Fitting in: The Roles of Social Acceptance and Discrimination in Shaping the Psychological Well-Being of Latino Youth

Stephanie Potochnick
Department of Public Policy at UNC Chapel Hill

Krista Perreira
Department of Public Policy at UNC Chapel Hill

Andrew Fuligni
Center for Culture and Health, UCLA

February 19, 2009

Paper presented at the Population Association of America, Detroit, May 1, 2009

Correspondence: Please address correspondence between 1/2009- 8/2009 to Krista M. Perreira, Russell Sage Foundation, 112 East 64th St., New York, NY 10065, Email: perreira@rsage.org. Thereafter, correspondence may be sent to Krista M. Perreira, Carolina Population Center, CB#8120, 123 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, NC 27516.

Acknowledgements: We gratefully acknowledge funding from the Russell Sage Foundation (RSF 88-06-07; 87-03-01, 87-05-02), the Russell Sage Visiting Scholar program, and the William T. Grant Foundation (WTG #9203) in support of this research. We also thank Sandi Chapman and Paula Gildner for their excellent project management. In addition, we would like to thank Christina Holub, Tia Palermo, and Pan Riggs for their assistance with data collection and data entry.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how the contexts of reception in new and traditional receiving communities influence the daily psychological well-being of Latino youth. Data came from two companion studies, the *UCLA Study of Adolescents' Daily Lives* and the *Southern Immigrant Academic Adaptation* study. Compared to Latino youth in Los Angeles, North Carolina's youth experienced higher levels of daily happiness, but also experienced higher levels of daily depressive and anxiety symptoms. Using random effect models, we evaluated how perceived discrimination, social acceptance, and daily ethnic treatment contributed to these differences in daily psychological well-being. We found that discrimination and daily negative ethnic treatment worsened; whereas social acceptance combined with daily positive ethnic treatment improved daily psychological well-being.

The Latino population is at the forefront of dramatic racial and ethnic demographic changes occurring in the U.S. Latinos accounted for more than half (50.5%) of the U.S. population growth since 2000 (Fry 2008), and by 2050 they are expected to make up 29% (compared to 15.1% in 2007) of the U.S. population (Passel and Cohn 2008). The majority of Latinos have direct ties to immigration either because they are immigrants themselves (44%) or because they are children of immigrants (20%) (IPUMS 2000).

As the Latino population has grown, it has also become less geographically concentrated within the United States. Today's Latino immigrants and U.S.-born Latinos no longer solely live in traditional receiving communities (e.g., Texas, Florida, California, Illinois, New Jersey and New York) (Guzman 2001) but are moving to new settlement areas, particularly in the South (Suro and Tafoya 2004). This dispersion and growth creates significant public policy challenges, as new receiving communities struggle to meet the needs of a changing citizenry.

One challenge faced by new receiving communities is determining how best to provide education and services that support educational achievement to the children of immigrants. Recent research suggests that mental health is essential for educational achievement (Fletcher 2008; Kao 1999; Roeser, Eccles, and Strobel 1998). Furthermore, dropout prevention programs and other programs to support academic achievement of minority youth can be more successful when they include a mental health component (Gonzales et al. 2002; Knight et al. 2006).

Not only can positive mental and emotional health significantly improve an adolescent's academic motivations and achievement, but positive mental and emotional health during adolescence can reduce risky behavior, such as smoking and drinking, drug use, sexual activity, and juvenile delinquency (Saluja et al. 2004; Schoen et al. 1997). At the same time, positive mental and emotional health during adolescence can reduce the likelihood of mental health disorders, increase labor market participation rates, and lead to higher wages in adulthood (Ettner, Frank, and Kessler 1997; Jayakody, Danzinger, and Kessler 1998; Kessler et al. 1995; Kessler and Frank 1997; Wilcox-Gok et al. 2004).

Because of the challenges that immigrant youth and their families face in adapting to life in the United States, historically researchers believed that the first- (i.e. foreign-born children with foreign-born parents) and second-generation children (i.e. U.S. born children with foreign-born parents) of immigrants would be at high risk for mental health problems (Burnam et al. 1987; Rumbaut 1994; Srole et al. 1978). However, most studies of adults, especially Latinos, have found that foreign-born individuals show better psychological adjustment despite the fact that they experience higher levels of economic and social risk (Alegría et al. 2007; Ortega et al. 2000; Vega et al. 1998). Sometimes referred to as the "immigrant paradox," this result has been replicated not only with respect to mental health outcomes but also with respect to several other physical health and educational outcomes as well (Harris 1999; Kao and Tienda 1995; Singh and Siahpush 2001, 2002).

In contrast to studies of adults, results from studies examining difference in mental health between foreign-born and U.S.-born adolescents vary widely. Some find little or no difference by immigrant generation (Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008; Gonzales et al. 2002; Harker 2001; Rumbaut 1999); others identify lower rates of positive mental well-being and higher rates of psychological distress among first- and second-generation immigrants (Bankston and Zhou 2002; Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008; Kao 1999; Padilla and Duran 1995; Rumbaut 1999); and a few conclude that first-generation, foreign-born youth are at lower risk of depression and other poor mental health outcomes than their second-generation peers born in the U.S. to foreign-born parents (Harker 2001; Harris 1999; Mossakowski 2007; Sam et al. 2006).

These and other studies of migration and adolescent mental health primarily focus on the relationship between mental health and individual acculturation as measured by time in the U.S., English language skills, social affiliations, and adoption of U.S. cultural norms and values. Few studies have examined how other factors associated with migration (e.g., the context of leaving one's home country and entering a new country and the characteristics of settlement communities) affect physical health (Lee and Ferraro 2007; Mulvaney-Day, Alegría, and Sribney 2007; Wickrama, Elder, and Abraham 2007), mental health (Rumbaut 1991), and associated risky health behaviors (Frank, Cerda, and Rendon 2007).

No studies have examined how the social contexts of reception in new vs. traditional receiving communities shape the psychological well-being of children of immigrants.

With some exceptions (Fuligni, Yip, and Tseng 2002; Yip and Fuligni 2002), previous research also fails to consider how acculturation experiences operate on a daily basis and influence the psychological well-being of youth. On a daily basis, immigrant and minority youth engage in activities and social interactions which influence their sense of psychological well-being. It is the accumulation of these daily moods and emotions that contributes to youth's overall mental health. In fact, many mental health measures, including the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) and the Child Depression Inventory (CDI), evaluate the respondent's mental health based on symptom frequency over a period of a week or two.

This paper examines the daily psychological well-being of Latino youth living in Los Angeles (LA), a traditional receiving community, and Latino youth living in North Carolina (NC), a new receiving community. Using random effect models, we assess how baseline and daily social interactions in school and at home affect the daily psychological well-being of these Latino youth. Our analysis contributes to understanding the assimilation of immigrant youth, the immigrant paradox, and the roles of social context in shaping adolescent mental health.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Context of Reception

The immigration and settlement process encompasses experiences of loss, trauma, discrimination, and other stressful events that can deteriorate the mental well-being of immigrants (Perreira, Chapman, and Stein 2006). The relationship formed between the host society and immigrant group can either exacerbate or ameliorate the psychological stress of immigrating.

According to the theory of segmented assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut 2006), the success of an immigrant's adaptation will depend on a multitude of factors that comprise the social context of reception. These include the interaction of immigrant resources and community reception, the congruence in the pace of acculturation within a family, economic barriers, such as joblessness and concentrated poverty, and external barriers. Prominent external barriers include racial discrimination (Portes and Rumbaut 2006), the social isolation of minority groups (Massey 1990), and underclass subcultures that promote an oppositional culture (Ogbu 2004). Residing in a supportive, co-ethnic enclave can mitigate some of these external barriers (Alba and Nee 2003) and lead to fewer mental health problems (Vega and Rumbaut 1991).

Several positive and negative factors shape the context of reception in North Carolina. Most importantly, the Latino population in North Carolina grew by 394% between 1990-2000, thereby making it the state with the largest Latino population growth rate in the country (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As a result, the state has had limited prior experience with hosting Latino and immigrant populations. This can both promote and hinder the successful adaptation of Latino immigrants and their children. On the one hand, Latino immigrants moving to North Carolina may benefit from settling into communities that are less racially and economically segregated than urban areas where Latino immigrants have traditionally settled (Alba, Logan, and Stults 2000; Logan, Alba, and Zhang 2002). On the other, they must learn to adapt in communities where there is not a strong co-ethnic presence and where many public institutions (i.e. schools, health facilities, and social services), lack the resources and personnel to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate services (Perreira, Chapman, and Stein 2006). At the same time, public reception to Latino newcomers has varied from an outpouring of support (Maitland 2006) to open hostility, as witnessed by one local sheriff's public comment that "Mexicans are trashy" (Walker 2008) and the state attorney general's banning of undocumented immigrants from attending community colleges (Bonner 2008). These and other measures taken by state and local governments have increased the social marginalization of many Latinos and have added new barriers to their adaptation.

In contrast, Los Angeles, once a part of Mexican territory, has had a long history of building relationships with and providing services for Latinos and various other immigrant populations. As a result, Los Angeles has developed strong social, political, and cultural institutions that support the needs of its multi-cultural citizenry. While Latinos in Los Angeles still face economic and educational challenges, they are highly integrated into their communities; have well-established co-ethnic networks, and weld substantial political influence. Moreover, many professionals throughout the city speak Spanish in addition to English. Consequently, Los Angeles is a city well-equipped to meet the needs of its Latino immigrant populations and facilitate their adaptation.

Given that Latino youth in North Carolina may face greater institutional (particularly linguistic) barriers to their successful adaptation and that large co-ethnic communities may insulate Latino youth in Los Angeles from the stresses associated with minority or foreign-born status, we would expect, all else equal, Latino youth in North Carolina to be at greater risk for psychological distress, daily depressive symptoms, and symptoms of anxiety. However, the co-ethnic communities of Los Angeles can also be socially-isolated communities replete with poverty and unemployment, neighborhood factors typically associated with poor health outcomes (Frank, Cerda, and Rendon 2007; Goodman et al. 2003; Harris 1999; Wheaton and Clarke 2003; Xue et al. 2005). Thus, we have no *apriori* expectations for differences in the psychological well-being of Latino adolescent youth by location of residence.

Discrimination and Social Acceptance

Experiences with discrimination are a significant concern for the Latino population. One study found that eleven percent of Latino adolescents had been the targets of hate speech and thirty-six percent were exposed to hate related graffiti (Kaufman et al. 2001). Evidence suggests that discrimination against Latinos may be a prevalent problem in both North Carolina and Los Angeles. A 1996 poll of North Carolinians indicated that 42% were uncomfortable with the increasing presence of Hispanics, 67% thought that their neighbors would not approve of Hispanics moving into their neighborhoods, and 55% felt uncomfortable around people who do not speak English (Johnson, Johnson-Webb, and Farrell 1999). A 2002 poll of Los Angelinos found similar hostility where 54% of blacks and 33% of whites believed that Hispanics were "most in conflict with their group" (Sears 2002).

Social discrimination negatively impacts psychological well-being in both the short and long term. Discrimination creates structural barriers that limit access to valued social roles or fulfillment of everyday role obligations, such as being a helpful family member (Garcia Coll and Szalacha 2004; Vega and Rumbaut 1991). In addition to (and as a partial consequence of) these role constraints, discrimination has been found to lower self-esteem (Greene, Way, and Pahl 2006; Rumbaut 1994, 1999) and overall mental health (Gee et al. 2006; Hwang and Goto 2008), increase depressive symptoms (Araujo and Borrell 2006; Finch, Kolody, and Vega 2000; Greene, Way, and Pahl 2006; Mossakowski 2003; Rumbaut 1994, 1999), and increase parent-child conflict (Rumbaut 1994). The long-term negative impacts of discrimination are not only a result of chronic mistreatment (Araujo and Borrell 2006; Mossakowski 2003) but can stem from one discriminatory experience (Araujo and Borrell 2006; Mossakowski 2003) or even the fear of discrimination (Rumbaut 1994).

In contrast, positive race-related treatment and social acceptance by adults and peers can protect youth from the detrimental influences of discrimination (DeGarmo and Martinez 2006; Grossman and Liang 2008), can increase feelings of belonging (McNeely and Falci 2004; Mendoza-Denton et al. 2002; Newman, Lohman, and Newman 2007), and improve psychosocial well-being (Cornwell 2003; Kao 1999; Meadows 2007; Newman et al. 2007; Sun and Hui 2007; Ueno 2005). In accordance with current research, we expect that discrimination will be negatively associated with daily psychological well-being; whereas, social acceptance will be positively associated with daily psychological well-being. Moreover, we expect that Latino youth in North Carolina and Los Angeles will have differing experiences with social discrimination and acceptance, which in turn, could explain observed differences in their daily psychological well-being.

Nativity Status

Previous research on the relationship between nativity status and mental health is inconclusive. Studies have identified no nativity differences (Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008; Gonzales et al. 2002; Harker 2001; Rumbaut 1999), a foreign-born advantage (Harker 2001; Harris 1999; Mossakowski 2007; Sam et al. 2006), and a U.S.-born advantage (Bankston and Zhou 2002; Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008; Kao 1999; Padilla and Duran 1995; Rumbaut 1999). Two theories—acculturative stress and immigrant optimism— help explain differences in mental health status by nativity and why different studies find conflicting results.

Acculturative stress theory emphasizes how immigration and adaptation processes heighten stress levels and reduce overall mental well-being (Padilla and Duran 1995). Foreign-born adolescents experience more acculturative stress than U.S.-born adolescents due to the challenges of learning a second language, changing socioeconomic status, changing family dynamics, new social norms, a new minority status, and perceived discrimination (Padilla and Duran 1995; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001). Consequently, acculturative stress theory predicts that foreign-born youth will experience greater mental health problems such as depression and anxiety. At the same time, however, cultural values such as *familismo, respecto,* and *personalismo* can mitigate the potentially deleterious effects of acculturative stress.[1] Thus, U.S.-born second-generation youth who are more acculturated to U.S. values and customs may be more at risk of mental health problems than their first-generation peers (Gil, Vega, and Dimas 1994).

Optimism theories focus on immigrants' frames of reference and argue that upon entering the U.S., foreign-born adolescents expect to encounter challenges but optimistically believe they can overcome these challenges and succeed (Kao and Tienda 1995; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001). Compared to the harsh environments many face in their home countries (Alvarez 1971), the U.S. environment offers more opportunities and rewards for highly motivated individuals. From this perspective, foreign-born youth will be more resilient and experience more positive psychological well-being than their U.S.-born peers.

Ethnic and Family Identification

In examining how the daily psychological well-being of Latino adolescents living in North Carolina compares to those in Los Angeles, we consider the potential influence of two key contributors to psychological well-being -- ethnic and family identification. Ethnic identity represents the extent to which adolescents positively view and connect with their ethnic backgrounds and feel that their ethnicity is an integral part of their identities. Ethnic identity has been linked to quality of life (Utsey et al. 2002) and can protect against the deleterious influences of discrimination (Greene, Way, and Pahl 2006; Mossakowski 2003; Umaña-Taylor and Updegraff 2007; Wong, Eccles, and Sameroff 2003) and daily stressors in general (Kiang et al. 2006). Latino adolescents with strong ethnic ties are able to tap into unique cultural resources and into support systems from a collectivist group with strong communal relationships (Greenfield et al. 2003). Thus, we expect that a strong ethnic identity will be positively related to daily psychological well-being.

Family identity represents the extent to which adolescents feel connected to their families and the importance of their families to their overall identity (Fuligni and Flook 2005). Family support and cohesion among immigrant populations can serve to protect adolescents from wider negative social influences (Coohey 2001) and buffer them from the negative mental health consequences of discrimination (Padilla and Duran 1995). Similarly, youths' roles, responsibilities, and obligations to their families can affect their psychological well-being but the extant research is equivocal. On the one hand, Chase (1999) found that adolescents forced to take on adult roles prematurely suffer negative mental health consequences. On the other, Fuligni and his colleagues (Fuligni 1998; Fuligni, Yip, and Tseng 2002) find that the assumption of adult roles positively affects mental health. Although the time and energy required to assist family can increase the stress adolescents' experience, the satisfaction that adolescents develop from assisting their own families compensates for this stress (Telzer and Fuligni in press). We expect that family identification as measured by family support, family respect, and daily family relations will be positively associated with daily psychological well-being. However, the number of family obligations that youth take on may be negatively related to psychological well-being.

METHODS

Data

This paper uses data from two companion studies, the *UCLA Study of Adolescents' Daily Lives* and the *Southern Immigrant Academic Adaptation* (NC-SIAA) study, that assess the daily acculturation experiences of Latino youth in terms of educational engagement, academic achievement, and mental health outcomes. The combined LA-NC SIAA data include 557 Latino adolescents (318 in Los Angeles; 239 in North Carolina) enrolled in 9th grade during the 2005-06 (Los Angeles) and 2006-07 (North Carolina) school years. The LA sample was selected from three public high schools with a high concentration of Latino youth. The North Carolina study utilized a stratified clustered design to sample students in 4 urban and 5 rural public high schools with at least 24 Latino students enrolled in 9th grade in 2000.[2]

Procedure

After receiving active consent from parents, all students in the schools who self-identified as Hispanic or Latino were recruited. The response rate was 48% for North Carolina and 60% for LA.[3] Students in both studies completed the same baseline questionnaire, take-home questionnaire, and 14 daily diary checklists in their preferred language (English or Spanish). The two questionnaires gathered information regarding the students' immigration histories, socioeconomic backgrounds, language use, family relationships, cultural and ethnic identifications, educational attitudes, and physical and mental health.

Upon finishing the questionnaires students were given a set of 14 daily diary checklists to complete before bedtime for the next two-week period. The checklists included yes/no questions about: (1) negative events and stressors, (2) time spent on school, work, and family activities, (3) academic engagement, (4) feelings and daily mental health well-being, and (5) role fulfillment. To ensure that participants completed the diary sheet every night rather than a few at a time, students were given a stamp that automatically indicated the time and date. Students were required to put their diary sheet in a sealed envelope with the time and date stamped across the seal. Students who handed in all 14 diary sheets in the proper form at the end of the 14 day period were provided an additional incentive.

Sample

After deleting missing observations on the dependent variable (N=7) and independent variables (N=88), the analytic sample consisted of 462 Latino youth (LA=253; NC=209) who contributed between 1 and 14 daily diary observations. We observed a total of 6,126 person-days for daily depressive symptoms, 6,126 for daily anxiety, and 6,117 for daily happiness.[4] The average age of participants was 15 and the sample was evenly split between genders (Table 1). While the majority of Los Angelinos

(72%) had foreign-born parents, North Carolinians were significantly more likely to be immigrants themselves (67% vs. 17%).

Measures

Daily Psychological Well-Being. Using a modified version of the Profile of Mood States (Lorr and Mcnair 1971; Yip and Fulgni 2002), students reported their feelings across 19 items (e.g., on edge, exhausted, sad, joy, scared, etc.) on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). By calculating average responses across non-missing items, we created three subscales: daily happiness (happy, joy, calm), daily depressive symptoms (sad, discouraged, hopeless), and daily anxiety (on edge, nervous, uneasy, unable to concentrate). Thus, we were able to identify three dimensions of daily psychological well-being.

Discrimination. We created two dimensions of discrimination—perceived likelihood of discrimination and concern about discrimination. Following the work of Mendoza Denton et al. (2002), we derived the perceived likelihood of discrimination based on four hypothetical situations of mistreatment (e.g., watched by a store clerk in a convenience store) presented to the respondent. The respondents indicated the likelihood of such treatment occurring to them. The concern measure came from the same hypothetical situations but reflects how concerned or anxious the respondent would be in each situation. For each measure, responses to the 4-items were averaged and scores ranged from one to five with higher scores indicating greater likelihood or concern. Both scales possessed good internal consistency—likelihood: $\alpha = .81$ and concern $\alpha = .83$—and the variables were moderately correlated—r=.59, $p < .05$.

Social Acceptance. We defined social acceptance along two measures—school climate and adult encouragement. Adapted from Tyler and Degoey (1995), our 4-item measure of school climate taps the extent to which students feel that they are respected and valued by the school (e.g., “I feel that the adults at my school respect the work that I do”). Our measure of encouragement by adults at school is based on responses to two items regarding how often adults at school have encouraged a student to take college placement or honors courses and how often they have encouraged a student to continue his/her education after high school. Both measures ranged from 1 to 5 and possessed good internal consistency–school climate (α = .87) and adult encouragement (α = .73). The correlation between these two measures was r = .29, $p < .05$.

Ethnic Identification. We combined two components of cultural orientation into one ethnic identification variable. First, we created ethnic affirmation and belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the ethnic group I belong to," "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group," and "I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments") from a subscale of items on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure developed by Phinney (1992). Second, we measured ethnic identity centrality and regard based on the work of Sellers et al. (1997). We calculated the mean of student responses to fifteen items including "In general, being a member of my ethnic group is an important part of my self-image," "being a part of my ethnic group is an important reflection of who I am," and "being a part of my ethnic group is not a major factor in my social relationships."

Because these two measures were highly correlated—r=.80, $p < .05$—we created a combined ethnic identification measure by averaging across all items from each of these subscales. The combined ethnic identification index ranged from one to five and had a good internal consistency—α =.86. Recognizing that the different components of ethnic identity can have differing effects on mental health (Greene, Way, and Pahl 2006), we ran specification models using the two measures and the combined measure separately and found similar results. We present only the results using the combined ethnic identification measure.

Family Identification. Two measures of youths' sense of family identification were used. Family respect was derived from six items where students evaluate the importance of respecting parents and older family members, doing well for the sake of the family, and making sacrifices for the family (Fuligni, Tseng, and Lam 1996). To measure family future support, we averaged six items on how important students believe it is to help their parents financially in the future, live or go to college near their parents, or help take care of their parents and other family members in the future (Fuligni 1997). Scores on both scales ranged from one to five. Both scales also possessed good internal consistency—Respect: α = .78 and Future: α =.77—and the measures were moderately correlated r=.65, $p < .05$.

Daily Ethnic Treatment and Negative Interactions. Although ethnic identification measures the strength of a student's identity at baseline, it does not capture daily experiences that students may attribute to their race-ethnicity. In the daily diary checklist, students responded yes or no to the following two questions: (1) "something bad happened to you or you were treated poorly because of your race or ethnicity"; (2) "something good happened to you or you were treated well because of your race or ethnicity." Based on these questions, a dichotomous positive ethnic/racial treatment variable (1 = experienced positive ethnic/racial treatment; 0 otherwise) and a dichotomous negative ethnic/racial treatment variable (1=experienced negative ethnic/racial treatment; 0 otherwise) were created. Interestingly, positive and negative ethnic treatment were positively correlated (r = .23). Thus, youth who experienced negative treatment in some circumstances experienced positive treatment in others.

An additional dichotomous variable was created to indicate whether the student had a negative interaction in the school and/or community that day. The negative interaction variable equals one if the student reported one of the following situations: (1) being harassed, picked on or teased by someone in the school, (2) being harassed, picked on or teased by someone outside of school, (3) had an argument or were punished by an adult at school. This variable allows us to differentiate between general negative treatment and race-specific negative treatment. These two dimensions of negative treatment were positively correlated (r = .24). Data were not available to create a similar measure for general positive treatment.

Family Daily Relations. In addition to measuring baseline family identification, we measure daily fluctuations in whether youth report getting along with their parents each day (1 = yes, 0 otherwise) and whether youth spent time with their families each day (1 = yes, 0 otherwise). Youth were classified as having spent time with their families if they responded yes to one of three items—ate a meal with your family, spent leisure time with your family, and/or spent time with aunts, uncles, cousins, or grandparents. Number of family obligations was created by summing responses to a list of eight family assistant activities (e.g., took care of siblings, helped parents at their work, ran family errands) that students engage in that day.

Analytical Strategy

To understand differences in students' experiences by state of residence, we first estimated T-tests to evaluate mean differences in daily psychological well-being, perceptions and concerns about discrimination, social acceptance, ethnic identification, and family identification for Latino youth living in North Carolina vs. Los Angeles. We also conducted T-tests to evaluate differences in daily race-ethnicity interactions, negative interactions, and family interactions by location of residence (i.e. NC vs. LA). To evaluate differences in our daily variables, we first calculated the 14-day average of each daily variable (e.g., daily positive interactions) for each student. Then, estimated mean differences in the average daily variables by state of residence.

Next, we estimated random effects models on our three measures of daily psychological well-being.[5] As shown by comparisons of the standard deviations, the daily psychological well-being of our sample varied both between individuals ($SD_{Happiness}$=.88; $SD_{Depression}$=.62; $SD_{Anxiety}$=.60) and within individuals ($SD_{Happiness}$=.78; $SD_{Depression}$=.56; $SD_{Anxiety}$=.52). All regressions were calculated using Huber/White/sandwich robust variance estimates, and corrected for clustering at the school level.[6] The general equation used for the final models was:

$$Y_{id} = \beta_0 + \beta_j \text{Demographic}_i + \beta_k \text{Baseline}_i + \beta_l \text{Daily}_{id} + \beta_{l+1} \text{Weekend}_{id} + \nu_i + \varepsilon_{id}$$

where Y_{id} represents the outcome variable of interest (daily happiness, daily depressive well-being or daily anxiety) for day *d* of individual *i*, β_0 is the intercept of the regression model, β_j represents a vector of coefficients for demographic control variables including state of residence, foreign-born status, sex, age, family structure, and parental education; β_k represents a vector of coefficients for the individual-varying baseline covariates (i.e. perceived discrimination, concern about discrimination, social acceptance, ethnic identification, and family identification), β_l represents a vector of coefficients for the day-varying covariates (i.e. daily interactions and daily family interactions), ν_i represents the residual for individual *i*, and ε_{id} is the residual for the d^{th} day of the i^{th} individual. Regressions also controlled for whether the observation occurred on a weekend day.

RESULTS

Daily Psychological Well-Being in North Carolina and Los Angeles

[INSERT TABLE 2]

Overall, 91% of Latino youth reported feeling moderately to extremely happy, 17% of Latino youth reported feeling moderately to extremely depressed, and 16% reported feeling moderately to extremely anxious on at least 3 or 20% of the 14 days observed during our daily diary collection period.[7] As one would expect, the number of days youth reported feeling moderately to extremely depressed was negatively correlated (r = -.10) with the number of days students reported feeling moderately to extremely happy and positively correlated with the number of days youth reported feeling moderately to extremely anxious (r = .77). Latino youth from North Carolina experienced higher levels of daily depressive symptoms and daily anxiety than youth from LA (Table 2, part A). Moreover, they reported more days with symptoms of depression and anxiety. At the same time, they also experienced higher levels of daily happiness. These differences persisted after adjusting for the gender, age, and socio-economic status of students in North Carolina and Los Angles (Table 3, part A).

[INSERT TABLE 3]

Social Discrimination and Daily Psychological Well-Being

Differences in discrimination experienced between Latino youth in North Carolina and LA may explain differences in their reported daily psychological well-being. Indeed, Latino youth in North Carolina perceived a greater likelihood of experiencing discrimination and were more concerned about discrimination than youth in Los Angeles (Table 2 part B). Although these differences in perceived discrimination had a significant effect on daily levels of depressive symptoms ($\beta = .08$, $p < .05$) and anxiety ($\beta = .06$, $p < .05$) experienced by youth, perceived discrimination had no significant effect on daily reports of happiness (Table 3 part B). Concern about discrimination had no significant effect on any of our three measures of daily psychological well-being. As a result, differences in perceived discrimination only partially explained differences in psychological well-being between youth living in North Carolina and Los Angeles. The magnitude of the NC coefficient decreased by 26% in the depressive symptoms model and by 29% in the daily anxiety model.

The Effect of Nativity Status on Daily Psychological Well-Being

Youth in North Carolina were significantly more likely to be immigrants than youth in Los Angeles (67% vs. 17%, respectively) (Table 1). The positive correlation between residing in North Carolina and being foreign-born ($r = .52, p<.001$) raises concerns that nativity status is confounding the relationship between daily psychological well-being and state of residence. In comparison to U.S.-born students, foreign-born students experienced higher levels of daily depressive symptoms ($M_{FB} = 1.74$; $SD_{FB} = .71$; $M_{US} = 1.43$; $SD_{US} = .52$; $t = 5.10$, $p < .001$), anxiety ($M_{FB} = 1.75$; $SD_{FB} = .67$; $M_{US} = 1.58$; $SD_{US} = .54$; $t = 2.83$, $p < .01$), and happiness ($M_{FB} = 3.64$; $SD_{FB} =.95$; $M_{US} = 3.40$; $SD_{US} =.81$; $t = 2.79$, $p < .01$). Foreign-born students also perceived discrimination as being more likely ($M_{FB} = 2.63$; $SD_{FB} = 1.15$; $M_{US} = 2.18$; $SD_{US} = 1.02$; $t = 4.30$, $p < .001$) and were more concerned about discrimination ($M_{FB} = 2.71$; $SD_{FB} = 1.24$; $M_{US} = 2.32$; $SD_{US} = 1.15$; $t = 3.35$, $p < .001$) than their U.S.-born peers.

To determine whether differences in nativity status explain differences in daily psychological well-being, we added nativity status to the random effect models (Table 3, part C). We found that the advantage North Carolina's youth had in terms of daily happiness was partially accounted for by their foreign-born status. The coefficient on North Carolina declined from .31 to .25 with the addition of foreign-born to the model, but remained significant.

Though foreign-born status could only partially explain differences in happiness by state of residence, the addition of foreign-born status to our models of daily depressive and anxious mood fully explained differences in these measures of poor psychological health by state of residence. After controlling for the higher proportion of foreign-born Latinos that reside in North Carolina, we found no location difference in daily depressive well-being for Latino youth. Most importantly, we found that foreign-born students experienced significantly higher levels of daily depressive symptoms than U.S. born students, regardless of their state of residence. Foreign-born status approached significance at the .10-level in the anxiety models. These results strongly support theories of acculturative stress and psychological well-being.

Social Acceptance and Daily Psychological Well-Being

At the same time that youth in North Carolina report perceiving more discrimination and being more concerned about discrimination than their peers in LA, they also report more positive school climates and encouragement from adults (e.g., teachers, principals, and guidance counselors) in their schools (Table 2, part C). Thus, we added these measures of social acceptance to our random effects models (Table 3, part D). Using a Wald test, we found that our two measures of social acceptance (i.e. positive school climate and adult school encouragement) were jointly significant in each model (happiness: $\chi^2(2)=89.6$ $p < .001$; depressive symptoms: χ^2 $(2)=11.5$ $p < .01$; anxiety: χ^2 $(2)=11.0$ $p < .01$).

A positive school climate was associated with improved daily happiness and partially accounted for the higher levels of happiness experienced by North Carolina's youth compared to LA's youth. The attenuation of the coefficient on North Carolina from .25 to .16 indicates that the higher levels of social acceptance among North Carolina's Latino youth partially contributed to their higher levels of daily happiness.

As expected, positive school climate was negatively associated with daily depressive symptoms and daily anxiety. Moreover, after controlling for positive school climate, the harmful effects of perceived discrimination diminished and become insignificant. This result suggests that the effects of discrimination may be mediated through school climate. Students who perceive discrimination may be less likely to feel valued and respected at their schools and students who feel less valued and respected at school are more likely to experience depressive symptoms and anxiety on a daily basis.

Contrary to our expectations, we found that adult school encouragement was positively associated with daily anxiety. This positive association may have less to do with the attention from adults at school and their encouragement, than with the focus of adults' attention. Questions about college placement or honors courses and questions about continuing one's education after high school can be stressful for youth, add to the pressure they feel to do well in school, and provoke anxiety. This may be especially true for foreign-born youth who are not able to attend college due to financial consideration or restrictions on U.S. college admission for foreign-born youth who are undocumented.

Effects of Ethnic and Family Identification on Daily Psychological Well-Being

Latino youth in North Carolina expressed a significantly stronger sense of ethnic identification than Latino youth in Los Angeles (Table 2 part C). In comparison to LA's Latino youth, North Carolina's Latino youth also reported higher levels of respect for their family and a stronger desire to support their family in the future.

To assess whether these differences in ethnic and family identification contributed to differences in daily psychological well-being in the two locations, we added these variables to the random effect models (Table 3, parts E and F). Ethnic identity was positively associated with happiness and negatively associated with both depressive symptoms and anxiety. In the model of daily happiness, the attenuation of the North Carolina coefficient from .25 to .17 indicates that the stronger sense of ethnic identification among North Carolina's Latino youth partially accounted for their higher levels of happiness when compared to LA's youth. We also found that the coefficient for residing in North Carolina became significant when ethnic identification was added to these two models. Thus, ethnic identification must be acting as a protective factor.   Similarly, the coefficient on foreign born became insignificant in the happiness model with the addition of ethnic identification and increased in significance in both the depressive symptoms and anxiety models. This shows that foreign-born youths' sense of ethnic identity ($M_{FB} = 4.12$; $SD_{FB} = .59$; $M_{US} = 3.79$; $SD_{US} = .74$; $t = 5.35$, $p < .001$) partially explains their sense of positive well-being and protects them from the stresses of migration.

As with ethnic identification, family identification (especially family support) was positively associated with happiness and negatively associated with depressive symptoms and daily anxiety (Table 3, part F). Although it's protective influence on adolescent psychological well-being is not as strong as the protective influence of ethnic identification, all evidence suggests that family support helps to inoculate Latino youth against the stress of migration. Foreign-born youth report higher levels of family respect (M_{FB} = 4.08; SD_{FB} = .68; M_{US} = 3.92; SD_{US} = .74; t = 2.38, p < .05) and of future support (M_{FB} = 3.76; SD_{FB} = .86; M_{US} = 3.46; SD_{US} = .85; t = 3.64, p < .001) than their U.S.-born peers.

Effects of Daily Acculturative Experiences on Daily Psychological Well-Being

The first set of models presented in Tables 4 shows how baseline demographic characteristics, ethnic and family identifications, and social experiences influence the daily psychological well-being of Latino youth. In Table 2 (parts D and E) and Table 4, we turn our attention to the influence of daily acculturation experiences (i.e. daily social interactions and family interactions). For comparative purposes, we also include our final models with each of our baseline characteristics in Table 4 (i.e. Models 1a, 2a, and 3a).

First, we found that average daily ethnic treatment—both positive and negative—and average daily negative interactions differed by state of residence (Table 2, part D). During the 14-day study period, North Carolina's youth experienced more negative interactions overall and both more negative and more positive race-ethnic interactions, specifically. Moreover, youth in North Carolina reported at least twice as many positive interactions (12% of 14 days or 1.7 days) as they did negative interactions (5% of 14 days or <1 day). The same was not true in Los Angeles.

Second, we found that youth in LA reported getting along with their parents more often than youth in North Carolina (76% of 14 days vs. 70% of 14 days) and reported fewer average family obligations per day (M_{LA} = 1.65 vs. M_{NC} = 2.28) (see Table 2 part E). Youth in both locations reported spending time with their family on nearly every day of the study period (81-83% of 14 days).

[INSERT TABLE 4]

Third, we found that, consistent with our hypotheses, negative interactions and negative ethnic treatment was associated with lower daily positive well-being (Table 4, Model 1b) and higher daily negative well-being (Table 4, Models 2b and 3b).[8] In addition, daily positive ethnic treatment was associated with higher daily positive well-being (Table 4, Model 1b). However, in contrast to our initial expectations, daily positive ethnic treatment was also positively and significantly associated with daily anxiety (Table 4, Model 3b). It is possible that positive ethnic treatment reported by students reflect cases where teachers or other adults at school assist Latino youth, especially those whose second language is English, with homework and other challenges they may face as ESL and foreign-born students. Although this assistance is positive and supportive, the extra attention and focus on school work may also make students feel more pressured about their performance in school and, consequently, anxious.

Lastly, we found that healthy daily relationships with parents improved daily psychological well-being by increasing daily happiness and by decreasing daily depressive symptoms and anxiety. In addition, adolescents who spent more time with their family experienced lower levels of depressive symptoms and anxiety. We identified no association between the number of daily family obligations and youths' daily psychological well-being.

DISCUSSION

The growth and dispersion of the U.S. Latino population during the last two decades has provided researchers with an opportunity to test theories of segmented assimilation and determine how social contexts shape the development of Latino youth. In this analysis, we examine how social interactions in schools, the community, and the family influence the psychological well-being of Latino youth growing up in North Carolina, an emerging receiving community for Latino families in the U.S., and Los Angeles, a historical receiving community. Additionally, we evaluate the "immigrant paradox" and examine how daily psychological well-being varies by nativity.

In our comparison of Latino youth in North Carolina and LA, we found higher levels of both positive and negative daily psychological well-being among youth living in North Carolina. North Carolinians experienced more happiness on a daily basis and more symptoms of depression or anxiety. As measured by discrimination and concern about discrimination, negative social interactions in youths' schools and communities significantly reduced their positive well-being. However, positive social interactions, especially feeling valued and respected by teachers at their schools, significantly increased positive well-being and diminished the negative influence of perceived discrimination.

Not only did we find that social interaction overall influenced the daily psychological well-being of Latino youth, but we also found that *daily* positive and negative social interactions influenced youth's well-being. On a daily basis, negative racial interactions were associated with less happiness and more symptoms of depression and anxiety while positive racial interactions were associated with greater happiness and fewer symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Overall, differences in the prevalence of positive and negative social interactions largely explained differences in the psychological well-being of Latino youth growing up in North Carolina and Latino youth growing up in Los Angeles. The results strongly support the segmented assimilation model by demonstrating that the social contexts of reception influence the adaptation of first- and second-generation immigrant youth (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Latino youth living in a new receiving community such as North Carolina are more likely to have both positive and negative social interactions outside of their ethnic group and these social interactions strongly affect their daily psychological well-being.

Although differences in the prevalence of positive and negative social interactions explained much of the observed differences in the psychological well-being of North Carolinians and Los Angelinos, these differences were also partially accounted for by demographic differences in the Latino populations in each state. Proportionally more foreign-born, first-generation immigrant youth resided in North Carolina than in Los Angeles. Compared to U.S.-born Latinos, foreign-born Latinos were both more likely to be happy and more likely to experience depressive symptoms. These seemingly contradictory results reflect the duality of immigration. On the one hand, acculturative stress associated with migration places foreign-born youth at risk for mental health disorders (Padilla and Duran 1995). On the other, immigrant optimism and a country-of-origin frame of reference increase the likelihood that youth will feel happy, joyful, and calm upon moving to the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2001). The fact that the foreign-born adolescents simultaneously reported higher levels of psychological distress and happiness suggests that both acculturative stress and immigrant optimism may be at work in the well-being of foreign-born youth living in North Carolina and Los Angeles

After adjusting for positive and negative social interactions as well as factors associated with SES (i.e. living in a two-parent family and parental education levels), we largely explain differences in positive well-being by nativity. However, we are unable to fully explain nativity differences in negative well-being (i.e. depressive symptoms and anxiety). The higher frequency of depressive and anxious feelings, even after controlling for both SES characteristics and daily experiences, reflects the challenges these youth face due to migration and the difficulty of adapting to a new and different society. At the same time, they maintain a level of happiness and positivity that appear to be due in part to their identification and connection with their families and ethnic background. Together, these results suggest that the debate about existence and reliability of the so-called "immigrant paradox" may be due to the fact that immigrant children can simultaneously demonstrate both disadvantages and advantages in their adjustment when compared to their American-born peers. Rather than treating the paradox as an either/or proposition, future research should assess both positive and negative aspects of adjustment simultaneously and focus on identifying the subgroups of immigrant children who differ in the relative balance between the two.

Two factors mitigate the vulnerability of Latino youth, especially foreign-born youth, to depressive symptoms and anxiety – their strong ethnic and family identifications. Ethnic identification as measured by a sense of ethnic affirmation, belonging, centrality, and regard promotes daily happiness and actually protects youth, especially foreign-born youth, from having higher levels of psychological distress. Likewise, a strong sense of obligation to the future support of family members, positive daily relationships with family members, and spending time with family on a daily basis each increases youths' sense of positive well-being and reduces their sense of negative well-being. These results are consistent with other studies demonstrating how Latino adolescents overcome daily stressors by relying on strong ethnic and family ties for support (Fuligni, Yip, and Tseng 2002; Kiang et al. 2006; Utsey et al. 2002).

Recognizing the importance of changing immigration trends, this study is among the first to examine how the social context of reception influences the daily psychological well-being of Latino youth. To further extend this research, additional comparative studies of adolescent youth living in traditional and emerging receiving communities must be undertaken. These studies should not only measure potentially deleterious aspects of adolescents' social environments (e.g., discrimination) but must also measure salubrious aspects of their social environments (e.g., social acceptance). Finally, studies building upon this research can further explore how distinct characteristics (e.g., co-ethnic concentration, poverty rates, unemployment rates) of new and traditional communities or schools in these communities shape assimilation experiences and student outcomes. Doing so will allow research and policy makers to better develop programs to support the health and educational attainment of our largest and fastest growing population of minority youth.

ENDNOTES

---

[1] *Familismo* or *familism* refers to feelings of loyalty and solidarity towards family members and emphasizes the importance family has on self-identify (Cortes 1995). *Respeto* or respect emphasizes the importance of teaching children the proper levels of courtesy and manners for interacting in various social settings. *Personalismo* refers to the warmth that makes one feel welcomed and accepted.

[2] Urban high schools were defined as high schools serving counties where over 50% of the population was living inside an urbanized area or urban cluster. Rural high schools were defined as serving counties where 50% or less of the population lived in an urbanized area or urban cluster.

[3] Schools in North Carolina and Los Angeles required an active consent process. In addition, all 9th grade students in Los Angeles schools were asked to participate. In North Carolina, only Latino students were asked to participate.

[4] We did not identify substantial bias resulting from the deletion of observations with missing values on our independent variables. However, deleted observations were more likely to be from Los Angeles (70% vs. 55%), had less positive moods (3.36 vs. 3.52), and were less likely to experience negative ethnic/racial treatment (2.2% vs. 3.3%) and negative interactions (4.9% vs. 6.4%), and were less likely to get along with parents (60% vs. 74%), and spend time with family (74% vs. 82%).

---

[5] We estimated individual fixed effects models as well. These yielded similar results with respect to our time-varying variables. We prefer random effects models to identify the influence of non-time varying characteristics.

[6] We also ran school fixed effect models (available upon request) and found similar results.

[7] In the North Carolina sample, students also completed the 20-item Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression (CES-D) scale (Radloff 1977) as part of the in-school survey. A score of 16 or more on this scale typically indicates significant symptoms of depression. North Carolina students who reported feeling moderately or extremely depressed on at least 3 out of 14 days had an average CES-D score of 22.78 North Carolina students who reported feeling moderately to extremely anxious on at least 3 out of 14 days had an average CES-D score of 23.37

[8] We evaluated 1-day lags in the effects of daily interactions and daily family relations. Results (available upon request) were nearly identical to those reported here. However, time spent with family became significant at the .05 levels in all models when lagged.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, and Brian J. Stults. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 79(2):587-621.

Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream*. Harvard University Press.

Alegría, Margarita, Norah E. Mulvaney-Day, Maria Torres, Antonio Polo, Zhun Cao, and Glerisa Canino. 2007. "Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorders across Latino Subgroups in the United States." *American Journal of Public Health* 97(1):68-75.

Alvarez, Rodolfo. 1971. "The Unique Psycho-Historical Experiences of the Mexican-American People." *Social Science Quarterly* 52(2):15-29.

Araujo, Beverly Y., and Luisa N. Borrell. 2006. "Understanding the Link between Discrimination, Mental Health Outcomes, and Life Chances among Latinos." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 28(2):245-266.

Bankston, Carl L., III, and Min Zhou. 2002. "Being Well vs. Doing Well: Self-Esteem and School Performance among Immigrant and Nonimmigrant Racial and Ethnic Groups." *International Migration Review* 36(2):389-415.

Bonner, Lynn. 2008. "Community College Ban on Illegal Immigrants Stands." *News and Observer*, August 16.

Burnam, M. Audrey, Richard L. Hough, Marvin Karno, Javier I. Escobar, and Cynthia A. Telles. 1987. "Acculturation and Lifetime Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorders Among Mexican Americans in Los Angeles." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 28(1):89-102.

Chase, Nancy D. 1999. "Parentification: An Overview of Theory, Research, and Societal Issues." Pp. 3-34. *Burdened Children: Theory, Research, and Treatment of Parentification*. Nancy D. Chase, editor. Sage.

Coohey, Carol. 2001. "The Relationship between Familism and Child Maltreatment in Latino and Anglo Families." *Child Maltreatment* 6(2):130-142.

Cornwell, Benjamin. 2003. "The Dynamic Properties of Social Support: Decay, Growth, and Staticity, and Their Effects on Adolescent Depression." *Social Forces* 81(3):953-978.

Cortes, Dharma E. 1995. "Variations in Familism in Two Generations of Puerto Ricans." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 17(2):249-255.

DeGarmo, David S., and Charles R. Martinez, Jr. 2006. "A Culturally Informed Model of Academic Well-Being for Latino Youth: The Importance of Discriminatory Experiences and Social Support." *Family Relations* 55(3):267-278.

Driscoll, Anne K., Stephen T. Russell, and Lisa J. Crockett. 2008. "Parenting Styles and Youth Well-Being Across Immigrant Generations." *Journal of Family Issues* 29(2):185-209.

Ettner, Susan , Richard Frank, and Ronald Kessler. 1997. "The Impact of Psychiatric Disorders on Labor Market Outcomes." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 51(1):64-81.

Finch, Brian K., Bohdan Kolody, and Willliam A. Vega. 2000. "Perceived Discrimination and Depression among Mexican-Origin Adults in California." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41(3):295-313.

Fletcher, Jason. 2008. "Adolescent Depression: Diagnosis, Treatment, and Educational Attainment." *Health Economics* 17(11):1215-35.

Frank, Reanne, Magdalena Cerda, and Maria Rendon. 2007. "Barrios and Burbs: Residential Context and Health-Risk Behaviors among Angeleno Adolescents." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 48(3):283-300.

Fry, Richard. 2008. *Latino Settlement in the New Century*. Washington D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Fuligni, Andrew J. 1997. "The Academic Achievement of Adolescents from Immigrant Families: The Roles of Family Background, Attitudes, and Behavior." *Child Development* 68(2):351-363.

—. 1998. "The Adjustment of Children from Immigrant Families." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 7(4):99-103.

Fuligni, Andrew J., and Flook, Lisa. 2005. “A social identity approach to ethnic differences in family relationships during adolescence.” Pp. 125-152. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*. Robert Kail, editor. Academic Press.

Fuligni, Andrew J., Vivian Tseng, and May Lam. 1996. "Attitudes toward Family Obligations among American Adolescents from Asian, Latin American, and European Backgrounds." *Child Development* 70(4):1030-1044.

Fuligni, Andrew J., Tiffany Yip, and Vivian Tseng. 2002. "The Impact of Family Obligation on the Daily Activities and Psychological Well-being of Chinese American Adolescents." *Child Development* 73(1):302-314.

Garcia Coll, Cynthia T., and Laura A. Szalacha. 2004. "The Multiple Contexts of Middle Childhood." *Future of Children* 14(2):81-97.

Gee, Gilbert C., Andrew Ryan, David J. Laflamme, and Jeanie Holt. 2006. "Self-reported Discrimination and Mental Health Status among African Descendants, Mexican Americans, and Other Latinos in the New Hampshire REACH 2010 Initiative: The Added Dimension of Immigration." *American Journal of Public Health* 96(10):1821-1828.

Gil, Andres, William Vega, and Juanita Dimas. 1994. "Acculturative Stress and Personal Adjustment Among Hispanic Adolescent Boys." *Journal of Community Psychology* 22(1):43-54.

Gonzales, Nancy A., George P. Knight, Antonio A. Morgan-Lopez, Delia Sanenz, and Amalia Sirolli. 2002. "Acculturation and the Mental Health of Latino Youths: An Integration and Critique of the Literature " Pp. 45-76. *Latino Children and Families in the United States: Current Research and Future Directions.* Josefina M. Contreras, Kathryn A. Kerns, and Angela M. Neal-Barnett, editors. Praeger.

Goodman, Elizabeth, Bin Huang, Terrance Wade, and Robert Kahn. 2003. "A Multilevel Analysis of the Relationship of Socioeconomic Status to Adolescent Depressive Symptoms: Does School Context Matter?" *Journal of Pediatrics* 143(4):451-456.

Greene, Melissa L., Niobe Way, and Kerstin Pahl. 2006. "Trajectories of Perceived Adult and Peer Discrimination among Black, Latino, and Asian American Adolescents: Patterns and Psychological Correlates." *Developmental Psychology* 42(2):218-238.

Greenfield, Patricia M., Heidi Keller, Andrew Fuligni, and Ashley Maynard. 2003. "Cultural Pathways through Universal Development." *Annual Review of Psychology* 54(1):461-490.

Grossman, Jennifer M., and Belle Liang. 2008. "Discrimination Distress among Chinese American Adolescents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37(1):1-11.

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

Harker, Kathryn. 2001. "Immigrant Generation, Assimilation, and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being." *Social Forces* 79(3):969-1004.

Harris, Kathleen M. 1999. "The Health Status and Risk Behaviors of Adolescents in Immigrant Families." Pp.286-347. *Children of immigrant : health, adjustment, and public assistance.* Donald J. Hernandez, editor. National Academy of Press.

Hwang, Wei Chin, and S. Goto. 2008. "The Impact of Perceived Racial Discrimination on the Mental Health of Asian American and Latino College Students." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 14(4):326-335.

IPUMS. 2000. "IPUMS On-line Data Analysis System." Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center. Available at: http://usa.ipums.org/usa/sda/.

Jayakody, Rukmalie, Sheldon Danzinger, and Ronald Kessler. 1998. "Early-Onset Psychiatric Disorders and Male Socioeconomic Status." *Social Science Research* 27(4):371-387.

Johnson, James H., Karen D. Johnson-Webb, and Walter C. Farrell. 1999. "A Profile of Hispanic Newcomers to North Carolina." *Popular Government* 65(1):2-12.

Kao, Grace. 1999. "Psychological Well-Being and Educational Achievement among Immigrant Youth." Pp. 410-477. *Children of Immigrants: Health, Adjustment, and Public Assistance.* Donald J. Hernandez, editor. National Academy of Press.

Kao, Grace, and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly* 76(1):1-19.

Kaufman, Phillip, Xianglei Chen, Susan P. Choy, Katharin Peter, Sally A. Ruddy, Amanda K. Miller, Jill K. Fleury, Kathryn A. Chandler, Michael G. Planty, and Michael R. Rand. 2001. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2001*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education and Justice.

Kessler, Ronald C., and Richard G. Frank. 1997. "The Impact of Psychiatric Disorders on Work Loss Days." *Psychological Medicine* 27(4):861-873.

Kessler, Ronald C., Cindy Foster, William B. Saunders, and Paul Stang. 1995. "Social Consequences of Psychiatric Disorders 1: Educational Attainment." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 152(7):1026-1032.

Kiang, Lisa, Tiffany Yip, Melinda Gonzales-Backen, Melissa Witkow, and Andrew J. Fuligni. 2006. "Ethnic Identity and the Daily Psychological Well-Being of Adolescents From Mexican and Chinese Backgrounds." *Child Development* 77(5):1338-1350.

Knight, George P., Ryan P. Jacobson, Nancy A. Gonzales, Mark W. Roosa, and Delia S. Saenz. 2006. "An Evaluation of the Psychology Research on Acculturation and Enculturation Processes among Recently Immigrating Populations." Pp. 9-32. *Strengths and Challenges of New Immigrant Families: Implications for Research, Policy, Education, and Service*. Rochelle Dalla, John Defrain, Julie Johnson, and Douglas Abbot, editors. Lexington Publisher.

Lee, Min-Ah, and Kenneth F. Ferraro. 2007. "Neighborhood Residential Segregation and Physical Health among Hispanic Americans: Good, Bad, or Benign?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 48(2):131-148.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Wenquan Zhang. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles." *American Sociological Review* 67(2):299-322.

Lorr, Maurice, and Douglas M. Mcnair. 1971. *The Profiles of Mood States Manual*. Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

Maitland, Scott. 2006. "We are All Immigrants." *Chapel Hill News*, April 30.

Massey, Douglas S. 1990. "American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass." *American Journal of Sociology* 96(2):329-357.

McNeely, Clea, and Christina Falci. 2004. "School Connectedness and the Transition Into and Out of Health-Risk Behavior Among Adolescents: A Comparison of Social Belonging and Teacher Support." *Journal of School Health* 74(7):284-292.

Meadows, Sarah O. 2007. "Evidence of Parallel Pathways: Gender Similarity in the Impact of Social Support on Adolescent Depression and Delinquency." *Social Forces* 85(3):1143-1167.

Mendoza-Denton, Rodolfo, Geraldine Downey, Valerie Purdie, Angelina Davis, and Janina Pietrzak. 2002. "Sensitivity to Status-Based Rejection: Implications for African American Students' College Experience." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(4):896-918.

Mossakowski, Kaysia N. 2007. "Are Immigrants Healthier? The Case of Depression among Filipino Americans." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(3):290-304.

Mossakowski, Krysia N. 2003. "Coping with Perceived Discrimination: Does Ethnic Identity Protect Mental Health?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 44(3):318-331.

Mulvaney-Day, Norah E., Margarita Alegría, and William Sribney. 2007. "Social Cohesion, Social Support, and Health among Latinos in the United States." *Social Science and Medicine* 64(2):477-495.

Newman, Barbara M., Brenda J. Lohman, and Philip R. Newman. 2007a. "Peer Group Membership and a Sense of Belonging: Their Relationship to Adolescent Behavior Problems." *Adolescence* 42(166):241-263.

Newman, Barbara M., Philip R. Newman, Sarah Griffen, Kerry O'Connor, and Jayson Spas. 2007b. "The Relationship Of Social Support To Depressive Symptoms During The Transition To High School." *Adolescence* 42(167):441-459.

Ogbu, John U. 2004. "Collective Identity and the Burden of 'Acting White' in Black History, Community, and Education." *Urban Review* 36(1):1-35.

Ortega, Alexander N., Robert Rosenheck, Margarita Alegría, and Rani A. Desai. 2000. "Acculturation and the Lifetime Risk of Psychiatric and Substance Use Disorders among Hispanics." *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders* 188(11):728-735.

Padilla, Amado, and David Duran. 1995. "The Psychological Dimension in Understanding Immigrant Students." Pp. 131-161. *California's Immigrant Children*. Ruben G. Rumbaut, and Wayne A. Cornelius, editors. University of California.

Passel, Jeffrey S., and D' Vera Cohn. 2008. *U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050*. Washington D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Perreira, Krista M., Mimi V. Chapman, and Gabriela L. Stein. 2006. "Becoming an American Parent: Overcoming Challenges and Finding Strength in a New Immigrant Latino Community." *Journal of Family Issues* 27(10):1383-1414.

Phinney, Jean S. 1992. "The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A New Scale for Use with Diverse Groups." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 7(2):156-176.

Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait, 3rd Edition*. University of California Press.

Radloff, Lenore S. 1977. "The CES-D Scale: A Self-report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population." *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1(3):385-401.

Roeser, R., J. Eccles, and K. Strobel. 1998. "Linking the study of schooling and mental health: selected issues and empirical illustrations at the level of the individual." *Educational Psychologist* 33(4):153-176.

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1991. "The Agony of Exile: A Study of the Migration and Adaptation of Indochinese Refugee Adults and Children. Refugee." Pp. 59-91. *Children: Theory, Research, and Service*. F.L. Ahearn, and J.L. Athey, editors. John Hopkins University Press.

—. 1994. "The Crucible Within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation among Children of Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 28(4):748-794.

—. 1999. "Passages to Adulthood: The Adaptation of Children of Immigrants in Southern California." Pp. 478-542. *Children of Immigrants: Health, Adjustment, and Public Assistance*. Donald J. Hernandez, editor. National Academy of Press.

Saluja, Gitanjali, Ronaldo Iachan, Peter Scheidt, Mary Overpeck, Wenyu Sun, and Jay Giedd. 2004. "Prevalence of and Risk Factors for Depressive Symptoms among Young Adolescents." *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 158(8):760-765.

Sam, David L., Paul Vedder, Colleen Ward, and Gabriel Horenczyk. 2006. "Psychological and Sociocultural Adaptation of Immigrant Youth." Pp. 117-142. *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation across National Contexts.* John W. Berry, Jean S. Phinney, Kyunghwa Kwak, and David L. Sam, editors. Eribaum.

Schoen, Cathy, Karen Davis, Karen S. Collins, Linda Greenberg, Catherine Des Roches, and Melinda Abrams. 1997. *The Commonwealth Fund Survey of the Health of Adolescent Girls*. New York: Common Wealth Fund.

Sears, David. 2002. "Assessment of Interracial/Interethnic Conflict in Los Angeles." Los Angeles: Center for Research in Society and Politics.

Sellers, Robert M., Stephanie A. J. Rowley, Tabbye M. Chavous, J. Nicole Shelton, and Mia A. Smith. 1997. "Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity: A Preliminary Investigation of Reliability and Construct Validity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73(4):805-815.

Singh, Gopal K., and Mohammad Siahpush. 2001. "All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality of Immigrants and Native Born in the United States." *American Journal of Public Health* 91(3):392-393.

—. 2002. "Ethnic-Immigrant Differentials in Health Behaviors, Morbidity, and Cause-Specific Mortality in the United States: An Analysis of Two National Data Bases." *Human Biology* 74(1):83-104.

Srole, Leo, Thomas S. Langner, Stanley T. Michael, Price Kirkpatrick, Marvin K. Opler, and Thomas A.C. Rennie. 1978. *Mental Health in the Metropolis: The Midtown Manhattan Study*. Leo Srole, and Anita Kassen Fischer, editors. New York University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, Carola, and Marcelo Suárez-Orozco. 2001. *Children of Immigration*. Harvard University Press.

Sun, Rachel C. F., and Eadaoin K. P. Hui. 2007. "Psychosocial Factors Contributing to Adolescent Suicidal Ideation." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 36(6):775-786.

Suro, Roberto, and Sonya Tafoya. 2004. *Dispersal and Concentration: Patterns of Latino Residential Settlement*. Washington D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Telzer, Eva H., and Fuligni, Andrew J. in press. "Daily family assistance and the psychological well being of adolescents from Latin American, Asian, and European backgrounds." *Developmental Psychology*.

Tyler, Tom R., and Peter Degoey. 1995. "Collective Restraint in Social Dilemmas: Procedural Justice and Social Identification Effects on Support for Authorities." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69(3):482-497.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. "Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3)—Sample Data." Available at: http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2002/sumfile3.html.

Ueno, Koji. 2005. "The Effects of Friendship Networks on Adolescent Depressive Symptoms." *Social Science Research* 34(3):484-510.

Umaña-Taylor, Adriana J., and Kimberly A. Updegraff. 2007. "Latino Adolescents' Mental Health: Exploring the Interrelations among Discrimination, Ethnic Identity, Cultural Orientation, Self-esteem, and Depressive Symptoms." *Journal of Adolescence* 30(4):549-567.

Utsey, Shawn O., Mark H. Chae, Christa F. Brown, and Deborah Kelly. 2002. "Effect of Ethnic Group Membership on Ethnic Identity, Race-Related Stress, and Quality of Life." *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology* 8(4):366-377.

Vega, William A., Bohdan Kolody, Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola, Ethel Alderte, Ralph Catalano, and Jorge Caraveo-Anduaga. 1998. "Lifetime Prevalence of DSM-III-R Psychiatric Disorders among Urban and Rural Mexican Americans in California." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 55(9):771-778.

Vega, William A., and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1991. "Ethnic Minorities and Mental Health." *Annual Review of Sociology* 17:351-383.

Walker, Marlon. 2008. "NC Sheriff’s Slurs Snarl Locals’ Immigration Work." *News and Observer*, Oct. 22.

Wheaton, Blair, and Philippa Clarke. 2003. "Space Meets Time: Integrating Temporal and Contextual Influences on Mental Health in Early Adulthood." *American Sociological Review* 68(5):680-706.

Wickrama, K. A. S., Glen H. Elder, and W. Todd Abraham. 2007. "Rurality and Ethnicity in Adolescent Physical Illness: Are Children of the Growing Rural Latino Population at Excess Health Risk?" *The Journal of Rural Health* 23(3):228-237.

Wilcox-Gok, Virginia , Dave Marcotte, Farah Farahati, and Carey Borkoski. 2004. "Early onset depression and high school dropout." Pp. 27-52. *The Economics of Gender and Mental Illness*. Dave Marcotte, and Virginia Wilcox-Gok, editors. JAI Press.

Wong, Carol A., Jacquelynne S. Eccles, and Arnold Sameroff. 2003. "The Influence of Ethnic Discrimination and Ethnic Identification on African American Adolescents' School and Socioemotional Adjustment." *Journal of Personality* 71(6):1197-1232.

Xue, Yang, Tama Leventhal, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Felton J. Earls. 2005. "Neighborhood Residence and Mental Health Problems of 5- to 11-year-olds." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 62(5):554-563.

Yip, Tiffany, and Andrew J. Fulgni. 2002. "Daily Variation in Ethnic Identity, Ethnic Behaviors, and Psychological Well-being among American Adolescents of Chinese Descent." *Child Development* 73(5):1557-1572.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Latino Students in NC and LA

	NC			LA			
	N	%/M	(SD)	N	%/M	(SD)	T or $\chi 2$
Student Characteristics							
Female	117	56%	--	127	50%	--	1.53
Age (mean)	209	15.31	(0.86)	253	14.84	(0.38)	7.42 ***
Generational Status[1]							
First generation	139	67%	--	44	17%	--	115.42 ***
Second generation	62	30%	--	140	55%	--	30.65 ***
Third generation	8	4%	--	65	26%	--	41.12 ***
Missing generation	0	0%	--	4	2%	--	3.33 †
Country of Birth							
United States	66	32%	--	209	83%	--	123.7 ***
Mexico	77	37%	--	24	9%	--	50.14 ***
Central America or Carribean	47	22%	--	6	2%	--	45.61 ***
South America	19	9%	--	6	2%	--	10.1 **
Missing country of birth	0	0%	--	8	3%	--	6.73 *
Age of Entry							
Born in U.S.	66	32%	--	209	83%	--	123.7 ***
Under age 6	26	12%	--	20	8%	--	2.63
Ages 6-12	71	34%	--	15	6%	--	59.41 ***
Ages 13 or more	46	22%	--	2	1%	--	55.35 ***
Missing age of entry	0	0%	--	7	3%	--	5.87 ***
Family Characteristics							
Two-parent family	152	73%	--	175	69%	--	0.70
Parent graduated high school	102	49%	--	195	77%	--	39.84 ***

† p<.10, * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

[1] Percentages exceed 100 due to rounding.

NOTE: T-tests using the sattertwaite adjustment for unequal variances were used to compare differences in means. Chi-square tests were used to compare differences in proportions. Second and third-generation youth include a small number born abroad to U.S. citizens.

Table 2. Mean Differences in Average Daily Psychological Well-Being, Discrimination, Social Acceptance, Ethnic Identification, Family Identification, Average Daily Interactions, and Average Daily Family Relations of Latino Students in NC and LA

	NC	LA	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	T
A. Daily Psychological Well-Being			
Strength of avg. daily happiness	3.64 (0.93)	3.38 (0.81)	3.21 ***
% days moderately-extremely happy	75 (0.30)	70 (0.38)	1.57
Strength of avg. daily depressive symptoms	1.68 (0.68)	1.45 (0.55)	3.93 ***
% days with moderate-extreme depressive symptoms	13 (0.22)	8 (0.17)	3.06 **
Strength of avg. daily anxiety	1.73 (0.64)	1.58 (0.56)	2.56 *
% days with moderate-extreme anxiety symptoms	12 (0.22)	8 (0.17)	1.79 †
B. Discrimination			
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	2.68 (1.15)	2.09 (0.98)	5.88 ***
Concern about discrimination	2.67 (1.25)	2.32 (1.14)	3.05 **
C. Social Accpetance, Ethnic Identification, and Family Identification			
Social Acceptance			
Positive school climate	3.79 (1.07)	3.40 (0.93)	4.15 ***
Adult school encouragement	4.08 (1.06)	3.79 (1.13)	2.78 **
Ethnic Identification			
Ethnic identification	4.17 (0.58)	3.71 (0.72)	7.65 ***
Family Identification			
Family respect	4.09 (0.63)	3.90 (0.78)	2.91 **
Future support	3.74 (0.82)	3.45 (0.88)	3.73 ***
D. Daily Interactions			
% days of positive ethnic treatment	12 (0.24)	3 (0.10)	4.69 ***
% days of negative ethnic treatment	5 (0.14)	2 (0.06)	3.13 **
% days of negative interaction	8 (0.17)	5 (0.11)	1.60
E. Daily Family Relations			
% days got along with parents	70 (0.31)	76 (0.25)	-2.39 *
% days spent time with family	81 (0.27)	83 (0.22)	-0.70
Avg. # of family obligations per day	2.28 (1.23)	1.65 (1.01)	5.98 ***
N=	209	253	

† p<.10, * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

NOTE: T-tests using the sattertwaite adjustment for unequal variances were used to compare differences in means. All daily measures were observed over a 14-day period.

Table 3. Effects of State of Residence, Discrimination, Foreign-born Status, Social Acceptance, Ethnic and Family Identification on Daily Psychological Well-Being

	(1) Daily Happiness b (s.e.)	(2) Daily Depressive Symptoms b (s.e.)	(3) Daily Anxiety b (s.e.)
A. Baseline			
North Carolina	0.29 (0.08) ***	0.19 (0.06) **	0.14 (0.07) *
B. Discrimination Experiences			
North Carolina	0.31 (0.08) ***	0.14 (0.06) *	0.10 (0.06)
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	-0.05 (0.03)	0.08 (0.03) *	0.06 (0.03) *
Concern about discrimination	0.04 (0.05)	0.03 (0.05)	0.04 (0.04)
C. Foreign-Born			
North Carolina	0.25 (0.06) **	0.03 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)
Foreign-born	0.15 (0.08) †	0.26 (0.07) ***	0.12 (0.07)
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	-0.05 (0.03)	0.08 (0.03) *	0.06 (0.03) *
Concern about discrimination	0.03 (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
D. Social Acceptance			
North Carolina	0.16 (0.06) **	0.06 (0.06)	0.07 (0.05)
Foreign-born	0.04 (0.08)	0.30 (0.06) ***	0.15 (0.07) *
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	0.03 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)
Concern about discrimination	0.00 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
Positive school climate	0.30 (0.04) ***	-0.12 (0.04) **	-0.09 (0.03) *
Adult school encouragment	-0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.05 (0.02) *
E. Ethnic Identification			
North Carolina	0.17 (0.07) *	0.10 (0.05) *	0.13 (0.05) **
Foreign-born	0.12 (0.09)	0.28 (0.06) ***	0.14 (0.07) *
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	-0.05 (0.03)	0.09 (0.03) **	0.07 (0.03) **
Concern about discrimination	0.02 (0.05)	0.03 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)
Ethnic identification	0.22 (0.06) ***	-0.21 (0.06) **	-0.22 (0.07) **
F. Family Identification			
North Carolina	0.19 (0.08) *	0.06 (0.05)	0.08 (0.05)
Foreign-born	0.12 (0.08)	0.27 (0.06) ***	0.13 (0.07) †
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	-0.01 (0.02)	0.06 (0.03) †	0.05 (0.03)
Concern about discrimination	0.00 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	0.05 (0.04)
Family respect	0.27 (0.04) ***	-0.13 (0.06) *	-0.17 (0.05) **
Future support	0.06 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.00 (0.03)
N=	6117	6126	6126

† p<.10, * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Note: Regressions include additional controls for students' sex, age, living in a two-parent family, having at least one parent with a high school degree, an indicator variable for missing values on parent education, and a dummy control for weekend days. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the school-level.

Table 4. Full Regressions on Daily Psychological Well-Being Including Daily Acculturation Experiences of Latino Youth in NC and LA

	(1a)	(1b)	(2a)	(2b)	(3a)	(3b)
	Daily Happiness	Daily Happiness	Daily Depressive Symptoms	Daily Depressive Symptoms	Daily Anxiety	Daily Anxiety
	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)
North Carolina	0.12 (0.08)	0.15 (0.07) *	0.12 (0.05) *	0.09 (0.05)	0.13 (0.05) *	0.10 (0.05) *
Foreign-born	0.04 (0.08)	0.03 (0.08)	0.31 (0.05) ***	0.31 (0.05) ***	0.16 (0.07) *	0.15 (0.07) *
Discrimination						
Perceived likelihood of discrimination	0.04 (0.03)	0.03 (0.02)	0.06 (0.03) †	0.05 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)
Concern about discrimination	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)	0.05 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)
Social Acceptance						
Positive school climate	0.24 (0.03) ***	0.23 (0.03) ***	-0.08 (0.03) **	-0.07 (0.03) *	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.02)
Adult school encouragment	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.03)	0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.05 (0.02) **	0.05 (0.02) **
Ethnic Identification						
Ethnic identification	0.06 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	-0.17 (0.06) **	-0.15 (0.06) *	-0.18 (0.07) *	-0.17 (0.07) *
Family Identification						
Family respect	0.19 (0.04) ***	0.18 (0.05) ***	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.12 (0.04) **	-0.12 (0.04) **
Future support	0.04 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.00 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)
Daily Interactions						
Positive ethnic treatment		0.16 (0.07) *		0.06 (0.05)		0.18 (0.04) ***
Negative ethnic treatment		-0.13 (0.07) †		0.19 (0.08) *		0.12 (0.07) †
Negative interaction		-0.14 (0.05) **		0.20 (0.06) **		0.20 (0.07) **
Daily Family Relations						
Got along with parents		0.27 (0.03) ***		-0.18 (0.04) ***		-0.15 (0.03) ***
Spent time with family		0.08 (0.06)		-0.08 (0.03) **		-0.04 (0.02) †
Number of family obligations		0.01 (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)		-0.01 (0.01)
N=	6117		6126		6126	

† p<.10, * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Note: Regressions include additional controls for students' sex, age, living in a two-parent family, having at least one parent with a high school degree, an indicator variable for missing values on parent education, and a dummy control for weekend days. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the school-level.