DRAFT: PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE WITHOUT AUTHORS' PERMISSION

CONTEXTS FOR BILINGUALISM AMONG US-BORN LATINOS, 1990 and 2000[1]

April Linton

Tomás R. Jiménez

University of California, San Diego
Department of Sociology
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0533
aplinton@ucsd.edu
tjimemez@ucsd.edu

Abstract
This paper focuses on bilingualism among Latino adults who were born in the US or are members of the "1.5 generation" of Latinos who immigrated to the US aged ten or younger. We ask: Under what contextual circumstances does bilingualism thrive among US-born and 1.5-generation Hispanics? While we acknowledge that Spanish retention across generations is in part a factor of individual- and household-level circumstances our interest is in broader contexts because these reflect contemporary developments that could influence *change* in both the real and perceived value of bilingualism. Our analysis encompasses US metropolitan areas in 1990 and 2000, emphasizing dynamics of demographic, economic, political, and socio-cultural change. We explore the contextual circumstances under which bilingualism could become a stable and compatible aspect of being American – part of an additive process of immigrant adaptation that incorporates, rather than replaces, characteristics of the sending country.

[1] The authors thank Joyce Lui for research assistance.

CONTEXTS FOR BILINGUALISM AMONG US-BORN LATINOS, 1990 and 2000

Historically, immigrants to the United States have been discouraged from using their native tongue and passing it on to their children. Immigration for most groups took place during a compressed period, and opportunities to speak the mother tongue of the immigrant generation dwindled after immigration ceased (Alba 1988; Massey 1995). The dominance of English in government, industry, education, and popular culture has made language "the single most important element in construction of national identity, both positively as a communicative instrument shared by members of the nation and as a boundary marker affirming their distinction from others" (Zolberg and Long 1999:22). It is thus not surprising that the vast majority of sociological research on language in the US focuses on English acquisition and use rather than other-language maintenance. The prevailing assumption is that bilingualism is a transitional state on the way to English monolingualism – maybe not for new immigrants, but definitely across generations.

Of late, some scholars have begun to question that assumption in the case of Spanish-English bilingualism (Alba et al. 2004, Alba and Nee 2003, Jiménez 2005, Linton 2004, Rumbaut 2002). Spanish has persisted to a much greater degree than other non-English languages spoken in the United States, with Spanish speakers comprising over half of those who speak a language other than English at home. A continuous flow of Latin American immigrants makes it more practical for US Hispanics[2] to retain Spanish now than it was in the past, providing greater opportunities and incentives for bilingualism. A change in dominant ideology

[2] We use the designations 'Hispanic' and 'Latino' interchangeably. We recognize the vast diversity within these categories. However, given our interest in Spanish-English bilingualism, the fact that the various subgroups (i.e., Cubans, Mexicans, Salvadorans) share a common language makes these categories quite relevant for the purposes of this paper.

from Americanization to multiculturalism has elevated the status of Spanish. Globalizing economies and the emergence of communities that span national borders (Portes 2003; Smith 2005) have altered the costs and benefits of English monolingualism and bilingualism.

This paper focuses on bilingualism among Latino adults who were born in the US or are members of the '1.5 generation' – immigrants who arrived as children age ten or younger. We ask: Under what contextual circumstances does bilingualism thrive among US-born and 1.5-generation Hispanics? While we acknowledge that Spanish retention across generations is in part a factor of individual- and household-level circumstances (Alba et al. 2002, Bean and Stevens 2003, Linton 2004, Stevens 1985), our interest is in broader contexts because these reflect contemporary developments that could influence *change* in both the real and perceived value of bilingualism. Our analysis encompasses US metropolitan areas in 1990 and 2000, emphasizing dynamics of socio-cultural, demographic, economic, and political change. We explore the contextual circumstances under which bilingualism could become a stable and compatible aspect of being American – part of an additive process of immigrant adaptation that incorporates, rather than replaces, characteristics of the sending country (Bean and Stevens 2003, Logan et al. 2002, López 1996, Yinger 1994).

BILINGUALISM AS A POSSIBLE *ENDPOINT* OF LINGUISTIC ASSIMILATION

Bilingualism may not just be a transition stage prior to English monolingualism. It may in fact be an endpoint of language change. Stevens (1985) suggests that bilingualism could be a stable outcome of linguistic assimilation among groups characterized by high rates of ethnic endogamy and non-English linguistic homogamy. Her 1992 study establishes the importance of the demographic context in determining whether US-born adults with a non-English mother tongue

continue to use that language alongside English, and that the influence of demographic variables on linguistic choices is "partly channeled through their effects on marriage patterns, i.e., the likelihood that a respondent has a spouse with facility in the same non-English language" (p.181).

The case for why bilingualism may become an endpoint of language shift becomes clear in recent research that measures the advantages of bilingualism for integration into American society. In their longitudinal study of the children of immigrants in San Diego and Miami, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) observed a high rate of shift away from their mother tongue, but found that the fluently bilingual teenagers in their sample were youths who did better in school, had higher aspirations for the future, enjoyed better mental health and family relations, and were more likely to have friends from abroad. Second-generation Latino youths are more likely to belong to this group than youths from other backgrounds, especially if their parents use Spanish at home and they have co-ethnic friends (p.141). Rumbaut's (2002) analysis of data from the third wave of the same survey,[3] in which the respondents had reached adulthood, showed that the Latinos' ability to speak and read Spanish "did not atrophy but rather improved appreciably from their teen to their twenties" (p. 67). About 25 percent reported fluent bilingualism, and over 75 percent of the respondents (who reported being English-dominant, Spanish-dominant, fully bilingual, or bilingual in a limited way) expressed the wish to raise their own children in Spanish and English.

Alba et al. (2002) also evidence some "staying power" for Spanish, especially in supportive familial and community contexts (p. 480). Using 1990 PUMS and CPS data to study language patterns of second- and third-generation children, they found that the rate of

[3] Rumbaut's (2002) study uses only data from the San Diego survey site.

intergenerational language shift is lower for Spanish-speakers, compared to other immigrant groups or to Spanish-speakers in times past.

There are many reasons why Spanish has persisted to a much greater degree than other non-English languages. Most contemporary immigration to the US is from Spanish-speaking countries. Spanish-speakers are, overwhelmingly, the largest non-English-language group in the country, comprising over half of those who generally speak a language other than English at home. Spanish language institutions and media are well established in many parts of the country, and using Spanish alongside English has become key to Latino political identity and efficacy – both in symbolic and practical terms.

Recent research shows that later-generation Mexican Americans, who by virtue of their later-generation status would seem most likely to see their Spanish-language skills enter a twilight, are maintaining Spanish alongside English (Alba 2004). Jiménez's (2005) ethnographic study of Mexican Americans in Garden City, Kansas, and Santa Maria, California, shows that the replenishment of a Mexican immigrant population to these cities creates a linguistic context that maintains and in some cases resuscitates bilingualism among later-generation Mexican Americans. Jiménez's work identifies demographic, economic, and ideological factors that contribute to bilingualism among Mexican Americans. The large size of the Mexican immigrant population allows for frequent interpersonal interactions between Mexican Americans and their immigrant brethren, facilitating the use Spanish in Mexican Americans' daily life, and marriages and romantic partnerships between Mexican Americans and immigrants bring Spanish language close to home for Mexican Americans. The large immigrant population also creates a demand for bilingualism in public- and private-sector jobs. Indeed, bilingualism has come to be seen as an important "hard skill" that employers reward though hiring preferences and financial

incentives. Many Mexican Americans are well aware that their ethnic origin combined with their Spanish-language abilities make them the first to "get the call" when employers seek bilingual workers. The growing Mexican immigrant population also yields an increase in Spanish language media (i.e., television, radio, live music, etc.) that Mexican Americans access, further bolstering their Spanish language skills (also see Macias 2004). The opportunities for Spanish language use in Garden City and Santa Maria operate within a larger multicultural ideological context that, relative to an earlier era when Americanization dominated, tolerates and even supports bilingualism.

This multicultural context is also evident in Linton's (2002, 2004) research on dual-language school programs in which native English- and Spanish-speaking children are educated together, bilingually. Her qualitative case studies in Chicago, Los Angeles, and five other Southern California school districts show that parents and education professionals choose the dual-language option not only because they believe it will improve students' academic performance and future college and employment options, but also because they highly value multiculturalism and want children to grow up knowing how to get along with people who are different from themselves. For parents this value holds regardless of race, ethnicity, and Spanish or English ability.

THEORIZING LANGUAGE CHOICE

In their research on the new second generation in America, Portes and Rumbaut (1996, 2001) develop three typologies of immigrant incorporation. One looks very much like the "melting pot" (Alba 1990; Waters 1990). The second generation adopts mainstream American customs, speaks mostly or only English, and is upwardly mobile. The second typology applies to children

of immigrants who downwardly acculturate not to the mainstream, but to inner-city subcultures. While these groups' educational and labor market outcomes are opposite those of the first, their linguistic outcome is the same: English monolingualism (though perhaps not in 'standard' English).

A third course is *selective acculturation*. In this process, ethnic networks and strong communities support children as they learn to deal with prejudice, navigate the education system, and find a place in the labor market. The outcome is upward assimilation combined with bilingualism and biculturalism: "While such a path may appear inimical to successful adaptation in the eyes of conventional assimilationists, in fact it can lead to better psychosocial and achievement outcomes because it preserves bonds across immigrant generations and gives children a clear reference point to guide their future lives" (Portes and Rumbaut 2001:309; cf. Glazer and Moynihan 1963). Selective acculturation offers a scenario in which maintaining a language other than English makes sense for Americans. In terms of contextual factors' influence on Spanish maintenance in the US, one would expect that – to the extent that bilingualism among native-born Hispanics is a result of selective acculturation – there will be proportionally more bilinguals in places where Latino populations are concentrated and where Latinos have economic and political resources at their disposal.

Language choice also depends on the durability of language options. The theoretical canon of language assimilation (Fishman 1965; Gordon 1964) was built on the study of European-origin immigrant groups that came to the US before and after the turn of the last century. As Waters and Jiménez (2005) point out, this wave of immigration took place during a temporally compressed period (roughly 1880-1920), and so each new generation born in the US after the immigrant generation had less contact with a sizable co-ethnic immigrant population.

With fewer immigrants replenishing the American ethnic population, each successive generation had fewer opportunities to speak the mother-tongue of their immigrant ancestors, expediting widespread English monolingualism among the descendents of these immigrant groups. Waters and Jiménez also point out that the forces that initiate and perpetuate migration (see Massey 1999) appear to be well entrenched, making the continual replenishment of immigrants from particular countries, like Mexico, a feature of American immigration into the foreseeable future. Immigrant replenishment already has (Alba 2004) and will likely continue to increase the durability of non-English language options (most especially Spanish), and therefore bilingualism, by making opportunities to speak Spanish even more pervasive. If immigrant replenishment plays a role in the rate of bilingualism, then there is a temporal component to understanding the contextual factors that shape bilingualism such that we would expect the rate of bilingualism over time to change proportional to changes in the size of the Latino immigrant population.

Several other theories offer predictions about when and where the linguistic aspect of selective acculturation, bilingualism, will be maintained. Neoclassical economic (e.g., Pool 1991), human capital (e.g., Chiswick and Miller 1995; Chiswick 1991) and functionalist (e.g., Gellner 1983) theories posit that bilingualism will only be practical or desirable to the extent that it represents a significant labor market advantage. In the first cases, the advantage is to individuals in society, in the last case it is to a particular society within a world of societies. Other theorists such as Anderson (1991), Greenfeld (1992), and Hobsbawm (1990) downplay economic incentives, instead pointing to ethnic identities and their meanings for members of various groups as the salient factors that inform official language policy and individual decisions about language acquisition and maintenance. For instance, Hobsbawm links language with the development of local political identities. This emphasis suggests that social factors such as the

relative status and influence of a language, its speakers, and the ethnic group(s) with which they identify will be important determinants of linguistic choice.

Modeling Bilingual Contexts

Our aim is to model the contextual factors that support bilingualism among American-born and 1.5-generation Latinos. Drawing on the theoretical discussion above and previous studies of language usage and assimilation, we test the following hypotheses:

> H1: Latinos will be more likely to preserve Spanish alongside English in cities where there is a relatively large and growing Latino population.
>
> H2: Influxes of Spanish-speaking immigrants will positively influence the degree to which US-born/1.5-generation Latinos retain bilingualism.
>
> H3: The relative size of an area's 1.5-generation population will positively influence bilingualism among US-born/1.5-generation Latinos.
>
> H4: Bilingualism will be more likely to flourish among US-born/1.5-generation Latinos in areas where Latinos in general have a relatively high level of status and political influence.
>
> H5: US-born/1.5-generation Latinos will be more likely to use Spanish when there are financial incentives to do so.
>
> H6: More US-born Latinos will be bilingual in places where there has been a relatively continuous and long-standing influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants.

DATA, VARIABLES, AND MEASURES

The units of analysis in this study are metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) or primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs) and the native-born and 1.5-generation Hispanic adults (age 18-75) who live in them. Person who did not report English fluency are excluded. Our analysis is limited to MSA/PMSAs that (1) existed as such and (2) were at least 5 percent Hispanic in both 1990 and 2000. Data about general characteristics of the Hispanic population come from the 1990 and 2000 Census (file STF3C). Data about bilingualism or English

monolingualism, bilinguals' relative socioeconomic status, and some contextual variables come from the 1990 and 2000 1-percent PUMS (Ruggles and Sobek 1997). Data on Hispanic elected officials comes from the *Directory of Hispanic Elected Officials* published by NALEO (2000). We gathered data on municipal government bilingual pay by phoning municipalities included in the data set and asking human resource specialists whether or not the municipality provided additional pay to bilingual employees. Table 1 provides additional details about the variables. Here we discuss how each is relevant to testing the hypotheses outlined above.

- Table 1 about here -

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is the proportion, in 2000, of native born or 1.5-generation Hispanics, fluent in English, who retain Spanish. The Census asks respondents which language they speak at home, and how well they speak English. Here, Spanish-English bilinguals as those who report that they speak Spanish at home *and* speak English "very well." This measure by no means encompasses all bilinguals (e.g., Spanish-speakers who are married to English monolinguals and thus do not speak Spanish at home). It also does not provide information about a respondent's competency or literacy in Spanish. However, it is the best indicator available at the macro level, and well-worth using (Bills 1989; Hart-Gonzalez and Feingold 1990; Solé 1990). Speaking Spanish at home reflects a preference for using the language, and – where applicable – a desire for one's children to know and use it.

Independent Variables

Three variables reflect the demographic context within which people make choices about language: the proportion of a MSA/PMSA's population that is Hispanic, the proportion of Hispanics who are foreign-born, and the proportion belonging to the 1/5 generation (whose

likelihood of having been raised in a Spanish-speaking home is higher than for US-born Hispanics in general).

The most obvious factor to influence Spanish retention is the presence of other speakers in one's area of residence (Scrauf 1999; Stevens 1992). Lacking a community of speakers – or at least of people for whom the Spanish language constitutes a part of a shared cultural heritage – it is improbable that many people who are fluent in English will actively maintain Spanish. We expect that more US-born Latinos will be bilingual in places where a relatively large portion of the Hispanic population is foreign born. Foreign-born Hispanics – even those who speak English well – are very likely to use Spanish in their daily lives. Thus, immigrants expand the community within which it is useful or desirable, and sometimes necessary to speak Spanish. Furthermore, as Stevens (1992) points out, in such places Hispanics are more likely to marry other Hispanics, possibly increasing the prevalence of bilingual households.

To explore the extent to which the influence of Hispanics in a given area influences the desire to maintain a distinct identity by retaining or becoming fluent in Spanish, we employ a ratio that reflect bilinguals' and English monolinguals' relative Duncan socioeconomic indicator (SEI) score. This variable is an indicator of local status (Frank 1985) as well as economic advantages associated with bilingualism. Our measure of political influence is representation: the number of Latino elected officials relative to a MSA/PMSA's total Latino population.

How do economic incentives shape language decisions? Bilingualism is often a benefit to workers in neighborhoods, regions, or occupational areas where more than one language is regularly spoken. The extent to which this economic benefit exists, and translates into good jobs and high incomes, should influence the prevalence of bilingualism. Overall, however, Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States earn less than English monolinguals do (Chiswick and

Miller 1997). In an older study of intergenerational transmission of Spanish, López (1982) shows evidence of the same, but also discusses a secondary pattern in which high educational and economic achievement, Spanish maintenance, and English competence are all positively associated. This trend tended to be "submerged" in the broader association between low socio-economic status and the continued use of Spanish (Solé 1990:49). López's work suggests that bilingualism will not be an economic disadvantage in every case. There may be more bilingualism in areas where the disadvantage is lower than average, does not exist at all, or is reversed. To test this proposition, we include a marker indicating that municipal governments within a MSA/PMSA pay a premium to bilingual workers.[4]

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

We report the OLS results of cross-sectional models using 2000 data (Table 2) as well as dynamic models incorporating change between 1990 and 2000 (Table 3).[5]

- Table 2 about here -

The coefficients in all tables in the paper should be read as the relationship between a unit change in the independent variables and the proportion of bilingual individuals in an MSA/PMSA. As predicted, the models in Table 2 show robust, positive relationships between a metro area's proportion Hispanic and proportions of Hispanics who are foreign-born and 1.5-generation and the degree to which US-born and 1.5-generation Hispanics in that metro area retain bilingualism. Models 4 and 5, however, do not support our hypotheses about the

[4] Two MSAs encompass cities that do and do not pay a premium for bilingualism: Charlotte/Gastonia/Rock Hill NC-SC-MS and Salt Lake City/Odgen UT. These are both coded '1' because there is a bilingual premium in the majority of the MSA.
[5] One outlier, Lancaster, PA, is excluded from our analysis. In the 2000 PUMS, 74 percent of Lancaster's US-born and 1.5 generation Latinos are bilingual. This is about 50 percent above the level our models predict.

connections between status, representation, and financial incentives and bilingualism.[6] The ratio of bilingual Hispanics' socio-economic status to that of those who are English monolinguals is positively correlated with bilingualism (see Appendix 1), but it is also correlated with a MSA/PMSA's proportion Hispanic and proportion foreign-born Hispanic. Similarly, in the regression models the positive relationship between higher pay for bilinguals and bilingualism is submerged by the fact that it is within MSA/PMSAs where there are lots of Hispanics that municipal governments are most likely to pay a premium for Spanish-English bilingual workers.[7]

Political representation is not significant in our models. In an analysis of 1990 Census data, Linton (2004) found a more complicated indicator of Hispanics' political influence – a composite measure that encompasses voters as well as elected officials (Santoro 1999) – to be significantly related to bilingualism even with controls for the demographic variables included here. Our present "representation" variable does not distinguish between Hispanics who are voters and those who are not, and is negatively correlated with a metro area's proportion of foreign-born Hispanics. This suggests that our simplified measure is inadequate and needs to be refined.

- Table 3 about here -

Table 3 explores the "replenishment" hypothesis that more US-born Latinos will be bilingual in places where there has been a relatively continuous and long-standing influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants. Here we model metro-area-level change in bilingualism between 1990 and 2000. We examine the degree to which bilingualism in 2000 can be predicted by its

---

[6] In earlier models, ratios of bilinguals' and English monolinguals' education and income were also non-significant.
[7] In Appendix 1, it is interesting to note that bilinguals' relative socio-economic status is most strongly positively correlated with a MSA/PMSA's proportion foreign-born Hispanics, whereas higher pay for bilinguals is only correlated with proportion Hispanic. These relationships call for further exploration.

level in 1990, by 1990 measures of the variables that are significant in our 2000 analysis (Table 2), and by 1990-2000 change in these measures.[8]

Not surprisingly, the 1990 level of bilingualism in a MSA/PMSA is a robust predictor of bilingualism in 2000. More interestingly, Models 3 and 4 of Table 3 show that the 1990 proportion of foreign-born and 1.5-generation Hispanics – not the area's overall proportion Hispanic – are positively related to Spanish maintenance. Model 5 confirms that increases in Latino population due to immigration positively influence bilingual maintenance among native-born and 1.5-generation Hispanic adults. Our data do not adequately represent continuous and long-standing immigration, but this finding invites further exploration of how long-term immigration trends relate to the language choices of Latinos who are not immigrants themselves.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study has specified contextual circumstances under which bilingualism is most likely to be a stable feature of Hispanic American identity rather that a step along the way to English monolingualism. In doing so, it has demonstrated a strong relationship between macro-level incentives and individual choices. The US is probably not moving toward a bilingual norm, but our findings provide evidence that, where the context is favorable, selective acculturation could persist beyond the second generation. This is largely due to the fact that continuing immigration is replenishing the ethnic identity of US-born Latinos, making ethnicity a more vibrant, accessible, and desirable (particularly where language is concerned) part of US-born Latinos' identity repertoire.

---

[8] In exploratory models we also looked at the proportion of US-born/1.5 generation Hispanic adults in a metro area who had moved from another city between 1995 and 2000. This is not significant.

Our findings suggest that demographics matter; having a large, Spanish speaking population and the replenishment thereof contributes to bilingualism among U.S.-born Latinos and the 1.5 generation. The increased "supply" of Spanish speakers creates greater opportunities for US-born Latinos to speak Spanish. We also show that in places where Latin American immigration is replenished, so too are the opportunities for Spanish language use among US-born Latinos and the 1.5 generation. The mechanisms that account for how immigrant replenishment encourages bilingualism are highlighted in Jiménez's (2005) research among later-generation Mexican Americans. As mention above, Jiménez shows that serendipitous encounters, friendships, and even romantic relationships with Mexican immigrants provides later-generation Mexican Americans with ample opportunity to maintain and even re-learn Spanish. We suspect these same opportunities account for the effect of the immigrant population and the growth thereof on bilingualism among US-born and 1.5-generation Latinos in our sample.

Of course, neither a substantial supply nor replenishment of Spanish speakers tells the full story. Latin American immigration has created a supply and demand for bilingualism that demographic data does not directly measure. The massive influx of immigrants from Latin American in the 1990s spawned a marketing frenzy among American and Latin American corporations that sought to tap into the "Hispanic market" (Dávila 2001). The U.S. witnessed an exponential growth in Spanish language media – television, radio, and print – that gave advertisers the opportunity to make their pitch to this "multi-billion dollar" market. In many metro areas Spanish-language media is prominent in radio, television, and print forms, furthering the visibility and accessibility of Spanish to U.S.-born and 1.5 generation Latinos. Our future analysis will examine how access to Spanish language media affects bilingualism. We are

currently collecting data on the number of Spanish-language radio stations and newspapers available within the metro areas in our study, and we believe that the presence of Spanish language media will prove to be a significant contributor to the prevalence and durability of bilingualism.

If a supply of Spanish language comes from immigration and media, there is also a "demand" that further supports the persistence of bilingualism. This demand is reflected in both economic incentives and the ascendant status of Spanish language and the people who speak it. Where former is concerned, employers increasingly seek out bilingual employees who can make goods and services more accessible to both Spanish monolinguals *and* an American-born English monolingual clientele. Employers incentivize available positions by expressing preference for bilingual job applicants and by remunerating bilingual employees. In 30 percent of the metro areas included in this study, city government workers are paid more if they are Spanish-English bilinguals. We do not have systematic data on the prevalence of premium pay for bilingualism in the private sector, but our perusal of employment listings suggests that this is at least as prevalent there. Yet, with MSA/PMSA percent Hispanic in the model, our analysis did not show any effect of economic incentives on bilingualism. We think this is because our measurement of economic incentives does not fully capture the range of incentives in a metro area. We measure the presence or absence of bilingual pay in the public sector, but we cannot capture the extent to which private sector jobs provide incentives for to bilingual workers through direct payment or through preferences in hiring. It may also be the case that the presence of financial incentives for bilingualism is simply too new of a phenomenon to create a significant response among workers. Workers have to be aware that they may receive additional pay in the first place, and if bilingual-

pay policies are relatively new, workers may not be sufficiently recognize the very real financial advantages that accrue to bilingualism.

We aim to continue our exploration of ways that Latino political representation and status contributes to a context within which bilingualism flourishes. The presence of Latino elected officials is a very visible and significant form of a broader Latino ascendancy in American society. Even as many poor immigrants enter the U.S. from Latin Americans, many Latinos are moving into white-collar jobs and are a more visible part of America's middle class (Rodriguez 1996). What's more, in contrast to a past era, Latinos do not necessarily have to compromise their ethnic identity for the sake of upward mobility, as ethnicity can in fact be an important part of their professional class identity (Macias 2003). Spanish language use is intimately tied to ethnic identity (Zolberg and Long 1999), and in places where Latinos have achieved some status Spanish language has a parallel status that makes bilingualism more attractive.

Our analysis suggests several important questions for future research. To what extent does bilingualism prevalent among later-generation individuals? The Census does not ask individuals where their parents were born, thus providing very little detailed information on an individuals generational distance from their immigrant ancestors. We know whether or not individuals are native- or foreign-born, but not whether the native-born are third generation or beyond. A substantial body of research shows that a shift to English monolingualism is more likely among later-generation individuals (Alba 2004). Qualitative research points to a contexts that were decidedly against perseveration of Spanish, thus hindering the intergenerational transmission of Spanish (Jiménez 2005; Macias 2003; Ochoa 2004). If later-generations lack any ability to speak Spanish, are we likely to see these individuals resurrect Spanish in their family, or does bilingualism en masse require a base of Spanish more likely to be found among

those closer to the immigrant generation? Will a context that is more receptive to bilingualism, in ways that we have modeled in this paper, preserve bilingualism among the descendent of today's immigrant, 1.5, and second generation?

To be sure, there are forces that work against bilingualism, reacting directly to the conditions that make bilingualism a more real and enduring possibility. Anti-immigrant groups, policies that aim to slow immigration, anti-bilingual education measures, and loudly voiced fears about non-English languages tearing at the American social fabric are important parts of the context that shapes language patterns. Yet, our research shows that the forces that might work against bilingualism are counterweighed by conditions that encourage bilingualism as a durable part of Latino and indeed American identity.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D. 2004. "Language Assimilation Today: Bilingualism Persists More Than in the Past, But English Still Dominates." Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA.

---------. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.

Alba, Richard D., John Logan, Amy Lutz, and Brian Stults. 2002. "Only English by the Third Generation? Loss and Preservation of the Mother Tongue among the Grandchildren of Contemporary Immigrants." *Demography* 39(3):467-484.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso.

Bean, Frank and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bills, Garland D. 1989. "The US Census of 1980 and Spanish in the Southwest." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 79:11-28.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1991. Speaking, Reading, and Earnings among Low-Skilled Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics* 9(2):149-170.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller.1997. "Immigrant Earnings: Language Skills, Linguistic Concentrations and the Business Cycle." Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, Working Paper No. 31.

----------. 1995. "The Endogeneity between Language and Earnings: International Analyses." *Journal of Labor Economics* 13(2):246-288.

Dávila, Arlene M. 2001. *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1965. "The Status and Prospects of Bilingualism in the United States." *Modern Language Journal* 49:143-155.

Frank, Robert H. 1985. *Choosing the Right Pond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ri* é Hernández. 1983. "A Demographic Profile of the Mexican Immigration to the United States, 1910-1950. *Journal of Inter-American Affairs* 25:920-942.

Gordon, Milton Myron. 1964. Assimilation in American Life: the Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins. New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press.

Greenfeld, Liah. 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hart-Gonzalez, Lucinda and Marcia Feingold. 1990. “Retention of Spanish in the Home.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 84:5-34.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jiménez, Tomás. 2005. “Replenished Identity: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants and Ethnic Identity” Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

----------. 1988. “Language and States.” Wilder House Working Paper No. 4. University of Chicago: Center for the Study of Politics, History, and Culture.

Linton, April. 2004. “A Critical Mass Model of Bilingualism among U.S.-Born Hispanics.” *Social Forces* 83(1):279-314.

----------. 2002. "Spanish for Americans? The Politics of Bilingualism in the United States." Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Wenquan Zhang. 2002. “Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles.” *American Sociological Review* 76(2):299-322.

López, David E., 1999. “Social and Linguistic Aspects of Assimilation Today.” Pp. 212-222 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

----------. 1996. “Language: Diversity and Assimilation.” Pp. 139-164 in *Ethnic Los Angeles*, edited by Roger Waldinger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

----------. 1982. *Language Maintenance and Shift in the United States Today: The Basic Patterns and Their Social Implications*. Los Alamitos, CA: National Center for Bilingual Research.

López, David E. and Ricardo Stanton-Salazar. 2001. “Mexican Americans: A Second Generation at Risk.” Pp. 57-90 in *Ethnicities*, edited by A. Portes and R.Rumbaut. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Macias, Thomas. 2004. "*Imaginandose Mexicano*: The Symbolic Context of Mexican American Ethnicity Beyond the Second Generation." *Qualitative Sociology* 27:299-315.

----------. 2003. "The Changing Structure of Structural Assimilation: White-Collar Mexican Ethnicity and the Significance of Ethnic Identity Professional Organizations." *Social Science Quarterly* 84:946-957.

Massey, Douglas S. 1999. "Why Does Immigration Occur?: A Theoretical Synthesis." Pp. 34-52 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

NALEO (National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials). 2000. *National Directory of Latino Elected Officials*. Los Angeles: NALEO Education Fund.

Ochoa, Gilda. 2004. *Becoming Neighbors in a Mexican American Community: Power, Conflict and Solidarity*. Austin, TX: Univ. of Texas Press.

Pool, Jonathan. 1991. "The Official Language Problem." *American Political Science Review* 85(2): 495-514.

Portes, Alejandro. 2001. "Theories of Development for a New Century: Migration, Transnationalism, and the Informal Economy." Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, Anaheim, CA, August 21.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press and New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

----------. 1996. *Immigrant American: A Portrait*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Richard Schauffler. 1996. "Language and the Second Generation: Bilingualism Yesterday and Today." Pp. 8-29 in *The New Second Generation,* edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rodriguez, Gregory. 1996. "The Emerging Latino Middle Class." Pepperdine Public Policy Institute.

Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek et al.1997. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0. Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota (http://www.ipums.umn.edu).

Rumbaut, Rubén. 2002. "Severed or Sustained Attachments? Language, Identity, and Imagined Communities in the Post-Immigrant Generation." Pp.43-95 in *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*, edited by P. Levitt and M.C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage.

Santoro, Wayne A. 1999. "Conventional Politics Takes Center Stage: The Latino Struggle against English-Only Laws." *Social Forces* 77(3):887-909.

Solé, Yolanda R. 1990. "Bilingualism: Stable or Transitional? The Case of Spanish in the United States." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 84:35-80.

Stevens, Gillian. 1999. "A Century of U.S. Censuses and the Language Characteristics of Immigrants." *Demography* 36(3):387-397.

----------. 1992. "The Social and Demographic Context of Language Use in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 57(2):171-185.

----------. 1985. “Nativity, Intermarriage, and Mother-Tongue Shift.” *American Sociological Review* 50(1):74-83.

Veltman, Calvin. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Waters, Mary C. and Tomás R. Jiménez. 2005. "Immigrant Assimilation: Current Trends and Directions for Future Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:105-125.

Yinger, J. Milton. 1994. *Ethnicity: Source of Strength? Source of Conflict?* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Zolberg, Aristide R. and Long Litt Woon. 1999. “Why Islam is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States.” Politics and Society 27(1):5-38.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for U.S. Metro Areas (N=90)

Dependent Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Proportion of US-born/1.5-generation Hispanics who are bilingual, 2000	0.13	0.81	0.45	0.13
Independent Variables				
Proportion of US-born/1.5-generation Hispanics who are bilingual, 1990	0.12	0.96	0.48	0.17
Proportion Hispanic, 2000	0.01	0.88	0.14	0.17
Proportion Hispanic,1990	0.01	0.85	0.14	0.15
Proportion foreign-born Hispanics, 2000	0.02	0.17	0.08	0.03
Proportion foreign-born Hispanics, 1990	0.00	0.27	0.02	0.04
Proportion 1.5-generation (of US-born/1.5-generation), 2000	0.15	0.88	0.55	0.16
Proportion 1.5-generation (of US-born/1.5-generation), 1990	0.10	0.91	0.49	0.17
Bilinguals' SEI : English monolingual Hispanics' SEI, 2000	0.84	1.85	1.12	0.18
Hispanic political representation, 2000 (elected officials per capita)	0.00E+00	1.56E-03	1.15E-04	0.00
Municipal government(s) pay bilingual workers more, 2000 (0/1)	0.00	1.00	0.30	-
1990-2000 change: Hispanic population	-0.26	0.12	0.00	0.10
1990-2000 change: proportion foreign-born	0.15	0.82	0.54	0.16
1990-2000 change: proportion 1.5-generation	-0.17	0.14	0.06	0.05

Sources: 1990 and 2000 Census and 1% PUMS, *National Directory of Latino Elected Officials* , municipal governments

Table 2. Coefficients for Regression of the Proportion Spanish-English Bilingual among Native-Born and 1.5-Generation Hispanic Adults in US MSAs/PMSAs, 2000 (N=90)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Proportion Hispanic	0.421 ***	0.444 ***	0.434 ***	0.431 ***	0.431 ***
	(0.071)	(0.060)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.057)
Proportion foreign-born Hispanics		0.359 ***	0.227 ***	0.265 ***	0.226 ***
		(0.061)	(0.054)	(0.063)	(0.055)
Proportion 1.5-generation			1.777 ***	1.760 ***	1.777 ***
			(0.280)	(0.285)	(0.282)
Bilinguals' SEI : English monolinguals' SEI				-0.078	
				(0.053)	
Hispanic political representation				5.723	
				(39.667)	
Higher pay for bilingual workers					0.002
					(0.020)
constant	0.391 ***	0.189 ***	0.126 ***	0.190 ***	0.126 ***
	(0.015)	(0.036)	(0.032)	(0.054)	(0.032)
Adjusted R2	0.279	0.481	0.642	0.643	
F	35.397	42.225	54.229	33.037	40.270

* p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Table 3. Coefficients for Regression of the Proportion Spanish-English Bilingual among Native-Born and 1.5-Generation Hispanic Adults in US MSAs/PMSAs, 2000, Dynamic Models (N=90)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Proportion bilingual, 1990	0.476 ***	0.612 ***	0.420 ***	0.416 ***	0.383 ***
	(0.061)	(0.085)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.060)
Proportion Hispanic, 1990		-0.217 *	-0.068	-0.076	0.067
		(0.096)	(0.087)	(0.088)	(0.066)
Proportion foreign-born Hispanics, 1990			0.318 ***	0.295 ***	0.162 *
			(0.058)	(0.061)	(0.072)
Proportion 1.5-generation, 1990				0.274 ***	0.747 *
				(0.250)	(0.377)
1990-2000 change in proportion Hispanic					0.552 ***
					(0.068)
1990-2000 change in proportion foreign-born					0.124 *
					(0.057)
1990-2000 change in proportion 1.5-generation					0.666 *
					(0.292)
constant	0.222 ***	0.187 ***	0.103 **	0.112 **	0.059 *
	(0.476)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.029)
Adjusted R2	0.399	0.439	0.569	0.570	0.780
F	60.075	34.017	40.166	30.499	46.179

* p < 0.05   ** p < 0.01   *** p < 0.001

Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Appendix 1. Correlation of Table 1 Variables (N=90)

Name	np.bil00	p.hisp00	p.fbh00	p.1.5.00	seicom00	rep00	paymore
np.bil00	1	0.536 ***	0.418 ***	0.548 ***	0.221 *	-0.072	0.274 **
p.hisp00	0.536 ***	1	-0.064	0.006	0.228 *	-0.044	0.455 ***
p.fbh00	0.418 ***	-0.064	1	0.383 ***	0.399 ***	-0.232 *	0.044
p.1.5.00	0.548 ***	0.006	0.383 ***	1	0.143	0.065	0.009
seicom00	0.221 *	0.228 *	0.399 ***	0.143	1	0.060	-0.073
rep00	-0.072	-0.044	-0.232 *	0.065	0.060	1	-0.032
paymore	0.274 **	0.455 ***	0.044	0.009	-0.073	-0.032	1

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Name	*Label*
np.bil00	Proportion of US-born/1.5 generation Hispanics who are bilingual, 2000
p.hisp00	Proportion Hispanic, 2000
p.fbh00	Proportion foreign-born Hispanics, 2000
p.1.5.00	Proportion 1.5 generation (of US-born/1.5 generation), 2000
seicom00	Bilinguals' SEI : monolinguals' 'SEI, 2000
rep00	Hispanic political representation, 2000 (elected officials per capita)
paymore	Municipal government(s) pay bilingual workers more, 2000 (0/1)