

How do Coethnic Communities and Host Countries Matter for Education? Evidence from  
the US, Canada, and the UK

Prepared for PAA 2015 Annual Meeting in San Diego, CA

Rennie Lee

Ph.D. Candidate

Department of Sociology, UCLA

Please do not cite without author's permission

An underlying concern of all countries with immigrant populations is whether immigrants and their children are assimilating to the host society. Approximately 52% of the world's share of immigrants settle in the US compared with 11% in Canada and another 9% in the UK (López Real 2011:3). For old and new immigrant countries, such as the US, Canada, and the UK, the educational attainment of the children of immigrants, who comprise one in five school-age children in the US, one in three school-age children in Canada, and one in six school-age children in the UK, will have direct consequences on the labor market and the economy. Thus, it is imperative to understand which factors account for educational disparities and educational attainment among the children of immigrants. This study examines how coethnic communities affect the educational attainment of immigrant children and the children of immigrants in the US, Canada, and the UK?

## **Literature Review**

The social, economic, and political characteristics of the host country, also referred to as the modes of incorporation, shape the children of immigrants' educational attainment in the host society (Portes and Zhou 1993:83). Three modes of incorporation include: government policies, the prejudices of the host country, and the coethnic community. First, a host country's government policies include a country's immigration policy. The immigration policy of a host society may directly influence immigrant composition because countries with immigration policies that select on skill, versus family reunification or humanitarian reasons, will have a more educated and highly skilled migrant composition than countries that do not select on skill (Entorf and Minoiu

2005:357; Levels, Dronkers, and Kraaykamp 2008:838). In turn, this may positively affect the children of immigrants' educational outcomes because highly selected immigrant parents can transfer their human capital to their children. For instance, Levels {2008wk p838} posits that the children of immigrants living in host countries with more selective policies will have greater educational attainment because the immigrants will also be more educated and high skilled.

Second, the prejudices of the host country, especially towards minorities, can be assessed by the presence or absence of a country's integration policies and racial/multicultural policies. The legislative measures that national governments adopt are a reflection of a country's dominant ideologies. Although most western countries prohibit discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities, subtle forms of discrimination may exist, depending on the how well-established the policies are (Levels et al. 2008:838). Immigrant integration policies, multicultural policies, and race relations policies may overlap and are not mutually exclusive. How these policies are created and enacted are done on a country by country basis so what the policies entail and how they are implemented vary widely.

In general, a host society may offer a formal integration policy or program that offers settlement assistance in the form of English language classes, employment training, and social assistance. Countries that offer more formal integration programs can ease the settlement process. A country's immigrant integration policy may matter for the children of immigrants' outcomes because children in countries with less established integration policies may encounter more discrimination into institutions, such as higher education, and thus attain lower levels of education (Levels et al. 2008:838; Portes and Zhou 1993).

Another is a multicultural policy. Some host countries adopt multicultural policies, which generally refers to equal rights and promotion of ethnic, racial, religious, or sexual minorities (Joppke 1996:449). Typically, these policies are, in some form, state-sponsored (Bloemraad 2005:869-870; Saggar and Somerville 2012:10). Countries that adopt multicultural policies are more tolerant of minorities and they may experience lower levels of discrimination and thus, positively affect the children of immigrants' outcomes. For instance, countries with multicultural policies may offer multicultural education, which can positively affect academic performance. Multicultural education emphasizes ethnic materials and experiences, which are more meaningful and engaging for students from diverse backgrounds. In turn, multicultural education leads to greater focused efforts and academic achievement (review in Gay 1994:8).

A third mode of incorporation includes the characteristics of the coethnic community in the host society, which can also affect educational attainment. Coethnic communities refer to the characteristics of national origin groups in specific destination countries (Levels et al. 2008:837). While there are different interpretations of the coethnic community, particularly at which geographic area it should be defined (Bygren and Szulkin 2010:1313; Fleischmann et al. 2011:398; Gronqvist 2006:371; Levels et al. 2008:843), this paper operationalizes the coethnic community as individuals from the same national origin group living together in close proximity or in small geographical areas, such as a neighborhood or Census tract., as described by classical assimilation theorists (Burgess 1967 [1925]) and ethnographic studies (Gibson 1988; Portes and Zhou 1993; Zhou and Bankston 1998). For instance, the Chinese living in the same neighborhood share similar coethnic community characteristics, such as the average

education level of coethnics in a neighborhood or the percentage of coethnics living in a neighborhood.

There are two primary explanations that describe the influence of the coethnic community on education. One explanation emphasizes that living in close proximity with coethnics generates social capital that positively affects educational outcomes. In particular, the children of immigrants benefit from bounded solidarity; adult coethnics are concerned with coethnic childrens' academic well-being because of their shared national origin with immigrant parents. Parents rely on their networks of coethnic adult neighbors to help monitor childrens' behavior (Pong and Hao 2007:209; Portes and MacLeod 1996:255; Portes and Rumbaut 2001:108). Constant supervision of coethnic children in the neighborhood makes it difficult for youth to engage in deviant behavior and encourages academic achievement (Zhou and Bankston 1994:831; 1998:106). Thus, the ethnic enclave hypothesis suggests that living with a larger percentage of coethnics is uniformly positive.

A second set of studies posits that the coethnic community may have a positive or negative effect on education, but it depends on the socioeconomic composition of the coethnic community. Two characteristics of the coethnic community are associated with educational attainment: 1.) level of education; and 2.) level of resources. First, the second generation living in coethnic communities with high levels of collective education are more likely to obtain high education and children living in coethnic communities with low levels of collective education also obtain low education because coethnics act as role models (Gibson 1988; Gibson and Bhachu 1988). Second, coethnic communities with higher median incomes have superior resources, such as supplementary ethnic schools

that can facilitate greater academic success among second generation youth (Zhou and Kim 2006).

Ethnographic studies on the US found that living with more coethnic neighbors had a positive effect on educational attainment and this effect remained even though coethnic neighbors were low SES (Gibson 1988; Zhou and Bankston 1998). However, when this was tested quantitatively in Sweden, Bygren and Szulkin (2010) and Gronqvist (2006) found that living in a larger coethnic community was positive only if coethnic neighbors were highly educated. This suggests that the composition of the coethnic neighbors may be more important than the number of coethnic neighbors. Swedish studies are more convincing because they examined neighborhoods using official registry data for all children of immigrants in Sweden, so the data was comprehensive and generalizable to the entire population of children of immigrants in Sweden. Furthermore, ethnographic studies in the US examine small and localized samples so it is not clear whether the findings are generalizable to a wider population. Thus, a systematic crossnational study with nationally representative data would be useful to establish the validity of these community studies.

#### *Case Studies: United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom*

I compare the US, Canada, and the UK because the three countries represent the first, third, and fourth largest immigrant receiving countries (López Real 2011). Continuous migration to these countries has resulted in a sizeable population of immigrants and their children. There are some major institutional differences across the three countries that may affect educational attainment and the role of coethnic

communities in the three countries: immigration policy, integration policy, official language, and ethnic/racial composition.

The US is a traditional immigrant country. With the 1965 amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, abolished the quota system, preference system, and labor clearances for certain classes of immigrants. These policies led to differences in the composition of immigrants in terms of national origin and occupation levels (Keely 1971:157). Thus, immigration at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was primarily from Europe whereas post-1965 migration has been dominated by immigration from Latin American and Asian countries. Immigrants are granted entry into the country using a points system, in which those with more points are granted entry. In the US, immigration policy preferences family reunification (first and second preferences) and a small category for professionals (third preference). For instance, family preference is allotted 480,000 visas per year compared with 140,000 professional visas per year.<sup>1</sup> Approximately 71 percent of US migration is family based whereas 21 percent of migration is for labor. US immigration policy is viewed in terms of security and law enforcement vulnerability rather than nation building (Bloemraad 2005:870). Unsurprisingly, the government takes a laissez faire approach to immigrant integration as it is mainly conducted at the individual or family level. Therefore, immigrants must rely on their own family, friends, and resources. Often, due to the limited amount of federal supported assistance, immigrants rely on non-profit organizations to provide settlement assistance and social services (Joassart-Marcelli 2013:731).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/how-united-states-immigration-system-works-fact-sheet>

The US also does not have an official language at the federal level (Califa 1989:293), although approximately 27 states have English as the official language<sup>2</sup> (Califa 1989:300-301). Consistent with the laissez faire approach to immigrant integration, the US government does not offer English language courses. Many English language courses are offered through non-profits but these are in high demand and there are long wait lists.

The US government offers official resettlement assistance for officially recognized refugees only. For refugee organizations, the US contracts the work which helps develop refugee organizational capacity which was limited or non-existent (Bloemraad 2005:868). In general, the US takes a more laissez faire approach to ethnic communities. The INS does not have the right to provide public money to communities as it is not a grant-making agency. For the INS to do so, Congress would have to approve a legislative change allowing the INS to provide funds or it would have to be approved through the Department of Justice.

Immigrants in the US are largely integrated in racial terms (Waters et al. 2013). The patchwork of civil rights legislation and minority policies incentivize immigrants to define themselves in racial rather than ethnic terms (Bloemraad 2006:140; Joppke 1996:457). Immigrants in the US may inadvertently benefit from larger programs aimed at racial inequality and discrimination, such as affirmative action, although its intention is not for immigrant integration (Joppke 1996:457). Affirmative action programs differ from immigrant integration programs, though, because they do not address immigrants' needs directly (Bloemraad 2005:867; Joppke 1996:457).

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.languagepolicy.net/archives/langleg.htm#State>



Canada is also a traditional immigrant country and celebrates its identity as nation of immigrants. Canada's immigration policy is seen as fulfilling the needs of the country. In general, its policy is selective on and based on capital and skill and uses a points system to do so. The points system favors highly skilled professionals as well as entrepreneurs. Canada has also made it so easy for investors to immigrate that the government has been accused of selling citizenship for those who can afford it (Smith 1994:61). In addition to education, there was an increased emphasis on language proficiency in the point system. Approximately 62 percent of Canada's migration is based on labor migration whereas family comprises approximately 25 percent. Thus, Canada's immigration policy is more selective in economic terms than in race based terms. Canada adopted the points systems as a way to select immigrants based on their characteristics rather than using race per se. In Canada, the main immigrant groups are primarily from European and Asian countries. The major sending countries to Canada are the Philippines, India, China, the UK, the US, France, Iran, United Arab Emirates, Morocco, and South Korea. Canada has the largest proportion of first (21%) and second generation (9%) individuals relative to the total population.

The Canadian government offers immigrant and refugee groups support for basic integration and settlement and ethnic organizations are financially supported and promoted through the government's official policy of multiculturalism (Bloemraad 2005:867). Canada's multiculturalism policy emphasizes and legitimizes ethnic groups, rather than racial groups. Although multicultural policies since the 1980s have begun to emphasize race, race is conceived differently in terms of visible and non-visible

minorities (Bloemraad 2006:140). Visible minorities refer to all non-White groups, but the government refuses to explicitly use white and nonwhite labels.

Unlike the US and Canada, the UK is not a traditional immigrant country and has never viewed itself as an immigrant country, only as a country of emigrants. The UK has an exclusionary immigration policy that reflects their desires to maintain a culturally homogenous society. Their immigration policy privileges birthplace and descent. In 2013, the primary reasons that visas were granted were for studying, students, work, and family. Migrants who came to study for a limited time made up the largest group (41.2%), followed by work visas (28.9%), students (14.6%), and family (6.4%). Thus, the UK's immigration policy heavily favors selective migration through those who enter as students or come to study for a course.

In the UK, migration from the New Commonwealth occurred in the later half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, it was dated to the arrival of Caribbeans in 1948. The 1948 British Nationality Act offered unrestricted access for 800 million people that were citizens of the colonies or Commonwealth (Waters et al. 2013). After Caribbeans, many immigrants from northern India arrived in the early 1960s. They were fairly educated and recruited to work in hospitals. Around the same time, Pakistani Muslims also began immigrating to the UK to fulfill low-wage jobs in the textile industry. Most Pakistani immigrants were poorly educated and had little knowledge of English from rural areas. There is a long history of Chinese immigration to the UK, which started in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Earlier waves of Chinese migration were low-skilled and found occupational niches in restaurants and laundry. Contemporary migration to the UK is more diverse than the US or Canada. Most of these immigrants settle in London but overall, there are

about 182 different national origin groups in London. The largest immigrant groups in the UK are primarily from New and Old Commonwealth countries, other UK countries, Ireland, and China. Contemporary migration has shifted the origins from the EU, Eastern Europe, and African countries (Nigeria, Sudan, Ghana, Congo, and Malawi). Immigrants and their children make up approximately 10 percent and 5 percent of the population respectively.

The extent of the UK's immigrant integration program includes English language and citizenship courses. Much of immigrant integration has been based on anti-discrimination legislation that protects ethnic minorities, rather than immigrants per se, from poor treatment in public services and private markets (Kesler 2010:564; Waters et al. 2013:124). The distribution of British housing, social services, and jobs of ethnic minorities is "color blind", but in certain circumstances, there are some programs that are directed toward a specific ethnic group. For instance, special employment opportunities for groups that underrepresented in the labor force, such as Hindus in Hindu neighborhoods. In general, there have been few programs addressing immigrant integration directly and where there have been policies, they have limited funding or do not survive. Instead, immigrants' needs have been addressed through broad social policies addressing schooling, housing, employment, health care, etc. Therefore, the UK government has had to pinpoint and adjust mainstream policies to address the needs of immigrants and minorities (Saggar and Somerville 2012:2). There is, however, an integration policy for officially recognized refugees that has been in place since 2000, albeit limited (Saggar and Somerville 2012:12,14). Although there is no official integration policy supporting immigrant communities per se, many immigrants and their

children benefit from community cohesion programs that are targeted at the local level and in the neighborhoods where the children of immigrants live (Saggar and Somerville 2012:13,15). Programs are directed toward local areas with immigrants so while there is no direct funding to coethnic communities as is the case in Canada, the communities that immigrants live in are supported in indirect ways.

The UK's multicultural policy has always been more laissez faire and focused at the local level (Joppke 2004:249; Saggar and Somerville 2012:11). In 2001, the government has shifted to moving "beyond multiculturalism" with a greater emphasis on civic integration (Joppke 2004) Although the trend of the UK is moving away from multiculturalism, there is a greater use of multicultural rhetoric in the US but less so than Canada, and there is greater overall support for immigrants, even if largely addressed in terms of the language of ethnic minorities.

## **Data and Methods**

### *Analytic Strategy*

Currently, no data set incorporates individual, community, and group levels. So, I construct community and group variables using different data sources and append the variables to individuals in nationally representative surveys for the US, Canada, and the UK. For each country, I need data at three levels—individual, community, and group. My approach for obtaining data is similar in all three countries: a.) individual data is retrieved from nationally representative surveys; b.) community data is created using aggregated survey or national Census data; and c.) group characteristics are coded from various

public sources. Community and group variables can be attached to the individual level data because all three individual level surveys have geographic identifiers.

I examine the first generation (persons born abroad) and second or higher generations (born in the destination country) in the US, Canada, and the UK. The dependent variable is educational attainment measured as a dichotomous variable of a respondent's highest degree. Key independent variables are two community variables: education and income. Group level variables include educational selectivity, political stability, and economic inequality of the origin country. Individual level controls include the respondent's sex, age, and generational status.

The data sets provide different information about time of arrival and migration history so the 1.5 and second generations in the US and Canadian are analyzed as a single category with the first generation as the reference group. In the UK analysis, the 1.5 and second generations are analyzed as separate categories and the 1.5 generation is the reference category.

Individual level data is retrieved from nationally representative survey data for each country. For the US, I use non-public releases of the 2006 Sensitive General Social Survey (GSS), a biannual survey that collects data on education, work, and communities in the US, and 2000 Census data. The GSS contains individual level variables. The 2006 Sensitive GSS data (with tract level identifiers) is available for use with special permission from NORC and 2000 Census data is publically available. Sensitive GSS files indicate the tract (small areas with a population of 2500 to 8000 persons) where respondents live, which are not included in the public versions. This geographic identifier makes it possible to match the community and group variables to the individual level data.

The Canadian analyses requires non-public releases of Statistics Canada 2002 Ethnic Diversity Study (EDS), a one-time survey that collected information on social, economic, and cultural life for persons of different ethnic backgrounds in Canada, and 2006 Canadian Census data. The EDS includes individual level variables. Non-public EDS and 2006 Canadian Census are available for use at research data centers in Canada. Non-public releases of the EDS contain respondents' Census tracts that are not available in the public versions. This geographic identifier is used to match community and group variables with individual level data.

For the British analyses, I use the UK Annual Population Survey (APS), a 5% sample of individuals from the UK that collects information on the education, employment, and ethnicity of UK residents, and 2001 UK Census data. The APS includes individual level variables. Non-public APS is available at Cardiff University and 2001 UK Census data are available at Office of National Statistics (ONS) data labs in the UK. Non-public APS data is necessary because it provides the geographic indicators of respondents' residences at the Super Output Area (SOA) level, small areas with an average population of 5,600 to 10,000 persons, that are not available in the public version. These geographic identifiers are used to match community and group characteristics with individual level data. Thus, the three data sets meet the data requirements necessary to answer the research question: a.) nationally representative data; b.) small area data; and c.) data at the individual, community, and group levels.

I create community characteristics using aggregated data from nationally representative Censuses or surveys. Because each country uses different levels of geography, the community is defined differently but still comparable in size. For the US,

I define the community at the tract level. I create two community characteristics (education and income) using GSS data and will create community size using Census data to code the average education level, income level, and population of all immigrant adults in the tract. I attach the three characteristics to the individual level data representing the 1.5 and second generation respondents in the GSS.

Canadian and UK communities are coded similarly. Canadian communities are also defined at the tract level. I create community education, income, and size using 2006 Census and attach these characteristics to 1.5 and second generation respondents in the EDS. For the UK, I define the community at the SOA level. I code the three community characteristics using aggregated UK Census data and attach these characteristics to 1.5 and second generation respondents in the APS.

Group characteristics are coded from public sources. Educational selectivity for the US is coded using Feliciano's (2005, 2006) published measures; I replicate Feliciano's (2005, 2006) method to code educational selectivity for Canada and the UK. Political stability is coded using Worldwide Governance Indicators from the World Bank (a scale from -2.5 to 2.5 ranking a country's perceived chance of being overthrown) (<http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>) (Kaufmann et al. 2005). Economic inequality is coded using the World Bank's estimate of Gini coefficients (<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?>). All group characteristics are matched to individual level data in the GSS, EDS, and APS. Individual level characteristics (sex, age, generational status, etc.) come from the GSS, EDS, and APS. Data for each country is analyzed separately because they are non-public and cannot be removed or combined.

### *Logistic Regression Analysis*

This project uses logistic regression analysis to examine the effects of individual, community, and group level effects on educational attainment. These models are estimated and analyzed with the statistical package, Stata 13. I also analyzed the data using multilevel regression but there is little difference in the results between the two regression methods. Logistic regression is a better fit for this project for three reasons. First, survey weights—which are applied to make the data nationally representative—cannot be analyzed with multilevel regression in Stata. Second, the rationale for using multilevel regression is to account for individuals that may be clustered in communities or groups, but survey weights can account for this. Third, multilevel regression in Stata can only be used with dichotomous outcomes (e.g., high school versus less than high school), which measure specific educational outcomes rather than educational attainment more generally.

### **Results**

The analysis in this study relies on non-public data that were analyzed on secure computers in each country. Because data were prohibited from removal from the secure labs, data from the three countries could not be merged together and were analyzed separately for each country. The logic of the analysis is to analyze the data of each country with identical models to ensure that the data as comparable as possible.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE



Table 1, Model 1 presents the odds ratios of the community, group, and individual factors for the US, Canada, and the UK respectively. Group and individual variables are included as controls so I will only report and interpret on the community education and income variables. In Model 1, column 1, the odds ratio for community education is 2.167 and statistically significant. This suggests that a one year increase in the average education of the community increasing the odds of college attainment by 2.2. Model 1, column 2 presents the odds ratios for Canada. The odds ratio for community education in Canada is 1.147 and statistically significant. The odds ratio for community income is 1.499 and statistically significant. Model 1 shows that net of controls, community education and income are positive predictors of college attainment in Canada.

Model 1, column 3 presents the odds ratios predicting college attainment in the UK. Model 1, column 3 shows that the odds ratio for community education is 3.86 and statistically significant. The odds ratio for community income is 1.023, which suggests that community income is a positive predictor of college attainment in the UK. Model 1, column 3 shows that both community education and income are positive predictors of college attainment in the UK, but the effect of community education is about 3 times as strong on college attainment than the effect of community income. Overall, Model 1 shows that net of controls, the role of community education has a strong and positive effect on the odds of college attainment in the US, Canada, and the UK. Furthermore, community income has a strong and positive effect on the odds of college attainment in Canada and the UK, but not in the US. Overall, community education is the strongest predictor of college attainment in the UK and in the US, but not Canada.

In Model 2, I examine an interaction between coethnic community education and generational status. In Model 2, column 1, I find that the interaction term between 1<sup>st</sup> generation and community education is 1.491 and not statistically significant. This suggests that the effect of community education on college attainment does not differ across generational status.

In Model 2, column 2, I examine the interaction between community education and generational status in Canada. When an interaction term is included in the equation, the interpretation of the odds ratio changes. The odds ratio of a variable no longer corresponds to a change in odds ratio; this interpretation only applies to an equation without any interaction terms. In interpreting the interaction between community education and generational status, there are three variables to consider: community education, generational status (first generation), and the interaction term. In Model 2, column 2, the odds ratio for the interaction term is 1.153 and is statistically significant. The odds ratio for community education is 1.102; this represents the odds ratio of college attainment or higher compared with high school or less for a one year increase in community education for second or higher generation respondents. To calculate the corresponding odds for the first generation, it is less straight-forward. I need to multiply the odds ratio of community education by the odds ratio of the interaction term ( $1.102 \times 1.153 = 1.271$ ). Thus, for a one-unit increase in community education, the odds of being the college attainment category are 1.27 greater than the odds of being in the high school or less categories, for the first generation. The odds ratio for the first generation is 0.292. This represents the *difference* in odds ratio of attaining a college degree or more versus high school or less for the first and second or higher generations, given that

community education is equal to zero. The predicted odds that the first generation obtains a college degree or more are 0.292 times lower than the corresponding predicted odds for the second or higher generations given that community education is equal to zero.

In Model 2, column 3, the odds ratio for the interaction term is 1.794 and statistically significant. This represents the ratio of the two odds ratios (odds ratio of attainment for a one year increase in community education for the first generation and the odds ratio of attainment for a one year increase in community education for the second or higher generations). Thus, the odds ratio of community education on college attainment or more for the first generation is 1.153 times the odds ratio of community education on college attainment for the second or higher generations.

In Model 2, column 3, I examined the interaction between community education and generational status in the UK. Again, I focus on the three variables associated with the interaction. The odds ratio for community education is 3.715 and statistically significant. This suggests that for a one year increase in community education, the odds of completing college or more are 3.7 times greater than the odds of attaining a high school degree or less, for the second or higher generation. To calculate the corresponding odds for the first generation, I multiply the odds ratio for the first generation by the odds ratio of the interaction term ( $3.715 \times 1.794 = 6.66$ ). For a one year increase in community education, the odds of attaining a college degree or more are 6.6 greater than the odds of attaining high school or less for the first generation. The exponentiated coefficient for the first generation is 0.292 and is statistically significant. This suggests that the predicted odds that the first generation attaining a college degree or more is 0.29 times lower than the corresponding predicted odds for the second or higher generations. The exponentiated

coefficient for the interaction term is 1.794 and statistically significant. This suggests that the odds ratio of community education on college attainment for the first generation is 1.79 times the odds ratio of community education on college attainment for the second or higher generations.

## **Discussion**

There are two main findings of this paper. First, coethnic community education is a positive predictor of educational attainment in the three countries, regardless of the institutional differences across the three countries. One explanation is that the US, Canada, and the UK recognize racial and ethnic minorities. In contrast, other European countries may show worse outcomes through the coethnic community because European governments are less supportive of ethnic and racial minorities (Thomson and Crul 2007:1036). There is less recognition of ethnic and racial minorities in other European countries. For instance, France does not collect any data on race.

One reason why the average education of coethnics matters is that average education is a proxy for the average composition of the coethnic community. Waters et al. (2010:1189) argues that the children of immigrants benefit from coethnic communities with a substantial portion of college educated and professionals because they can exchange information with poorer and less educated coethnics in the community. Although my study does not focus on class heterogeneity of the coethnic community per se, the average education of the coethnic community captures some of this effect.

Second, there is an interaction between coethnic community education and the first generation in Canada and the UK. Thus, the positive effect of living with educated

coethnics is stronger among the first generation in Canada and the UK. Three institutional differences that may account for this interaction effect. One difference is that US immigration policy heavily favors family migration compared with labor migration or student migration as is the case in Canada and the UK. As a result, immigrants and the children of immigrants in the US will have more family members, immediate and extended, present in the host country. Due to the large number of visas associated with family reunification, this suggests that immigrants in the US are more likely to have extended kin members with whom they can rely on. Therefore, other coethnic adults may be less essential to immigrants in the US because they can rely on their family. For instance, Keefe et al. (1979) found that Mexican Americans were less likely to rely on secondary networks, such as neighbors, friends, etc., because of their extensive family network in the US. In the UK and Canada, immigrants and their children will have fewer family members present in the host country, which suggests that they may need to rely more extensively on other coethnic neighbors. Zhou and Bankston (1998:87) found that Vietnamese families that were incomplete due to resettlement relied on fictive kin members, suggesting that when immediate or extended family members are not available, immigrants may rely on other coethnics for support.

A second institutional difference is that Canada and the UK have official languages whereas the US does not. The presence of an official language in Canada and the UK may exert greater pressure on the first generation to learn the official language in these two countries. The coethnic community may help immigrant children acquire the official language in Canada and the UK as both countries expect incoming adult immigrants to have some understanding of the official language prior to entry.

Furthermore, coethnic community programs are federally sponsored so the goals of the community programs will be consistent with or reinforce the government's larger goal of learning the official language of the country. Thus, the presence of an official language and expectation for immigrant children to adopt the official language may explain why coethnic community education has a more significant role for the first generation compared with later generations in Canada and the UK.

A third institutional difference is that Canada and the UK offer government assistance for immigrants whereas the US does not. In Canada and the UK, the first generation receives integration assistance that is largely distributed at the community level. Thus, the coethnic community may be more significant for the first generation compared with later generations because the community assists the first generation adapt to the host society. In addition, educated coethnics may have greater knowledge about access to integration assistance or programs. In addition, educated coethnics may be more likely to receive federal funding to support community programs. For instance, Canada requires community organizations to submit grant applications to receive funding. Thus, educated coethnics may be better equipped to submit successful grant applications. Therefore, the first generation may benefit more from educated communities than the second or higher generations because of the immigrant integration services that are provided through the community.

## **References**

- Bloemraad, I. 2005. "The Limits of De Tocqueville: How Government Facilitates Organisational Capacity in Newcomer Communities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(5):865–87.
- Bloemraad, I. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen*. Univ of California Press.

- Califa, A. J. 1989. "Declaring English the Official Language: Prejudice Spoken Here." *Harv CR-CLL Rev.*
- Entorf, H., and N. Minoiu. 2005. "What a Difference Immigration Policy Makes: a Comparison of PISA Scores in Europe and Traditional Countries of Immigration." *German Economic Review* 6(3):355–76.
- Gay, G. 1994. *A Synthesis of Scholarship in Multicultural Education.*
- Joassart-Marcelli, P. 2013. "Ethnic Concentration and Nonprofit Organizations: the Political and Urban Geography of Immigrant Services in Boston, Massachusetts." *International Migration Review* 1–43.
- Joppke, C. 1996. "Multiculturalism and Immigration: a Comparison of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain." *Theory and society* 25(4):449–500.
- Joppke, C. 2004. "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy1." *The British Journal of Sociology* 55(2):237–57.
- Keely, C. B. 1971. "Effects of the Immigration Act of 1965 on Selected Population Characteristics of Immigrants to the United States." *Demography.*
- Kesler, C. 2010. "Immigrant Wage Disadvantage in Sweden and the United Kingdom: Wage Structure and Barriers to Opportunity1." *International Migration Review* 44(3):560–92.
- Levels, M., J. Dronkers, and G. Kraaykamp. 2008. "Immigrant Children's Educational Achievement in Western Countries: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects on Mathematical Performance." *American Sociological ...* 73(October):835–53.
- López Real, J. 2011. "Family Reunification or Point-Based Immigration System? the Case of the United States and Mexico."
- Portes, A., and M. Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1):74–96.
- Saggar, S., and W. Somerville. 2012. "Building a British Model of Integration in an Era of Immigration: Policy Lessons for Government." *Migration Policy Institute Washington.*
- Smith, S. J. 1994. "Immigration and Nation-Building in Canada and the United Kingdom." Pp. 50–77 in *Constructions of Race, Place, and Nation.* U of Minnesota Press.
- Thomson, M., and M. Crul. 2007. "The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How Is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7):1025–41.

Waters, M. C., A. F. Heath, V. C. Tran, and V. Boliver. 2013. "Second-Generation Attainment and Inequality: Primary and Secondary Effects on Educational Outcomes in Britain and the United States." in *The Children of Immigrants at School*. NYU Press.

Waters, M. C., V. C. Tran, P. Kasnitz, and J. H. Mollenkopf. 2010. "Segmented Assimilation Revisited: Types of Acculturation and Socioeconomic Mobility in Young Adulthood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33(7):1168–93.

Zhou, M., and C. L. Bankston III. 1998. *Growing Up American: How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States*. Russell Sage Foundation.



Table 1. Odds ratios predicting college degree or more in the US, Canada, and the UK

	Model 1			Model 2		
	US	Canada	UK	US	Canada	UK
<i>Community</i>						
Education	2.167*** (0.117)	1.147*** (0.016)	3.855*** (0.053)	2.112*** (0.116)	1.102*** (0.019)	3.715*** (0.053)
Income	0.976 (0.076)	1.499*** (0.141)	1.023*** (0.002)	0.968 (0.077)	1.556*** (0.162)	1.023*** (0.002)
<i>Group</i>						
Educational Selectivity	0.384 (0.471)	1.771*** (0.237)	1.154 (0.209)	0.399 (0.497)	1.710*** (0.229)	1.036 (0.225)
Gini	0.915 (0.071)	1.000 (0.004)	1.001 (0.005)	0.945 (0.082)	0.998 (0.004)	1.000 (0.057)
Political Stability	0.414 (0.242)	0.740*** (0.050)	0.985 (0.044)	0.537 (0.351)	0.745*** (0.051)	0.993 (0.057)
<i>Individual</i>						
Female	0.888 (0.116)	1.192** (0.069)	1.052** (0.017)	0.885 (0.115)	1.199** (0.070)	1.050** (0.017)
Age	0.983** (0.006)	0.965*** (0.003)	0.986*** (0.001)	0.984** (0.006)	0.966*** (0.003)	0.986*** (0.001)
1st generation (ref: 2+ generation)	0.782 (0.348)	1.215** (0.081)	0.912 (0.073)	0.003 (0.013)	0.195*** (0.074)	0.292*** (0.051)
<i>Interaction</i>						
1st generation X community education				1.491 (0.449)	1.153*** (0.033)	1.794*** (0.119)
N	1969	14420	126649	1969	14420	126649

\*\*\*p<.001; \*\*p<.01; \*p<.05