent their whole lives in circumstances affected by the application of strict immigration policies. Whether native born or born abroad, most have been affected—directly or indirectly—by the shadow of deportations, whose number skyrocketed during the early 21st century and reached unprecedented levels between 2008 and 2013, under the Barack Obama administration.

^{xxvi} Samuel Huntington (2006). *Who Are We?: The Challenges to America’s National Identity*. Simon and Schuster.

^{xxvii} Patricia Fernández-Kelly (2008). “The Back Pocket Map: Social Class and cultural Capital as Transferable Assets in the Advancement of Second-Generation Immigrants.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (November); 620(1): 116-137.

^{xxviii} Richard Alba and Victor Nee (2005). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Harvard University Press.

^{xxix} Ann Swidler (1986). “culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies.” *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, No. 2(April): 273-286; Patricia Fernández-Kelly (2015). *The Hero’s Fight: African Americans in West Baltimore and the Shadow of the State*. Princeton University Press: 232-253.

^{xxx} Edward E. Telles and Vilma Ortiz (2009). *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation and Race*. Russell Sage Foundation.

^{xxx}_i Philip Kasinitz, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters, and Jennifer Holdaway (2008). *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. Harvard University Press.

^{xxx}_{ii} Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou (1993). "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 530(Nov): 74-96.

^{xxx}_{iii} Alejandro Portes, Patricia Fernández-Kelly and William Haller (2005). "Segmented Assimilation on the Ground: The New Second Generation in Early Adulthood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6): 1000-1040. See also Yu Xie and Emily Greenman (2005). "Segmented Assimilation Theory: A Reformulation and Empirical Test." Population Studies Center, University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, Report 05-581(August).

^{xxx}_{iv} In light of current debates about the soundness and reliability of ethnographic research, I intend to make this project a model for rigorous qualitative data collection and evaluation. I see qualitative research as part of a scientific mission aimed at the production of reliable knowledge of interest to policy. I will give attention to the efficacy of instruments and procedures and develop strategies to increase precision in interpretation.

^{xxx}_v By contrast to large scale surveys whose purpose is to use stochastic means for purposes of generalization to broad universes, ethnographic methods aim to deepen understanding about specific questions. In the past, ethnographic and other forms of qualitative research relied mainly on immersion over extended periods of time to obtain a proper portrayal of "ways of life" typically found in remote, often deemed as exotic, areas. More recently, the availability of advanced technology and the extension of ethnographic techniques to urban settings enable researchers to optimize observation and compress the time required to obtain precise representations of the phenomena being investigated. Sound collaborative arrangements using a common set of tools further enable investigators to collect reliable information over comparatively short time periods.

^{xxx}_{vi} Unobtrusive in that such methods do not require repeated and continuous interaction with interviewers; non-speculative in that the same methods will yield factual information and reduce conjecture on the part of observers. See Odgers, Caspi, Bates, Sampson, and Moffitt (op.cit); Bail (op.cit). See also Ethan Lewis and Elizabeth Cascio (2012). "Cracks in the Melting Pot: Immigration, School Choice, and Segregation." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* Vol 4, No 3(August): 91-117

^{xxx}_{vii} The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), spearheaded by Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut, between 1991 and 2006, is regarded as the most comprehensive and reliable study of second-generation immigrant youngsters growing up in the U.S. The original survey was conducted with large samples of second-generation immigrant children attending the 8th and 9th grades in public and private schools in the metropolitan areas of Miami/Ft Lauderdale (Florida) and San Diego (California).

^{xxx}_{viii} More than 7000 Community ID Cards have been issued since 2009 by the Latin American Legal Deense and Education fund, a grassroots organization founded in 2004 by local activists whose purpose is to educate and advocate on behalf of Latinos in Central New Jersey.