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1 We use the term West Indian, consistent with the usage adopted by Foner (2001), to refer to people from...
ular interest to social scientists because of two competing factors. On the one hand, they are an immigrant group whose first language is English, thus giving them some advantage over other immigrants who must learn a new language before having ready access to educational and occupational opportunities in the United States. On the other hand, because the majority of these immigrants are black, they enter a country in which their skin color becomes the basis for discriminatory treatment.

To the extent that the first of these factors—facility with English—is dominant, one would predict that West Indian immigrants would do well in educational and occupational domains, making progress more rapidly than immigrants from non-Anglophone countries. On the other hand, to the extent that West Indian immigrants are subject to color-based discrimination, they should be impeded relative to white immigrants. Indeed, one might expect that being subjected to some of the same discriminatory conditions that confront native-born African Americans, West Indians would become similar to these groups in a variety of psychological ways. Of particular interest here is the degree to which West Indian immigrants are susceptible to the effects of stereotype threat, in which an awareness of negative group stereotypes about the capability of African Americans results in performance decrements for members of this group (Steele 1997; Steele and Aronson 1995; Steele, Spencer, and Aronson 2002).

BACKGROUND AND THEORY

Occupational and Educational Outcomes of West Indian Immigrants

Despite the potential for negative treatment, West Indian immigrants have often fared quite well by traditional educational and occupational markers. Typically these assessments are made in comparison to native-born African Americans. Model (1991, 1995), using census data from 1970, 1980, and 1990, found that West Indian men and women have higher labor force participation rates than native-born African Americans. She also reported that first-generation West Indian immigrants show higher educational aspirations and greater educational attainment than native-born African Americans. Similarly, Kalmijn (1996) found that black immigrants were more educated, had higher prestige occupations, and earned more than black Americans. Although there continues to be some debate as to whether West Indians have an earnings advantage over native-born African Americans, the employment and occupational advantage of first-generation West Indians appears to be reliable (Waters 1999b).

Whereas first-generation West Indian immigrants systematically outperform native-born African Americans, their advantage is not as clear in the second generation. Waters et al. (1998) found that second-generation West Indian respondents typically report many spells of short employment. Additionally, the educational achievement of second-generation West Indians often declines from elementary school to high school. It should be noted that this decline from first to second generation is in contrast to the linear process of assimilation that characterized earlier generations of white immigrant groups (Portes 1995). Indeed, contemporary analyses of immigrant pathways from first to second generation (often referred to as models of segmented assimilation) point to downward assimilation as one possible outcome, most likely to be experienced by groups who are most subject to societal discrimination (Portes 1995; Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

Sociological theories that attempt to explain West Indian success focus on factors such as: the selectivity effects of immigration (Portes and Rumbaut 1992), the development of social and community networks (Portes 1995; Tilly 1990), a preference by whites for foreign-born blacks (Kasinitz and Rosenberg 1996; Waters 1999b), and cultural differences.
between West Indians and black Americans (Reid 1939). Although supportive data are available for some of these explanations, more often these factors have been suggested as possible causes but not tested empirically. More importantly for the present purposes, although some of these theories work reasonably well in explaining first-generation patterns, they typically do not speak to possible differences between the generations. Would we expect, for example, that immigrants who arrive as early teenagers with their parents would be any more or less highly selected than children born in the United States to parents who also chose to come to the United States? Or would one predict that first- and second-generation black immigrants would have different experiences with race discrimination in the United States? What is needed, we argue, is the introduction of a psychological perspective that can more closely look at the individual-level processes that may be critical to the immigrant experience.

The Potential Role of Stereotype Threat

Work on stereotype threat by Steele and his colleagues (Aronson et al. 1999; Steele 1997; Steele, Spencer, and Aronson 2002) compellingly shows that when negative stereotypes about a group’s abilities and potential are “in the air,” they can undermine the performance of members of that group. When a stereotype is believed to be relevant to a domain of performance, it poses the threat that the person will be judged or treated in terms of the stereotype. The impact of that threat is reduced performance on domain-relevant tasks, an effect that has been consistently demonstrated in scores of studies across groups varying in gender, ethnicity, and social class.

Particularly relevant to the present work are studies that consider the performance of African American students (e.g., Steele and Aronson 1995). Here the data show that when the negative stereotype of black intellectual ability is made salient (for example, by characterizing the test as diagnostic vs. non-diagnostic), African American students perform more poorly on achievement tasks than do whites. In contrast, when ethnicity is not salient, the two groups perform at equivalent levels (after adjusting for SAT scores). These experimental data are important in arguing against explanations that rely primarily on assumed differences in cultural dispositions. African Americans and whites can differ in their academic performance, but whether they do or do not in this particular task setting depends on characteristics of the situation to which they were randomly assigned, not to inherent differences in their capabilities or to the cultural context and social structure that frame their lives.

In addition to the experimental demonstrations of stereotype threat provided by Steele and his colleagues, Massey and his colleagues (Massey et al. 2003; Massey and Fischer 2005) have shown evidence of the phenomenon in a large-scale survey study of several thousand first-year college students at 28 selective academic institutions in the United States. They found that the psychological state of stereotype threat, conceptualized in their terms as the combined effects of disidentification and performance burden, led to lower grade point averages for both black and Latino students. In their calculations, the difference between maximum and minimum levels of the stereotype threat factors that they assessed meant a difference of approximately one-third of a point in grade point average of black students in their first year of college (Massey and Fischer 2005).

In the present study, we draw from these data on the impact of stereotype threat on African Americans to explore the implications for first- and second-generation black immigrants from English-speaking countries of the Caribbean. Specifically, we ask whether the differences between first- and second-generation West Indians suggested by some of the educational and occupational outcome data might be in part explained by a greater susceptibility to stereotype threat on the part of the second generation. With more time in the United States, second-generation black immigrants would have had more exposure to the negative stereotypes about black intellectual capability and those stereotypes might be
more likely to be salient when they themselves were engaged in intellectual tasks.

This prediction assumes, of course, that there are distinctive stereotypes about the two groups and that evaluations of West Indians are more favorable than those of African Americans. There is some support for this assumption. In interviews with employers, Waters (1999a) asked about perceived differences between foreign-born and American-born blacks. White employers frequently reported differences, most typically seeing West Indians as more ambitious and hard working and African Americans as more troublesome. In a study with diverse college students, Tormala (2005) asked participants to list positive and negative stereotypes about “Blacks in the United States” and “Black immigrants to the United States,” as they thought these would be endorsed by “most people in the United States.” Her respondents generated significantly more negative than positive stereotypes about black Americans; in contrast, there was no difference in the frequency of positive and negative stereotypes assigned to black immigrants. Qualitatively, her analysis showed that stereotypes of black immigrants are far less consistent than stereotypes of native-born African Americans. (However, the category itself is probably more diverse in this case, potentially including immigrants from Africa as well as the Caribbean.)

The existence of differential stereotypes in the culture at large does not, of course, establish that West Indians themselves are aware of these stereotypes. However, data both from the West Indian workers that Waters (1999a) interviewed and from the black immigrant participants in the Tormala (2005) study suggest that stereotypes about black Americans are both known and endorsed by West Indians themselves. Although these studies give us some basis for our assumption that there is an awareness of negative stereotypes about black Americans, it will nonetheless be important that we establish the existence of those perceptions in the particular population that we are tapping. Further, it is important to know not only what our participants believe to be the stereotype about African Americans, but also what they believe is the prevalent stereotype about their own group of West Indian origin. As shown by recent sociological work (Sigelman and Tuch 1997; Torres and Charles 2004), these metastereotypes—beliefs about the stereotypes of others toward one’s own group—can influence behavior and indeed are a basis for the operation of stereotype threat.

To the extent that West Indian immigrants believe that there is a meaningful distinction between their group and the more general black American group, and in particular a difference that would favor their ingroup over the outgroup, we might also anticipate that they could show enhanced performance under conditions of stereotype threat. This stereotype lift effect, as documented by Walton and Cohen (2003), refers to a boost in performance shown by members of groups (e.g., whites, males) who are not negatively stereotyped themselves but are aware of the negative stereotypes associated with comparison groups. Although stereotype lift effects are typically not as pronounced as stereotype threat effects (Walton and Cohen 2003), they are more apt to emerge when people believe in the validity of the negative stereotypes. In the present case, a stereotype lift effect would be more likely if West Indians assumed that their ethnic group was more favorably regarded than African Americans and wanted to distinguish themselves from that group.

**Ethnic Identification in West Indians**

Earlier investigators typically assumed that one’s ethnic identification was coterminous with the categorical definition, that is, if you were born of Italian parents, then your ethnic identification was as an Italian. More recently, however, most social psychologists have recognized that ethnic identification is a subjective state as well as, and perhaps more importantly than, an objective characterization (Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe 2004; Deaux 1996, 2006; Waters 1990). Like other forms of social identification, it is essential to consider what people call themselves, a labeling process that can vary both in the category that is claimed and the importance of
that category (Deaux 1996, 2006). In the case of ethnic identification specifically, Waters (1990) found, through an analysis of census data as well as interviews with ethnic whites in the United States, that ethnic identification is a personal choice, both in terms of which ethnic identity to claim and whether to self-describe in terms of ethnicity at all. Further, Waters discussed the ways in which ethnic identity can change over the life course, both in its importance and the meanings it holds.

In the case of West Indian immigrants, Waters (1994, 1999a, 1999b) has also reported on the variability in ethnic labeling. In interviews with adolescent West Indian immigrants in New York City, Waters found three different patterns of identification. Of her sample, 31% identified as West Indian (either generally, or with specific reference to their country of origin). Somewhat more of these adolescents (41%) identified primarily as African American, having shifted from the country of origin to the immediate context as a source of identification. A third group, representing 27% of her sample and consisting primarily of people who had more recently immigrated to the United States, thought of themselves in terms of a more generic immigrant category, rather than a nationality-linked identity. Thus, although the demographic backgrounds of these youth were quite similar, their subjective definitions of ethnicity showed considerable variation. It is important to note, however, that the current conditions of these three groups of immigrant youth were not always equivalent. Residential neighborhood and quality of school both variegated, with those who considered themselves African American more likely to be in poorer neighborhoods and lower-quality schools.

The potential for variations in ethnic identification between first- and second-generation immigrants seemed to us considerable, even with age held constant, and presented important implications for the predicted generational effects in performance under stereotype threat. If a West Indian immigrant comes to identify primarily as African American, as did 41% of the adolescents in Waters’ (1994) sample, then would they be more susceptible to stereotype threat than would those immigrants who continue to identify with their country of origin, where negative stereotypes about Blacks are not part of the cultural representations? Within the stereotype threat literature, the role of group identification is not totally clear. Schmader (2002), focusing on women’s math performance, found that women with stronger gender identification showed greater decrements in performance under stereotype threat conditions than did women for whom gender identification was not as strong. With regard to ethnic identification among African Americans, however, the data are less consistent (Steele et al. 2002). Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that immigrants who identify as African Americans would be more likely to see stereotypes about African Americans as being relevant to themselves than would immigrants who continue to identify with their country of origin. However, in line with the Steele and Aronson (1995) findings, we would expect to find differences in performance only when the conditions made these stereotypes salient.

Another potential moderator of stereotype threat effects in West Indian immigrants is experience with race-based discrimination. Would more experience with discrimination lead, not only to stronger expectations of and anxiety about being discriminated against, but also greater susceptibility to threats related to stereotypes of African Americans? Or would the prevalence of race as a master status in the United States override any distinctions between generational cohorts?

To summarize, numerous sociological and demographic studies of West Indian immigration have concluded that first-generation West Indians are likely to succeed in educational and occupational domains at rates greater than their native-born African American cohorts.

---

2 One explanation for some of the inconsistent data with regard to ethnic identification among African Americans, as discussed by Steele et al. (2002), may involve differences between simple scalar measures of the importance of an identity on the one hand, and more qualitative meaning systems associated with an identity (the latter of which could include both domain relevance and coping strategies). See Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe for a more extensive discussion of the various dimensions of collective identification.
Many of the proffered explanations for these observations come up short, however, when faced with evidence of second-generation decline. Our goal in this research is to explore the viability of social psychological explanations for the generational shift that has been observed, and in so doing to highlight the ways in which context and psychological process interact.

Hypotheses

Reasoning from the available evidence and theory, we hypothesized that the differences between first- and second-generation West Indian immigrants are associated, at least in part, with differential susceptibility to stereotype threat effects. Specifically, we predicted that first-generation West Indian immigrants are protected from or insensitive to stereotype threat, and thus will not show a performance decrement when stereotypes are salient, that is, when a test is described as diagnostic of ability.

In contrast, we predicted that second-generation West Indian immigrants will show the same pattern of stereotype threat effects typically evidenced in African American respondents, that is, decrements in performance when a test is labeled diagnostic as opposed to non-diagnostic. Thus, we predicted a significant interaction between stereotype threat condition and generation. Potential moderators of this predicted effect, which might be expected to vary between first- and second-generation immigrants include: (a) ethnic identification, (b) metastereotypes of African Americans and West Indians, and (c) expectations of race-based discrimination.

The study was conducted in two parts. First, a questionnaire was administered to a large sample of West Indian immigrants, both first and second generation, all of whom were students within a large public university system in New York City. Second, a subsample of the initial group was contacted to participate in an experimental study in which the conditions of stereotype threat were manipulated and performance on an achievement test was assessed.

Although a primary purpose of the questionnaire study was to identify students to participate in the subsequent experimental session, data collected in the questionnaire were important in several ways. First, and perhaps most important, questions about perceived stereotypes of both African Americans and West Indians could be evaluated to determine whether first- and second-generation West Indians differ in their perceptions of the positivity or negativity of these stereotypes. If subsequent experimental results show a resistance to stereotype threat effects, it will be important to know if such resistance is based on a lack of awareness of the stereotypes, or if it reflects knowledge of the stereotypes but a belief that those stereotypes are irrelevant to the self. Second, comparisons of first- and second-generation students in terms of ethnic identification and sensitivity to discrimination allow us to further characterize the psychological similarities or differences between the two generations.

QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY

Method

Participants. New York City has been a major destination for immigrants from the Caribbean, particularly since the 1965 changes in U.S. immigration policy. They are now the largest immigrant group in the city, with approximately half a million first-generation West Indian immigrants living in the city by the late 1990s (Foner 2005). At the same time, unlike some other immigrant destinations such as London, Black immigrants to New York enter a community that has a large native Black population. In 2000, the black population of New York City was approximately 25% of the city’s total population of 8 million; 28% of this proportion was foreign-born (Foner 2005). Thus questions of race and ethnicity are examined and defined within a multicultural context.

In this study, a total of 270 West Indian students who were currently enrolled at one of the 4-year undergraduate colleges within the City University of New York system completed the initial questionnaire. Students identified through university records as being of
West Indian heritage were contacted by letters; additionally, the researchers made direct contact with students at three selected colleges within the system that have a high percentage of enrolled West Indian students. All students who agreed to complete the questionnaire were paid $10 for their participation.

**Questionnaire.** The questionnaire was designed to assess a number of concepts pertinent to the hypotheses of the study, as well as relevant background material on the participants. Key concepts in terms of the theoretical framework that we are using were stereotype knowledge and ethnic identification. Additional measures collected to explore possible differences between groups included sensitivity to race-based rejection and demographic material, including immigration history.

**Favorability of African American and West Indian Stereotypes.** Perceived favorability of cultural stereotypes was assessed with two scales, one with African Americans as the target group and the other with West Indians as the target group (with the order of presentation of these two scales counterbalanced). In each case, respondents were asked to rate (on a 6-point scale) the degree to which each of 12 adjectives (6 positive and 6 negative) were believed by people in general to be characteristic of the target group. Positive adjectives included traits such as hard-working, smart, and friendly; negative adjectives included poor, lazy, and criminal. Ratings on the negative items were reverse coded, and the 12 items were summed for an overall positivity score.

**Ethnic identification.** Ethnic identification was assessed in two ways. First, we used Phinney’s Multi-Ethnic Identity measure (1998), which includes an initial open-ended question of ethnic identification followed by a 12-item scale. A second measure of ethnic identification was developed to more directly assess relative identification with West Indian versus African American ethnicity. This measure consisted of a single 5-point scale that asked respondents to indicate whether they considered themselves “definitely West Indian,” “more West Indian than African American,” “equally West Indian and African American,” “more African American than West Indian,” and “definitely African American,” where 1 indicated the strongest West Indian identification and 5 the strongest African American identification.

Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) measure of collective self-esteem was also included as an additional measure of ethnic identification. We used three of the four subscales from this measure: identity (the importance of the group to one’s self concept), private regard (the favorability that one has toward his or her own group), and public regard (the perceived favorability of others toward one’s group). Each subscale consists of 4 items, to which participants respond on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A group-specific version of the CSE was used, such that each statement was made in reference to the ethnic group that the respondent had chosen in the open-ended question of the Multi-Ethnic Identity measure.

**Expectations of discrimination.** A shortened version of the Sensitivity to Race-Based Rejection measure (Mendoza-Denton et al.2002) was included in order to assess possible differences between first- and second-generation immigrants in their anxiety and expectation of discrimination. Participants were asked to imagine themselves in each of six situations (e.g., you are in a store and a clerk glances your way). In each case, participants are asked to estimate the degree to which they would expect that their race/ethnicity would be an issue (e.g. “The clerk might continue to look at me because of my race/ethnicity”) and how anxious they would be about that situation. Separate scores for expectation and anxiety were calculated, each summed over the six situations.

**Demographic information** A variety of demographic questions were included to assess immigration history of the respondent and his/her parents, including country of birth,
date of immigration to the United States, parents’ occupations and education, and their perceived class standing. Also included in this section of the questionnaire were inquiries about the degree of contact the respondent had with their Caribbean origin and their use of cultural media related to those countries.

**Results**

**Sample Characteristics.** Of the total 270 participants, 145 were first-generation immigrants (born outside of the United States) and 125 were second generation (born in the United States to parents who were born in the West Indies). In this sample, 61% were female and 39% were male. The average age of students in the sample was 22.3; first-generation students were slightly older on average ($M = 23.4, SD = 6.6$) than were second-generation students ($M = 21.0, SD = 3.2$), $t(266) = 3.76, p < .001$.

In terms of the ethnic identification of the group, the sample was clearly skewed towards identification as West Indian. On the 5-point scale where $1 = $ definitely West Indian (WI), $3 = $ equally West Indian and African American, and $5 = $ definitely African American (AA), the mean score of the sample was 2.2 ($SD = 1.1$). In percentage terms, 63% of the sample considered themselves definitely or primarily West Indian; 25% rated themselves equally West Indian and African American, and only 12% regarded themselves as definitively or primarily African American.

**Comparison of First- and Second-Generation Immigrants.** Means and standard deviations for the two groups are shown in Table 1. Differences between the two generational groups appeared on a number of measures, the two most interesting for our purposes being measures of ethnic identification and perceived stereotypes and evaluations of West Indians and of African Americans.

First, with regard to ethnic identification, first-generation students more strongly identified as West Indian than did second-generation students. This is evident in the significant difference in mean scores on the 5-point identification scale, $t(260) = 6.35, p < .001$, as well as in a significant correlation between generation and ethnic identification, $r(262) = .37, p < .001$. It is important to note, however, that these differences are relative rather than absolute. Mean scores on ethnic identification are to the West Indian side of the midpoint for both first-generation ($M = 1.8, SD = 1.0$) and second-generation ($M = 2.6, SD = 1.2$) stu-

| Table 1. Comparison of First and Second Generation Afro-Caribbean Immigrants |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| **Generation**                           | **First (n = 145)** | **Second (n = 125)** | **t-value** |
| **Ethnic identification**                | $M(SD)$          | $M(SD)$          |         |
| **Collective self-esteem:**              |                 |                 |         |
| Identity importance                      | 19.0 (5.1)      | 19.0 (5.5)      | 0.06    |
| Private regard                           | 25.7 (3.7)      | 25.0 (3.9)      | 1.66    |
| Public regard                            | 19.9 (4.7)      | 17.1 (5.2)      | 4.52**  |
| **Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure:**      |                 |                 |         |
| Search                                  | 25.6 (5.6)      | 24.8 (5.3)      | 1.15    |
| Belonging                               | 43.8 (6.0)      | 41.5 (5.9)      | 3.08**  |
| **Sensitivity to race-based rejection:** |                 |                 |         |
| Race-based anxiety                       | 13.4 (7.3)      | 13.4 (7.1)      | 0.05    |
| Race-based expectations                 | 21.7 (7.0)      | 22.4 (7.2)      | 0.75    |
| **Probability of returning to live in the West Indies at some future date** | 3.4 (1.4) | 2.3 (1.4) | 6.65** |

**Class-relevant data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Note:</strong> * $p &lt; .05$; ** $p &lt; .01$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* scale from 1 (some graduate work) to 5 (did not complete high school).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dents, indicating that although these second-generation students are shifting toward an incorporation of African American into their identity definition, they continue to maintain a strong sense of West Indian identification as well.

Although first- and second-generation students differed in their endorsement of specific ethnic labels, the strength of their ethnic identification was for the most part equivalent. On both the Identity and Private Regard subscales of the collective self-esteem scale, in which the referent was whatever group label they chose as self-identifying, first- and second-generation students did not differ. That is, they accorded their ethnic identification equivalent importance and equally regarded that identity as positive. The groups also scored similarly on the Search subscale of the Phinney measure. On the belonging subscale of the Phinney measure there was a significant difference between groups, with first-generation students showing stronger endorsement than second-generation students, $t(265) = 3.27, p < .001$. In addition, the groups differed significantly in their scores on the Public Regard subscale of the collective self-esteem scale, a scale that assesses how one thinks other people regard their group. In this case, first-generation students believed people were more favorable to their group ($M = 19.9, SD = 4.7$) than did second-generation students ($M = 17.1, SD = 5.2$), $t(262) = 4.52, p < .001$.

Interestingly, first- and second-generation immigrants did not differ from each other on the measure of Sensitivity to Race-based Rejection. On both the anxiety and expectation scales of the measure, the two groups expressed equivalent reactions.

Comparisons of the two groups on the various demographic questions showed a few scattered differences between first- and second-generation students. The mothers of first-generation students had less education, $t(260) = 3.94, p < .001$, and first-generation students perceived their parents to be lower in socioeconomic standing, $t(240) = 4.55, p < .001$, both as compared to the second-generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metastereotypes of:</th>
<th>First (n = 145)</th>
<th>Second (n = 125)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>35.3 (9.8)</td>
<td>33.8 (9.6)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indians</td>
<td>47.8 (9.6)</td>
<td>42.7 (10.1)</td>
<td>4.13**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
students. First-generation students also believed it more likely that they might return to live in the West Indies at some future date than did second-generation students, \( t (263) = 6.64, p < .001 \).

Men and women differed only in terms of perceptions of discrimination. Men were more likely to expect race-based rejection than women were \( (p < .01) \) and they tended to be more anxious about such rejection \( (p = .07) \). There were no other gender differences in any of the study variables.

Discussion

In order to hypothesize stereotype threat effects, we needed to establish that West Indian immigrants have knowledge of the unfavorable image of African Americans and that first- and second-generation immigrants do not differ in that regard. The data show that to be the case: both first- and second-generation West Indians believe that stereotypes of African Americans are less positive than stereotypes of West Indians, and the two generations do not differ in their metastereotype of African Americans. Thus, the beliefs are “in the air,” as Steele (1997) observed, and that air is the same for both generations of West Indian immigrants.

What does differ between the generations is the metastereotype of West Indians. For second-generation immigrants, the favorability of this image has decreased—not to the level of the African American stereotype, but substantially below the level endorsed by first-generation immigrants. This more negative metastereotype of West Indians is reflected also in the public regard measure of collective self-esteem. Here we found a significant difference between first- and second-generation immigrants, such that the latter believed the public had a less favorable view of their group than did first-generation students.

The question to be addressed is whether the negative beliefs about African Americans constitute an equivalent threat for first- and second-generation immigrants. We are hypothesizing that they do not. First-generation immigrants, although aware of the stereotypes associated with African Americans, are hypothesized not to see those images as self-relevant to the same degree that second-generation immigrants do. Because first-generation immigrants have spent some years in a Caribbean country, where Blacks are in the majority and race discrimination is not prevalent, we assume that they are able to maintain some distance between society’s unfavorable views of African Americans and their image of themselves as a different kind of black. Second-generation immigrants, in contrast, do not have that same experience. Rather, from birth onward, they are often treated by others as members of the category African American, not distinguishably different from native-born African Americans. Thus, we hypothesize that second-generation students will show the same type of stereotype threat effects that have been previously shown in African American populations. In contrast, we expect that first-generation immigrants will show no performance decrement when stereotype threat conditions are present.

As suggested earlier, subjective ethnic identification may also influence the degree to which Afro-Caribbean immigrants are susceptible to stereotype threat effects. Comparisons of first- and second-generation immigrants in our questionnaire data establish some important parameters. First, the data show that ethnic identification, as assessed both by the identity importance and the private regard subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem scale, is equivalent for the two groups. Thus, whatever group they are identified with is equally important to their self-definition. However, the definition of that group differs significantly between the two groups, as the measure of ethnic identification (a dimension ranging from “definitely West Indian” to “definitely African American”) indicates. First-generation immigrants were significantly stronger in their endorsement of a West Indian identity. At the same time, it is important to note that the majority of all the participants placed themselves toward the West Indian side of the scale, showing a more skewed distribution than Waters (1994) observed in her high school sample. The difference between the two samples could be due to differential selection based on socioeconomic factors. Waters
(1994) reported that ethnic identity was associated with socioeconomic status in her sample, such that the students who identified as African American were more likely to be in poorer neighborhoods with lower quality schools. Those students, we can surmise, would be less likely to enter college than would students from better school systems and neighborhoods, students who in the Waters study were more likely to hold on to a West Indian identity. Thus, our sample of college students would be biased in favor of those more academically prepared students who are more identified with their West Indian heritage.

Finally, it is worth noting that despite differences in identification and length of time in the country, the two generations do not differ in their expectations of and anxiety about possible discriminatory experiences. Although one might assume that first-generation students had less actual experience with discrimination directed toward them, the approximately 10 years that they had spent in the United States was apparently ample time for them to expect and be anxious about the possibility of being a target. These findings reaffirm the widely-accepted idea that being black is a “master status” within the United States (Foner 2005), a category used by others that commonly ignores possible distinctions among people who vary in ethnicity and nationality.

Our questionnaire data establish the difference between first- and second-generation immigrants in terms of their ethnic identification, showing a greater or lesser tendency, respectively, to identify as West Indian. Although this covariance is far from perfect, it does establish a psychological difference between the two demographic categories that is consistent with our theoretical position. Equally important is the evidence that both first- and second-generation immigrants have a clear understanding of the unfavorable stereotype that exists in U.S. society with regard to African Americans. Thus any evidence that first-generation immigrants are not susceptible to stereotype threat effects would not be based on a lack of awareness of the stereotype, but rather some protection or distancing from that stereotype.

The purpose of the experimental study is to test the hypothesis that second-generation West Indian immigrants are more susceptible to stereotype threat than are first-generation immigrants. In addition, we consider the extent to which possible moderators, such as ethnic identification, might influence reactions to stereotype threat.

An additional factor in the experimental design is the race of the experimenter, a variable that has been shown to be influential in some previous research (e.g., Danso and Esses 2001; Katz and Greenbaum 1963; Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 1965). Katz et al. (1965), for example, found that the presence of a white experimenter caused decrements in the performance of black students when the task was presented as an intelligence test, while it enhanced performance when the same task was presented as a motor coordination task. If we assume that the intelligence test instructions are comparable to stereotype threat conditions, then we might expect that decrements would be greater for second-generation students when the experimenter was white as opposed to black. Support for this prediction also comes from Massey and Fischer’s (2005) study. Students whose college experience included a higher than average number of minority faculty did not report the kind of performance burden that was associated with lower academic performance. In line with these studies, we anticipated a possible three-way interaction, namely that the predicted two-way interaction of generation and stereotype threat condition would be more likely to occur with white experimenters and less likely, or even absent, in the presence of Black experimenters.

**EXPERIMENTAL STUDY**

**Method**

To assess the effect of stereotype threat on the performance of West Indian immigrants, we conducted an experimental study in which first- and second-generation students were randomly assigned to conditions that would or would not activate stereotype threat. The goal
was to determine whether, within this specific sample, performance would vary as a function of the particular experimental condition. A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ design was used, crossing generation of student (first vs. second), diagnosticity of the test (diagnostic vs. non-diagnostic of ability) and race of experimenter (black vs. white).

Participants

From the sample of students who completed the questionnaire, 75 students (41 women and 34 men) were recruited to participate in the experimental study of stereotype threat. First- and second-generation students were recruited in approximately equal numbers ($N = 41$ and 34, respectively). Because self-ascribed ethnic identification was correlated with generation, and because the distribution of ethnic identification scores was heavily skewed toward identification as West Indian, it was not possible to select participants on the basis of their identification, independent of generational status. However, we did attempt to recruit as many students as possible from that group who identified themselves as more African American or at least equally West Indian and African American to balance out the more numerous West Indian identified participants.

Procedures

Participants were tested in small rooms at the colleges, in groups ranging in size from one to six. Typically two experimenters were present at a session, and we kept teams “color consistent”, thus allowing us to systematically consider possible experimenter effects.³ Race of experimenter team was randomly assigned across experimental conditions. Both first- and second-generation students were mixed within a typical session, and the experimenters were not aware of the generational status of the participants in their sessions.

Manipulation of stereotype threat. One experimenter read the instructions aloud to participants, and participants could read along with the same text, printed on the first page of their booklet. The manipulation of stereotype threat was contained within these instructions, using a task description that has proved to be effective in establishing different levels of stereotype threat (cf. Steele and Aronson 1995). In the Diagnostic (Stereotype Threat) Condition, the instructions stressed that the test was an assessment of the student’s verbal abilities and limitations. In the Non-diagnostic condition, the test was described as an exercise in test development, evaluating the test itself rather than individual ability. The assumption made by Steele and his colleagues, and supported by considerable research, is that this seemingly subtle salience of diagnosticity of the test will bring the group stereotype to mind, along with the threat of confirming that stereotype (Steele, Spencer, and Aronson 2002). Participants were then given 25 minutes to answer as many questions as they could, on a 27-item exam. Items were taken from a GRE preparation text and were selected to be reasonably difficult for the study sample. The average performance was 9.8 out of a possible score of 27, thus verifying the anticipated difficulty of the test.

At the end of the allotted time period, the experimenters collected the performance material and participants were given a postexperimental questionnaire to complete, assessing their views of the test, their performance, and the testing conditions. Participants were then debriefed, providing them a full explanation of the ways in which instructions affect performance and of the normative difficulty of the test. The participants were asked not to discuss the findings with others at their college until the end of the term.

Results

The principal test of our hypothesis is based on a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ analysis of variance, appropriate to the experimental design that we
used and consistent with other studies of stereotype threat (e.g., Steele and Aronson 1995). The three dichotomous categories, experimentally manipulated or controlled, were generation (first vs. second), diagnostic condition (threat vs. no threat), and race of experimenter (black or white), with performance as the dependent variable. Performance on the test can be assessed in three different ways: in terms of number attempted, number correct, and percentage correct. In the results described below, we use percentage correct as the primary dependent variable, consistent with a number of previous investigators. In general, using the simple number correct produces similar results, while the number of items attempted does not vary by experimental condition.

Tests of Generational Hypotheses

Analysis of variance results are presented in Table 3. This analysis showed no main effects of diagnostic condition, generation, or experimenter team on the measure of percentage of problems solved correctly. The predicted two-way interaction between generation and diagnostic condition on performance was significant, as shown in Table 3 and in Figure 1.

Tests of simple effects within each diagnostic condition showed that the difference between first- and second-generation participants was not significant when the test was presumed to be non-diagnostic. This lack of a difference is theoretically important, as it counters claims that first- and second-generation immigrants possess intrinsic differences in motivation, ability, or cultural characteristics that might account for differential outcomes. Instead, we find that when conditions are psychologically neutral, there is virtually no difference in capability on a difficult academic test.

Table 3. Analysis of Variance of Performance Data (Percentage correct)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational status</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype threat condition</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenter’s race</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation × Condition</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation × Experimenter</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition × Experimenter</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation × Experimenter × Condition</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Performance (Percentage Correct) of First- and Second-Generation Students in Diagnostic and Non-Diagnostic Conditions.
In contrast, the performance of first- and second-generation students differed significantly when the instructions stressed the diagnosticity of the test, $t(35) = 1.95, p < .05$, one-tailed. It should be noted that changes in the performance of both groups contribute to this significant effect: first-generation students perform better when diagnosticity is stressed than they do in more neutral conditions, while second-generation students show the anticipated decrement in performance.

To further explore the significant interaction between generation and diagnostic condition, a number of covariate analyses were performed. First, we considered the possible role of length of time in the United States as a factor. Because second-generation students have spent more time in the United States, it is likely that they have had greater exposure to its norms and culture, including the negative stereotypes about African Americans. However, a covariance analysis with time in the United States had relatively little impact on the finding: the covariate itself was not significant, and its inclusion shifted the significance level only slightly to 0.054. We also examined the correlation between time in the United States and the various measures of performance within the first generation only (and separately for diagnostic and non-diagnostic conditions). No significant relationships were found, suggesting that time in the United States, though a frequently-used demographic index, is not a reliable gauge for psychological processes that may or may not occur in a given interval of time. Additionally, an examination of gender differences showed that men and women performed equally in both diagnostic and non-diagnostic conditions. Thus the differences between the generations in the two experimental conditions appear quite robust.

Experimenter Effects

It was anticipated that race of experimenter might affect performance, such that stereotype threat effects would be more pronounced when the experimenters were white. This possibility, which would be evidenced in a significant three-way interaction, was not supported. Race of experimenter did have a significant influence on performance, however, as evidenced by significant two-way interactions between experimenter and diagnostic condition ($p < .001$), as well as between experimenter and generation ($p < .05$).

With regard to the first of these interactions, the pattern of means shows that performance in the diagnostic condition is enhanced when the experimenter is white ($M = 46.2, SD = 17.7$ for white experimenters, $M = 34.2, SD = 16.7$ with black experimenters). In contrast, performance in the non-diagnostic condition is better when the experimenter is black ($M = 43.9, SD = 15.1$ for black experimenter, $M = 34.7, SD = 10.2$ for white experimenter).

Analysis of the significant interaction between generation and experimenter also shows reverse patterns for the black and white experimenters. First-generation students do better when the experimenter is white ($M = 47.7, SD = 15.7$ for white experimenter, $M = 38.3, SD = 14.7$ for black experimenter). Second-generation students, in contrast, do better when the experimenters are black ($M = 44.2, SD = 15.6$) than when they are white ($M = 36.5, SD = 14.7$). We consider the possible meaning of these somewhat unexpected patterns in the discussion.

Ethnic Identification and Stereotype Threat

Correlational analyses indicated that generation and ethnic identification are related, both in the larger preliminary sample, $r(262) = .37, p < .001$, as well as in this experimental subsample, $r(73) = .43, p < .001$. This relationship suggested two analytic strategies. First we used ethnic identification as a covariate in the generational analysis. This inclusion did not substantially alter the obtained interaction between generation and diagnosticity (nudging the significance level from 0.036 to 0.051).

Another way to test the influence of ethnic identification was to use this variable as a factor in the analysis of variance design. Because ethnic identification and generation
covary, and because the sample size was limited, it was not possible to factorially vary the two within a single analysis. Consequently, we chose to analyze the data in a second $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design, this time substituting ethnic identification for generation. As noted earlier, ethnic identification scores in the sample were generally skewed toward identification as West Indian. Thus, in this analysis we divided the sample on the basis of stronger or weaker West Indian identification, such that those who responded with a 1 or 2 (definitely or mostly West Indian) are contrasted with those who responded with either 3, 4, or 5 (definitely African American through an equal endorsement of the two ethnic labels).

Results of this analysis, focusing on the two-way interaction between ethnic identification and diagnostic condition, showed the anticipated pattern of means, although the interaction itself did not attain conventional levels of significance, $F(1, 65) = 2.50, p = .12$. Thus, although the pattern that we find is consistent with the hypothesis that students who identified more with African American will be more susceptible to the effects of stereotype threat, the lack of a sharp demarcation between the two groups in terms of their ethnic identification does not allow a strong test of the hypothesis.

Discussion

Differences between first- and second-generation West Indian immigrants, suggested in more macrolevel data such as educational and occupational achievement, clearly find a parallel here at a psychological level. Although the difference in the time that first- and second-generation students have spent in the United States is only 11.5 years, their performance under conditions of stereotype threat differs significantly. Both groups are affected by the instructions, but in opposite directions. Second-generation students show a pattern of performance that is similar to that reported previously for African American students (Steele and Aronson 1995; Massey and Fischer 2005), as well as for other groups for whom negative stereotypes about their group's abilities exist (e.g., women in math, Spencer, Steele, and Quinn 1999; people who have low socioeconomic status, Croizet and Claire 1998). Specifically, when stereotype threat is present, their performance drops in comparison to the first-generation comparison group and to their own performance when the test is non-diagnostic.

When conditions do not make stereotype threat salient, first- and second-generation students perform equivalently. This equivalence of first- and second-generation students in the non-diagnostic condition is important, as it rules out alternative explanations based on assumed differences between the two groups in terms of competency or general test-taking ability. The difference between the groups is not in their capability to perform on the test (or their academic preparation and motivation to perform), but in the specifics of the testing condition that bring other influences to bear. Further, although not testable here, the results also give us some reason to question the utility of those explanations of differences between West Indians and African Americans that rely on dispositional factors, such as migration selectivity and differential ability or motivation.

First-generation immigrants show a quite different reaction to stereotype threat conditions. Not only do they not show a decrement, but in fact their performance increases, relative to the non-threat condition. The seeming immunity of first-generation West Indian immigrants to stereotype threat effects cannot be explained either by a lack of awareness of the prevailing images of African Americans, nor by the absence of experience with race-based discrimination. Indeed, despite their relatively short time in the United States, first-generation immigrants do not differ in either respect from their second-generation counterparts who were born in the United States. Both are equally likely to expect discrimination and to anticipate anxiety in the variety of social situations tapped by the measure of Sensitivity to Race-based Discrimination. Both see a difference in the images that society has of African Americans in contrast to West Indians.

The difference between the two generations may be explained in part by the positivity of metastereotype of West Indians. First-
generation students are more positive in their appraisal, believing that others view West Indians more favorably than do the second-generation students (evidenced both in measures of stereotypes and in the public regard subscale of the Collective Self-esteem Scale). Accordingly, first-generation students appear able to turn to a positive image of their group in the face of diagnostic pressure and to distance themselves more effectively from the negative stereotypes associated with black performance in the United States. Recent work by Gilkes (2005), who interviewed first-generation West Indian immigrants in New York City and Toronto, is also consistent with this analysis, showing that a positive view of one’s group serves as a source of resilience in the context of discriminatory treatment. This distancing strategy appears to have limited utility for the second generation, however, who are more aware of and immersed in the prejudicial views against blacks that persist in the United States.

The first-generation pattern of increased performance in the face of possible threat is also suggestive of the stereotype lift effect that Walton and Cohen (2003) have documented. As defined by Walton and Cohen, “stereotype lift is the performance boost caused by the awareness that an outgroup is negatively stereotyped” (2003:456). In a review of previous research, they show that people who are members of non-stereotyped groups (e.g., men, whites) are also aware of the stereotypes. When put in a situation that brings those stereotyped groups to mind, people in the more favorable group engage in a process of downward comparison that in turn elevates their sense of self-efficacy. The consequence is a significant increase in performance, as compared to a non-threat control condition. Further, Walton and Cohen (2003) conclude that stereotype lift effects are particularly likely when people believe in the validity of the negative stereotypes about the other group or when they endorse the legitimacy of a group-based hierarchy. It is possible that some or all of these conditions are true for first-generation immigrants. As we have shown, they are aware of the African American stereotype, and there is literature to suggest that they see differences between themselves and African Americans (Vickerman 1999; Waters 1999a). Experimental work by Barreto, Ellemers, and Palacios (2004) also points to the relevance of one’s past experience with discrimination. They find that people who have a collective history of success will view situations in which they are a token as a challenge and perform better. In contrast, those who are historically disadvantaged are more likely to experience token situations as threatening and to perform worse. By extension, first-generation immigrants who have lived in a society in which their group was the ruling majority may see the diagnostic situation as a challenge, in contrast to second-generation immigrants whose historical basis is the race-based status hierarchy of the United States.

Ethnic Identification

Generational effects in performance are paralleled by differences in ethnic identification. Second-generation West Indian immigrants are significantly less likely to identify as West Indian. It is important to note, however, that even second-generation students in this sample were more identified as West Indian than as African American, as indicated by their mean scores on the bipolar scale. This skew in the sample makes a strong test of the ethnic identification and stereotype threat hypothesis difficult, in that those who might be most strongly identified as African American are not well represented in the sample. Nonetheless, the fact that we found a clear trend in the predicted direction, in the face of relatively weak differences in ethnic identification, suggests that the influence of identification is a real phenomenon.

It is interesting to compare the patterns of ethnic identification found here with the data of Waters (1994), obtained from adolescents in a similar locality. Waters found roughly equal proportions of students claiming African American versus country of origin identification. In contrast, only 12% of our students identified as either wholly or mostly African American. One source of the difference may be related to the demographic patterns that Waters found, wherein adolescents
who were more identified as African American were also more likely to live in poorer neighborhoods and to attend lower quality schools. Thus, it is probable that students in her sample who identified as African American are less likely to attend college; consequently, a sample of college students (even in this case at a large public university) are likely to show a skewed distribution toward the West Indian end of the identification dimension.5

This study was done with undergraduate students at a public university in New York City, a context whose particular features need to be kept in mind. Accordingly, we can not generalize to the population of West Indian immigrants at large. On the one hand, the results of Massey and Fischer (2005) show that stereotype threat effects are evident in students of color across a broad range of more elite universities (although less pronounced when representation of minority faculty was greater). At the same time, the general composition both of the immediate university setting and the larger community could well be influential. Stereotype lift effects might be more common, for example, when there is a viable West Indian community with which one can identify.

Although we talk in a language of contrasts convenient to experimental design, that is, a contrast between identification as West Indian or African American, it is evident to us that ethnic identification in immigrant communities is resistant to such simple dichotomies. Open-ended responses to a question asking for ethnic identification frequently elicit multiple terms that include references to both race and ethnicity. Both the labels themselves and the meanings associated with the categories differ among first- and second-generation Afro Caribbean immigrants (Butterfield 2004; Foner 2005; Gilkes 2005). Butterfield (2004), for example, argues that second-generation West Indian immigrants typically have both a racial and an ethnic identity, distinct in form but equally important to self-definition. This multidimensionality of ethnic identification suggests both caution and challenge when conducting research with immigrant populations.

Experimenter Effects

We had anticipated a possible three-way interaction when race of experimenter was included in the analysis, such that the predicted two-way interaction between generation and diagnostic condition would be more likely to occur with white experimenters and less likely, or even absent, in the presence of black experimenters. This three-way interaction did not emerge. However, race of experimenter clearly influenced the performance of our participants, as shown in the two significant two-way interactions between experimenter and both diagnostic condition and generation. White experimenters elicited better performance when the test was diagnostic and when the participants were first-generation; black experimenters elicited better performance when the test was non-diagnostic and when the participants were second-generation.

The finding that second-generation students do better with a black experimenter is consistent with the Massey and Fischer (2005) findings that a context with a higher percentage of minority faculty was more favorable for black and Latino students. The difference between first- and second-generation students in these different experimenter conditions is perhaps more easily understood if we consider the differing metastereotypes of first- and second-generation students. First-generation immigrants believe that their group is regarded more favorably by society in general, which we can assume would be defined largely in terms of the white majority. Accordingly, a white experimenter may act as a proxy for that larger reference group and lead participants to want to live up to that perceived standard and distinguish themselves from the African American image that they view as significantly less favorable. Second-generation students, in contrast, have a diminished view of the metastereotype of West Indians and are at the same time more likely to see themselves as

5 We note that ethnic identification as an African American or West Indian was not correlated with students’ perceptions of class status within our larger sample ($r = .11$).
defined by the stereotype of African Americans. This shifting identification may lead them to be more comfortable with a black experimenter and less comfortable with a white experimenter whom they might assume is negatively disposed toward them.

For first-generation students, the white experimenter was associated with enhanced performance. To the extent that first-generation students believe that the society at large (which is predominantly white) has a favorable view of West Indians, the white experimenter may serve as a cue for enhanced performance. Indeed, the stereotype lift effect suggested earlier may be enhanced by the presence of a white experimenter, who is more closely associated with the dominant and judging society.

Future Directions

A key question for future research concerns the possible mediators of the generation-performance relationship. Although identification is clearly related to generation, as well as to stereotype threat, it alone cannot account for the differences between first- and second-generation respondents. As is the case for stereotype threat research in general, the search for mediating mechanisms continues. One possibility is that differences in motivational states or self-regulatory focus (see Higgins 1997) may be related to the generational patterns. Keller and Blass (2003) have reported that the manipulation of a prevention focus facilitates stereotype threat effects, whereas manipulating a promotion focus minimizes such effects. Following this logic, it might be that first-generation West Indians are more characterized by a promotion focus, in which the emphasis of achievement is on the approach to a desired goal. Second-generation West Indians, in contrast, because of more experiences with race-based discrimination in the United States, might be more motivated by a prevention strategy, in which achievement is seen as the avoidance of possible negative events.

The generality of these findings for other immigrant populations is also of considerable interest. Immigrants from Mexico, for example, are often burdened with negative stereotypes of intellectual capability as well, and could be subject to the same kind of stereotype threat effects as we observed here among West Indians. In the case of Mexicans, however, it is not certain whether first-generation immigrants would be impervious to stereotype threat effects, given the negative stereotypes that often characterize both Mexican nationals and Mexican immigrants. Thus, first-generation Mexican immigrants might show equal or even greater stereotype threat effects than would later generations. In contrast, we might think about a group such as Asian immigrants, for whom the stereotype of a high-performing “model minority” is frequently invoked. Would stereotype lift effects be more evident in this group when the group stereotype was made salient? These questions speak to the complexity of the immigrant experience and the need for careful consideration of specific stereotypes and contexts.

The findings reported here contribute to the burgeoning literature on stereotype threat effects, adding immigration status to the categories of persons potentially subject to performance decrements under threat conditions. More importantly, however, the results speak to the dynamic relationship between person and context. West Indian immigrants do not automatically become subject to stereotype threat because they are black; rather they learn to experience stereotype threat as a result of their socialization into U.S. society where being categorized as black has negative contingencies. Because these connections are learned, one has to allow the possibility that, given optimal interventions, they can be overcome as well.

These results also speak to the importance of understanding social psychological processes inherent to the immigration experience. Sociologists and demographers have generated a wealth of data on the fortunes and adaptations of immigrants, including occupational status, educational outcomes, and intermarriage patterns. Underlying these group-level analyses are a wealth of psychological processes that need to be unpacked and articulated. We suggest here that stereotype threat is one of the psychological processes that may
be at work. We of course recognize that our data are based exclusively on college students, considering the ways in which a form of academic performance can be affected by stereotype threat. Whether this process could also be detected in more complex settings remains to be established (though the work of Massey and his colleagues in a broader range of educational settings attests to the likely generalizability of the phenomena).

More than simply an account of the numbers of people entering a country, immigration is a dynamic process of interplay between people and their social and cultural environment. Further analysis of the psychological processes will allow us to determine what factors either enhance or impede the participation of immigrants in their new culture.
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