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Juvenile Arrest Rates and Population Asian

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, National Center for Juvenile Justice
National, aggregate data suggest that API delinquency is not an issue

Source: U.S. arrests age 10-17/100,000 persons in ethnic group age 10-17, from OJJDP, 2006
## Juvenile Arrest Rate by Ethnicity, Oakland, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Arrest Incidents in 2005</th>
<th>Juvenile Population 10 – 17 Years Old</th>
<th>Rate Per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American/ Black</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td>25,916</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>14,368</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic*</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>12,986</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda County Probation Department; 2005 Census, U.S. Census Bureau. NOTE: Juvenile population numbers may exceed total juvenile population due to overlapping of multiracial persons.

*According to the Census, Hispanic is an ethnicity and is its own variable; therefore, a person can be any race and Hispanic.*
## Population, Arrests, Adjudications & Placements of Juveniles by Ethnicity,
Oakland, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Juvenile Population</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>Adjudications</th>
<th>Institutional Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API</td>
<td>7,827</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18,243</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10,866</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41,333</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda County Probation Department; 2000 Census, U.S. Census Bureau.
## California Youth Authority, 2002 Ward Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (N=6121)</th>
<th>Percent (P=100%)</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5839</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immigration Status and Violence
Serious Violence Statistics by Immigration Status

Source: API Center Risk and Protective Factors Youth Survey

- First Generation (n=91): 8.8%
- Second Generation (n=237): 20.3%

Source: API Center Risk and Protective Factors Youth Survey
Asian Violence By Immigration Status
National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

Note: One-third of Asian respondents were Filipino, 20% of Asians were Chinese, a little over 20% were Japanese or Korean. Violence: get into serious physical fight, hurt someone badly; armed robbery; pull a knife or gun on someone; stab or shot someone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>1st Gen</th>
<th>2nd Gen</th>
<th>3rd+ Gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A little more than 20% of the Asian respondents were Chinese and a little less than 20% were Filipino, 15% were Southeast Asians. Violence defined as yes if respondent answered yes to getting into physical fights with or hurting someone.

Context of Immigration

- **Autonomous**
  - Those coming to US with significant means and status

- **Immigrant**
  - Those coming to US with intent on improving their social, economic, and political status

- **Involuntary**
  - Caste-like (e.g., African Americans)
  - Aliens in own land (e.g., Native Americans)
  - Refugees: As a result of war or displacement

Source: Ogbu, 1983
Influences on developmental change

Degree Of influence

Non-normative
Biological/physical
Historical/context

Infant
Young-middle adulthood
Old
Acculturation

• “The changes that groups and individuals undergo when they come into contact with another culture” (Williams & Berry, 1991)

• Behavior, values, knowledge, identity (Kim & Abreu, 2001)
Ethnic Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Integration (Bicultural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melting Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Marginalization (oppositional youth culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Berry, 1990; Berry, 1997; Phinney et al., 2001)
Youth Development

- Process of acculturation
  - Intergenerational/intercultural conflict
  - Acculturative dissonance
  - Family stressors

- What factors affect delinquency?
  - Values, attitudes, beliefs
  - Identity
  - Relationship with parents
STUDY 1: Individualism vs. Collectivism

Literature Review

• Process of individuation
  – Autonomy vs. separation
  – Separation more detrimental in certain cultural environments (Fuhrman & Holmbeck, 1995)

• Family socialization practices
  – Confucianism in Asian families

• Collectivists youth’s attitudes toward violence (Tyson & Hubert, 2002, 2003; Wong, 1997)

• Peer influence (Kim & Goto, 2000; Le, 2005)
Hypotheses

• H1: Individualism will be positively related to delinquency/violence
• H2: Collectivism will be negatively related to delinquency/violence
• H3: The relation between individualism/collectivism and delinquency/violence will be mediated through peer delinquency
Design

Sample
• Recruit from CBOs
• Cambodian, Chinese, Lao/Mien, Vietnamese youth (N= 339)
• Males/Females
• Generation Status

Procedure
• Parental consent
• Face-to-face interview, both youth and parent separately
Method

• Measures
  – Demographics
  – INDCOL (Singelis et al., 1995)
    • 32 item scale
  – Peer Delinquency (Thornberry et al., 1994)
    • 16-item scale
  – Self-Reported Delinquency (Elliott et al., 1985)
    • 16 items minor (e.g., truancy, cheating on tests)
    • 21 items serious (e.g., aggravated assault, robbery, arson, selling drugs)
Analysis

• Structural Equation Models
  – Mplus 3.1 (Muthen & Muthen, 2003)
  – Latent variables created by forming 3 item-parcels
• Measurement models
• Structural models
• Factorial invariance
• Strong factorial invariance for measurement model supported
  $\chi^2 = 3082, df = 240, p = .002, \chi^2:df = 1.28, RMSEA = .059, TLI = .971, CFI = .974$

• Strong factorial invariance for structural model supported
Figure 1

Model A: No Mediation through Peer Delinquency

Model B: Partial Mediation through Peer Delinquency

Model C: Full Mediation through Peer Delinquency
Model C: Partial Mediation through Peer Delinquency

\[ X^2 = 329.8 \text{ df } = 248, p < .001, X^2/df = 1.33, \text{ RMSEA } = .063, \text{ TLI } = .966, \text{ CFI } = .968 \]

\[ p < .05 \]
Study 2: Ethnic Identity vs. Acculturative Dissonance

**Roots**

The roots is important
Because roots is where all things start from
Without the roots, identity will vanish
Like a beautiful plant that has been forgotten
To be nourished with water
It will die
U take care of it
It will last and give
A beautiful flower
Without root
That flower will not bloom
So don’t forget your root
Because it’s where you came from
And where it starts.

-Norman Mercado, AYPAL/PIKA youth
Identity

• Ethnic Identity
  – Identity central to adolescent development (Erikson, 1960)
  – Judgment of oneself, in comparison with others, and in comparison with social and cultural norms

• Literature review
  – Supports positive role of EI with outcomes, but vary by ethnic groups
Acculturative Dissonance

• Rates of acculturation differ for parent and youth (e.g., Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993)
• Differences in value
• Developmental factors
  • Youth strive for autonomy and independence, process of individuation
  • Person-environment fit
• Literature Review (e.g., Rumbaut & Portes, 2002)
Hypotheses

• H1: Ethnic identity (EI) will be negatively related to delinquency/violence
• H2: Acculturative dissonance (AD) will be positively related to delinquency/violence
• H3: The relation between EI and AD to delinquency/violence will be mediated through peer delinquency
Design

• Sample
• Measures
  • Ethnic Identity (MEIM; Phinney, 1990)
  • Acculturative Dissonance
    – Measured by 6 items
      • youth experiences conflict between values learned at home and American values
      • youth agree with parents’ values but do not always act that way
      • youth can deal with different cultural demands (American and Asian) expected of youth
      • Parents criticize American values
  • Serious violence: 5 items (Denver Youth Survey)
• Analysis
Model C: Full Mediation through Peer Delinquency

- Cultural Conflict → Peer Delinquency
- Ethnic Identity → Peer Delinquency
- Peer Delinquency → Serious Delinquency

$X^2 = 251.87$ df $= 183$, $p < .001$, $X^2/df = 1.38$, RMSEA $= .053$, TLI $= .965$, CFI $= .968$, $p < .05$
STUDY 3: PARENTAL STRESS

Parental Stressors for Immigrant/Refugee Families

• Refugee experiences
  – Disruption of family structure (e.g., single parent)
  – Disruption of family bonds, relations with youth
  – PTSD of parents

• Immigration stressors
  – Economics, jobs
  – Language difficulty
Hypotheses

• H1: Parents’ refugee status (PRS) will be positively related to delinquency/violence
• H2: Immigration stressors (IS) will be positively related to delinquency/violence
• H3: The relation between PRS and IS to delinquency/violence will be mediated through peer delinquency and parental engagement
Design

• Sample
• Measures
  • Peer Delinquency: 16 items (Thornberry et al., 1994)
  • Serious violence: 5 items (Denver Youth Survey)
  • Interpersonal violence: 1 item (hit a family member or boy/girlfriend within the last 6 months)
  • Parental engagement: affective relations, close communication, parental supervision (Hirschi, 1969)
  • Refugee status: 1 item
  • Parental immigration stress: 7 items (getting a job, getting along with others, speaking English)
• Analysis
  • SEM using Mplus 3.1 (Muthen & Muthen, 2003)
Results

- Parent’s refugee status → peer delinquency → serious violence
- Parent’s refugee status -> parental engagement -> serious violence
- Similar for interpersonal violence
- Full mediation supported, but only for Vietnamese
- Immigration stressors non-significant
CURRENT PROJECT: MULTICULTURALISM
Multiculturalism

• Kosmopolites – world citizens (Stoics)
  – Local community of birth
  – Larger community of commonality (source of moral and social obligations)
  – Critical examination of habits and customs
  – Morally & Ethically important (Fowers & Davidov, 2006)
Possible Benefits of Multicultural Context

• Development of personality assets (e.g., empathy, flexibility, adaptability)

• Increase comfort with others (Kurlaender & Yun, 2002)

• Feelings of safety, less victimization for ethnic minority youth (Graham, 2006; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2006)

• Neighborhood diversity & psychological outcomes (Georgiades, Boyle, & Duku, 2007)

• Bicultural competency & positive mental health (Garcia Coll et al., 1996; Yasui & Dishion, 2007)
Multiculturalism

• Psychological state of openness
• Objectively as an index
  – Presence of a diverse context in which no one group represents a 50% majority (Graham, 2006)
  – Interracial exposure of black and Hispanic students to white students (Frankenberg & Lee, 2002)
• Subjectively as perception of school context
  – “students’ perceptions of whether cultural diversity is valued, utilized, and encouraged both at the organizational (school) level and in the classroom” (Tan, 1999)
Multiculturalism

- **School multiculturalism**
  - Students’ perception of teachers’ responses to diversity
  - Diversity in curriculum (Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999)
  - Focus on the structural & organizational dimensions

- **Relational multiculturalism**
  - Focus on the interpersonal dimensions
  - Cross-race friendships; favorable attitudes toward other groups
Literature/Empirical Gap

• Limited empirical studies on multiculturalism with respect to youth development
• Mechanisms & Processes
Conclusions

• Trends in Asian American youth violence
  – Ethnic subgroups
  – Generation status

• Acculturation – what changes relate to delinquency/violence?
  – Cultural values
  – Parent relations/conflict
  – Ethnic identity

• Limitations
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