

**Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research**

<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>

Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

Working Paper Series 2008-14

**ENGLISH ACQUISITION AND JAPANESE LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE
AMONG JAPANESE-AMERICAN YOUTH**

**Sayaka Kawamura
Franklin Goza**

**Department of Sociology and
Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403**

Direct Correspondence to:

Sayaka Kawamura

Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403

Phone: (419) 372 - 7256

Fax: (419) 372 - 8306

e-mail: sayakak@bgsu.edu

English Acquisition and Japanese Language Maintenance among Japanese-American Youth

Despite the growing number of Japanese speaking immigrants in the U.S. and the pronounced linguistic dissimilarity between Japanese and English, few studies have examined English proficiency levels or Japanese language maintenance. We use 2000 data from the 5% IPUMS file to examine English proficiency and language maintenance among first-, second-, and third-generation Japanese immigrant youth in the United States. Before presenting multivariate results for our dependent variables, descriptive statistics are presented detailing numerous significant differences within and across generations. Furthermore, the second-generation is divided into subgroups based on each parent's birthplace. This study also contrasts the results of Japanese-Americans with those of Korean-Americans, speakers of another language very distinct from English, in an attempt to ground the significance of our findings. Findings provide support for many of the hypotheses advanced. They also reveal that our regression models generally did a much better job explaining English acquisition among Japanese-Americans than Korean-Americans.

English Acquisition and Japanese Language Maintenance among Japanese-American Youth

Introduction

One important consequence of the relatively recent surge in U.S. immigration from non-traditional nations is that research now increasingly focuses on issues of cultural adaptation (e.g., Bean and Stevens, 2003; Farley and Alba, 2002; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). Perhaps the most important form of immigrant cultural adaptation is English acquisition, since language usually serves as the key means of communication, not only within families, but also in social realms outside the home, such as school and work.

Since 1990, Asians have comprised more than 30 % of all legal immigrants to the U.S. (DHS, 2006). Most of these new arrivals come from countries where English, if spoken at all, is spoken as a second or third language. One such Asian group that has experienced a significant increase in U.S. immigration since 1990 is the Japanese. During the 1990s Japanese immigration was 50 % higher than in the 1980s and the current decade is on pace to experience even more growth (DHS, 2006). In spite of the increased number of Japanese immigrants to the U.S., and the fact that the linguistic distance (Romaine, 1995) between Japanese and English is very pronounced (Chiswick and Miller, 2004), few studies have specifically examined English proficiency levels or language usage patterns among this group. This oversight is unfortunate, especially given the significant linguistic differences between English and Japanese (Padilla et al., 1985; Chiswick and Miller, 2004).

This study contributes to prior research on immigrant cultural adaptation by focusing on English proficiency and language maintenance patterns at home by examining the experiences of

first-, second-, and third- or higher generations Japanese immigrant youth in the United States. To do this we will analyze 2000 U.S. census data from the 5 % Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS). IPUMS consists of high-precision samples of the American population drawn from the fifteen surviving federal censuses that cover the 1850-2000 period. IPUMS assigns uniform codes across all samples in order to facilitate the analysis of social and economic change (Ruggles et al., 2004).

Next, we will compare the results for Japanese-Americans with those of Korean-Americans, speakers of a language also very distant from English, in an attempt to ground the significance of our findings. Furthermore, because many U.S. immigrants currently come from Asian nations with languages that are also linguistically very different from English (Chiswick and Miller, 2004), the findings of this study may yield policy recommendations that assist those groups more rapidly acquire English speaking skills.

We proceed by first reviewing relevant literature on English language acquisition and immigrant native language maintenance. Next, we present sections detailing our research hypotheses, data, and methodology. Finally, study results and conclusions are presented.

Theoretical Overview

Cultural Assimilation Theory

Because cultural adaptation is so important to immigrant success, numerous scholars have addressed this issue. Nonetheless, disagreement remains and various paradigms have emerged. Some (e.g., Bean and Stevens, 2003) suggest that studies with this focus can be separated into two distinct viewpoints. The first, classic cultural assimilation theory, argues that all immigrants gradually become incorporated into mainstream culture by absorbing the cultural values and norms of the new society (Gordon, 1964). This perspective suggests there is

essentially but one path through which immigrants can be integrated into mainstream society. The other perspective, however, argues that the assimilation model does not fully explain the integration experiences of immigrant groups who differ from the majority population. For example, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) argue that there is no normative assimilation path because American society has become extremely heterogeneous. In *Immigrant America*, they explain that distinct racial/ethnic groups may experience different challenges with regard to their cultural integration. They also argue that parents' race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, educational background, and community resources affect the cultural integration process. Similarly, Kuo (1995) argues that different ethnic groups cope with cultural integration difficulties, such as racial discrimination, in different ways. These arguments underline the importance of considering diversity in cultural adaptation across and within different immigrant groups. In the context of the present study, this suggests that the processes and speed with which English language ability is acquired should vary by immigrant group and generational status.

New Language (English) Acquisition: Process and factors

Among the many past studies examining the process of immigrant linguistic adaptation, May's (2000) research is worth reviewing. May introduces three stages that newcomers pass through when experiencing a language shift. During the first stage, immigrants receive social pressure to speak the majority language in formal settings, such as schools. Nonetheless, during this stage their native language continues to be the one they most often speak in their daily lives. In the second stage, both native and majority languages are spoken. Although bilingualism occurs, at this stage fewer immigrants now fluently speak the native language. May (2000) suggests that this decline in usage affects younger speakers at a higher rate than older ones. In the third stage, the majority language replaces immigrants' native languages as they become

virtually monolingual in the language of their adopted land. However, even in this stage, a few speakers will continue to use the minority language. May also posits that the third stage could occur as early as the first generation, but normally not until the second or third generation.

Prior research generally concurs that there are several key determinants of English acquisition among immigrants. First, age at immigration is strongly and negatively associated with English proficiency at adulthood (e.g., Espenshade and Fu, 1997; Stevens, 1999). As such, the younger an immigrant is at time of arrival, the higher his/her English proficiency is expected to be at adulthood (e.g., Stevens, 1999). Second, length of U.S. residence is positively associated with English acquisition (e.g., Espenshade and Fu, 1997; Portes and Schauffler, 1994).

Conversely, Portes and Schauffler (1994) found that parental educational attainment, occupational status, and social class are not associated with English language fluency among Latin American immigrants in Florida. Likewise, Stevens (1999) found that neither the influence of family background nor the educational attainment of second-generation immigrants affected English acquisition levels. One possible explanation for this is that almost all second-generation immigrants are exposed to the host society language, regardless of their socioeconomic background. Another explanation is the weight of the social forces immigrants encounter. For instance, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) argue that parents who try to educate their offspring in their native language experience negative social pressures. Similarly, Bean and Stevens (2003) state “the perception that immigrants and their youth are, or should be, obligated to learn English is widespread” (p.168). Thus, new language acquisition not only stems from internal immigrant motivations but also from powerful, external social pressures.

Linguistic Distance

The pace at which immigrants learn English is affected by their prior linguistic abilities, especially the way in which their first language is related to English (Romaine, 1995). Although prior research on immigrant language acquisition examined the influence of social and human capital on immigrant language adaptation (e.g., Portes and Schauffler, 1994; Stevens, 1999), only recently have studies of immigrant language adjustment begun to consider the importance of linguistic distance between the languages spoken in the countries of origin and destination (Chiswick and Miller, 2004). This concept is crucial because the greater the linguistic difference across languages, the more difficult it is to learn the new language (Chiswick and Miller, 2004; Romaine, 1995). The notion of “linguistic distance” takes into consideration that distinct languages may be similar or very different. Hart-Gonzalez and Lindemann (1993) used this idea to develop a scale for quantitatively measuring the difference, or distance, between languages. Using English as the base, they developed a measure of the difficulty English speakers have in mastering 43 other languages. This distance measure has since been used by others to predict difficulty levels that may be experienced by various immigrant groups attempting to learn English (e.g., Chiswick et al., 2006; Chiswick et al., 2005; Chiswick and Miller, 1999).

If a foreign language is structurally similar to the original language, acquisition should be easier than in cases where the foreign language is very different (Chiswick and Miller, 2004; Romaine, 1995). Therefore, Chiswick and Miller (2004) argue that one reason for distinct language acquisition levels among different immigrant groups is due to the distance between the language spoken in the home country and that of the destination. They used this idea to modify Hart-Gonzalez and Lindemann’s work (1993) into a scale that incorporates U.S. census codes for 43 languages. According to their instrument, linguistic distance can be summarized with a linear scale where scores range from 1.0 to 3.0. A score of 1.0 reflects the greatest amount of linguistic

distance or difficulty in learning the language. Examples of extreme scores range from 1.0 for Japanese to 3.0 for Afrikaans. As such, the latter language would be the least difficult for English speakers to learn. Conversely, because the score for Japanese is 1.0, English acquisition will generally be more difficult for Japanese immigrants than for immigrants speaking languages less dissimilar. Examples of intermediate distance scores are 2.5 for French and 1.5 for Mandarin. Thus, if researchers are to understand the divergent experiences of English acquisition among various immigrant groups, it is crucial that they consider linguistic distance.

Level of English Proficiency versus Language Use Patterns

Those examining English acquisition among U.S. immigrants have oftentimes used U.S. census data measuring English language proficiency (e.g., Portes and Schauffler, 1994; Stevens, 1999). In the IPUMS data, English proficiency categories are *speaks only English, very well, well, not well, and not at all*. Since this score is self-reported, it does not provide an objective measure of English language proficiency. It is also difficult for a respondent to differentiate between *very well* and *well* or *well* and *not well* without any specific guidelines, something that might occur with a standardized English proficiency test. Thus, although we will also utilize this oft-used measure of English proficiency, it may be insufficient for fully understanding immigrant English acquisition.

Regardless of immigrants' English proficiency levels, they may continue to speak their native language (Lieberson and Curry, 1971; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Stevens 1992). Furthermore, some scholars suggest that language usage patterns serve as better indicators of cultural adaptation than English proficiency levels. In keeping with the commonly used definition of language usage (e.g. Steven, 1992), this study also will define it as the language spoken at home.

Stevens (1992) argues that studying immigrant language use patterns is more important than examining their English fluency levels. She also suggests that studying the language immigrants speak at home is important to understanding how they linguistically and culturally adapt to a new society. She emphasizes this point by stating that first-generation immigrants are not necessarily more likely to use their native language at home, nor are second and higher generation immigrants more likely to speak only English at home (Stevens 1992).

Similarly, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) show that although second-generation children are proficient in English, they usually speak their native language at home. This leads us to expect that second-generation Japanese-American youth will also be bilingual speakers of both English and Japanese. However, if Romaine's (1995) hypothesis is correct, English will completely replace Japanese among the higher generations, an outcome he expects because of the linguistic dissimilarity between the English and Japanese languages.

Maintenance of Native language

As discussed above, immigrants continue to use their native languages even once they begin to use a new language. Native language maintenance has especially important implications for immigrant youth in terms of nurturing their ethnic identity and retaining the cultural values of their country of origin. Furthermore, language plays a significant role in the process of socialization within the family (Gecas, 1981; Shibata, 2000; Yaeo Siegel, 2004).

Past research has identified the importance of several key factors associated with native language maintenance among immigrants. First, linguistic similarity between the new language and the native language is associated with language maintenance (Romaine, 1995). If Romaine's (1995) hypothesis is correct, then because Japanese is very different from English, we would expect to see significantly fewer Japanese speakers in higher generations, a result that should be

significantly different among immigrant groups that speak languages linguistically closer to English.

Second, the nativity status of parents is an important determinant of their children's language acquisition. More specifically, if both parents share a language it is expected that second-generation youth will speak their parents' native language (Stevens, 1985). On the other hand, if both parents do not share a native language then their children may be more likely to acquire their mother's language since mothers typically spend more time with their children. Portes and Schauflier (1994) did find gender differences in language use patterns as second-generation female youth were more likely to retain the parental language than their male counterparts. However, Stevens (1985) did not find any effect of parents' gender or nativity status on the language acquisition of the second-generation youth she studied.

Present Study

Relatively little research has examined English acquisition and Japanese language maintenance among Japanese-American youth, in spite of the increasing number of Japanese speakers in the United States. This investigation is warranted given how prior research suggests that each ethnic group may have a different cultural adaptation experience (e.g., Kuo, 1995; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). Similarly, Whorf (1940) suggests that intellectual growth, especially language acquisition, may itself be conditioned by one's cultural background. Finally, even within a single ethnic group it is possible that each generation will experience diverse patterns of language acquisition (e.g., Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). Hence this study will develop models to document and analyze the process of English acquisition and Japanese language maintenance, as well as contrasting results among first-, second-, and third- or higher generations of Japanese-American youth.

We limit our focus to those between the ages of 5 and 18. We begin at age 5 because data on language spoken is not recorded for those younger than 5. We stop at age 18 because our desire is to monitor this important aspect of cultural adaptation among those who are most directly affected by the U.S. educational system. That is, immigrant youth tend to be exposed to, if not immersed in, the English language in a manner that directly promotes their English acquisition. The results for this generation can then serve as a baseline against which to monitor the transitions occurring among the successive generations. Furthermore, English acquisition is a key part of the cultural adaptation of immigrant youth since it influences subsequent academic and occupational success in the U.S. (e.g., Stevens, 1985; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). At the same time, native language maintenance is essential for maintaining ethnic identity and learning cultural values (e.g., Gecas, 1981; Stevens, 1985; Shibata, 2000; Yaeo Siegel, 2004). As such, this study will contribute to prior research on cultural adaptation by examining English acquisition and Japanese language maintenance among Japanese-American youth in the United States. Furthermore, in order to ground our findings, the results found for Japanese-Americans will be contrasted with those of Korean-Americans, another group speaking a language that is equidistant from English, as both of these languages have the highest possible distance score, a score of 1.0 (Chiswick and Miller, 2004).

Hypotheses

Below we present several key hypotheses that will be evaluated in an attempt to better understand the processes of English acquisition and Japanese language maintenance among Japanese-American youth living in the United States.

I. Because linguistic dissimilarity between native and new languages makes it difficult to maintain the native language (Romaine, 1995), we expect that second- and third- or higher

generation youth will be less likely to speak Japanese at home than first-generation youth and that they will also be more likely to speak only English at home.

II. As an extension of Stevens' research (1985), we hypothesize that second-generation youth will be more likely to speak Japanese at home if both parents are Japan-born than would occur if only one parent was born there. Furthermore, in families where only one parent is from Japan we expect that those with a Japanese mother will be more likely to speak Japanese at home, than will occur when only the father is from Japan.

III. In keeping with a possibility suggested by Portes and Schauffler (1994), we hypothesize that Japanese- American female youth will be more likely to speak Japanese at home than males.

IV. Earlier studies determined that age at immigration and length of U.S. residence are associated with English acquisition, regardless of family background characteristics (Portes and Schauffler, 1994; Espenshade and Fu, 1997; Stevens, 1999). Accordingly, we hypothesize that second- and third- or higher generation youth have higher levels of English proficiency than first-generation youth. Among first-generation youth, we hypothesize that duration of U.S. residence will be positively related to English proficiency levels, regardless of family background.

Data and Methods

This study uses IPUMS data from the 5 % sample of the 2000 U.S. Census of Population (Ruggles et al., 2004) to analyze English proficiency and language use patterns among first-, second-, and third- or higher generations Japanese-American youth. The IPUMS data includes the two dependent variables analyzed in this study, English proficiency and language spoken at home. In addition, the IPUMS family-linkage feature enables us to match and

combine parental measures (e.g., father's education and place of birth) to respondent records enabling us to monitor the effects of various theoretically important independent measures.

This project's focal group consists of Japanese-American youth who were between the ages of 5 and 18 in 2000. In this study, first-generation youth refers to those born in Japan, and for whom both parents were also born in Japan (N = 733). The second-generation group consists of those born in the U.S. with at least one parent born in Japan (N = 4781). The second-generation is then subdivided into three categories based on their parents' birthplaces. These groups are as follows: (1) both parents born in Japan (N = 561), (2) father born in the U.S. and mother born in Japan (N = 2447), and (3) father born in Japan and mother born in the U.S. (N = 1773). We believe that these second-generation subgroups are the only way to fully capture the diversity among second-generation immigrants. The third- or higher generations consist of those who identified their primary ancestry as Japanese, but also indicated that they and both parents were born in the U.S. (N = 3206).

Descriptive Results

Dependent variables

The dependent variables used in this study are English proficiency and language spoken at home. The first, English proficiency, is coded such that 1 represents *does not speak English at all*, 2 *not well*, 3 *well*, 4 *very well*, and 5 *speaks only English*. The second dependent variable, language spoken at home, is coded as a dichotomous measure so that 0 represents English and 1 represents Japanese. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was undertaken to examine cohort differences on both dependent and independent measures. These contrasts and other summary statistics are presented in Tables 1a and 1b.

[Table 1a about here]

As hypothesized, English proficiency varied significantly across the three generations examined. The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1a reveal that average English proficiency among first-generation youth was 2.95, a figure significantly lower than that of the second-generation, which was also significantly lower than the third- or higher generation youth ($p < .001$). Among second-generation youth, English proficiency varied by parents' nativity. When both parents were born in Japan the mean score was 3.84, significantly lower than the means of youth with one U.S.-born parent, as well as third- or higher generation Japanese-Americans. The mean English proficiency score was 4.95 among third- or higher generation youth, indicating that nearly this entire cohort was fluent in the English language. However, this score was not significantly higher than those of second-generation youth with a Japan-born mother (4.81) or a Japan-born father (4.92).

When examining parallel results for three generations of Korean-Americans, similar English proficiency patterns emerged (see Table 1b). However, first-generation Korean-American youth had a significantly higher ($p < .001$) mean proficiency score (3.33) than that of their Japanese-American counterparts (2.95).

[Table 1b about here]

Among U.S.-born Japanese-American youth, fewer than 2.1 % spoke languages other than English or Japanese at home. These languages included Spanish, German, French, Portuguese, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Indonesian, or Filipino. Meanwhile, among youth born in Japan, less than 1 % spoke a language other than English or Japanese at home. For clarity of focus, these cases are excluded from our analyses.

Our chi-square results reveal there were significant differences in Japanese usage at home across the three generations (see Table 1a); results that conform to our earlier advanced

hypotheses. Among the first-generation cohort, almost all youth spoke Japanese at home (97.0 %), and among this cohort there were no significant gender differences.

Among the second generation cohort, however, significant differences did emerge. The subgroup with two parents born in Japan was the one most likely to speak Japanese at home (79.8 %). Consistent with Stevens (1985), the proportion of second-generation youth speaking Japanese at home declined significantly when one parent was born in the United States ($p < .001$). However, while Stevens (1985) found the effect of a foreign-born parent's gender to be insignificant, we did not. More specifically, those with mothers born in Japan spoke significantly more ($p < .001$) Japanese at home than did those with fathers born in Japan.

Although there was not a gender gap in Japanese usage among first-generation youth, gender differences were significant among several second-generation subsets (see Table 2a). For instance, when both parents were born in Japan, significantly more ($p < .001$) females spoke Japanese at home (82.7 %) than males (75.5 %). The percentage of second-generation youth speaking Japanese at home declined to 13.0 % for females with only a Japan-born mother, and among their male counterparts was significantly lower ($p < .001$). In the case of second-generation youth with only a Japan-born father, gender differences were insignificant.

Consistent with previous research (Portes and Rumbaut, 2006; Portes and Schauffler, 1994; Romaine, 1995), and as earlier hypothesized, there was a significant decline in Japanese language usage among the third- or higher generations, as relatively few members of this cohort spoke Japanese at home (2.8 %). However, as noted in earlier generations, third- or higher generations females continued to be significantly more likely than males to speak Japanese at home ($p < .001$).

First-generation results reveal that 97 % of each ethnicity spoke their respective Asian language at home. However, among the second- and third generations more Korean-American youth spoke their parents' language at home (see Table 1a and 1b). Nonetheless, similar usage patterns emerged for both groups as the proportion of second-generation youth who spoke Japanese or Korean at home declined dramatically when one parent was born in the United States. Furthermore, and just like the Japanese-Americans, those whose mothers were born in Korea spoke significantly ($p < .001$) more Korean at home (18.0 %) than those whose fathers were Korea-born (9.6 %).

When examining gender differences in language usage at home, we generally found similar patterns for both ethnicities. Although there were gender differences among first-generation Korean-American youth, these were insignificant (see Tables 2a and 2b). However, statistically significant gender gaps emerged among all three second-generation Korean-American sub-groups. Specifically, when both parents were born in Korea, significantly more ($p < .001$) females (89.5 %) spoke Korean at home than males (86.0 %). This was also the case for those with only a Korea-born mother as significantly more females spoke Korean at home (20.7 %) than did their male counterparts (14.1 %). Similar to Japanese-Americans, those males with only a Korea-born father were slightly more likely ($p < .01$) to speak Korean (10.7 %) at home than females (8.1 %).

[Tables 2a and 2b about here]

Independent variables

The independent variables used to predict English proficiency are years in U.S., gender, age, father and mother's English proficiency, and father and mother's educational attainment.

ANOVA was used to determine the significance of group differences on these independent variables.

Individual characteristics

The variable years in U.S. is only relevant for first-generation youth and ranged from 0 to 18. Years in U.S. is calculated by subtracting years since immigration from age in 2000. Mean number of years in the U.S. was 4.0 for first-generation Japanese youth, while it was 5.5 years for first generation Korean-American youth. This difference was insignificant.

Gender is equally distributed in the sample, except in the case of second-generation youth for whom both parents were born in Japan. In that subgroup, there are slightly more males (55%) than females. Gender is also equally balanced among the Korean-American youth sample.

The mean age of first-generation Japanese youth was 10 years old, making this group slightly younger ($p < .05$) than the second- and third- or higher generation youth. Age differences among second-generation youth, regardless of parental nativity status, and third- or higher generation youth were not significant. The mean age of the Korean-American first-generation was 12, making them significantly ($p < .001$) older than their Japanese counterparts.

Parental characteristics

Measures for father and mother's English proficiency are coded as they are for the respondents. Among first-generation Japanese youth, mean English proficiency scores for fathers and mothers were 3.0 and 2.5, respectively. Among second-generation youth for whom both parents were born in Japan, fathers' and mothers' mean levels of English proficiency were 3.5 and 3.1, respectively. In those cases where the father was born in the U.S. and the mother in Japan, the mother's mean English proficiency score was 4.6, or near fluency. For those with a

mother born in the U.S. and a father born in Japan, the father's mean English proficiency score was even higher at 4.8. On average, these findings suggest that the second-generation generally had two parents who were able to speak English very fluently, regardless of where they were born.

Among first-generation Korean youth, mean English proficiency scores for fathers and mothers were 2.8 and 2.4, respectively. These differences are insignificant. Among second-generation youth for whom both parents were born in Korea, fathers' and mothers' mean English proficiency scores were 3.1 and 2.9, respectively. These scores are significantly ($p < .001$) lower than those of their Japanese counterparts. In those cases where the father was born in the U.S. and the mother in Korea, mothers' mean English proficiency score was 4.0, again significantly ($p < .001$) lower than that of mothers born in Japan. For those with a mother born in the U.S. and a father born in Korea, the father's mean English proficiency score was 4.6.

The measures monitoring fathers' and mothers' educational attainment were recoded to reflect the mean number of years of schooling captured by the educational categories IPUMS provides. Thus the categories "1st - 4th grade" and "5th - 8th grade" were recoded as 2.5 and 6.5, respectively. However, for categories such as "9th grade" or "10th grade" no transformations were required as these categories became 9 and 10, respectively. Of the two relevant IPUMS measures, we opted to employ *Educational Attainment, 1990* as this provides six categories beyond high school, whereas the other variable, *Educational Attainment Recode*, provides only two. This additional detail is especially relevant to this study as the majority of parents born in Japan and Korea possess advanced educations. Consequently, the scores on our recoded measure for years of schooling completed range from 0, for no years of school completed, to 21 for the completion of a doctorate degree.

Among first-generation Japanese youth, mean educational attainment was 16.1 years for fathers and 14.5 years for mothers. Descriptive statistics show that approximately 84 % of these fathers had at least 4 years of college education (not shown). Father's educational attainment for first-generation youth was significantly ($p < .001$) higher than for fathers of the other generations. Among second-generation youth for whom both parents were born in Japan, fathers' and mothers' mean years of schooling were 15.1 years and 14.3 years, respectively. In those cases where the father was born in the U.S. and the mother in Japan, fathers' and mothers' mean years of schooling completed were 14.8 years and 14.4, respectively. For those with a mother born in the U.S. and a father born in Japan, fathers' and mothers' mean attainment was 14.7 years and 14.2 years, respectively. Among third- or higher generations, fathers' and mothers' mean years of schooling were 15.1 years and 14.8 years, respectively. Scores for fathers' and mothers' educational attainment among second- and third- or higher generations were not significantly different from one another.

Among first-generation Korean youth, the means for years of schooling completed were 15.2 years for fathers and 14.0 years for mothers. Among second-generation youth for whom both parents were born in Korea, fathers' and mothers' mean levels of educational attainment were 15.1 years and 14.2 years, respectively. In those cases where the father was born in the U.S. and the mother in Korea, the mean educational levels for fathers and mothers were 14.5 years and 12.6, respectively. For those with a mother born in the U.S. and a father born in Korea, fathers' and mothers' mean years of schooling completed were 15.0 years and 14.3 years, respectively. Finally, among third- or higher generations, mean scores for fathers' and mothers' educational attainment were 14.6 years and 14.0 years, respectively.

When contrasting Japanese and Korean parents' educational attainment, observe that Japanese first-generation fathers had significantly higher ($p < .001$) educational attainment (16.1 years) than any other group, irrespective of gender or ethnicity. At the other extreme, Korean-born mothers wed to U.S.-born fathers who were the parents of second-generation youth had a significantly lower ($p < .001$) mean educational level (12.6 years) than did any other gender, ethnic or generational group.

Analytic Strategy

This section will proceed by presenting the results from ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analyses designed to predict those factors that best determine English proficiency among first- and second-generation Japanese-American youth. Because, as documented above, almost all third- or higher generation youth are fluent in English, we will not use regression analyses to examine that group. Initially, we also planned to conduct regression analyses designed to predict Japanese language usage at home among second- and third- or higher generation youth. The first-generation was to be omitted since virtually all of this group speaks Japanese at home. However, the item measuring English proficiency overlaps the measure native language usage. More specifically, two of the responses for English speaking proficiency are “*does not speak English at all*” and “*speaks only English.*” As a result, the correlation between English proficiency and Japanese usage at home (0 = speak only English, 1 = speak Japanese) is very high. Thus, we were not able to undertake regression analyses to predict Japanese usage at home. As such, Japanese usage at home is used only as a descriptor for documenting gender and intergenerational differences in language usage.

As discussed above, we will conduct OLS regression for each Japanese-American generation, and for each second generation sub-group. We will then repeat these analyses for all first- and second-generation Korean-American sub-groups. For the first generation, years in U.S. will be entered into the Model 1. Individual characteristics, gender and age are then added into Model 2. Four parental characteristics, father's and mother's English proficiency and educational attainment, are added into Model 3. For the second-generation, individual characteristics are entered into Model 1 and parental characteristics are added into Model 2. In those cases where one parent was born in the U.S., only the foreign-born parent's English proficiency is entered into the model.

Analytical Results

Ordinary least squares regression is used in the analyses presented below. In order to test for multicollinearity, we first estimated the variance inflation factor (VIF) for all independent variables. The VIF result shows that the tolerance is in the range of 0.1 to 10, indicating there are no multicollinearity issues (DeMaris, 2004).

Regression results for Japanese-American youth are shown in Table 3a. We begin our presentation with first-generation youth, followed by the second-generation, before finishing with third- and higher generations. The first column of Table 3a presents Model 1 for first-generation youth. This shows, as hypothesized, that years in U.S. is significantly ($p < .001$) and positively associated with the English proficiency of first-generation Japanese-American youth. Model 2 reveals that years in U.S. is still positively and significantly ($p < .001$) associated with English proficiency, even after controlling for gender and age. Male gender was significantly ($p < .05$) and negatively associated with English proficiency. Age is also significantly ($p < .01$) and positively associated with English proficiency when controlling for U.S. tenure and gender.

[Table 3a about here]

Model 3 shows that years in the U.S. retained its prior significance level, while age and gender increased in significance. In this the full model, the English proficiency of both parents was significantly ($p < .001$) and positively associated with youth English proficiency. However, like Stevens (1999) and Portes and Schauffler (1994), we also found the educational attainment of both parents to be statistically insignificant. The adjusted R-square in the final model was 0.46, indicating that about 46 % of variance was explained by those factors included in this analysis.

In the next three columns of Table 3a we present the results for second-generation youth. However, since years of U.S. residence is only relevant for the first-generation, these models only contain the measures of individual and parental characteristics. Column 4 of Table 3a shows that age was significantly ($p < .001$) and positively associated with English proficiency among second-generation members for whom both parents were born in Japan; a result earlier witnessed among the first-generation. In this model, gender was insignificant, a finding that is different from the first-generation results. When parental characteristics were added in Model 2, age retained its prior significance ($p < .001$) and consistent with first-generation results, English proficiency for both parents was again significant ($p < .001$) and positively associated with youth English proficiency. One somewhat unexpected result is that mothers' education is a significant and negative ($p < .05$) predictor of youth English proficiency, while fathers' education, however, is insignificant. The adjusted R-square for this final model is 0.25.

Column 6 shows that not a single individual-level characteristic was significant in Model 1 for second-generation members with a U.S.-born father and a Japan-born mother. When parental characteristics were added in Model 2, two measures reached significance. Mother's

English proficiency was significant ($p < .001$) and positively associated with youth English proficiency. However, mothers' educational attainment was again significant ($p < .01$) and negatively associated with youth English proficiency. The adjusted R-square for this final model was 0.21.

Lastly, in columns 8 and 9 we present results for second-generation individuals with a father born in Japan and a U.S.-born mother. Among this cohort, no individual characteristics were significant, a result earlier witnessed among the second-generation sub-group comprised of youth with a U.S.-born father and a Japan-born mother. In Model 2 father's English proficiency was significant ($p < .001$) and positively associated with youth English proficiency. Parental educational attainment was not significant. The adjusted R-square for the final model was 0.14.

In order to ground the significance of our findings we now contrast Japanese-American results with those of Korean-Americans, speakers of another language that is equally distant from English (Romaine, 1995). Results for Korean-Americans are shown in Table 3b and parallel those contained in Table 3a. Columns 1 to 3 document many similarities with the first-generation Japanese. More precisely, duration of stay in the U.S., age, and father and mother's English proficiency were significant predictors of English proficiency among first generation the Korean-American youth. However, gender was not a significant predictor it was for Japanese-Americans. Although parental educational attainment was insignificant among first-generation Japanese-American youth, for Korean-Americans mothers' educational attainment was significant ($p < .01$) and positively associated with youth English proficiency. The adjusted R-square in the final model for this Korean-American subgroup was only 0.29, whereas among similar Japanese-Americans it was nearly twice as high (0.46).

[Table 3b about here]

Columns 4 and 5 reveal that results for the Korean-American second-generation with two foreign-born parents were almost identical to those of the corresponding Japanese-American sub-group. The lone exception is that mother's education was not a significant predictor for the Korean-Americans. Nonetheless, the adjusted R-square in the final model for this subgroup was still much higher for Japanese- (0.25) than Korean-Americans (0.07).

Among second-generation youth with a U.S.-born father and a Korean-born mother, we found several ethnic differences (see column 7). For Korean-Americans, male gender is significant ($p < .01$) and positively associated with English proficiency, while it was insignificant among Japanese-Americans. For the parallel Japanese-American cohort, mother's educational attainment was significant ($p < .001$) and negatively associated with English proficiency. Among Korean-Americans, however, this measure is insignificant. However, for both ethnicities mother's English proficiency was a significant and positive predictor ($p < .001$). Again, the adjusted R-square in the final model was much higher for Japanese- (0.20) than Korean-Americans (0.06).

Finally, among second-generation youth with a foreign-born father and a U.S.-born mother (see column 9) all predictors operated in the same way, regardless of ethnicity. More specifically, only fathers' English proficiency was significant for each ethnicity. For this subgroup, however, the adjusted R-square for the final model was higher among Korean-Americans (0.34) than Japanese-Americans (0.14).

These findings have implications for acculturation research, cultural adjustment, and immigrant counseling. To begin, they reveal that scholars should not simply combine distinct immigrant groups based on geographic proximity of place of origin. While our multivariate models produced some parallel results, they generally fit Japanese-Americans much better than

Korean-Americans. These findings reiterate the importance of considering specific cultural backgrounds when examining language acquisition, a point expounded by Whorf in 1940. This point is further reinforced given that both the Korean and Japanese languages have linguistic distance scores of 1.0, but very distinct multivariate outcomes.

In a related vein, this study also documents that just as scholars such monitor cultural differences, so too should immigrant counselors. This is because different immigrant groups may very well present unique challenges when attempting to learn English. Japanese immigrant youth generally have more difficulties in acquiring English than youth from other countries. Thus, counselors should attempt to understand their specific difficulties as they attempt to adapt culturally and linguistically. In some cases, this may mean that specific groups need extra classroom support or ESL tutoring.

Conclusions

This study investigated both English acquisition and native language maintenance across three generations of Japanese- and Korean-American youth. For both groups we found significant variations in language usage among second-generation youth depending on parents' nativity and gender status. These results highlight the importance of distinguishing between the various subsets of second-generation immigrant youth, since these important within-group variations would be concealed if they all were treated as a single group. More specifically, those whose mother was born in Asia are more likely to speak Japanese or Korean at home than are those with only an Asian born father. Perhaps this is because mothers typically spend more time with children. Although we found similar patterns in Japanese and Korean usage at home, we found that for all three generations larger proportions of Korean-American youth spoke Korean than did similar cohorts of Japanese-Americans. Perhaps this is because the Korean-American

population is relatively less assimilated and thereby interacts more often with other Korean speakers. However, support for this possibility requires additional research and is beyond the scope of the present study. Consistent with prior research, we also found significant gender differences in language usage at home as larger proportions of female youth tended to speak these Asian languages than did their male counterparts. Regression results were also consistent with prior research as they revealed that the longer foreign-born youth are in the United States the higher their expected level of English proficiency. In addition, this study documented a significant association between parents' English proficiency and youth English proficiency. With only one exception (i.e., the second-generation subset with a foreign-born father and a U.S.-born mother), our regression models were best able to predict the English proficiency of Japanese-American youth. The reason for this will also require additional study. Future research on English acquisition and native language maintenance may benefit from contrasting our results with those of other Asian or European immigrant groups with closer linguistic distances to English. One final result that merits additional study is the significant and negative relationship between mothers' education and the English proficiency of second generation Japanese-American youth that occurs with a mother born in Japan. We suspect this is because either these families expect to return to Japan, where Japanese linguistic ability would be expected, or because these relatively well educated women spend more time with the children and consciously socialize them to be bilingual.¹ However, all of these possibilities require additional study.

This study has various limitations that are impossible to address with census data. For instance, we could not determine the extent to which immigrant youth have the opportunity to

¹ Maternal employment status was analyzed as an attempt to control for mothers' time spent with youth, however, this measure was never attained statistical significance.

speak Japanese or Korean outside the house. For example, Shibata (2000) found that Japanese Saturday Schools have a powerful influence on Japanese language maintenance among immigrant youth. In addition, this study was unable to monitor numerous environment effects that might affect language acquisition. For example, does the number of English only speaking friends relate to English proficiency levels? Regardless of the aforementioned limitations, this study contributes to the research literature on English acquisition and native language maintenance and usage at home among Japanese- and Korean-American groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research at Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959-01). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America. The authors also thank Susan Brown, Kimberly Goyette, Alfred DeMaris, and the anonymous IM reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions that helped improve the quality of this article.

REFERENCES

- Alba, R., J. Logan, A. Lutz, and B. Stults. 2002. Only English by the third generation? Loss and Preservation of the mother tongue among the grandyouth of contemporary immigrants. *Demography*, 39:3: 467 - 484.
- Bean, F.D., and G. Stevens. (eds). 2003. America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity. A Volume in the American Sociological Association's Rose Series in Sociology. Russell Sage Foundation, NY.
- Chiswick, B.R., and P.W. Miller. 1999. "Immigration, Language and Multiculturalism in Australia." *The Australian Economic Review* 32 (4), 369–385.
- Chiswick, B.R., Y.L. Lee, and P.W. Miller. 2006. "Immigrants' Language Skills and Visa Category." *International Migration Review* 40 (2), 419–450.
- Chiswick, B.R., Y.L. Lee, and P.W. Miller.. 2005. "Family Matters: The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Destination Language Acquisition." *Journal of Population Economics* 18 (4), 631-647.
- Chiswick, B.R., and P.W. Miller. 2004. "Linguistic Distance: A Quantitative Measure of the Distance Between English and Other Languages." *Discussion Paper Series*. Institute for the Study of Labor.
- DeMaris, A. 2004. Regression with social data: modeling continuous and limited response variables. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Department of Homeland Security. 2006. Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2005. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.
- Farley, R, and R. Alba. 2002. "The New Second Generation in the United States." *International Migration Review* 36: 669-701.
- Gecas, V. 1981. "Contexts of Socialization." In M. Rosenberg and R. Turner (ed.), Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Basic Books.
- Gordon, M. 1964. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hart-Gonzalez, L., and S. Lindemann. 1993. "Expected Achievement in Speaking Proficiency, 1993." School of Language Studies, Foreign Services Institute, Department of State, mimeo.
- Heinz, W. 2002. "Socialization Theory is Dead – Long Live the Life Course? The Transformation of a Concept." Pp. 41- 64. in *Advances in Life Course Research* 7.
- Henkel, R.E. 1976. Test of Significance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Ishizawa, H. 2004. Minority language use among grandyouth in multigenerational households. *Sociological Perspectives*, 47, 4, 465 - 483.
- Kuo, W.H. 1995. "Coping with Racial Discrimination: The Case of Asian Americans." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18: 1: 109-127.
- Liebertson, S., and T.J. Curry. 1971. "Language shift in the United States: Some demographic clues." *International Migration Review*, 5, 2, 125-137.
- Massey, D.S., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, and J.E. Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19: 431 - 466.
- May, S. 2000. Uncommon languages: The challenges and possibilities of minority language rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21, 366-385.
- Padilla, A.M., Y. Wagatsuma, and K. Lindholm. 1985. "Acculturation and Personality as Predictors of Stress in Japanese and Japanese-Americans." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 125: 3: 295-305.
- Portes, A., and R.G. Rumbaut. 2006. Immigrant America: A Portrait, 3rd edition, Revised, Expanded, and Updated.
- Portes, A., and R. Schaufliker. 1994. "Language and the Second Generation: Bilingualism Yesterday and Today." *International Migration Review* 28: 4: 640-661.
- Romaine, S. 1995. Bilingualism, 2nd edition. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Ruggles, S., M. Sobek, T. Alexander, C. Fitch, R. Goeken, P.K. Hall, M. King, and C. Ronnander. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2004. <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>
- Settersten, R. 2002. "Socialization and the Life Course: New Frontiers in Theory and Research" Pp. 13-40 in *Advances in Life Course Research* 7.
- Shibata, S. 2000. "Opening a Japanese Saturday School in a Small Town in the United States: Community Collaboration to Teach Japanese as a Heritage Language." *Bilingual Research Journal* 24: 4.
- Stevens, G. 1985. "Nativity, Intermarriage, and Mother-Tongue Shift." *American Sociological Review* 50: 1: 74-83.
- Stevens, G. 1992. "The Social and Demographic Context of Language Use in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 57: 2: 171-185.

Stevens, G. 1999. "Age at Immigration and Second Language Proficiency among Foreign-born Adults." *Language in Society* 28: 555-578.

Whorf, B. 1940. "Science and Linguistics." *Technology Review* 42: 229-231, 247-248.

Table 1a: Weighted Descriptive Statistics, By Generation, for Dependent and Independent Variables; Japanese-Americans

Variable Names	First-generation			Second-generation						Third- or higher generations					
	Japan -born Parents			Japan-born Parents			U. S. -born Father Japan-born Mother			Japan-born Father U. S. -born Mother			Japanese ancestry		
	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range
<i>Dependent variables</i>															
English proficiency ***	2.95 ^a	0.99	(1 - 5)	3.84 ^b	0.86	(1 - 5)	4.81 ^c	0.52	(1 - 5)	4.92 ^c	0.38	(1 - 5)	4.95 ^c	0.29	(1 - 5)
Japanese spoken at home ***	96.69 ^a	0.18	(0 - 100)	79.82 ^b	0.40	(0 - 100)	11.82 ^c	0.32	(0 - 100)	2.61 ^d	0.16	(0 - 100)	2.80 ^e	0.17	(0 - 100)
<i>Independent variables</i>															
Years in U. S.	3.87	3.3	(0 - 18)	n.a			n.a			n.a			n.a		
Gender (1 = male) % ***	49.93	0.50	(0 - 100)	54.75	0.50	(0 - 100)	51.90	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.05	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.37	0.50	(0 - 100)
Age *	10.41 ^a	3.76	(5 - 18)	10.89 ^b	4.02	(5 - 18)	11.04 ^b	3.89	(5 - 18)	10.92 ^b	3.87	(5 - 18)	11.24 ^b	3.89	(5 - 18)
Father's English proficiency***	3.02 ^a	0.79	(1 - 5)	3.45 ^b	0.84	(1 - 5)	n.a			4.84 ^c	0.49	(1 - 5)	n.a		
Mother's English proficiency***	2.48 ^a	0.78	(1 - 5)	3.12 ^b	0.91	(1 - 5)	4.60 ^c	0.72	(1 - 5)	n.a			n.a		
Father's education ***	16.08 ^a	2.42	(0 - 21)	15.14 ^b	2.62	(0 - 21)	14.83 ^b	2.38	(0 - 21)	14.71 ^b	2.32	(0 - 21)	15.07 ^b	2.25	(0 - 21)
Mother's education	14.52	1.78	(0 - 21)	14.28	2.03	(0 - 21)	14.41	2.00	(0 - 21)	14.23	2.11	(0 - 21)	14.77	1.98	(0 - 21)
N (unweighted)	N = 733			N = 561			N = 2447			N = 1773			N = 3206		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. The same letter indicates there is no significant difference. For Gender, proportional difference within generation

Table 1b: *Weighted Descriptive Statistics, By Generation, of Dependent and Independent Variables; Korean Americans*

Variable Names	First-generation			Second-generation						Third- or higher generations					
	Korea -born Parents			Korea-born Parents			U. S. -born Father Korea-born Mother			Korea-born Father U. S. -born Mother			Korean ancestry		
	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range
<i>Dependent variables</i>															
English proficiency ***	3.33 ^a	0.85	(1 - 5)	3.85 ^b	0.71	(1 - 5)	4.72 ^c	0.65	(1 - 5)	4.87 ^d	0.35	(1 - 5)	4.93 ^d	0.39	(1 - 5)
Korean spoken at home ***	96.97 ^a	0.17	(0 - 100)	87.71 ^b	0.33	(0 - 100)	17.96 ^c	0.38	(0 - 100)	9.64 ^d	0.3	(0 - 100)	3.93 ^e	0.19	(0 - 100)
<i>Independent variables</i>															
Gender (1 = male) % ***	53.94	0.50	(0 - 100)	52.53	0.50	(0 - 100)	49.17	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.05	0.50	(0 - 100)	55.40	0.50	(0 - 100)
Years in U. S.	5.46	4.34	(0 - 18)	n.a			n.a			n.a			n.a		
Age *	12.37 ^a	3.95	(5 - 18)	10.90 ^b	3.88	(5 - 18)	11.45 ^b	3.96	(5 - 18)	9.98 ^b	3.99	(5 - 18)	10.47 ^b	4.00	(5 - 18)
Father's English proficiency***	2.66 ^a	0.84	(1 - 5)	3.10 ^b	0.7	(1 - 5)	n.a			4.64 ^c	0.66	(1 - 5)	n.a		
Mother's English proficiency***	2.38 ^a	0.80	(1 - 5)	2.87 ^b	0.82	(1 - 5)	3.97 ^c	0.88	(1 - 5)	n.a			n.a		
Father's education	15.20	3.12	(0 - 21)	15.14	2.84	(0 - 21)	14.47	2.16	(0 - 21)	15.00	2.54	(0 - 21)	14.59	2.47	(0 - 21)
Mother's education ***	13.96 ^a	2.72	(0 - 21)	14.19 ^a	2.46	(0 - 21)	12.60 ^b	2.93	(0 - 21)	14.31 ^a	2.52	(0 - 21)	14.01 ^a	2.34	(0 - 21)
N (unweighted)	N = 1864			N = 3528			N = 1389			N = 203			N = 307		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. The same letter indicates there is no significant difference. For Gender, proportional difference within generation

Table 2a: *Gender Differences, By Generation in Language Spoken at Home: Japanese-Americans*

	First-generation		Second-generation						Third- or higher generations	
	Japan -born Parents (N = 733)		Japan-born Parents (N = 561)		U. S. -born Father Japan-born Mother (N = 2447)		Japan-born Father U. S. -born Mother (N = 1773)		Japanese ancestry (N = 3206)	
<i>Language</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>
English only	3.45	2.92	25.46	17.31 ***	89.11	87.05 ***	97.22	97.39	97.21	96.59 ***
Japanese	96.55	97.08	74.54	82.69 ***	10.89	12.95 ***	2.78	2.61	2.79	3.41 ***
<i>Total %</i>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 2b: *Gender Differences, By Generation in Language Spoken at Home; Korean-Americans*

<i>Language</i>	First-generation		Second-generation						Third- or higher generations					
	Korea -born Parents (N = 1864)		Korea-born Parents (N = 3528)		U. S. -born Father Korea-born Mother (N = 1389)		Korea-born Father U. S. -born Mother (N = 203)		Korean ancestry (N = 307)					
	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>male</i>	<i>female</i>				
English only	3.35	3.33	14.04	10.52	***	85.90	79.26	***	89.93	91.90	**	96.49	97.46	*
Korean	96.65	96.67	85.96	89.48	***	14.10	20.74	***	10.67	8.10	**	3.51	2.54	*
<i>Total %</i>	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00	

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 3a: OLS Regression Models of Predictors on English Proficiency; *Japanese-Americans*

Variable Names	First-generation									Second-generation																	
	Japan -born Parents (N = 733)									Japan-born Parents (N = 561)						U. S. -born Father (N = 2447) Japan-born Mother			Japan-born Father (N = 1773) U. S. -born Mother								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 1			Model 2			Model 1			Model 2								
	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE			
<i>Individual characteristics</i>																											
Years in U. S.	0.15	0.51 ***	0.01	0.14	0.47 ***	0.01	0.12	0.39 ***	0.01																		
Gender (1 = male)				-0.16	-0.08 *	0.06	-0.16	-0.08 **	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.11	-0.005	-0.003	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	-0.03	0.02
Age				0.03	0.11 **	0.01	0.03	0.11 ***	0.01	0.05	0.24 ***	0.01	0.05	0.23 ***	0.008	0.003	0.02	0.003	0.003	0.02	0.002	0.002	0.02	0.002	0.004	0.04	0.002
<i>Parental characteristics</i>																											
Father's English proficiency							0.32	0.25 ***	0.04				0.26	0.25 ***	0.05			n.a.				0.33	0.38 ***	0.02			
Mother's English proficiency							0.34	0.26 ***	0.04				0.24	0.25 ***	0.45			0.33	0.45 ***	0.01						n.a.	
Father's education							-0.01	-0.02	0.01				-0.02	-0.04	0.01			-0.005	-0.03	0.004				0.004	0.03	0.004	
Mother's education							0.004	0.008	0.02				-0.04	-0.08 *	0.01			-0.02	-0.06 **	0.005				-0.002	-0.01	0.004	
Intercept	2.37	0 ***	0.05	2.21	0 ***	0.10	0.54	0 *	0.28	3.26	0 ***	0.11	2.38	0 ***	0.30	4.76	0 ***	0.03	3.56	0 ***	0.10	4.90	0 ***	0.029	3.26	0 ***	0.12
Adjusted R-square	0.2565			0.2714			0.4616			0.0531			0.2518			0.0006			0.2047			-0.0005			0.1438		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

Table 3b: OLS Regression Models of Predictors on English Proficiency; *Korean-Americans*

Variable Names	First-generation									Second-generation																	
	Korea -born Parents (N = 1804)									Korea-born Parents (N = 3528)						U. S. -born Father Korea-born Mother (N= 1389)			Korea-born Father U. S. -born Mother (N = 203)								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 1			Model 2			Model 1			Model 2								
	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE	b	B	SE			
<i>Individual characteristics</i>																											
Years in U. S.	0.10	0.48 ***	0.004	0.10	0.48 ***	0.004	0.09	0.43 ***	0.004																		
Gender (1 = male)				-0.03	-0.02	0.35	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.07 **	0.03	-0.03	-0.04	0.05	0.001	0.01	0.04
Age				0.001	0.01	0.005	0.01	0.07 **	0.004	0.04	0.19 ***	0.003	0.03	0.18 ***	0.003	0.001	0.009	0.004	0.005	0.03	0.004	-0.002	-0.02	0.01	0.001	0.01	0.004
<i>Parental characteristics</i>																											
Father's English proficiency							0.12	0.12 ***	0.02				0.09	0.10 ***	0.02			n.a.							0.32	0.60 ***	0.031
Mother's English proficiency							0.17	0.15 ***	0.02				0.09	0.10 ***	0.02			0.18	0.25 ***	0.02						n.a.	
Father's education							-0.01	-0.03	0.01				0.01	0.03	0.01			-0.01	-0.03	0.01				0.01	0.04	0.01	
Mother's education							0.02	0.08 **	0.01				-0.01	-0.03	0.005			-0.01	-0.02	0.01				-0.01	-0.03	0.01	
Intercept	2.82	0 ***	0.028	2.82	0 ***	0.06	1.81	0 ***	0.13	3.46	0 ***	0.04	2.91	0 ***	0.09	4.67	0 ***	0.06	4.10	0 ***	0.15	4.91	0 **	0.07	3.39	0 ***	0.23
Adjusted R-square	0.2295			0.2290			0.2906			0.0351			0.0666			0.0025			0.057			-0.008			0.3400		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)
 Note: statistical difference *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Appendix A: *Weighted Descriptive Statistics, By Nationality of Origin (Japanese vs Korean)*

<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Japanese-Americans</i>		<i>Korean-Americans</i>		<i>Range</i>
	<i>Mean or %</i>	<i>St. Deviation</i>	<i>Mean or %</i>	<i>St. Deviation</i>	
<i>Dependent variables</i>					
English proficiency ***	4.66 ^a	0.78	3.96 ^b	0.89	(1 - 5)
Japanese/ Korean spoken at home ***	18.23 ^a	0.39	71.15 ^b	0.45	(0 - 100)
<i>Independent variables</i>					
Gender (1 = male) % ***	51.01 ^a	0.50	51.66 ^b	0.50	(0 - 100)
Age ***	11.03 ^a	3.89	11.34 ^b	3.98	(5 - 18)
Father's English proficiency***	4.65 ^a	0.77	3.43 ^b	1.12	(1 - 5)
Mother's English proficiency***	4.51 ^a	0.94	3.09 ^b	1.08	(1 - 5)
Father's education	15.02	2.37	15.00	2.79	(0 - 21)
Mother's education ***	14.50 ^a	2.01	13.84 ^b	2.69	(0 - 21)
N (unweighted)	N = 8720		N = 7292		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. The same letter indicates there is no significant difference.

Appendix B: *Weighted Descriptive Statistics, By Generation (Japanese and Korean combined)*

Variable Names	First-generation			Second-generation						Third- or higher generations					
	Foreign –born Parents			Foreign-born Parents			U. S. -born Father Foreign-born Mother			Foreign-born Father U. S. -born Mother			Japanese/Korean ancestry		
	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range	Mean or %	St. Deviation	Range
<i>Dependent variables</i>															
English proficiency ***	3.22 ^a	0.91	(1 - 5)	3.85 ^b	0.73	(1 - 5)	4.78 ^c	0.57	(1 - 5)	4.92 ^d	0.37	(1 - 5)	4.94 ^d	0.30	(1 - 5)
Japanese/Korean spoken at home ***	96.90 ^a	0.17	(0 - 100)	86.64 ^b	0.34	(0 - 100)	14.13 ^c	0.35	(0 - 100)	3.48 ^d	0.18	(0 - 100)	2.91 ^e	0.17	(0 - 100)
<i>Independent variables</i>															
Years in U. S.	5.01	4.13	(0 - 18)	n.a			n.a			n.a			n.a		
Gender (1 = male) %	52.50	0.50	(0 - 100)	51.87	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.91	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.35	0.50	(0 - 100)	50.73	0.50	(0 - 100)
Age ***	11.82 ^a	4.00	(5 - 18)	10.89 ^b	3.90	(5 - 18)	11.19 ^b	3.92	(5 - 18)	10.82 ^b	3.89	(5 - 18)	11.17 ^b	3.90	(5 - 18)
Father's English proficiency***	2.76 ^a	0.84	(1 - 5)	3.15 ^b	0.81	(1 - 5)	n.a			4.82 ^c	0.51	(1 - 5)	n.a		
Mother's English proficiency***	2.41 ^a	0.79	(1 - 5)	2.90 ^b	0.83	(1 - 5)	4.37 ^c	0.84	(1 - 5)	n.a			n.a		
Father's education ***	15.45 ^a	2.97	(0 - 21)	15.14 ^b	2.81	(0 - 21)	14.70 ^b	2.31	(0 - 21)	14.74 ^b	2.35	(0 - 21)	15.02 ^b	2.27	(0 - 21)
Mother's education ***	14.12 ^a	2.50	(0 - 21)	14.20 ^a	2.40	(0 - 21)	13.75 ^b	2.53	(0 - 21)	14.24 ^a	2.15	(0 - 21)	14.73 ^c	2.02	(0 - 21)
N (unweighted)	N = 2598			N = 4089			N = 3836			N = 1976			N = 3513		

Source: 2000 The Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)

Note: statistical difference * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. The same letter indicates there is no significant difference.