

ADAPTATION EXPERIENCE OF POST-1991 EASTERN EUROPEAN
IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY
NINA MICHALIKOVA

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Juan: Thank you for your support and encouragement. Your story is the story of so many immigrants who continue coming to the United States from around the world in hopes of finding a better life, and who despite all the obstacles live their lives with dignity. You are my inspiration forever.

To My Family: Thank you for loving me, always being there for me, and trusting me enough to let me pursue my dream.

To My Home Country, Slovakia: Determination, perseverance, and diligence are the values that were instilled in me by my parents and educators in Slovakia. These values inspired me to succeed as a doctoral student in the United States. I thank my country for my being who I am today.

To Dr. Williams: Thank you for giving me a chance to accomplish something meaningful in my life. Your patience, support, and guidance over the years were extraordinary. I wish you strength to continue changing peoples' lives, as you changed mine.

To Dr. Yang: You are an inspiring pedagogue. Had it not been for you, I would probably never have developed an interest in immigration. Thank you for all the knowledge and attention you have given me. I learned so much from you.

To Dr. Cai: Thank you for challenging me. You taught me to trust in my abilities, and to always find a way to solve the problem.

To Drs. Cready, Tilton and Zottarelli: Thank you for listening in difficult times.

To Bev: My colleague, my friend, and my second mom. I would never have gotten to this point without you. Thank you for looking after me for all those years.

To Pat: You are an extraordinary person and a great inspiration for all of us. Enjoy your exciting PhD journey!

To everybody else: I thank all my professors and colleagues at TWU and UNT, and my friends in the U.S., Europe, and around the world who helped me to accomplish my educational goals.

ABSTRACT

NINA MICHALIKOVA

ADAPTATION EXPERIENCE OF POST-1991 EASTERN EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

MAY 2013

Despite the rapid growth in the numbers of new Eastern Europeans in the United States, very little is known about this immigrant population. There is no published systematic study of their adaptation to American life. Using the latest nationally representative quantitative data, this dissertation attempts to fill this gap in the literature by systematically examining the cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States. Two research questions will guide this study. First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States?

This dissertation is the first comprehensive study of the adaptation experience of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States. The study contributes to the field by simultaneously examining the cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political

adaptation of these new immigrants. In addition to an important methodological contribution and policy implications, the project reviews contesting perspectives of immigrant adaptation and develops a theoretical base for understanding Eastern European immigration. Since different Eastern European groups adapt to their new lives in the United States differently, their adaptation experiences can be best explained by different theoretical frameworks.

Data from the Department of Homeland Security were used to describe the recent trends and patterns of immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States. The 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS), the 2008-2010 Civic Engagement Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CES-CPS), and the 2002-2010 Voting and Registration Supplement of the Current Population Survey (VRS-CPS) collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used to address aspects of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. Ordinary least squares regression and logistic regression were used to test the hypotheses.

The results show that new Eastern European immigrants have achieved a relatively high degree of English proficiency, and being recent immigrants, they have a higher likelihood of retaining their native language than other immigrant groups. Overall, new Eastern European immigrants tend to be highly educated and professional, but their average personal income is surprisingly low. Participation in civic organizations and neighborhood interaction of new Eastern European immigrants is somewhat limited,

indicating that a relatively high degree of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation might not result in better structural adaptation for these immigrants. The naturalization rate among new Eastern European immigrants is comparable to that of American immigrants in general, but it is lower than the naturalization rate among other European and Asian immigrants. Voting behavior of new Eastern European immigrants is similar to other American immigrants.

Overall, it appears that new Eastern European immigrants adapt well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically, but there are cross-group differences in their adaptation. In addition, empirical evidence suggests that new Eastern European immigrants have become only partially assimilated in the United States, while partially maintaining their ethnic cultures. Therefore, assimilation theory has no relevance when explaining their diverse adaptation paths and experiences. However, cultural pluralism theory, revisionist assimilation theory, and segmented assimilation theory appear to be applicable to the experiences of various Eastern European groups across different adaptation dimensions.

The effect of a variety of individual and country-level factors on various dimensions of adaptation was tested. Age and length of stay are among the key determinants of cultural adaptation. The degree of socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants increases with length of stay, age, and English proficiency. Married immigrants tend to adapt better socioeconomically across all measures of this adaptation

dimension. Length of stay, marital status, education, and self-employment consistently increase the degree of structural adaptation among immigrants. Immigrants who reside in the United States for a longer period of time, are males, have more education, and are married tend to adapt better politically than their respective counterparts. In addition to a variety of individual factors, results show that adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants is affected by socioeconomic and political conditions in their countries of origin. Immigrants from economically stronger, ethnically homogeneous countries where political and personal freedoms are granted to the citizens tend to adapt better culturally and socioeconomically. However, immigrants originating in countries with weaker economies tend to adapt better structurally and politically than immigrants from economically more stable countries. In addition, ethnic diversity and limited political and personal freedoms in home countries facilitate immigrants` structural and political adaptation in the United States.

This dissertation has important implications not only for scholars of immigration, but also for policy makers, and immigrant groups themselves. Collectively, Eastern European immigrants adapt well in the United States, but this overall trend conceals wide cross-group differences. This study will, hopefully, draw the attention of policy makers to this understudied immigrant population, and will lead to an improvement in policies and increased support for groups in need. It is hoped that the information on different dimensions of adaptation included in this dissertation may be beneficial to immigrants

themselves, and help later waves of Eastern European immigrants live lives that are more meaningful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Research Problem	4
Significance of the Study	7
Theoretical Significance	7
Methodological Significance	8
Practical Significance.....	10
Contributions to the Literature.....	11
Dissertation Overview	12
II. THE NEW EASTERN EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES: AN OVERVIEW	13
Trends in Immigration from Eastern Europe	14
Early Eastern European Immigration (1880-1919).....	14
Eastern European Immigration between the Wars (1920-1949).....	21
Eastern European Immigration during the Communist Regime (1950-1990)	24
Post-1991 Eastern European Immigration	25
New Eastern European Immigrants at a Glance	27
Concentration of Eastern European Immigrants.....	29
Types of Immigrants	31
Family-sponsored Immigrants	31
Employment-sponsored Immigrants	32
Refugees and Asylees	32
Diversity.....	32
Summary	33

III. LITERATURE REVIEW, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS, AND HYPOTHESES	34
Literature Review.....	34
Cultural Adaptation	34
Socioeconomic Adaptation	37
Structural Adaptation	40
Political Adaptation	43
Theoretical Frameworks	45
Hypotheses	49
Summary	58
IV. DATA AND METHODS	59
Data.....	59
Data Sources	59
Samples	60
Variables and Measures.....	61
Dependent Variables	61
Independent Variables	66
Limitations of the Data	71
Methods of Data Analysis.....	72
Cultural Adaptation.....	73
Socioeconomic Adaptation	74
Structural Adaptation	75
Political Adaptation	75
Software	75
V. CULTURAL ADAPTATION.....	77
Descriptive Analysis	79
Correlation Analysis	81
Multivariate Analyses	83
English Language Proficiency	87
Native Language Retention.....	93
Summary	98
VI. SOCIOECONOMIC ADAPTATION	104

Descriptive Analysis	108
Correlation Analysis	110
Multivariate Analyses	111
Educational Attainment	113
Occupation	118
Self-employment.....	123
Personal Income.....	127
Poverty	131
Summary	134
VII. STRUCTURAL ADAPTATION	142
Descriptive Analysis	144
Correlation Analysis	147
Weighting.....	147
Multivariate Analyses	147
Organizational Memberships	148
Interaction with Neighbors	153
Summary	157
VIII. POLITICAL ADAPTATION	164
Samples	166
Descriptive Analysis	167
Correlation Analysis	169
Multivariate Analyses	170
Citizenship Acquisition.....	170
Voter Registration.....	175
Voting	179
Summary	182
IX. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	188
Summary of the Findings.....	188
Status of Adaptation.....	188
Determinants of Adaptation.....	195
Implications of the Findings	204
Contributions and Limitations	209
Future Research	210

REFERENCES 214

APPENDICES

A. Tables	235
B. IRB Approval Letter.....	300

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The immigration of Eastern Europeans to the United States is not a recent phenomenon, and Eastern Europe has been a constant source of immigrants since the 1880s (Daniels 2002; Healey 2003; Jones 1992; Parillo 2006). The numbers of Eastern European immigrants have fluctuated considerably over time. Hungary, Romania, Poland, the former Czechoslovakia, and other Eastern European countries sent large numbers of immigrants before 1945. However, during the Cold War, Eastern Europe was isolated from the Western capitalist countries, and emigration was interrupted for several decades (Massey 1995). The latest data from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security demonstrate a clear trend: the level of Eastern European immigration was the lowest from the end of WWII until the late 1980s, followed by significant increases after the fall of communism and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Overall, it is estimated that in the past two decades, more than one million Eastern Europeans settled in the United States (Morawska 2004). The number of immigrants born in Eastern Europe increased from 1.2 million in 1990, to 1.9 million in 2000, and their numbers continued to increase between 2000 and 2010 (Migration Policy Institute 2012). From 1987 to 2001, there was almost a six-fold increase in the number of Eastern European legal immigrants admitted to the United States (Robila 2007). During the same period, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, and Bosnia-Herzegovina were among the top ten immigrant-sending countries (Nesturek and

Marks 2009). Less than 160,000 Polish immigrants came to the United States between 1950 and 1989, but about 280,000 arrived since 1990. Similarly, about 64,000 Russians came to the United States during the 40-year post-war period, but more than 600,000 arrived in the past two decades (Robila 2010). According to the 2000 U.S. Population Census, it is estimated that 466,742 foreign-born in the U.S. originated in Poland, 340,177 in Russia, and 275,173 in Ukraine (Migration Policy Institute 2012). These trends clearly indicate the beginning of a new phase of Eastern European immigration, and call for renewed research on Eastern European immigration.

Scholars of immigration disproportionately focus on adaptation experiences of immigrants from Asia and Latin America, because these are the largest and fastest growing immigrant groups since 1965 (Morawska 2004; Yang 2011). Although the population of new Eastern Europeans is much smaller and less visible, it is rapidly growing. Despite this fact, very little is known about new Eastern European immigrants in the United States. There is no published systematic study of their adaptation to American life. A very few published articles and unpublished dissertations address certain aspects of the adaptation process. In addition, these existing studies have important limitations (Gold 2004; Morawska 2004; Robila 2007, 2010; Stodolska 2008). First, the researchers focus on a particular dimension of the adaptation process such as cultural or socioeconomic adaptation, and fail to provide a more complete picture by addressing other important dimensions of adaptation. Second, they examine the adaptation of immigrants from certain countries, but fail to examine immigrants from the

entire region of Eastern Europe. More specifically, existing studies tend to investigate the largest groups, such as Polish and Russian immigrants, while overlooking immigrants originating from smaller countries. Finally, most studies focus on adaptation experiences of adolescent immigrants who are refugees rather than adult non-refugee immigrants. No study has simultaneously addressed cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of various Eastern European groups in the United States. Using the latest nationally representative quantitative data, this dissertation attempts to fill these gaps in the literature.

Scholars have challenged the classical assimilation theory as a major explanation of incorporation of contemporary immigrants in major immigrant-receiving counties, including the United States. In addition, in the age of globalization, adaptation experiences of immigrants are altered by easy and inexpensive transportation, as well as new technologies and modes of communication facilitating immigrants` transnational connections (Foner 2001; Portes 1999; Portes et al. 1999). Transnationalism is not a new phenomenon, and immigrants have always maintained transnational ties (Morawska 2001). However, most of the recent technological developments were not available to earlier generations of immigrants arriving in the United States at the turn of the century, or even to those who immigrated several decades ago. How do these changes affect the adaptation processes of new Eastern European immigrants in the United States? Do these hinder or facilitate their process of adaptation? How different is it to be an immigrant in the 21st century? The examination of new Eastern Europeans, most of whom are first-

generation immigrants with limited ties to the United States, provides a unique opportunity to examine the adaptation experiences of contemporary American immigrants. While the study will examine immigrant adaptation of Eastern Europeans in the context of the American experience, the findings will be applicable to other recent immigrant groups and to a broader international context.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the adaptation experiences of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States. This population includes legal immigrants who were born in Eastern Europe and immigrated to the United States in 1991 or later. Unlike other immigrant groups who have been in the United States for several generations, such as some Asian and Latino groups, a majority of new Eastern Europeans have been recent immigrants residing in the United States for about a decade (Robila 2010). Because many of these immigrants might not even meet the minimum five-year residency requirement and thus may not qualify to apply for citizenship, this study includes both citizens by naturalization, and non-citizens. Including Eastern Europeans with diverse immigration backgrounds and statuses might provide some interesting insights into their adaptation process.

There are many definitions of Eastern Europe. This region encompasses many different cultures, ethnicities, languages, and histories, and grouping all that diversity under a single label is rather problematic. Like any other spatial identity, Eastern Europe is a social and cultural construct. This part of Europe can be described according to

different criteria. According to the definition by the United Nations Statistics Division (2012), Eastern Europe includes the following countries: Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. This definition, however, disregards one important commonality shared by most of the countries in this region of Europe: having lived under communist rule. Therefore, this study will use the definition that groups the countries broadly classified as being part of Eastern Europe based on their common experience of the “Iron Curtain” (Robila 2010). Considering this political boundary of the 20th century that determined the development of many countries until the early 1990s, the region of Eastern Europe includes: Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine. These countries formed the so-called “communist bloc,” and had been separated from the Western capitalist countries for more than forty years after 1945, when the Soviet Union established control over Eastern Europe. Thus, they conform to the definition of Eastern Europe in geopolitics. Estonia, Slovenia, Serbia and Montenegro belong to this region, but are not included in all datasets used in this study, and thus cannot be studied. This dissertation focuses on immigrants (the first generation). Children of immigrants who can trace their origins to one of the Eastern European countries, but were born in the United States (the second generation), will not be included in the analysis. Because of a lack of immigration

experience, the adaptation experience of the second generation could be vastly different from that of the first generation.

Adaptation refers to the adjustment of immigrants to their life in the host country. More precisely, the process of immigrant adaptation is defined as “relatively stable changes that take place in an individual or group in response to environmental demands” (Berry 1997: 20). The adaptation process has many dimensions. This dissertation will concentrate on cultural adaptation, socioeconomic adaptation, structural adaptation, and political adaptation. Cultural adaptation refers to the extent to which immigrants adopt the culture of the host country or retain their own cultures. Socioeconomic adaptation refers to how immigrants fare socioeconomically in the host society. Structural adaptation is defined as integration into the social groups (e.g., social clubs, cliques of friends, peers, and neighborhoods) and economic, social, political, legal, and educational institutions and organizations of the host country (Yang 2000). Finally, political adaptation refers to the extent to which immigrants participate in the political process of the host society (Yang 2011).

Two research questions will guide this study. First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This dissertation is the first comprehensive research project on the adaptation experience of new Eastern European immigrants in the United States, with an emphasis on the post-1991 period. The new Eastern European immigrants have been neglected in the sociology of contemporary immigration, and their adaptation experience is virtually unknown. The fall of communism in the late 1980s ended the isolation of Eastern Europe and resulted in a resurgence of immigration from this region to the United States. This new phenomenon requires a systematic study. It is important to systematically investigate the experiences of new Eastern European immigrants, considering their rapid increase over the past two decades. This dissertation is the first study that seeks to simultaneously examine the cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of these new immigrants.

Theoretical Significance

This dissertation is based on the framework by Milton Gordon (1964), who proposed seven stages of adaptation: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitude receptional, behavioral receptional, and civic assimilation. Consistent with this framework, this dissertation will examine cultural and structural dimensions, and add the socioeconomic dimension, which has been recognized by researchers as important in explaining immigrants' overall degree of adaptation (Yang 2011). Due to unavailability of data, other stages proposed by Gordon (1964) will not be examined.

Over the past few decades, scholars proposed several theoretical frameworks to explain immigrants` incorporation into American society. These will be reviewed and discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters, but generally, the most influential frameworks include: classical assimilation theory, melting-pot theory, cultural pluralism theory, revisionist assimilation theory, and segmented assimilation theory. This dissertation will test the applicability of these frameworks to explain immigrants` adaptation experiences. New Eastern European immigrants may be simultaneously similar to, and different from, new immigrants from Asia and Latin America in terms of ethnicity, class, context of exit, and context of reception. By examining their adaptation experience through the lenses of existing theories of adaptation, this study can help reveal the diverse adaptation experiences of contemporary immigrants in the United States and assess the utility of theoretical perspectives on immigrant adaptation. This study is unique in that it will test the applicability of various theories – some classical, some more recent – to explain the experiences of very recent immigrants. By doing so, the goal of this dissertation is to develop a theoretical base for understanding not only experiences of new Eastern European immigration, but contemporary American immigrants in general.

Methodological Significance

This dissertation will also make an important methodological contribution. Using a quantitative approach, nationally representative data, and a large sample size, it will empirically examine important adaptation dimensions of major Eastern European groups who immigrated to the United States since 1991. Existing studies of this

immigrant population are almost exclusively qualitative. While there is a great value to the qualitative approach, findings of qualitative studies cannot be generalized to the entire population. Generalizability is, however, one of the primary goals of this dissertation. Quantitative studies of new Eastern European immigrants are limited to simple statistical techniques, such as descriptive statistics and cross tabulations, and fail to analyze the recent nationally representative data. These studies provide some interesting findings and manage to assess the level of adaptation of certain groups. At the same time, however, they fail to examine factors that play a role in the immigrant adaptation process. Employing various regression techniques, this study moves beyond description to examine important determinants of immigrant adaptation. Each adaptation dimension is measured by a variety of indicators to increase the validity of measurements. The selection of measures is determined by the findings of existing literature on immigrant adaptation. This study tests several new variables that have only been available from the U.S. Population Census since 2008, and thus, it is among the first studies to test these measures. Merging data files across several years increases the pooled sample sizes and allows for cross-group comparisons. In addition, linking consecutive years adds a longitudinal dimension to the study and creates a unique opportunity to examine changes over time. The dissertation attempts to incorporate recent developments in the field of quantitative methodology and is guided by social statistics literature.

Practical Significance

Currently, there is no study addressing the experiences of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants. In the United States, these immigrants tend to be classified as “white,” and thus can be easily confused with the majority. However, regardless of their perceived racial classification, they are still immigrants with needs stemming from their immigrant status. Being confused with the majority might not necessarily facilitate their process of adaptation. It is likely that wide cross-group variations exist among these immigrants in terms of their language abilities, socioeconomic status, or other characteristics. Perhaps new Eastern Europeans are overlooked due to their racial similarity with whites, but doing so might create additional barriers to their adaptation, rather than facilitating it. New Eastern European immigrants are unlike contemporary immigrants from Western Europe who have always adapted very well. Importantly, lives of immigrant Eastern Europeans have been affected by fifty years of communist regimes that their countries of origin were subjected to. Holding on to the cultures of their homelands, quite distant from the American culture, values of new Eastern Europeans may be largely inconsistent with the idea of American individualism and assertiveness. Simply put, coming to the United States might be a cultural shock in many respects and having to adapt might be a difficult and complex process. For these reasons, the results of this dissertation will have significant practical implications. The findings can reveal how well new Eastern European immigrants adapt to American life and how diverse the experience of adaptation across groups actually is. The findings of this study can help to

develop policies that may aid immigrants to overcome challenges, facilitate the adaptation process, and make a positive impact on their lives. The conclusions can assist acculturating groups and individuals themselves by revealing to what extent the groups are similar or heterogeneous across different adaptation dimensions. They will reveal what obstacles they have to overcome and what pathways to adopt in order to successfully adapt in the United States.

Contributions to the Literature

Several important contributions to the literature will be made by studying new Eastern European immigrants. First, no other study before has examined the adaptation of this particular group systematically. The examination of a new immigrant group with unique backgrounds and immigration history might yield some interesting results that may alter the way contemporary immigration to the United States is currently understood. Second, this study will employ a wide variety of measures at both the individual and country-level, which makes it unique. Such a variety of measures has never before been employed when examining new Eastern European immigrants, and it is likely that some country-level characteristics considered in this dissertation are new to the studies of immigrant adaptation altogether. Lastly, this dissertation examines adaptation dimensions that are largely understudied. While many studies examined cultural and socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants, very few studies investigated structural and political dimensions. Thus, this dissertation not only contributes to knowledge regarding the experiences of a new immigrant group in the United States, but it will also contribute

to knowledge pertaining to the complexities of adaptation among contemporary immigrants in the United States and worldwide.

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

Chapter 2 describes contemporary trends in immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States, with a focus on numbers of immigrants, their demographic characteristics, settlement patterns, and class of admission. Chapter 3 summarizes the literature on cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants, reviews existing theories of adaptation applicable to explaining the experiences of this immigrant population, and proposes hypotheses for testing. Chapter 4 provides details about the data, samples, variables and measurements, coding, methods, and analytical strategies used in this study. Chapters 5 through 8 present the findings of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation. Each chapter consists of descriptive and multivariate analyses. The final chapter discusses the major findings of this dissertation, contributions to the existing literature, and proposes directions for future research.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW EASTERN EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES: AN OVERVIEW

During the final decades of the 20th century, a new wave of immigration to the United States occurred, and the number of immigrants increased significantly (Martin and Midgley 1999; Portes and Rumbaut). The foreign-born population grew from 6 percent (14.1 million individuals) of the total US population in 1980, to 8 percent (19.8 million individuals) in 1990. By 2000, the foreign-born made up 11 percent (31.1 million individuals) of the total US population. As of 2010, immigrants comprised 13 percent (40 million) of the total US population (Batalova and Lee 2012). Unlike in the early 1900s, a majority of recent immigrants originates in Latin America and Asia, and they represent the most frequently studied immigrant populations. Among recent immigrants, the new Eastern European immigrants have been increasing in numbers since the late 1980s. Volumes have been written about Eastern Europeans who came to the United States at the turn of the century, and numerous studies describe their characteristics, context of their departure and reception, and their adaptation experience. The research examining new Eastern Europeans is surprisingly limited. The United States today is not the place encountered by immigrants in the early twentieth century (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). In the context of changes that took place in the 20th century, the examination of

adaptation experiences of new Eastern European immigrants will yield findings that may contribute to the field of contemporary immigration.

TRENDS IN IMMIGRATION FROM EASTERN EUROPE

The following sections discuss the pre-1991 immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States. The discussion opens with a brief chronology of immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States. I analyzed several major waves of immigrants who arrived since the late 1880s: early Eastern European immigration (1880-1919), Eastern European immigration between the wars (1920-1949), during the communist regimes (1950-1990), and post-1991 Eastern European immigration. The overview includes the discussion of characteristics of early immigrants, such as their numbers, settlement patterns, demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds, and cultural values. Immigration policies in the sending countries and in the United States are also discussed.

Early Eastern European Immigration (1880-1919)

Small numbers of Eastern Europeans immigrated to the United States during early colonial times. These were mostly upper-class immigrants, such as merchants, soldiers, or nobles (Blumenthal 1981). During the 1880s, Eastern Europeans started to immigrate in large numbers, and the “classic” era of immigration began (Massey 1995). More accessible ways of travel combined with worsening conditions in Europe and a need for low-wage workers in America contributed to the mass immigration from Eastern Europe (Blumenthal 1981). Due to frequently changing boundaries and political turmoil in Eastern Europe, it is difficult to estimate the precise numbers of early Eastern European

immigrants. The U.S. Department of Immigration classified various groups under different names over time, or lumped distinct groups together. Immigration officials often counted Eastern Europeans as Germans or Austrians. Similarly, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and other groups were sometimes classified as Russians (Olsen 1994). Eastern European Slavs were the second largest group of immigrants after the Italians entering the United States during this period. The largest Slavic groups were the Polish, Czechs, Slovaks, and Russians (Wepman 2002). According to the data by the Department of Homeland Security presented in Table 1, more than 3 million Russians immigrated to the United States during the early period, followed by about 1.6 million immigrants coming from Hungary, and about 150,000 from Poland. Olsen (1994) estimated that the number of Polish immigrants arriving between 1877 and 1924 was as high as 3 million, while about 200,000 Lithuanians and 400,000 Ukrainians immigrated to the United States during the same period. In addition, about 527,000 Hungarian, 500,000 Czech, and 728,000 Slovak immigrants originated in the Austria-Hungary Empire (Olsen 1994).

Many studies examined characteristics and adaptation experiences of Eastern Europeans who came to the United States at the turn of the century. The literature portrays their adaptation process as more problematic than the smooth, straight-line assimilation experienced by immigrants from Northern and Western Europe (Blumenthal 1981; Healey 2003; Jaret 1999; Parillo 2006; Thomas and Znaniecki 1927; Zhou 2002). Early Eastern European immigrants tended to be non-Protestant, less educated, and less

skilled peasants, but there were important cultural and socioeconomic differences between groups (Perlmann and Waldinger 1997). Poles, Slovaks, Russians, Bulgarians, and other Slavic groups spoke different languages, had different customs, and came from countries with very different histories. They also differed in their socioeconomic backgrounds. Czechs, for example, were less likely to be illiterate than Germans or English immigrants, and Jews had a higher percentage of skilled workers than virtually any other European group, except the Scots (Jones 1992). Despite this incredible diversity, these groups were lumped together as “Slavs,” and perceived as homogeneous (Parillo 2006; Wepman 2002).

Despite their rural origins, Eastern Europeans had not become farmers in America (Jones 1992). Having no capital and unable to buy land, they performed mostly manual, low-paying jobs that required limited skills and knowledge of English. Concentrated in the large cities of the Northeast and Midwest, such as Detroit, Milwaukee, Buffalo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Chicago, men worked as laborers in factories, mines, or mills, and women were predominantly domestic servants in white middle-class households (Daniels 2002; Healey 2003; Olsen 1994). Many early Eastern European immigrants did not intend to stay in the U.S. permanently, and their goal was to save enough money to buy land back home. In fact, in some years, return migration to Eastern Europe was as high as fifty percent. Many immigrants, however, never returned to their home countries (Blumenthal 1981).

Finding a job in America was easy, but jobs available to immigrants did not allow for status improvement. Insecurity, limited pay, and lack of promotions perpetuated immigrants` poverty. The common workweek for a non-skilled worker was 84 hours – 6 days a week, 14 hours per day (Parillo 2006). The pay was often insufficient to cover basic necessities. For example, in a Pittsburgh steel district, two thirds of workers earned \$12.50 a week, and the rest had to be content with \$10, while \$15 was the minimum amount necessary for immigrants` families to make it through the week (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). The entire family – including children – had to work out of economic necessity. Immigrant children were expected to take after-school jobs, or leave school altogether, and help their parents to overcome economic hardship. Education of Eastern European immigrant children typically ended by the time they were 14, but in many documented cases, children as young as 10 years old were already working at the mines with their fathers (Greene 1968; Znaniecki-Lopata 1976). The consequences of child labor were significant and limited opportunities for upward socioeconomic mobility in the second and third generation.

Although child labor was common in immigrant families, not all Eastern European immigrants discouraged education of their children. Romanians, for example, tended to achieve the middle-class status by the second generation by keeping the family size small, and encouraging their children to continue their education (Olsen 1994). This pattern was not unusual for other Eastern European groups. For example, 50 percent of first generation Czechs and Slovaks moved into skilled jobs, and about 80 percent of the

second generation tended to experience some degree of upwards social mobility.

Similarly, about 67 percent of Jews who immigrated in early 20th century were skilled workers (Olsen 1994).

In addition to their lower socioeconomic background, religious beliefs further distinguished Eastern Europeans from earlier immigrants. They were largely Roman Catholics or Jews (Robila 2010). Some groups, like Bulgarians, Romanians, Russians, and Ukrainians were predominantly Orthodox Christians (Olsen 1994). About 90 percent of over 2 million Jews who left Europe in the late 19th century settled in the United States, and 70 percent of them originated in Russia (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). While Catholics immigrated to the United States due to economic hardship and did not plan to stay in the U.S. permanently, Jews left Europe because of religious persecution. Unlike many other Eastern Europeans, Jews had no intentions to return to their countries of origin, and aspired to become American citizens. In addition, unlike Catholics who were mostly peasants, many Jewish immigrants had entrepreneurial skills that helped them to secure skilled jobs outside the industrial sector (Healey 2003).

The relationship between early Eastern Europeans and other immigrant groups were not harmonious. By the time Eastern Europeans started arriving in large numbers, immigrants from Northern and Western Europe were skilled workers in the mines, mills, and factories where later immigrants worked as unskilled laborers. Relations between Eastern European groups were also tense. Groups shared the Eastern European origin, but spoke different languages, and had distinct customs and socioeconomic backgrounds

(Bankston et al. 2006). Resentment, isolation, and stereotyping inspired by intergroup differences resulted in Eastern Europeans` preference for ethnic communities, neighborhoods, and parishes where they could interact with immigrants of the same origin and ethnicity. They tended to be surrounded by friends and relatives of the same ethnicity who spoke the same language and practiced the same religion (Parillo 2006). Ethnic communities formed by immigrants in America closely resembled the European communities they left behind. In most cases, social mobility would require immigrants to abandon these communities. Socioeconomic advancement, however, was not as important to these immigrants as the sense of stability provided by ethnic neighborhoods. Holding onto their cultures and values, early Eastern Europeans maintained their ethnic affiliations, sacrificing opportunities for social mobility (Olsen 1994).

Growing numbers of Eastern European immigrants fueled anti-immigrant sentiments, and perceptions of social, cultural, political, and economic threat. Immigrants were considered unable to adopt American culture and values, and unfit to become fully American (Jaret 1999). Not only were immigrants viewed as threatening the established cultural values, they were also viewed as politically dangerous, loyal to foreign ideologies, and wanting to destroy American democratic institutions (Jaret 1999). In the eyes of nativists, Eastern European immigrants also posed a danger to a pure American race (Wepman 2002). The fears of racial inferiority inspired a frequently asked question: Are these immigrants white? The book *Passing of the Great Race* by historian Madison Grant (1916) represented anti-immigrant sentiments of this era,

proposing that the “old stock” was disappearing through what Grant labeled as “racial suicide.” Perceived differences in physical characteristics among various Eastern European groups, combined with their inferior cultural background, and low socioeconomic status were interpreted as indicators of their lower moral and intellectual qualities (Jacobson 1998). Some immigrant groups were favored over others, but in general, all immigrants from Eastern Europe occupied a strange, in-between position in the American racial hierarchy: above blacks, but below “white” Americans. According to a 1926 survey, for example, Serbo-Croatians ranked near the bottom of the list of groups whites were willing to interact with, and Poles ranked just above them (Barrett and Roediger 2005).

Early Eastern Europeans were frequently subjected to discrimination, prejudice, physical violence, threats, and lynching (Brodkin 2005; Healey 2003; Jaret 1999; Olsen 1994). The 1886 general strike in Chicago is one of the most significant documented incidents of physical violence against early Eastern European immigrants. During a peaceful demonstration, someone threw a bomb at the police, wounding 70 people, and killing an officer. Although it was never determined who was responsible for the incident, six immigrants were sentenced to death (Parillo 2006). Another incident happened in 1890, when dozens of Slavic coal miners were wounded and killed by Pennsylvania militia (Jaret 1999). Following similar events, the press portrayed immigrants as unruly, radical, violent, and lawless, contributing to anti-immigrant

hysteria, and paving the way for future restrictive immigration policies (Parillo 2006; Wepman 2002).

Eastern European Immigration between the Wars (1920-1949)

This era marks the sharp decline, and eventual termination of mass immigration from Europe (Massey 1995). Major contributing factors were restrictive immigration laws, the Great Depression, and World War II. New immigration legislation was passed as a response to nativist reactions and fears on the part of the dominant group. By the 1920s, most Americans were anti-immigrant, and the idea that the United States could ever become a melting pot was abandoned (Jaret 1999). Pressured by anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and anti-immigrant organizations, and by the general public that viewed newcomers as inassimilable, Congress passed the Emergency Quota Act of 1921. The law imposed a total limit of 357,000 immigrants per year. For the first time, the law limited the number of immigrants of each nationality to 3 percent of the number of earlier immigrants and their descendants of that nationality who resided in the United States according to the 1910 Population Census (Jones 1992; Wepman 2002; Yang 2011). The law was amended in 1924 and replaced with the National Origins Act, which further curtailed the number of immigrants admitted annually to only 150,000, and limited annual immigration to 2 percent of the number of people from each country present in the United States in 1910 (Jones 1992; Wepman 2002). The legislation was designed to promote immigration of Northern and Western Europeans, and reduce the numbers of Southern and Eastern European immigrants by allocating quotas much lower than the

prospective number of immigrants (Massey 1995; Parillo 2006). For example, while the annual quota for Britain was 65,000, the quota for Poland was only 5,982 per year. The number of Romanians who were allowed to immigrate was limited to 1,000, and only 100 Bulgarians were allowed to enter the United States after the passage of the Act (Robila 2010; Schaefer 2010). The legislation had no consideration for personal relationships, separating families if some family members had been born in a country with its quota still open, from others born in a country whose quota was exhausted (Wepman 2002).

The law, combined with the impact of the Great Depression, curtailed the numbers of immigrants from all Eastern European countries, and the overall immigration dropped to the lowest levels in the century (Healey 2003). Unemployment in the United States eliminated the demand for immigrant workers, and annual average in this period dropped to 53,000 immigrants (Massey 1995). In 1933, for example, only 23,068 immigrants arrived, the lowest number since 1831. Immigration decreased again during WWII. With the annual average of 40,000, the inflow of immigrants was even lower than during the Great Depression (Wepman 2002).

Despite the restrictive immigration policies, sizable numbers of Eastern Europeans managed to immigrate to the United States during this period. According to the data from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, about 223,000 immigrants from Poland and 101,000 immigrants from Czechoslovakia entered the United States in the 1920s (Table 1). Like early immigrants, Eastern Europeans who immigrated after WWII faced language barriers, and had limited skills and resources.

However, postwar economic prosperity, relatively immigrant-friendly climate, and a variety of ethnic, religious, and governmental organizations established to assist immigrants likely facilitated their adaptation process (Massey 1995).

The postwar period marks the beginning of the Cold War, often dated from 1947 - 1991. During this period, immigration from Eastern Europe was blocked, and the numbers of immigrants decreased dramatically. The Soviet Union established its dominance over countries that in prewar times sent the largest numbers of immigrants, such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or Romania. With the rise of communism by the 1950s, countries occupied by the Soviet Union adopted the strict Soviet approach to border control, which made emigration from these countries to the capitalist West nearly impossible (Dowty 1989). Despite these restrictions, in five years after WWII, 15 million Eastern Europeans managed to immigrate to West Germany, and thousands continued to apply for political asylum in the 1950s (Böcker et al. 1998). Having limited space and resources, West Germany could not accommodate all prospective immigrants. However, the legislation passed in the United States after the war increased resettlement quotas and allowed immigration of limited numbers of Eastern Europeans (Loescher 2001). The Displacement Person's Act of 1948 was the first U.S. law recognizing refugees (Rumbaut 1994). Because of this policy, 400,000 people arrived to the U.S., many of whom were refugees from Eastern Europe, fleeing oppressive communist regimes (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999; Martin and Midgley 1999).

Eastern European Immigration during the Communist Regime (1950-1990)

The Displaced Person's Act eventually expired, and was replaced by the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This law facilitated the immigration of 190,000 refugees, primarily from Europe (Martin and Midgley 1999). Sizable numbers of Yugoslavs, Bulgarians, Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, and other Eastern Europeans immigrated under this law, but their numbers were significantly lower than in earlier periods (Robila 2010). For example, 228,000 Polish immigrants entered the United States in the 1920s, but only 10,000 came in the 1950s (Massey 1995). Significant political events in Eastern Europe were often followed by new U.S. legislations to facilitate immigration of refugees. For example, after the Hungarian revolution in 1956, the U.S. Congress passed the law that resulted in admitting 29,000 refugees, mostly from Hungary (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). The most significant immigration legislation during this period was the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, which abolished the national origin quotas system. The Act established an annual limit of 170,000 immigrants from the Eastern hemisphere, and for the first time, the immigration from the Western hemisphere was limited to 120,000 immigrants (Yang 2011). The primary goal of this new policy was family reunification (Schaefer 2010; Yang 2011). The passage of the Act increased immigration by one third, but the numbers of Eastern European immigrants have not reached the levels from earlier periods.

In addition to declining numbers, the characteristics of Eastern European immigrants who entered the U.S. in this period were different compared to the previous

waves. In the post-war period, immigrants were political, rather than economic refugees (Robila 2010). They viewed immigration primarily as a means to escape communist regimes and political instability in their home countries. While immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe in 1910 constituted almost 70 percent of all American immigrants, this percentage decreased to 16 percent by 1960. In fact, this year marks the beginning of the sharpest reduction in Eastern European immigration to the United States (Rumbaut 1994). Numbers clearly demonstrate this trend. Out of approximately 390,000 immigrants from Poland in the United States, almost half arrived before 1960, but only 3 percent immigrated in the 1960s. The pattern of immigration from the former Soviet Union is very similar (Rumbaut 1994).

Post-1991 Eastern European Immigration

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, communist countries of Eastern Europe were transformed into democracies, and after more than fifty years of oppressive regimes, people were free to migrate to the West. Because of these political changes, several new waves of Eastern European immigrants entered the United States during the past two decades. Although the numbers never reached the magnitude of earlier eras, empirical evidence suggests that their numbers have been gradually increasing (Morawska 2004; Robila 2010). This increase can be attributed to changes in political regimes in all of Eastern Europe, and economic hardship forcing migrants to look for better opportunities abroad (Okolski 2000). Table 1 shows that slightly less than 65 thousand Russian immigrants came to the United States during the 40-year period between 1950 and 1989,

but almost ten times more emigrated from this country since 1990. Similar patterns can be observed for other Eastern European countries, demonstrating an increase in the numbers of new Eastern European immigrants.

As can be seen in Table 2, the highest number of immigrants from Eastern Europe who obtained legal permanent resident status during 1991-2010 were from Ukraine (290,591), followed by Poland (286,437), Russia (267,780), Bosnia and Herzegovina (128,129), and Romania (111,161). A mixture of patterns and a great variation in numbers of Eastern European immigrants admitted to permanent residency since 1991 emerges. This diversity possibly reflects the events in immigrants` countries of origin, and the speed of economic transformation and development after the fall of communist regimes, which can serve as push factors and affect decisions to migrate (Robila 2010). The flow of immigrants from some Eastern European countries has been relatively stable between 1991 and 2010, with approximately equal numbers of immigrants arriving during each 5-year period (e.g. Hungary, Latvia, or Romania). The number of immigrants from Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Macedonia, or Slovakia was the lowest between 1991 and 1995, and then gradually increased and remained stable. Immigration from other Eastern European countries – including the countries historically sending the largest numbers of immigrants – reached a peak at a certain point, and then decreased. For example, the number of legal permanent residents from Poland was the highest after the fall of communism, and then decreased and remained stable in the subsequent decades. Russia and Ukraine, on the other hand, registered the highest number of

permanent residents during the 2001-2005 period. The number of permanent residents from former Yugoslavia increased significantly during the civil war period (1995-2000), reached its peak during the post-war period (2001-2005), and then decreased.

NEW EASTERN EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS AT A GLANCE

Who are the new Eastern European immigrants in the United States? Existing studies provide an incomplete answer to this question. According to the limited literature, contemporary immigrants from Eastern Europe may be unlike their earlier predecessors in many respects. In addition, wide cross-country differences exist among those who immigrated after 1991 (Robila 2007, 2008, 2010). This dissertation focuses on various dimensions of adaptation, therefore, cultural, socioeconomic, and other characteristics of new Eastern Europeans will be addressed in later chapters. The rest of this chapter will only describe demographic backgrounds of new Eastern Europeans, such as their age, length of stay in the U.S., and marital status.

Table 3 shows selected demographic characteristics of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants. Calculations are based on the data from the Department of Homeland Security for all Eastern European immigrants who obtained legal permanent residency between 2006 and 2010. Both new arrivals and immigrants adjusting their status are included. Almost half of all immigrants were between 18 and 34 years old (46 percent), followed by the age category 35-64 (34 percent) and under 18 (15 percent). Almost all groups followed this age pattern, with exception of Albanian immigrants who tended to be 35 to 64 years old and Russian immigrants who tended to be younger than

18 years. In fact, Russian immigrants were the youngest, with 40 percent being younger than 18 years. Compared to other groups, immigrants from Moldova and Ukraine were also relatively young, with 24 percent being younger than 18 years. The overall pattern suggests that immigrants from countries of the former Soviet Union tend to be younger than immigrants from other Eastern European countries. The largest number of immigrants aged 18 to 34 comes from Slovakia (62 percent), Latvia (55 percent), and Czech Republic (53 percent). Immigrants from Croatia, Albania, and Poland tend to fall in the 35-64 age category.

Table 3 further indicates that a majority of new immigrants from Eastern Europe were married (66 percent), with some cross-country differences. Immigrants from Hungary and Slovakia were the most likely to be married (77 percent). On the contrary, Russian, Moldovan, and Ukrainian immigrants were the most likely to be single (51 percent, 39 percent, and 37 percent, respectively), which is not surprising, considering that these immigrants tend to be the youngest.

The data from the Department of Homeland Security did not include the information on length of stay, but existing limited research found that new Eastern European immigrants are not homogeneous in terms of their average length of residency in the United States. According to Robila (2010), the mean length of residence in the United States varied between 10 years for immigrants from Latvia and Lithuania to 22 years for Czech, Slovak, and Hungarian immigrants.

CONCENTRATION OF EASTERN EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS

Eastern Europeans at the turn of the century settled predominantly in the growing cities of the Northeast, where they found work in plants, mills, mines, and factories (Blumenthal 1981; Daniels 2002; Healey 2003; Jones 1992; Parillo 2006; Thomas and Znaniecki 1927). Lacking capital and English language skills, the pioneers concentrated in the ports on the East coast, including Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and New York. The later waves moved further inland, and settled in cities like Cleveland, Chicago, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis (Handlin 1951). In 1910, almost 80 percent of Eastern European immigrants were concentrated in the cities, compared to less than half of native-born Americans (Jones 1992). In the same year, the highest numbers of Russians and Romanians resided in New York City, Philadelphia, and Chicago, while Hungarians tended to settle in New York City, Chicago, and Cleveland (Lieberson 1980). Among early Eastern European immigrants, Russian were the most likely to live in the cities, with 5 out of 6 immigrants being concentrated in urban centers (Jones 1992). The size of immigrant populations in American cities mirrored that of the cities in Europe. Chicago, for example, was a leading Polish city of residence, with a population of 360,000 Poles. After Warsaw and Lodz, it was considered the largest Polish center worldwide (Thomas and Znaniecki 1927).

According to the 2000 Population Census, it is estimated that about 1.9 million first-generation immigrants from Eastern Europe resided in the United States. Of that number, 40 percent (762,884) were concentrated in the Northeast (Migration Policy

Institute 2012). The region with the second highest population of new Eastern European immigrants was the Midwest; here they constituted about 26 percent of all Eastern European immigrants (489,795). About 21 percent of all new Eastern European immigrants settled in the West (389,953), followed by 14 percent in the South (263,424). Table 4 demonstrates that in 2000, the five states with the largest populations of foreign born from Eastern Europe were New York, Illinois, California, New Jersey, and Florida. Combined, these five states constituted 60.4 percent of the total foreign-born population from Eastern Europe in the United States. New York remains the state with the largest percentage of Eastern European immigrants - 1 in 4 foreign-born Eastern Europeans in the United States resides in New York (22 percent). Among all foreign-born people in New York, approximately 1 in 10 originates in Eastern Europe (11 percent).

Table 5 shows the cross-country differences in settlement patterns. It appears that between 2006 and 2010, immigrants from most Eastern European countries tended to settle consistently in the same states. For example, over the span of five years, immigrants from Albania, Belarus, and Latvia tended to settle in New York. The state of first choice for Bulgarian, Lithuanian, and Polish immigrants was Illinois. Hungarians tended to settle in Florida, while Romanians and Russians preferred California. The settlement patterns of immigrants from other Eastern European countries were less consistent. Immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, settled in Missouri (2006), Illinois (2007-2009), Florida (2008), and New York (2010). Immigrants from Croatia and Ukraine were most

likely to settle in New York and California, while Slovaks resided in both New York and New Jersey.

TYPES OF IMMIGRANTS

Table 6 shows the percentage distributions of Eastern European immigrants by type of admission and sending countries of birth for fiscal years 2006-2010. On average, it appears that immediate relatives of U.S. citizens provides the main path of immigration for new Eastern European immigrants, as almost half of them entered the U.S. as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens between 2006 and 2010. The second most prevalent category is refugees and asylees, represented by 20 percent of all immigrants from Eastern Europe, followed by employment based preferences with 15 percent of immigrants falling in this category.

Family-sponsored Immigrants

This category of admission includes family-sponsored preferences and immediate relatives of U.S. citizens (Yang 2011). Comparisons of different Eastern European groups presented in Table 6 indicate that the majority of immigrants from Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia were admitted as family-sponsored immigrants. For example, between 70 and 72 percent of immigrants from Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, and Macedonia entered under this category, more than half of them as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens.

Employment-sponsored Immigrants

Another possible path of post-1991 Eastern European immigration is through employment preferences, which include five categories: priority workers; professionals with advanced degrees; skilled workers, professionals without advanced degrees or needed unskilled workers; special immigrants; and investors (Yang 2011). As seen in Table 6, a significant portion (20 percent or more) of Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Russian, and Slovak immigrants were admitted under this category. Of these groups, this category was a dominant mode of entry for Czech immigrants (45 percent), as well as immigrants from Slovakia (28 percent).

Refugees and Asylees

A refugee is “a person who has been forced out of his or her country of nationality” (Weeks 2009: 556). An asylee is defined as “a person who has been forced out of this or her country of nationality and who is seeking legal refuge (permanent residency) in the country to which he or she moved” (Weeks 2009: 546). Table 6 further indicates that the refugee/asylee category was the main mode of admission for individuals from Bosnia and Herzegovina (54 percent) and Moldova (46 percent). Above average numbers of Albanians, Belarusians, Croatians, Russians, and Ukrainians were also admitted as refugees or asylees.

Diversity

A significant portion of immigrants from several Eastern European countries was admitted under the diversity program. Through the lottery process, this program

attempted to diversify the sources of immigration since 1990, when it was created by the Immigration Act (Yang 2011). Above average numbers of Albanians, Belarusians, Bulgarians, Lithuanians, Macedonians, Romanians, and Russians benefited from this program.

SUMMARY

This chapter describes historical and contemporary trends in Eastern European migration, as well as characteristics, settlement patterns, and types of new Eastern European immigrants. This immigrant population is smaller and less visible than other recent immigrant groups, but rapidly growing. Despite this fact, researchers have not systematically examined new Eastern European immigrants. Preliminary results indicate that these immigrants are diverse in terms of their demographic characteristics. Their settlement patterns and context of admission are also not uniform. While existing studies recognize these differences, they fail to examine how the variations affect immigrants' adaptation experiences. In the following chapters, this dissertation will seek to fill the gap in the literature by systematically examining adaptation experiences of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS, AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter reviews existing research on various dimensions of the adaptation process among post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States, including cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation. Theoretical frameworks relevant to the understanding of immigrants` adaptation are discussed, and hypotheses for testing are proposed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing research on new Eastern European immigrants is very limited. Therefore, prior studies of Eastern Europeans who immigrated to the U.S. during the decades prior to 1991 are also included in the review.

Cultural Adaptation

The seminal work by Lieberson and Waters (1988) is a comprehensive study of white ethnics, including several groups of Eastern European ancestry. Using the 1980 Census data, the authors examined whether white ethnic groups, including Polish, Russians, Czechs, and Hungarians, differed in their cultural characteristics, more specifically their fertility and propensity to marriage. The results showed that the fertility level was low and decreased for all groups. Similarly, there were small differences in their marital patterns, with the exception of Russians, who were the least likely to get

married. The study offers a systematic quantitative analysis of the adaptation process, but focuses primarily on the second and third generations.

Prior studies of cultural adaptation use mainly a qualitative approach to investigate experiences of specific Eastern European groups, and thus do not allow for generalization to the entire population of Eastern Europeans. In a qualitative study of recent immigrants from Poland and Russia in Philadelphia, Morawska (2004) found that these two groups did not follow the same adaptation trajectories. Rather than being incorporated into the American mainstream, Polish immigrants tended to follow the ethnic path regardless of their socio-economic status. Most of them self-identified as Polish, maintained strong transnational ties, and had limited knowledge of English. Russian Jews, on the other hand, tended to be host-country oriented. They were more likely to self-identify as “Jewish American,” maintained only minimal transnational connections, and spoke English fluently.

In a different qualitative study, Huseby-Darvas (2003) found that Hungarian immigrants in Michigan tended to preserve their ethnic cultures through cooking Hungarian food, organizing ethnic festivals, or celebrating ethnic holidays. In a study of Russian Jews in San Francisco and California, Gold (2004) concluded that these immigrants “feel ambivalent about American culture and social practices” (2004: 34). Rather than socializing with American Jews, they tended to build their own communities. Belozersky and Borschovsky (2004) examined Russian Jews in Boston who arrived in the 1980s. Results showed that about 83 percent of these immigrants read Russian

newspapers, 43 percent listened to Russian radio, 61 percent visited Russian websites, and 58 percent watched Russian TV.

Quantitative studies focus primarily on acculturation among pre-1991 immigrants, and fail to use up-to-date data. Using the 1980 Census data, Chiswick (1993) found that immigrants from the former Soviet Union are more likely to speak a language other than English at home, and tend to be less fluent in English than other immigrants from Europe. Among immigrants from the former Soviet Union, more education and immigrating with children improved language skills, while older age, fewer years in the United States, refugee status, and having a spouse who speaks Russian delayed learning English.

Prior studies concentrate primarily on cultural adaptation of adolescent immigrants. Birman, Trickett, and Vinokurov (2002) assessed acculturation styles of Soviet Jewish refugee adolescents, and concluded that acculturation to both American and Russian cultures were associated with reduced loneliness and increased support from parents. Furthermore, acculturation into American culture was found to be associated with better school achievement and support from American peers, while acculturation to Russian culture was linked to support from Russian peers. Tartakovsky (2012) found acculturation of Russian adolescents to be impacted by their attitudes towards both the country of origin and the host country, in addition to environmental constraints including experiences of discrimination. Immigrants who felt accepted in the host country were more likely to be acculturated than those who felt rejected. Using a qualitative design and a small sample size, Stodolska (2008) examined cultural adaptation problems among

Polish adolescent immigrants brought about by the process of immigration. According to the author, the main adaptation problems these adolescents had to negotiate were related to the new environment in the host country, negative school experiences, discrimination by their peers, and lack of English proficiency.

Several qualitative dissertations addressed cultural adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. Sanallutov (2004) focused on various dimensions of acculturation among young Slavic-speaking refugees in the Midwest United States, and found their acculturation to be determined by their native cultures, experiences in home countries, and the ability to acquire education. The dissertation by Lyubansky (2000) explored the effects of cultural involvement on adjustment among older immigrants from the former Soviet Union. Stress experienced by immigrants was found to be a significant predictor in overall adjustment. Involvement in American culture was also significant to some extent. For example, immigrants who adopted U.S. values faced fewer psychological problems and were better adjusted; however, the effect of adopting U.S. behaviors on the process of immigrant adjustment was not significant.

Socioeconomic Adaptation

Chapter 2 discussed socioeconomic background characteristics of early Eastern European immigrants. Generally, these immigrants had limited education and resources, were concentrated at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy, performed mostly manual jobs requiring limited skills, and their earnings were very low. Despite the common perception that all early Eastern European foreign-born were uneducated peasants, there

were differences between groups in their socioeconomic background. In 1910, for example, illiteracy rate ranged from 3 percent among Czech immigrants to 37 percent among Croatian immigrants. In the same year, 36 percent of Russian immigrants were laborers, farmers, or servants, compared to 63 percent of Hungarian immigrants (Lieberson 1980). Additionally, after 1917 when a literacy test became a requirement for immigration to the U.S., the socioeconomic characteristics of Eastern European immigrants noticeably improved (Lieberson 1980).

Despite the limited socioeconomic adaptation of early immigrants, subsequent generations were able to achieve socioeconomic mobility. Lieberson and Waters (1988) found that in 1980, the median year of schooling among the native-born minorities of Eastern European ancestry was about thirteen, with Russian women having the highest educational level. In terms of occupational attainment, Czech men were more likely to be employed in agriculture compared with other groups. On the contrary, Czech and Polish women were the most likely to work in the service sector. The income of men of Russian origin exceeded the income of men in all other European groups, with Hungarian men being the second highest group.

Researchers investigating socioeconomic adaptation of post-1991 foreign-born Eastern Europeans fail to provide a complete picture by focusing on immigrants from particular countries, without examining cross-country differences. Using the 1990 Census data, Huseby-Darvas (2003) found that about 70 percent of recent Hungarian immigrants in Michigan completed high school, and 25 percent had attained at least a

bachelor's degree. Their family income was about \$59,000, exceeding the income of native-born Americans of Hungarian origin. Gold (2004) studied patterns of social and economic adaptation of Soviet Jewish immigrants in San Francisco and Los Angeles. He found that Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union were highly educated, and skilled, and had access to ethnic networks. Consequently, they tended to experience rapid economic mobility. One-third of former Soviet Jews worked as white-collar workers, such as professionals, managers, administrators, or technical specialists. Apparently, not all Eastern European immigrant groups experienced upward economic mobility. Erdmans (1998) interviewed 31 Polish refugees in Chicago and California, and conducted several surveys of Polish newcomers, a great majority of whom arrived in the United States in the 1980s. Results showed that most immigrants experienced a decline in their occupational status, and were unable to find positions corresponding to their educational level and experiences. Regardless of their similar socioeconomic backgrounds, immigrants experienced different patterns of incorporation into the labor market. The adaptation depended on their immigration status, with permanent immigrants being the most likely to find employment as skilled workers and professionals.

Very few studies use quantitative, nationally representative data to examine socioeconomic adaptation among new Eastern European immigrants. Based on the data from the 1980 Census, Chiswick (1993) found that earnings of immigrants from the former Soviet Union did not correspond to their high educational attainment, and these

immigrants earned 60 percent less than did other European immigrants. Similarly, using the 2000 Census data, Logan and Drew (2011) found that despite their strong educational and professional backgrounds, women from the former Soviet Union were employed in less prestigious occupations and earned less than their male counterparts, or female immigrants in general. In several quantitative studies, Robila (2007, 2008, 2010) examined socioeconomic characteristics of recent immigrants from Eastern Europe. The results showed wide disparities between groups. For example, immigrants from Bulgaria, Russia, and Romania tended to have the highest level of education, while immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia had the lowest. Immigrants originating in Hungary, Latvia, and Croatia had the highest per capita income and the lowest percentage of people below poverty level, and those from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, and Moldova the highest. According to Robila (2010), such diversity in socioeconomic profiles can be attributed to different socioeconomic and historical backgrounds of Eastern European countries, and differences in the immigration process.

Structural Adaptation

Eastern European immigrants who arrived at the turn of the 20th century were likely to socialize with other immigrants of the same ethnic origins (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). Immigrants were not hesitant to join organizations, but they were likely to be members of organizations established and attended by their co-ethnics. A variety of organizations established by immigrants helped to preserve their cultural heritage, language, and values. In 1910, about 7,000 ethnic Polish organizations existed in the

United States, and two thirds of Polish Americans belonged to at least one of them (Daniels 2002). Some examples of ethnic civic organizations established during this period include Polish National Alliance, Polish Roman Catholic Union, Ukrainian Women`s Alliance, Croatian Catholic Society, or South Slavic Socialist Federation (Daniels 2002; Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). The most important agencies for preserving immigrants` cultural heritage were churches. Other ethnic organizations included various aid societies, charities, credit unions, libraries, gymnastics societies, cafes, and taverns (Blumenthal 1981). In addition to ethnic organizations, native language press was published in every immigrant community, further strengthening the desire of immigrants to maintain connections to their own ethnic groups. In the peak of early Eastern European immigration, about sixty Polish newspapers were published in the United States. In 1920, there were four Czech dailies in Chicago alone (Blumenthal 1981). Struggling to survive, immigrants had little interest in becoming involved outside their ethnic communities.

Based on the scarce literature, it appears that recent European immigrants also tend to limit their social contact to immigrants of the same ethnic background. Hungarians in Michigan tend to interact with other Hungarian immigrants during the cultural events and festivals (Huseby-Darvas 2003). Russian Jews in San Francisco, Boston, and Los Angeles tend to meet other immigrants in their communities and in organizations established to preserve their cultural roots (Gold 2004). According to in-depth interviews with immigrants from various Eastern European countries, Robila (2010) found that

immigrants tend to select friends from the same ethnic group because it facilitates their mutual understanding and support, and enables them to connect through similar life events, family circumstances, and shared history. According to Robila (2010), immigrants from Romania and Armenia are mostly Orthodox Christians, and rather than attending American religious institutions, they tend to practice their religion in ethnic churches with immigrants of the same faith and ethnic background. Similarly, Erdmans (1998) found that recent Polish immigrants are not particularly willing to join established Polish American organizations because they perceive them as being “too formal, autocratic, and centralized” (1998: 103). Rather than joining existing organizations, immigrants from Poland in Chicago tend to form their own political and educational institutions that meet the needs of first generation immigrants.

Researchers believe that immigrants who are proficient in English and have a higher level of socioeconomic status are more likely to adapt structurally than immigrants who do not speak English well, or have lower socioeconomic status (Thapa-Oli 2011). Consistent with this argument, the level of structural adaptation may vary across Eastern European groups because of their diverse demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds. For example, according to the 2000 Census data, about 33 percent of Bulgarians had a graduate degree, as opposed to only 5 percent of Macedonians. The Hungarians had an average per capita income of \$34,624, and immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina \$12,513. Immigrants from Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, and Slovenia were the most likely to speak only English at home, and immigrants from Belarus, Moldova, and Bosnia and

Herzegovina the least likely (Robila 2010). These great variations may result in differences in structural adaptation.

Political Adaptation

Handlin (1951) described early European immigrants as uprooted peasants who found it difficult to participate in political institutions in the United States because they had no prior experience with democracy. They tended to be suspicious of the state, and needed time to internalize values and norms of American democracy. Empirical evidence suggests a high degree of political mobilization among early Eastern European immigrants. However, these immigrants were oriented towards the politics in Eastern Europe, and their participation in American politics was very low. For example, in Chicago, where every 8th person was a Polish American, the first representative of Polish origin was not elected to Congress until 1920 (Daniels 2002). Eastern European immigrants actively promoted independence of their home countries. For example, Polish immigrants promoted a reconstruction of free Poland during WWI, while Czechs and Slovaks campaigned to create a free Czechoslovakia (Olsen 1994).

Post-1991 Eastern Europeans were brought up in a political vacuum of communist regimes where governments suppressed freedom of political expression. Thus, the investigation of their political adaptation in the United States may yield some interesting findings. No study empirically examined the likelihood of American citizenship acquisition among new Eastern European immigrants. The preliminary examination of the data from the Department of Homeland Security suggests that the

naturalization pattern varies across countries. Between 2000 and 2009, the number of naturalized persons has been steadily increasing for Albanians, Ukrainians, Czechs, or Estonians. For other groups, including the Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian immigrants, naturalization has been declining. According to Simpson-Bueker (2005), immigrants from the former Soviet Union are more likely to naturalize than, for example, immigrants from Canada, Mexico, or Great Britain. One explanation for this trend is that reverse migration to the countries of former Soviet Union is difficult, and thus, American citizenship becomes more desirable among these immigrants.

Very little is known about specific patterns of political participation of new Eastern Europeans. Huseby-Darvas (2003) found that political activities of recent Hungarian immigrants in Michigan are quite diverse. Some are politically inactive, focusing more on making a living. Others, however, are very active in politics, but their interest is in political and social problems of their home countries. Limited information exists on voter registration and voting. Using a 1991 Jewish population study of New York, Gold (2004) found that 33 percent of Jews born in the former Soviet Union were registered to vote. Using the nationally representative quantitative data, Simpson-Bueker (2005) concluded that immigrants from the former Soviet Union are less likely to vote than are immigrants from Canada, Mexico, or Great Britain. This is most likely because they lack previous democratic experience.

The existing literature on new Eastern Europeans in the United States lacks the systematic analysis of their adaptation. Prior studies also fail to examine experiences of

immigrants from all Eastern European countries. Their focus is mainly on adolescent immigrants. In addition, researchers use primarily qualitative approach, which does not allow for generalizations of results to the entire population of Eastern European immigrants. Existing quantitative studies employ simple statistical techniques and fail to examine determinants of immigrant adaptation. To fill these gaps, this dissertation will offer a first systematic empirical analysis addressing the adaptation experiences of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Several theoretical perspectives are relevant to the understanding of the adaptation process among new Eastern European immigrants. Gordon (1964) proposed the seven stages of assimilation: cultural assimilation (acculturation); structural assimilation (entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society on a primary group level); marital assimilation (intermarriage); identificational assimilation (sense of peoplehood); attitude receptional assimilation (absence of prejudice); behavioral receptional assimilation (absence of discrimination); and civic assimilation (absence of value and power conflict) (Yang 2000). This perspective suggests that all new immigrant groups will eventually assimilate into the mainstream culture in the process of homogenization, and ethnic or cultural differences will disappear (Parillo 2009). In addition, this perspective predicts that adaptation of immigrants is supposedly a one-way process: the immigrant culture changes and eventually disappears, while the host culture remains the same (Yang 2000, 2011). Because of diminished ethnic cultures, all post-

1991 Eastern European immigrants should reach a high level of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation.

According to the cultural pluralism perspective, two distinct cultures are not expected to merge as assimilation theories predict, but rather remain distinct and coexistent (Yancey 2003; Yang 2000). This theory emphasizes the persistence of cultural heritage among different groups and assumes that society benefits from their cultural distinctiveness (Greeley 1974). This framework predicts that new immigrant groups will preserve their own traditions, languages, customs, and lifestyles, while also sharing a number of traits with the dominant group (Herring and Amissah 1997; Patchen 1998; Yang 2000). Cultural pluralism advocates “the preservation and appreciation of ethnic cultures and identities, as well as peaceful existence among groups” (Parillo 2009: 8). According to this perspective, all immigrant groups should be only partially adapted culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically, while also partially maintaining the aspects of their ethnic heritage.

Alba and Nee (2003) argue that the process of assimilation is not uniform. Instead, assimilation occurs at different rates for different ethnic and racial groups. Even within the same ethnic group, great variations exist in the extent of assimilation. This is because no single factor can explain immigrants` adaptation to their host society, but a variety of mechanisms operating at different levels should be taken into consideration. Alba and Nee (2003) offer the following key arguments: 1) Assimilation could be an unintended outcome or consequence of actions undertaken in order to achieve specific

goals; 2) the process of assimilation might be bumpy, but immigrants will likely experience upward social mobility in the second generation; 3) assimilation is a two-way, rather than a one-way process – not only do the natives influence the immigrants, but also vice versa; 4) variations exist in rates of assimilation depending on factors such as family capital. This theory continues to view assimilation as an inevitable characteristic of immigrant adaptation, but proposes diversity in adaptation outcomes. According to this perspective, while all Eastern European immigrants adapt to some extent, some groups may reach a higher degree of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation than other groups.

Portes and Zhou (1993) challenge previously discussed theories by proposing a segmented assimilation theory. This view confronts the myth that immigrant success is inevitable; assimilation is not a straight-line process, and upward mobility is not the only possible outcome. Instead, adaptation outcomes can be diverse, depending upon the sector of American society into which a particular immigrant group assimilates. This theory identifies three possible assimilation outcomes: 1) Upward mobility into white middle class; 2) downward mobility into an underclass; and 3) upward economic mobility, but lack of acculturation and preservation of immigrant cultures and institutions. According to this theory, different immigrant groups can experience different adaptation trajectories. Due to diversity among Eastern European immigrants, their adaptation process could be segmented. Some groups may reach a high level of overall adaptation, while other groups may not assimilate at all. This framework was

originally intended to explain the experiences of the second generation – children of immigrants – and it was limited to only three possible adaptation outcomes. Thus, its applicability to explain adaptation of new Eastern Europeans may be limited.

Researchers argue that descendants of “old” Eastern European immigrants are on the verge of full assimilation into the dominant society (Healey 2003). Different measures of equality indicate that these groups have reached average or above average levels of educational attainment, income, and poverty status. In addition, native Americans of Eastern European descent are likely to have a spouse of a different ethnic background, and their ethnicity is largely symbolic (Schaefer 2010). How do newcomers from Eastern Europe fit in this picture? To what extent have they adapted to their new lives in the United States? This dissertation will examine empirical data to determine which theoretical approach best captures various dimensions of the adaptation process among new Eastern European immigrants. Because of their diverse characteristics and unique challenges, I expect that no single approach can fully explain the adaptation process of these immigrants.

The above review of the limited literature suggests that not all Eastern European immigrant groups easily adapt to their new lives in the United States. Wide cross-group variations make it impossible to present a single uniform theory explaining the experiences of Eastern European immigrants to the United States within the past two decades. It is not plausible to assume that all immigrants will share the same adaptation experience. Instead, I expect that various Eastern European groups tend to go through

different adaptation trajectories, and the process of adaptation may be unique for each group. Because no single theory is broad enough to capture such diversity, I propose that different theoretical frameworks should explain the adaptation experience of various Eastern European groups.

HYPOTHESES

The hypothesis addressing the first research question assumes that, overall, post-1991 Eastern European immigrants adapt well to American life culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically, but with variations existing among groups. There are several reasons to support this expectation. Diversity in adaptation outcomes may result from different socioeconomic and historical backgrounds of immigrants` countries of origin (Robila 2010). Immigrants from economically less developed countries, such as countries where the communist regime was the most oppressive, will likely adapt less well than immigrants from economically stronger countries. In addition, diverse adaptation experiences among immigrants may stem from variations in their length of residence in the United States. While all new Eastern Europeans are recent immigrants, some Eastern European groups are more established than others. For example, immigrants from former Czechoslovakia were most likely to have arrived before 1990, making this origin group more deeply rooted in the United States. On the other hand, Bosnians, Albanians, or Bulgarians, and other more recent immigrants, may experience somewhat different adaptation trajectories (Russell and Batalova 2012). Possible diversity in adaptation outcomes could be attributed to

differences in immigration process – while some Eastern Europeans are skilled workers and professionals on arrival, others arrive as political refugees. The existing literature documents that individual characteristics of new Eastern European immigrants are also quite diverse. This immigrant population is far from homogenous in terms of demographic characteristics and socioeconomic backgrounds, further supporting the prediction about variations in adaptation outcomes (Russell and Batalova 2012).

Scholars suggest that a range of individual and country-level factors determines immigrant adaptation (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). To account for possible differences in individual and country-level characteristics, I will test several hypotheses to answer the second research question:

Hypothesis 1: The length of U.S. residency is positively related to the degree of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation, controlling for other variables in the analysis.

The existing literature suggests that as the length of stay in the U.S. increases, immigrants are more likely to use English, have more American friends, and live in less segregated neighborhoods (Kim and Hurh 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). The length of residency is also positively associated with immigrants` attitudes toward the host country. According to Jasinskaja-Lahti (2008), the longer immigrants reside in a host country, the higher the degree of their sociocultural and socioeconomic adaptation. Immigrants living in the U.S. for longer periods are also more likely to acquire American

education, and are better informed about occupational opportunities in the U.S. job market (Logan and Drew 2011).

Hypothesis 2: Older immigrants tend to adapt less well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than younger immigrants, all else being equal.

The likelihood of successful adaptation is lower for older immigrants, because the portion of life they spent in a different cultural setting is harder to ignore (Berry 1997). Older immigrants are not able to acquire new sociocultural skills as fast as their younger counterparts. This is often attributed to their greater attachment to the culture and language of their home countries (Espenshade and Fu 1997). While older immigrants tend to be better employed, they have more difficulties in developing new language skills than do younger immigrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti 2008).

Hypothesis 3: Males tend to reach a higher degree of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation than females, holding other variables constant.

According to the literature, immigrant adaptation is gender specific, with women generally demonstrating poorer well-being than men (Berry 2006). Female immigrants are perceived as being psychologically more vulnerable to distress, especially those of lower socioeconomic status (Aroian 2001). Women are likely to reach a lower level of psychological and socioeconomic adaptation (Jasinskaja-Lahti 2008). Female immigrants may lack opportunities for networking and economic success available to their male counterparts (Waldorf 1995). Labor force participation of female immigrants may be constrained by caretaking responsibilities. Number of children, as well as

husbands` earnings, tends to negatively affect economic integration among female immigrants (Logan and Drew 2011).

Hypothesis 4: Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. adapt better culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than married immigrants whose spouse is not present in the U.S., or immigrants who are not married, controlling for other variables.

Marriage is generally perceived as rewarding and having a positive effect on individuals` well-being (Lucas et al. 2003). Among immigrants, marital status may not have a direct effect on the level of their adaptation, but it may depend on whether or not a spouse is present in a host country. Presence of spouse represents an important attachment to a host country, and may serve as an important source of social support for married immigrants (Constant and Massey 2002). According to the literature, social support has moderating effects on stressful life events, promotes acculturation, and reduces depression. Social support provided by close relatives is perceived as being the most effective (Renner et al. 2012).

Hypothesis 5: Immigrants who settle in the Northeast adapt better culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants living in other parts of the country, holding other variables constant.

Immigrants tend to settle close to others from the same area of origin (Chiswick and Miller 2004). Historically, Eastern European immigrants settled in the states of the Northeast. According to the U.S. Population Census, this region remains preferred by

new immigrants from Eastern Europe (U.S. Population Census 2009). Immigrant concentrations may positively affect the level of adaptation among newcomers by facilitating their entrepreneurship or gaining political influence (Chiswick and Miller 2004).

Hypothesis 6: Immigrants surveyed in later years tend to adapt better culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants who were surveyed earlier.

Combining several subsequent years of data creates a possibility to examine changes in adaptation across different immigrant cohorts. This examination will reveal variations in adaptation processes over time, resulting from possible differences in characteristics of subsequent cohorts. Economic or political events in the United States may affect adaptation processes. Developments in countries of origin may also play a role. With time, post-communist countries gradually develop into more stable democracies, and these positive changes may affect the characteristics of later immigrants. Overall, it is expected that immigrants interviewed in later years adapt better, as later cohorts are more likely to include immigrants who are more likely to be adjusted, and are positively selected for immigration.

Hypothesis 7: English proficiency is positively related to the degree of socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation, controlling for other variables.

Language adaptation is the first step towards acculturation, and affects all subsequent stages of the adaptation process. Low English proficiency may decrease

chances to secure employment (Jackman 1995), and block access to education, social services, and other institutions (Thomas 1995). Poor English language skills may create stressful situations within immigrant families; complicate communication between parents and their U.S. born children, and cause tensions between spouses who reached different levels of English proficiency (Kisselev et. al 2010; Remennick 2005). English proficiency is associated with many positive outcomes, such as higher self-esteem, better academic performance, and lower stress (Kang 2006).

Hypothesis 8: Immigrants with a higher socio-economic status (measured by education, occupational background, and self-employment) tend to experience a higher degree of structural and political adaptation to the U.S. society than immigrants with a lower socioeconomic status, controlling for other variables.

Education is consistently associated with better immigrant adaptation. It is perceived as a resource that facilitates problem solving and predicts lower stress. Education is also an important correlate of other socioeconomic indicators, such as income, occupation, and overall position in society (Berry 1997). Immigrant professionals report higher levels of well-being and satisfaction than do their non-professional counterparts. They are also less likely to live in ethnic communities, increasing the likelihood of their interaction with the U.S. born population, thus facilitating the adaptation process (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

Hypothesis 9: Immigrants from Ukraine adapt less well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants from other Eastern European countries.

Researchers recognized the importance of country of origin in explaining immigrants` adaptation (Simpson-Bueker 2005). Ukraine was selected as a reference category for several reasons. Based on the 2005 data from the World Bank, Ukraine`s gross national income of \$1,520 was the lowest in the analysis (World Bank 2005). Moldova had even lower GNI (\$930), however, the small sample size did not allow for using this country as a reference category. Ukraine was a part of the former Soviet Union, another reason for its selection as a reference category. Researchers recognized that immigrants from the former Soviet Union are disadvantaged, compared to other non-Hispanic white immigrants (Logan and Drew 2010). They tend to be less proficient in English, and have lower earnings than other immigrants from Europe (Chiswick 1993). The share of refugees among immigrants from the former Soviet Union is higher than among other Eastern European groups, which could be another disadvantage and barrier to successful adaptation (Logan and Drew 2010).

Hypothesis 10: Immigrants who originate in countries with lower gross national income tend to adapt less well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants from countries with higher gross national income.

The GNI is an important indicator of the level of countries` economic development. In economically less developed countries, the opportunities for schooling and learning a foreign language might be limited, and immigrants originating in

economically weaker countries could possibly possess fewer resources. Immigrants with low human capital, such as low level of education and limited skills, experience negative reception in a host country by the authorities, and by the native population (Haller, Portes and Lynch 2011; Rumbaut 2005). Disparities in human capital and contexts of reception result in different adaptation patterns among immigrants and their children. Immigrants who are negatively received adapt less well across all adaptation dimensions. However, because it is more difficult, costly, and less desirable to return to economically less developed countries, immigrants from these countries may be more intent upon staying in the United States permanently. Consequently, they may be more likely to acquire citizenship, and adapt better politically in that respect.

Hypothesis 11: Immigrants who originate in more ethnically diverse countries tend to adapt less well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants from ethnically more homogeneous countries.

Ethnic diversity has often been linked with negative effects on economic development. Easterly and Levine (1997) argued “...interest group polarization leads to rent-seeking behavior and reduces the consensus for public goods...” (1997: 1241). According to these authors, ethnic diversity often results in low schooling, underdeveloped financial markets, high government deficits, and insufficient infrastructure. Four out of six countries in the analysis were classified as “most diverse,” where ethnic minorities accounted for 20 percent or more of the population. These were also among the least economically stable countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia,

Moldova, and Ukraine). Similarly, consistent with the arguments of Easterly and Levine (1997), three out of four countries in this dissertation classified as “least diverse” were also economically strongest (Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland). Therefore, a lower degree of economic development in the countries of origins, resulting from ethnic heterogeneity, may negatively affect the process of immigrant adaptation in the United States.

Hypothesis 12: Immigrants who originate in countries classified as partly free or not free tend to adapt less well culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically than immigrants from countries classified as free.

Immigrants who originate in countries where political and personal freedoms are limited may be more likely to immigrate as refugees, rather than economic immigrants. If immigrants leave their countries to escape political or religious tensions, they are less likely to be selected based on class (Ryan 2009). According to the literature, immigrants fleeing tensions in their home countries tend to arrive with limited resources and lack access to social capital. Therefore, they are less likely to adapt well in a host country than other immigrants. On average, they have limited English language skills, lower education, poorer health, and tend to be concentrated in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Connor 2010; Ryan 2009). In addition, refugees are offered minimal support by the U.S. public and voluntary organizations to facilitate their integration process (Chiswick 1993).

Researchers found that the effect of limited political and personal freedom on the degree of political adaptation varies, depending on how this adaptation dimension is

measured (Simpson-Bueker 2005). If measured by citizenship acquisition, immigrants from unfree countries may adapt better politically, as it is more desirable for these immigrants to secure permanent residence in the U.S. and acquire citizenship (Yang 1994). On the other hand, political adaptation measured by voter registration and voting may reveal that, due to lack of democratic experience, immigrants whose freedoms were oppressed in their home countries may be less likely to participate in political life in the U.S., and adapt less well politically.

SUMMARY

The limited literature suggests that post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States are very diverse in terms of their individual characteristics, historical, and socio-economic backgrounds of their home countries. I expect to find disparities in their level of adaptation, resulting from these wide cross-group variations. Because no single existing theory of immigrant adaptation can account for such diversity, it is assumed that the adaptation process may be unique for each Eastern European group, and consequently, different theoretical frameworks should explain adaptation experiences of new Eastern European immigrants. The effect of various individual and country-level predictors of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation was proposed for testing.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND METHODS

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the sources of data, and describe the samples and the variables used in the analysis. Statistical methods, analytical strategies, and limitations of the study are also introduced.

DATA

Data Sources

Due to the scarcity of data, this study combined several data sources to answer the research questions. Data from the Department of Homeland Security were used to describe the recent trends and patterns of immigration from Eastern Europe to the United States. In addition, these data included profiles of immigrants, providing various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, settlement patterns, and class of admission. The 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS), the 2008-2010 Civic Engagement Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CES-CPS), and the 2002-2010 Voting and Registration Supplement of the Current Population Survey (VRS-CPS) collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used to address aspects of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. In addition to providing the most recent picture, these datasets contained a large representative sample of immigrants from most Eastern European countries, and allowed for generalization of results to all Eastern European immigrants in the United States. The

disadvantage of these datasets is that they did not adequately address all dimensions of the adaptation process.

Samples

The data were restricted to respondents who are legal immigrants in the United States and were born in one of the following Eastern European countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Russia, Moldova, and Ukraine. The data on Estonia were only available in the American Community Survey, and the data on Slovenia, Serbia, and Montenegro were included only in the Current Population Survey. Therefore, these three countries were not included in the analysis. This dissertation focused on the adaptation experience of immigrants (first generation); second generation, or individuals who trace their origins to Eastern Europe but were born in the United States were not included in the analysis. Additionally, only immigrants who immigrated to the United States since 1991 were analyzed. This particular year is significant because it marks the collapse of the Soviet Union and communist regimes in all of Eastern Europe. Even though small numbers of Eastern Europeans immigrated to the U.S. prior to 1991, numbers of immigrants have increased significantly in the post-communist period when governments of Eastern European countries removed the legal barriers that previously blocked emigration to the West. The data were weighted to allow for generalizations from the sample to the population of all Eastern European immigrants. The restrictions of age varied, depending on the dependent variable. Measures of

cultural, structural, and political adaptation were restricted to respondents who were 18 years old or older. Among the indicators of socioeconomic attainment, the sample was restricted to respondents who were 25 to 64 years old for the dependent variable education, and respondents aged 16 to 64 were selected when examining self-employment and occupational background. Lastly, the sample was restricted to householders when testing the poverty status.

VARIABLES AND MEASURES

Table 7 summarizes the dependent and independent variables used in the analysis, including the variable names and their measurements.

Dependent Variables

Several measures were used to ascertain the level of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation. They are summarized in the following sections.

Cultural adaptation. Cultural adaptation was measured by two indicators: English proficiency and native language retention. English proficiency was an ordinal variable, and had the following categories: 1. Do not speak English; 2. Speak English, but not well; 3. Speak English well; 4. Speak English very well; 5. Speak only English. The variable was coded so that a higher value indicates a higher level of English proficiency. The second dependent variable, native language retention, was a dichotomous measure. The original variable was dummy coded 1 for “speaking language other than English at home,” and 0 for “speaking only English.”

Socioeconomic adaptation. Measures of socioeconomic adaptation included educational attainment, occupation, self-employment, income, and poverty status. The variable education was an ordinal variable with the following categories: 1. No schooling completed; 2. Nursery school to grade 4; 3. Grade 5 or grade 6; 4. Grade 7 or grade 8; 5. Grade 9; 6. Grade 10; 7. Grade 11; 8. 12th grade, no diploma; 9. High school graduate; 10. Some college, but less than 1 year; 11. One or more years of college, no degree; 12. Associate`s degree; 13. Bachelor`s degree; 14. Master`s degree; 15. Professional school degree; 16. Doctorate degree.

The original variable measuring occupational background had a broad range of categories and was recoded into the following categories according to the 2010 Occupational Code List of the U.S. Census Bureau: 1. Managerial occupations; 2. Professional occupations; 3. Sales and office occupations; 4. Service occupations; 5. Farming, fishing and forestry occupations; 6. Construction and extraction occupations; 7. Installation, maintenance and repair occupations; 8. Production occupations; 9. Transportation and material moving occupations; and 10. Military specific occupations. This variable was further recoded into two separate dummies. The dummy variable managerial and professional occupations was created by combining categories “Managerial occupations” and “Professional occupations” into a category coded 1; all other categories were coded 0. The alternative measure of occupational background was the dummy variable white-collar occupations, combining categories “Managerial

occupations,” “Professional occupations,” and “Sales and office occupations” into a category coded 1; all other categories were coded 0.

The measure of income was an interval/ratio variable measured in dollars, based on total person`s income. The categories of original variable ranged from -\$19,998 to \$999,000 (after restrictions, categories ranged from \$16,499 thru \$943,000). Income was used as an interval ratio variable, and it was also recoded into an ordinal variable. The ordinal level income had 22 categories coded as follows: 1. -\$16,499 thru \$0; 2. \$1 thru \$4,999; 3. \$5,000 thru \$9,999; 4. \$10,000 thru \$14,999; 5. \$15,000 thru \$19,999; 6. \$20,000 thru \$24,999; 7. \$25,000 thru \$29,999; 8. \$30,000 thru \$34,999; 9. \$35,000 thru \$39,999; 10. \$40,000 thru \$44,999; 11. \$45,000 thru \$49,999; 12. \$50,000 thru \$54,999; 13. \$55,000 thru \$59,999; 14. \$60,000 thru \$64,999; 15. \$65000 thru \$69,999; 16. \$70,000 thru \$74,999; 17. \$75,000 thru \$79,999; 18. \$80,000 thru \$89,999; 19. \$90,000 thru \$99,999; 20. \$100,000 thru \$149,999; 21. \$150,000 thru \$199,999; 22. \$200,000 thru \$943,000.

Poverty was measured by income-to-poverty ratio, which represents the ratio of family or unrelated individual income to their appropriate poverty threshold. “People and families are classified as being in poverty if their income is less than their poverty threshold. If their income is less than half their poverty threshold, they are below 50% of poverty; less than the threshold itself, they are in poverty (below 100% of poverty); less than 1.25 times the threshold, below 125% of poverty, and so on. The greater the ratio of income to poverty, the more people fell under the category, because higher ratios include

more people with higher incomes” (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). The original variable was coded so that a higher category indicated a lower poverty level, with categories ranging from 0 percent of poverty to 500 percent of poverty. The last category, 501 percent, indicated 501 percent of poverty or more. The variable was reverse coded, so that a higher category indicated a higher poverty level. In addition, I recoded the income-to-poverty ratio according to the U.S. Census Bureau categories to determine the percentage of respondents classified as severely poor (49 percent of the federal poverty level or less); poor (50 to 99 percent of the federal poverty level); near poor (100 to 124 percent of the federal poverty level); low income (125 to 199 percent of the federal poverty level); middle income (200 to 399 of the federal poverty level); and high income (400 percent of above of the federal poverty level).

Variable class of worker was dummy coded to measure respondents` self-employment: categories “Self-employed in own not incorporated business, professional practice, or farm” and “Self-employed in own incorporated business, professional practice, or farm” were combined in a category designating self-employment coded 1; all other categories of employment status were coded 0. The category “Unemployed and last worked 5 years ago or earlier or never worked” was not included in the analysis.

Structural adaptation. The level of structural adaptation was measured by immigrants` involvement in groups and organizations in the United States. Four dichotomous variables were combined to create a composite measure or scale that gauged the degree of immigrants` participation in various organizations: participation in a school

group, neighborhood, or community association; participation in a service or civic organization; participation in a sports or recreation organization; and participation in a church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious institution. After being summed, the scale was dummy coded 1 for participating in an organization, and 0 for otherwise.

An additional indicator of structural adaptation measured the frequency of interaction with one's neighbors. It was created by combining two ordinal variables with five categories: frequency of communication with one's neighbors (original categories ranged from "basically every day" to "not at all"); and frequency of doing favors for one's neighbors, such as helping with shopping, housesitting or lending garden and house tools (original categories ranged from "basically every day" to "not at all"). Before combination, variables were coded in the same direction so that a higher score indicated more interaction with one's neighbors.

Political adaptation. Several indicators were used to measure political adaptation. The variable citizenship status was used to create a dummy variable citizenship acquisition; category "foreign born, U.S. citizen by naturalization" was coded 1, and category "foreign born, not a citizen of the United States" was coded 0. Voting was a dummy variable, coded 1 for voting in the election, and 0 for otherwise. Voter registration was dummy coded 1 for being registered to vote, and 0 for otherwise.

Independent Variables

The following independent variables were used in the analysis:

Length of residence. Is a continuous variable that measures the number of years a respondent has lived in the United States. It was used as a predictor of all dimensions of adaptation examined in this dissertation.

Age. Is also a continuous variable measured by years. It was used as a predictor of all adaptation dimensions.

Sex. Is a dummy variable with 1 indicating male and 0 female. It was used to predict all adaptation dimensions.

Marital status. Is a dummy variable with 1 for married respondents whose spouse is present in the U.S. and 0 for married respondents whose spouse is absent or those who are widowed, divorced, separated, or never married. It is a predictor of all four adaptation dimensions.

Region of residence. Was created using the variable state of residence. Regions were created according to the coding scheme used in the *ipums.USA*, a project dedicated to collecting and distributing United States census data by the Minnesota Population Center at the University of Minnesota (<http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>). The following four regions were created: Northeast, used as a reference category (coded 1 for Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania , and 0 for other states); Midwest (coded 1 for Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North

Dakota, and South Dakota , and 0 for other states); West (coded 1 for Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington, and 0 for other states); and South (coded 1 for Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and 0 for other states). Region is a predictor of all adaptation dimensions.

Survey year. Was used to create a series of dummy variables indicating when respondents were interviewed. These variables were created based on the availability of particular years in the datasets. The variable survey year was not available in the 2006-2010 American Community survey, but I was able to create it, since the first four digits of the respondents` serial number indicated the year of interview. Then, I dummy coded this new variable, which was used in the examination of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation, as follows: survey year 2006, which served as a reference category (coded 1 for respondents interviewed in 2006, and 0 for respondents interviewed in 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010); survey year 2007 (coded 1 for respondents interviewed in 2007, and 0 for respondents interviewed in other years); survey year 2008 (coded 1 for respondents interviewed in 2008, and 0 for respondents interviewed in other years); survey year 2009 (coded 1 for respondents interviewed in 2009, and 0 for respondents interviewed in other years), and survey year 2010 (coded 1 for respondents who were interviewed in 2010, and 0 for respondents interviewed in other years). The original variable survey year was

available in the 2008-2010 Civic Engagement Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CES-CPS), and it was recoded into 3 dummy variables for respondents interviewed in 2008 (used as a reference category), 2009, and 2010. Similarly, the variable survey year from the 2002-2010 Voting and Registration Supplement (VRS-CPS) was used to create the following dummy variables: survey year 2002 (used as a reference category), 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010.

English proficiency. Was used to predict the degree of socioeconomic adaptation. It could not be used as a predictor of structural and political adaptation because the measure of English proficiency was not included in the Current Population Survey.

Education. Is used as a predictor of occupational background, self-employment, income, and poverty within the socioeconomic dimension. It is also used as a predictor of structural and political adaptation.

Occupation. Is an appropriate predictor of income, poverty status, and all measures of structural and political adaptation.

Income. Is potentially an appropriate predictor of structural and political adaptation. However, because the income variable included in the Current Population Survey was not coded consistently across years, its inclusion would result in a significant loss of cases. Additionally, income is not used as a predictor of poverty status due to a high degree of correlation between these two variables.

Poverty. Is a potential predictor of structural and political adaptation. However, because the measure of poverty was not included in the supplements of the Current Population Survey, its effect could not be tested.

Self-employment. Is used as a predictor of income, poverty, and all indicators of structural and political adaptation.

Country of birth. Was used to create a set of dummy variables for respondents' countries of origin. The analysis of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation included the following dummy variables: Ukraine, used as a reference category (coded 1 if respondents were born in Ukraine, and 0 for otherwise); Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Russia, and other countries with small sample sizes combined (including Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Croatia, Macedonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, and Moldova). The country of origin was coded the same way in the analysis of structural adaptation. However, in the analysis of political adaptation, I was not able to examine all previously used countries due to inconsistencies in coding of the variable country of origin in the 2002-2010 Voting and Registration Supplement of the Current Population survey (VRS-CPS). The following countries were included in the analysis of political adaptation: Ukraine, used as a reference category (coded 1 if respondents were born in Ukraine and 0 for otherwise); Poland, Romania, Russia, and other countries combined (including Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, and Slovakia).

Gross national income. Is a country-level variable created by recoding the variable country of birth to indicate the level of economic development in countries of origin. The 2005 estimates of gross national income per capita by the World Bank were used to create the variable measuring gross national income and it was coded as follows: category 1 included countries with GNI per capita lower than \$4,000 (Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Ukraine, and Moldova); category 0 included countries with GNI per capita of \$4,000 or higher (Czech Republic, Hungary, Croatia, Slovakia, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Russia). The value \$4,000 is a median GNI per capita for all countries in the analysis; thus, it is a meaningful cutting point.

Ethnic diversity. Is another country-level variable, also created by recoding the country of birth. It was created using the data from the 2005 CIA World Factbook, indicating the population share of the largest group in each Eastern European country. The year 2005 was used because the majority of respondents in the analysis were surveyed in 2006 or later. The population share ranged from 48 percent for Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was the most heterogeneous country in the analysis, to 96.7 percent for Poland, making it the most ethnically homogeneous country in the analysis. The examination of all percentages indicated that Bosnia, Latvia, Macedonia, Ukraine, Moldova, and Russia had the population share of the largest group of 80 percent or lower, being the most diverse. The share of the largest group between 80 and 90 percent was reported for Belarus, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Slovakia, Romania, and Croatia. The least ethnically diverse countries, with the population share of the largest group of less than 90

percent, were Czech Republic, Hungary, Albania, and Poland. The dummy variable designating the level of ethnic diversity was coded 1 for most ethnically diverse countries with population share of the largest group of 80 percent or less and 0 for other countries.

Political and personal freedom. In respondents` countries of origin was determined based on country rankings from the Freedom in the World, a survey created by Gastil (1980) and published by Freedom House. The countries were ranked by political rights and civil liberties as free, partly free, or unfree. According to the 2005 rankings, Eastern European countries in the analysis were classified as follows - free countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia; partly free countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Moldova, and Ukraine; and unfree countries: Belarus and Russia. These rankings were used to create the following two dummy variables: partly free countries (coded one for countries classified as partly free, and 0 for otherwise), and unfree countries (coded 1 for countries classified as unfree and 0 for otherwise).

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

One limitation is that the data did not include the measures of all adaptation dimensions. Thus, I was not able to examine the level of marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation among immigrants. If data are available, these dimensions of adaptation should be addressed. Cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation could be measured by different indicators rather than by those contained in the datasets used in this dissertation. Furthermore, when examining structural and political

adaptation, sample sizes were relatively small. Consequently, I was not able to determine cross-country differences in predictors of these two adaptation dimensions. Another limitation is the unavailability of some variables in the datasets, which could be used as predictors of immigrants` adaptation, such as variables measuring immigrants` transnationalism. Restrictions of the samples to post-1991 immigrants preclude an inclusion of those who arrived earlier. Additionally, inconsistency of coding across years did not allow for the analysis of all Eastern European countries.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used in data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to assess the extent of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation among new Eastern European immigrants, as well as their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. In order to obtain descriptive statistics, frequency distribution reports were employed to provide descriptive information about all variables in the analysis, such as measures of central tendency (mean and median) and measures of variation and dispersion (standard deviation). To determine the differences in the level of adaptation, descriptive analyses were conducted for the pooled sample of all Eastern European immigrants, as well as separately for selected Eastern European groups.

Regression analyses were conducted to test the effects of independent variables on the dependent variables for each dimension of adaptation. The purpose was to

ascertain which factors predict the level of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation and which factors are more important.

Cultural Adaptation

For cultural adaptation, I used ordinary least square regression (OLS) to test the effects of all independent variables on the dependent variable English proficiency, as this variable is ordinal with five categories. I tested five regression models. The first model included individual-level variables length of stay, age, gender, marital status, region of residence, and survey year. The second model added dummy variables for countries of origin to allow for cross-country comparisons. Remaining models included all variables from the first model in addition to country-level characteristics gross national income (Model 3), ethnic diversity (Model 4), and personal/political freedom (Model 5).

I examined the direction and the significance of unstandardized regression coefficients to ascertain the relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable in addition to the values of pseudo R², which indicated how much variation in the dependent variable was explained by all independent variables. Using the predicted values of the dependent variable, I calculated the squared structure coefficients (r_s^2), indicating a proportion of the variation in the dependent variable explained by each predictor. The values of standardized regression coefficients (β) were also examined.

Since the dependent variable native language retention was dichotomous, I used logistic regression. The values of χ^2 statistics and -2 log likelihood were examined to determine the model fit. Pseudo R² indicated how much variation in the dependent

variable is explained by all independent variables. The values of odds ratios were interpreted as percentages to determine the likelihood that a predictor will affect the dependent variable. The values of eta's squared were calculated using the values of odds ratios, to determine the importance of individual predictors in explaining the dependent variable. I tested the five regression models described in the previous section.

I ran regression analyses for the pooled sample of all Eastern European immigrants. Then, I tested both dependent variables separately for selected groups with sufficient sample sizes.

Socioeconomic Adaptation

When examining socioeconomic adaptation, I conducted regression analysis for each of the following dependent variables: educational attainment, personal income, occupational status, self-employment, and poverty level. Variables personal income and poverty level were interval/ratio with more than five categories, so the most appropriate regression technique was ordinary least squares regression (OLS).

Education was an ordinal variable with more than five categories; hence, OLS was the most appropriate technique to use. Since the variable self-employment was dichotomous, I performed logistic regression. Similarly, I employed logistic regression to test the dependent variable occupational status.

Five regression models described in the previous section were tested. In addition to previously tested independent variables, I included predictor English proficiency,

education, occupation, and self-employment, when appropriate. The models were tested for the pooled sample and separately for the groups with sufficient sample sizes.

Structural Adaptation

The scale measuring respondents` participation in various organizations was dummy coded; therefore, logistic regression was appropriate when testing this dependent variable. I selected OLS regression as a statistical strategy when testing the interaction with one`s neighbors, as this indicator was a scale with more than five categories.

Five regression models were tested; the models were composed of variables discussed above, including predictor education, occupation, and self-employment. Due to small sample sizes for individual countries, cross-country differences in structural adaptation could not be determined.

Political Adaptation

Logistic regression was used to test the effects of predictors on the dichotomous dependent variable citizenship status, voter registration, and voting. The five regression models were tested, and the predictors of political adaptation were the same as predictors of structural adaptation. Cross-country differences in political adaptation could not be determined.

SOFTWARE

The datasets used in this dissertation are large complex samples collected by a stratified random sampling technique. While this sampling design is the most feasible, researchers have recognized it poses challenges to statistical analyses. Using appropriate

strategies to handle these complex sample designs is recommended in order to ensure that the results are representative of the population and the variance estimates are accurate (Hahs-Vaughn 2005; Hahs-Vaughn et al. 2011). The SAS software is designed to handle complex samples; therefore, I used it to conduct multivariate analyses. It allows to conduct a weighted analysis, and to compute correct estimates and standard errors. As discussed in the previous sections, the level of measurement of dependent variables in the analyses requires OLS and logistic regression. Therefore, the following “SURVEY” procedures available in the SAS software were used to conduct multivariate analyses: “SURVEYREG” appropriate for OLS regression and “SURVEYLOGISTIC” appropriate for logistic regression. These specialized procedures ensure that standard errors are not underestimated and decrease the probability of Type I error. Because complex sample designs do not affect the accuracy of descriptive statistics, these were conducted using the SPSS software.

CHAPTER V

CULTURAL ADAPTATION

Gordon (1964) identified cultural adaptation as the first stage in the “seven stages of assimilation” model. According to this author, an important sign of successful cultural adjustment was immigrants` ability to communicate in English. Scholars today still consider learning a new language as one of the central elements in the cultural adaptation of immigrants. Researchers argue that inadequate English ability correlates with lower earnings, lower educational achievement, or inaccessibility to health care (Espenshade and Fu 1997). Thus, English proficiency opens the door to other stages of immigrant adaptation by increasing chances for finding a job, securing an income, and achieving overall upward mobility.

In addition to English proficiency, another important dimension of cultural adaptation examined in this dissertation is native language retention. Views regarding the effect of maintaining one`s native language on the likelihood of successful adaptation are polarized. In the past, total acculturation has often been perceived as beneficial for immigrants` economic progress and psychological well-being (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Some researchers still believe that to become well adapted, immigrants must shed their native language and speak “English only” (Huntington 2004). Empirical evidence, however, is not consistent with English monolingualism as the only route to successful adaptation. The knowledge of more than one language has been perceived as an

important intellectual achievement and resource, rather than a disadvantage (Portes and Hao 2002). A majority of immigrants who hold professional positions are fluent bilinguals who speak their native language at home (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

Therefore, rather than abandoning one's native language, fluent bilingualism has been a preferred way of adaptation for immigrants and their children (Robila 2007).

Eastern European immigrants at the turn of the century tended to lack English proficiency, had high likelihood of native language retention, and did not adapt well culturally (Blumenthal 1981; Jaret 1999; Perlmann and Waldinger 1997). Are new Eastern European immigrants different? This chapter examines the cultural adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants measured by their English proficiency and native language retention. The central research questions of this chapter are: First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt culturally to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of cultural adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States?

To answer these questions, I will first present the descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analysis and describe the characteristics of the sample. The discussion of correlation analysis will follow. The results of regression analyses will elucidate what factors influence the extent to which new immigrants from Eastern Europe adapt culturally to their new lives in the United States.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Means, medians, and standard deviations of the variables used in the analyses are presented in Table 8. Two dependent variables were used to measure cultural adaptation: English proficiency and native language retention. Respondents` overall English proficiency was 3.2 (median = 3.0), measured on a 5-point scale ranging from “not speaking English at all” to “speaking only English.” This suggests that, on average, new Eastern European immigrants tended to speak English well. The percentages in each category of the dependent variable show that about 66 percent of respondents reported speaking English well or very well, and 19 percent did not speak English well. About 7 percent of respondents spoke only English, or did not speak English at all. Results further indicate that about 93 percent of respondents spoke a language other than English at home. I tested the effect of the following independent variables: length of stay in the United States, age, gender, marital status, region of residence in the United States, survey year, respondents` country of origin, gross national income in the country of origin, ethnic diversity in the country of origin, and personal freedom in the country of origin. It appears that respondents resided in the United States on average for 12.6 years (median = 13). An average age was 40.9 (median = 38), with a standard deviation of 15.9 years. Less than half of all respondents in the sample were males (about 44 percent). The majority of respondents – 60 percent - were married, and their spouses accompanied them in the United States. About a quarter of all new Eastern European immigrants in the sample resided in the Midwest (26 percent), followed by the West (22 percent), and the

South (17 percent). Several countries were represented by a sufficient sample size to allow for cross-country comparisons in cultural adaptation: Albania (5 percent), Bulgaria (4 percent), Poland (20 percent), Romania (8 percent), Bosnia and Herzegovina (9 percent), and Russia (22 percent). Respondents from other Eastern European countries in the analysis comprised 14 percent of the sample. Half of the respondents were born in countries with a gross national income per capita (GNI) below \$4,000. Similarly, half of the respondents came from countries where ethnic minority groups accounted for at least 20 percent of the total population, contributing to a greater ethnic diversity. About 35 percent of all Eastern European immigrants in the sample were born in countries classified as partly free, and 25 percent were born in countries considered not free.

I ran separate analyses for Poland, Russia, and Ukraine. The descriptive statistics for these three countries are presented in Table 9. English proficiency for all three groups indicates that, on average, respondents from each of these countries tended to speak English well. More specifically, immigrants from Russia were the most likely to speak English well or very well (67 percent), followed by immigrants from Poland (65 percent) and Ukraine (60 percent). Ukrainian immigrants were the most likely to speak a language other than English at home (96 percent), and Russian immigrants were the least likely to do so (92 percent), suggesting small differences in native language retention across the three groups. The average length of stay in the United States for all three groups was about 13 years, consistent with the results for the pooled sample. Results further indicate that immigrants from the three separately examined countries tended to

be in their late thirties or early forties, with Polish immigrants being the youngest (38 years), and Ukrainian immigrants the oldest (45 years). Less than half of respondents from all three countries were males. Consistent with the results for the pooled sample, a majority of respondents from each country were married (between 57 and 62 percent). Polish immigrants tended to concentrate in the Midwest, while Russian and Ukrainian immigrants were the most likely to reside in the Northeast.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

I tested the strength of the relationships between both dependent variables and the predictors described in the previous section. The examination of the bivariate correlation coefficients indicated moderate to high correlations between several pairs of variables: partly free countries and GNI (.734); not free countries and Russia (.911); Russia and GNI (-.536); Poland and ethnic diversity (-.524); and Poland and GNI (-.500). These results were worrisome because high correlations could result in unstable magnitudes and signs of regression model estimates of the coefficients, and influence the validity of results. An examination of bivariate correlations is only one way to assess the strength of relationships between variables. To further test the assumption of multicollinearity, I requested the values of tolerance and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The tolerance values indicate the percent of variance in the predictor that cannot be accounted for by the other predictors in the analysis. Values should be as close to 1 as possible, with the tolerance of less than .10 suggesting a potential problem with multicollinearity. The VIF is 1 / tolerance. Generally, a variable whose VIF value is greater than 10 should be

investigated further (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). To determine if tolerance and VIF values were within an expected range, I ran an ordinary least squares regression (OLS) with English proficiency as the dependent variable and all independent variables from Table 8. The results confirmed the multicollinearity problem. Tolerance values of several variables were extremely low (Russia = 0.009; GNI = 0.026; ethnic diversity = 0.030; countries classified as not free = 0.027; countries classified as partly free = 0.000). This signaled that very little variance in these predictors was unexplained by other predictors in the model. Similarly, VIF values of these variables were unusually high (Russia = 113.290; GNI = 38.248; ethnic diversity = 33.164; countries classified as not free = 37.058).

Due to high multicollinearity among some predictors, I could not create nested models to simultaneously test the effects of all independent variables on each dependent variable. According to the literature, however, all independent variables selected for analysis potentially affect the degree of cultural adaptation. To eliminate negative effects of multicollinearity without omitting important independent variables, I created several – albeit not nested – models for each dependent variable. The first model (Model 1) tested the effects of variables length of stay in the U.S., age, male, marital status and presence of spouse, region of residence in the U.S., and survey year on the dependent variables English proficiency and native language retention. The second model (Model 2) included variables from the first model, in addition to dummies for countries represented by a sufficient sample size (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania,

Russia and “Other” countries). The third model (Model 3) tested variables from the first model and gross national income per capita (GNI). The remaining two models tested the effects of predictors from the first model, in addition to a dummy variable for ethnic diversity (Model 4) and two dummy variables for the level of personal and political freedom in a country of respondents` origin (Model 5).

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Cultural adaptation was measured by two indicators, and their level of measurement determined the appropriate regression technique. To examine English proficiency of new Eastern European immigrants, I used the ordinary least squares regression (OLS). Although the dependent variable is not continuous – a basic prerequisite for OLS to yield valid results - this technique was chosen because an ordinal variable with five categories is also an acceptable dependent variable (1 = Do not speak English; 2 = Speak English, but not well; 3 = Speak English well; 4 = Speak English very well; 5 = Speak only English). This technique enables testing how much variance in the dependent variable is explained by its linear relationship with the predictors. Logistic regression was used to examine the likelihood of native language retention because this dependent variable was dichotomous and nominal (1 = Speak language other than English at home; 0 = Speak only English).

The data used in the analysis are complex surveys that were collected through stratified sampling. To ensure that the analyzed samples are representative of the entire population and in order to make statistically valid inferences about the population of new

Eastern European immigrants, I applied a personal sampling weight available in the dataset. While it is necessary to weight the data, weighting procedures are known to be associated with difficulties (Hahs-Vaughn 2005). More specifically, traditional regression procedures tend to yield statistics with incorrectly estimated variances of an estimator. To account for this problem, I have used procedures “SURVEYREG” and “SURVEYLOGISTIC” available in the statistical software SAS. These are designed for the analysis of complex sample designs, such as those used in this study. These procedures were also used when examining other adaptation dimensions.

The direction and significance of unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression was examined to assess the relationship between predictors and the dependent variable English proficiency. In logistic regression, the values of χ^2 statistics and -2 log likelihood were used to determine the model fit. The values of odds ratios indicated the likelihood that a predictor will affect respondents` native language retention. Pseudo R² indicated how much variation in the dependent variable was explained by all independent variables in both logistic and OLS regression.

When using OLS regression, several assumptions must be met to ensure the reliability of the results. Normality is one important assumption; it means that residuals of the dependent variable should be normally distributed. If this assumption is violated, residuals of the dependent variable are not normally distributed and the distribution is skewed. To detect this abnormality, I examined the normal p-p plot and values of skewness and kurtosis for all variables in the analysis. The normal p-p plot of regression-

standardized residuals was diagonal and indicated minimal deviations from normality. The values for the dependent variable English proficiency were within an acceptable range (+/- 3). The kurtosis value for native language retention was high (8.84), which can be attributed to an uneven split between the two categories (a 93-7 split). In case of categorical variables, however, the skewness/kurtosis does not violate model assumptions. In addition, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the impact of kurtosis values higher than 0 is diminished in a large sample size. I also examined the values of skewness and kurtosis for all predictors. All continuous independent variables were normally distributed. However, dummy variables for most countries of birth – especially those with a very small sample size - were associated with extreme values of skewness and kurtosis (e.g. Croatia: 8.031/62.459; Slovakia: 9.783/93.714; Czech Republic: 8.850/76.330; Moldova: 6.665/42.419; Latvia: 10.740/113.347; Lithuania: 7.267/50.810; Hungary: 7.510/54.400, Macedonia: 10.47/107.70; Belarus: 5.20/25.03). To account for high values of skewness and kurtosis, I combined these countries into one dummy variable, which resulted in a skewness value of 2.03, and decreased the value of kurtosis to 2.12. This approach also helped to decrease the number of outliers (discussed below). The dummies for Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Bosnia and Herzegovina were also associated with higher kurtosis values. However, considering the categorical nature of these variables and a large sample size, the negative impact on the validity of results is unlikely.

Homoscedasticity occurs when residuals are not approximately equal for all predicted scores of the dependent variable (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). This assumption was tested by constructing a scatterplot. The data appeared homoscedastic because the plot of residuals was approximately the same width for all values of the predicted dependent variable.

Next stage of data screening involved detecting possible outliers. A univariate outlier is a case with an extreme value on one variable, while a multivariate outlier is a case with a strange combination of scores on two or more variables (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). Both types of outliers can distort statistics. Among dichotomous variables with an uneven split (e.g. 90-10 split), univariate outliers can be relatively easily identified. These are generally the cases “on the ‘wrong’ side of a very uneven split” (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007: 73). The results of descriptive statistics suggested that with an exception of Poland, Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Bulgaria, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, all other dummy variables for countries of birth possibly contained univariate outliers (Belarus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, and Moldova). This made it impossible to examine cross-country differences in cultural adaptation for all Eastern European groups. To decrease the effect of uneven splits of some dummy variables on the validity of results, I combined these variables into one single dummy variable. Among continuous variables, univariate outliers are cases with standardized z-scores higher than 3.29 ($p < .001$, two-tailed test). However, none of the

continuous variables in the analysis had cases associated with a z-score higher than this value.

To identify multivariate outliers, I requested Mahalanobis distance coefficients for each set of variables used in the regression analyses. This was done by regressing the case id variable (serial no.) on all variables in each regression model tested, saving Mahalanobis distance scores for each case. These scores were evaluated using the chi square distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). The critical chi square value is the one at the alpha level of .001, where the degrees of freedom are equal to the number of predictors in the model. Cases with Mahalanobis distance scores higher than the value of critical chi square were deemed multivariate outliers. I identified multivariate outliers for each of the ten regression models. After I excluded extreme cases from the analysis, the results did not change. The small changes in the level of significance of some variables that occurred after outliers were excluded are discussed in the sections that follow.

English Language Proficiency

An ordinary least squares regression (OLS) was used in this analysis. This was the most appropriate method because the dependent variable, albeit ordinal, has five categories. I tested five regression models. The regression coefficient estimates and the goodness of fit statistics of all models are presented in Table 10. For the reasons explained in the previous section, the models are not nested; therefore, none of them is the best fitting model. However, the F values are significant at the .001 level for all models, indicating that all models are good fit for the data. Values of adjusted R square

of all five models are very similar and suggest that predictor variables included in each model explain about 36 percent of the variance in the dependent variable English proficiency (predictors in Model 2 explain 38 percent of the variance). Almost all regression coefficient estimates reached statistical significance at the .001, which can be attributed to the large sample size, when even relatively unimportant differences become significant ($N= 45,900$). Considering the impact of a large sample, in addition to significance values, effect sizes associated with each predictor were also considered. The effect size available in SPSS is partial eta squared (η^2), and indicates the amount of variability in the dependent variable explained with the knowledge of an independent variables (Trusty, Thompson, and Petrocelli 2004). Considering the effect size will allow for a more accurate assessment of the relative importance of independent variables in predicting immigrants` English proficiency.

I will now turn to interpretation of constants and regression coefficients of all tested regression models (Table 10). The first model, Model 1, tested the effect of predictors' length of stay, age, male, marital status/presence of spouse, region of residence in the U.S., and survey year on the dependent variable English proficiency. The value of constant indicates an overall level of English proficiency, with a higher value of constant implying a higher level of English proficiency. Results of the first model suggest that, controlling for explanatory variables included in this model, post-1991 Eastern European immigrants tended to speak English very well.

The comparison of specific regression coefficients in the first model suggests that time positively affects the process of acculturation. Expectedly, the longer immigrants reside in the U.S., the more proficient they tend to be in English. For each additional year of residence in the U.S., immigrants` English proficiency increases by .051 levels, controlling for other predictors in the model. Consistent with the hypothesis, the association between age and English proficiency is negative, suggesting that as age increases, English proficiency tends to decrease .039 levels. This result is not surprising, considering older immigrants might have stronger attachments to their native cultures, and thus experience more difficulties adopting American cultural traits. The variable gender appears to be significant, indicating that males are less proficient in English than their female counterparts. Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. are less proficient in English than married immigrants whose spouse is not present or unmarried immigrants. This finding indicates that a complex relationship between marital status and English language proficiency is likely influenced by ethnicity of immigrants` spouses. The hypothesis about regional differences is only partially supported by the results. Immigrants living in the Midwest are significantly less proficient in English than immigrants living in the Northeast. However, English proficiency of immigrants living in the West and South tends to be higher than English proficiency of their counterparts living in the Northeast by .044 and .251 levels, respectively. This indicates that living in a region with a long history of immigration from Eastern Europe does not necessarily translate into better acculturation of

immigrants. The effect of variable survey year is significant, and consistent with the proposed hypothesis. The positive regression coefficients of each subsequent survey year indicate that immigrants who were surveyed between years 2007 and 2010 tend to achieve a higher level of English proficiency than immigrants surveyed in 2006.

The second model (Table 10, Model 2) included variables from the first model, in addition to the variable country of origin, coded into several dummy variables: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Russia, and “Other” (combining countries with insufficient sample size). Regression coefficients of the second model yielded results similar to the previously tested model. I will, therefore, focus on the interpretation of the regression estimates for countries of respondents` origin. With an exception of Poland and Bosnia and Herzegovina, all regression coefficients are expectedly positive and significant, suggesting that immigrants who were born in Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia, or other Eastern European countries in the analysis tended to be more proficient in English than immigrants from Ukraine (the reference category). The coefficients for Poland and Bosnia and Herzegovina were in an expected direction, but did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level.

The third model (Table 10, Model 3) tested the effect of variables from model one, in addition to the variable gross national income per capita (GNI). Because the results from model one remained unchanged in this model, I will not interpret them again. Highly consistent with the hypothesis, results showed the differences among immigrants in English proficiency, depending on the GNI of their country of origin. Consistent with

the results presented earlier, it appears that originating in a country with GNI lower than \$4,000 decreases English proficiency by .042 levels, the relationship being significant at the .001 level.

The next model (Table 10, Model 4) combined variables from the first model and the dummy variable ethnic diversity in a country of respondents` origin. This predictor was significant, indicating that respondents who originate in countries where ethnic minorities account for at least 20 percent of the total population tend to be less proficient in English by .115 levels than respondents who originate in countries with less ethnic diversity, all else being equal. This result is consistent with my initial hypothesis.

The last model (Table 10, Model 5) included the variables from Model 1, in addition to two dummy variables measuring the degree of personal and political freedom. Results confirmed the hypothesis that limited freedom in a country of origin is associated with the lower level of immigrants` English proficiency. More specifically, immigrants originating in countries classified as partly free or not free tend to be less proficient in English than those who originate in free countries by .212 and .045 levels, respectively.

Most of the regression coefficients are significant at the .001 level. This is not surprising considering the large sample size. In such cases, significance testing can help us understand the degree of group differences to some extent, but does not reveal much about the degree of relationship between predictors and the dependent variable. Not knowing the true degree of relationship can result in presenting relatively trivial findings as being practically meaningful (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). To avoid this error, I

compared estimates of partial eta squared (η^2), which is an effect size provided by SPSS for each independent variable in the analysis. The partial eta squared is an estimate of the amount of variance in the dependent variable that can be attributed to the independent variable (Trusty, Thompson, and Petrocelli 2004). In other words, it “assesses the amount of total variance in the DV that is predictable from knowledge of the levels of the IV” (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007: 54). The partial eta squared of .01 indicates small effects, .09 medium effects, and .25 large effects (Cohen 1988). According to the values of partial eta squared presented in Table 14, with an exception of age, all independent variables in the analysis are associated with low effect sizes. The predictors with the strongest effect are age (.338) and length of stay (.071). The value of eta squared associated with age means that about 34 percent of the variability in English proficiency is explained by this predictor. Similarly, length of stay accounts for about 7 percent of the differences in English proficiency. Each remaining independent variable in the analysis predicts about 1 percent or less of the variation in the dependent variable.

Next, I will examine standardized regression coefficients (β) from Table 10 and squared structure coefficients (r_s^2) presented in Table 14. It is useful to consult squared structure coefficients when there is a considerable degree of correlation between the predictors. In such cases, little credit may be given to some predictors, even though they explain some portion of the variation in the dependent variable. Squared structure coefficients indicate the percentage of observed effect accounted for by each variable, and can be computed by correlating the predictors with the predicted scores of the

dependent variable (Y hat) that were saved as part of the OLS regression analysis. Of the continuous predictors, age was the strongest and received the largest standardized coefficient. This predictor also received the largest squared structure coefficient, indicating that the predictor accounted for about 82 percent of the effect itself. Although the length of stay also yielded a relatively high standardized coefficient, which was statistically significant, this predictor accounted for only 2 percent of the observed effect. Several categorical predictors in the analysis were able to account for the same amount of variance explained: marital status (3 percent), south (3 percent), Bulgaria (2 percent), Russia (3 percent), and partly free countries (4 percent).

English proficiency was tested separately for Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian immigrants (Table 11). Largely, results are consistent with the findings for the pooled sample, and cross-country differences are minimal. The effect of length of U.S. residency is consistently positive for all three groups. Expectedly, older immigrants from all three countries are less proficient in English than younger immigrants. Consistent across countries, English proficiency tends to be lower for males, than for females. The effect of marital status and region varies across groups. However, consistent with the pooled sample results, English proficiency tends to increase with each subsequent immigrant cohort.

Native Language Retention

Logistic regression was used to test the effects of predictors on the probability of native language retention (Table 12). Five logistic regression models tested contained the

same variables as OLS regression models discussed in the previous section. The first model (Model 1) included the demographic variables and each subsequent model contained variables from model one, in addition to the variables for respondents` country of origin (Model 2), gross national income per capita (Model 3), ethnic diversity (Model 4), and personal/political freedom (Model 5). Significant values of χ^2 indicated that all models fit the data well. According to the values of pseudo R², predictor variables included in the analysis explained between 5 and 7 percent of the variation in the likelihood of native language retention. All models are statistically significant; therefore, appropriate to test the effect of predictors on the dependent variable. Due to high correlations between some variables, the models are not nested; therefore, I will interpret them individually.

With an exception of the variables survey year 2007 and 2008, all other predictors included in the first model are statistically significant (Table 12, Model 1). The negative relationship between length of stay and the likelihood of native language retention is expectedly negative, suggesting that for each additional year in the United States, immigrants are less likely to retain their native language by 2 percent (.981 – 1 = - .019). This complements the previously discussed finding and confirms the expectation that over time, immigrants are more likely to speak English at the expense of their native language. Consistent with the proposed hypothesis, each year of increase in age increases the likelihood of native language retention among immigrants by about 3 percent (1.027 – 1 = .027). This result corresponds to limited English proficiency among

older immigrants. Contradicting the original hypothesis, male immigrants are 24 percent more likely to retain their native language than their female counterparts, holding other variables constant. Surprisingly consistent with their limited English skills, this result reinforces the pattern of low acculturation among male immigrants. The marital status of immigrants and presence of spouse seem to make a significant difference in the likelihood of native language retention. Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. are 58 percent more likely to retain their native language than their respective counterparts. I suspect that married immigrants and their spouses tend to have the same ethnic background, which might account for their limited English proficiency and high native language retention.

Immigrants tend to differ in native language retention based on the region of residence in the United States. The values of odds ratio suggest that, controlling for other variables, immigrants who reside in the Midwest are 25 percent more likely to retain their native language than those living in the Northeast. However, immigrants in the West and South are less likely to retain their native language than immigrants in the Northeast by 16 and 38 percent, respectively. This finding is largely consistent with earlier discussed regional differences in English proficiency, and reinforces the pattern of higher acculturation among immigrants in the West and South, than in the Northeast.

Immigrants differ in their native language retention depending on the year when they were surveyed. As expected, immigrants surveyed in 2009 and 2010 are less likely to maintain their native language than those surveyed in 2006 by 17 and 25 percent,

respectively. Immigrants who were surveyed in 2007 and 2008 did not differ from immigrants surveyed in 2006 in the likelihood of native language retention, but the direction of the relationships is negative as expected. These findings coincide with my hypothesis and suggest a higher degree of acculturation among later immigrant cohorts.

Because the effect of the above discussed variables remained the same in the second model (Table 12, Model 2), I will focus on interpreting the dummy variables for respondents` countries of origin that were specific to this model. It appears that, with an exception of immigrants who originated in Bosnia and Herzegovina, immigrants born in all Eastern European countries are significantly less likely to maintain their native language than immigrants from Ukraine, which is economically the least stable country in the analysis. Immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina are more likely to retain their native language than immigrants from Ukraine, but only by 7 percent. Once again, this result points to a link between socioeconomic stability in immigrants` countries of origin, and their acculturation in the United States. This link is further reinforced by the examination of country-level characteristics presented in Model 3 (Table 12). It appears that, controlling for other variables in the model, immigrants born in countries with GNI below \$4,000 are 34 percent more likely to retain their native language than immigrants born in countries with higher GNI. The results in Model 4 (Table 12) further indicate that the degree of ethnic diversity in immigrants` country of birth affects the likelihood of native language retention. Consistent with the hypothesis, immigrants from countries where ethnic minorities account for at least 20 percent of the population are 45 percent

more likely to retain their native language than their respective counterparts. According to the results presented in Model 5 (Table 12), limited personal and political freedom is associated with a higher likelihood of native language retention. Immigrants from countries classified as partly free or not free are more likely to retain their native language than immigrants born in free countries by 102 and 30 percent, respectively.

To compare the amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by each predictor separately, the odds ratios from logistic regression can be interpreted as an effect size. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007: 463), “the closer the odds ratio is to 1, the smaller the effect.” To get an even more precise estimate of the effect, an odds ratio can be converted to Cohen’s *d* using the following formula: $\ln(\text{odds ratio})/1.81$. Cohen’s *d* is not an appropriate effect size in this case, because it compares the means of two groups. However, its value can be used to calculate partial eta squared (η^2), using the formula: $d^2/d^2 + 4$ (Chinn 2000).

With the exception of the variable partly free countries, effect sizes obtained for all other predictors in the analysis indicate weak to very weak effects (Table 14). Independent variables accounting for the most effect are: partly free countries ($\eta^2 = 0.111$); Romania ($\eta^2 = .076$); Bulgaria ($\eta^2 = .040$); other countries ($\eta^2 = .035$); South ($\eta^2 = .018$); and marital status ($\eta^2 = .015$). The value of eta squared for partly free countries means that this predictor accounts for 11 percent of the variation in native language retention among immigrants. Romania explains 8 percent, Bulgaria, and “other” countries about 4 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Variables South and marital

status account for about 2 percent of the effect. All other variables in the analysis explain about 1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Predictors of native language retention among Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian immigrants work in an expected direction and their effect is largely consistent with the results for the pooled sample (Table 13). Among Russian immigrants, the likelihood of speaking a language other than English at home decreases significantly with time spent in the United States. The effect of length of stay is insignificant for Polish and Ukrainian immigrants. Older immigrants from all three countries are more likely to speak language other than English than their younger counterparts. Males and married immigrants whose spouse is present in the United States tend to have a higher likelihood of speaking a language other than English across the three groups. The effect of region of residence and survey year did not show a clear pattern and varied across groups, indicating differences in native language retention.

SUMMARY

This chapter analyzed how well post-1991 immigrants from Eastern Europe in the United States adapt culturally. Cultural adaptation was measured by two indicators: English proficiency and native language retention. To test the effects of predictors on the dependent variables, I used ordinary least squares regression (OLS) and logistic regression. Results are presented in Tables 8 – 14.

The descriptive statistics show that, on average, respondents reported speaking English language well (Table 8). Two-thirds of respondents reported speaking English

well or very well (66 percent), and about 19 percent spoke English, but not well. Only 7 percent of respondents either did not speak English at all, or spoke only English. This result is comparable to language adaptation of other recent immigrants to the United States. Yang (2011) examined the language adaptation among post-1965 Asian immigrants. He found that a majority of respondents were partially adapted, speaking English well or very well (67 percent), or speaking English, but not well (17 percent). Only a minority of foreign-born Asians (6 percent) did not speak English at all. On the other hand, 11 percent spoke only English, and thus reached total language adaptation.

Results further show that about 93 percent of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants tend to retain their native language. This number is slightly higher compared to native language retention among other immigrant groups in the United States. Portes and Rumbaut (2006) found that 84 percent of all immigrants, aged five years or older, who came to the United States between 1970 and 1980, spoke a language other than English at home. Among foreign-born Asians who immigrated to the U.S. after 1965, 88 percent spoke their native language (Yang 2011). Portes and Rumbaut (2006) argue that as the proportion of an ethnic group that is U.S. born increases, the shift toward English becomes stronger. A majority of new Eastern European immigrants came to the U.S. during the last two decades, thus a proportion of U.S. born individuals who trace their origins to post-1991 Eastern Europe is likely very small. Therefore, higher native language retention of these immigrants is not surprising. This finding further suggests that, like many contemporary immigrants to the United States, recent immigrants from

Eastern Europe tend to perceive their native language in a positive way and do not foresee negative consequences being associated with speaking their mother tongue (Mucherah 2008).

Most of the predictors of English proficiency and native language retention seem to work in an expected direction. The longer immigrants reside in the U.S., the more proficient they tend to be in English, and the less likely they are to speak their native language. This is consistent with the findings of existing literature, suggesting that English-language abilities of most immigrants improve with additional years of experience in the United States (Espenshade and Fu 1997). The effect of age is also consistent with the findings of existing studies; older immigrants tend to have less proficiency in English than younger immigrants, and are more likely to speak their native language. Some explanations of this finding offered by researchers include difficulties learning a new language or a greater attachment to one's home culture by older immigrants (Friedberg 1992; McManus et al. 1983). Researchers are not in consensus regarding the effect of gender on immigrants' English proficiency, but many studies found that immigrant females tend to be more proficient in English than males (Stevens 1992). Results of the analysis are consistent with this finding. In addition to being more proficient in English, female immigrants are less likely to maintain their native language.

The effect of marital status and presence of spouse on English proficiency and native language retention contradicts the initial hypothesis, indicating a complex relationship between these variables. Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the

United States tend to be less proficient in English, and are more likely to retain their native language than their respective counterparts. Perhaps married immigrants have a spouse of the same ethnicity. If a spouse is present in the U.S., immigrants will likely continue to use their native language at home, and feel less pressured to become proficient in English. However, because ethnicities of spouses in this study are unknown, this is only an assumption.

It appears that immigrants who reside in the Midwest tend to be less proficient in English and are more likely to retain their native language than immigrants residing in the Northeast. In addition, residing in the West and South is associated with more English proficiency, and a lower likelihood of native language retention. This pattern of regional differences seems inconsistent, and only partially supports the original hypothesis that settling in regions with higher numbers of new Eastern European immigrants facilitates cultural adaptation.

Immigrants surveyed between 2007 and 2010 tend to be more proficient in English and are less likely to maintain their native language than immigrants who were surveyed in 2006. This finding suggests an overall trend toward a higher degree of language adaptation over time. Results show cross-country differences in cultural adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. More specifically, immigrants from all countries included in the analysis tended to be more proficient in English and were less likely to retain their native language than immigrants from Ukraine. This country was designated as a reference category because, based on its 2005 gross national income per

capita (GNI), it had the weakest economy from all countries in the analysis (with an exception of Moldova which did not have a sufficient sample size to be a reference category). This suggests that immigrants who originate in countries with weaker economies tend to adapt less well culturally than immigrants from economically stronger countries (Robila 2008, 2010).

All country-level characteristics tested in the analysis affect cultural adaptation as expected. Immigrants who were born in countries with GNI below \$4,000 have less English proficiency and are more likely to retain their native language than immigrants from countries with higher GNI. The economic stability of Eastern European countries tends to be negatively correlated with ethnic diversity. Consequently, immigrants who originate in countries with greater ethnic diversity tend to be less proficient in English and are more likely to maintain their native languages than immigrants from less ethnically diverse (and more economically developed) countries. The economy of Eastern European countries also tends to be correlated with the degree of personal freedom granted to the citizens. Countries where political and personal freedoms remain suppressed also tend to be less economically developed; and immigrants from these countries seem to adapt less well culturally in the United States.

Overall, consistent with the cultural pluralism perspective, post-1991 Eastern Europeans seem to balance learning a new language while maintaining the native one. As expected, results show differences in cultural adaptation among these immigrants depending on a variety of individual and country-level characteristics. Different groups

tend to follow different trajectories when adapting to the American culture, while to some extent, holding on to the cultures of their native countries.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIOECONOMIC ADAPTATION

Socioeconomic adaptation is an important dimension of overall immigrant adaptation, as it indicates immigrants` overall well-being (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006; Sakamoto and Xie 2006; Yang 2011). Socioeconomic attainment is defined as “the possession of scarce economic resources and social characteristics that are valued in society” (Sakamoto and Xie 2006: 54). The examination of immigrants` socioeconomic adaptation is important for several reasons. Factors such as limited language skills or inability to transfer professional credentials increase the likelihood of economic hardship experienced by immigrants (Robila 2010). The risk is especially high for recent immigrants who have resided in the United States for only a short period. A majority of recent Eastern European immigrants have been living in the United States for less than twenty years. Therefore, it is important to examine their socioeconomic achievement, which is indicative of their stage in the adaptation process. Researchers emphasize extraordinary diversity in immigrants ` socioeconomic status (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Zhou 1997). This heterogeneity may result in segmented adaptation outcomes and diverse experiences of social mobility among immigrants. Many contemporary immigrants are highly educated (Batalova and Lowell 2007). Having a large amount of human capital, some immigrant groups may move up the socioeconomic ladder faster than others. Instead of starting at the bottom of the racial hierarchy and following a

gradual route of upward mobility, immigrants may move directly into the middle class (Perlman and Waldinger 1997; Zhou 1997). In addition, socioeconomic achievement of the first generation affects the socioeconomic position of immigrant children, who have limited chances for socioeconomic mobility if their parents continuously face socioeconomic hardship (Blau and Duncan 1967; Lieberson 1980; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Zhou 1997). Furthermore, socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants likely leads to subsequent stages of adaptation, including structural and political adaption (Alba and Nee 1997).

In this dissertation, several measures have been used to examine how post-1991 Eastern European immigrants fare socioeconomically: education, occupation, self-employment, personal income, and poverty. Education plays a significant role in the socioeconomic mobility of first-generation immigrants (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Lieberson 1980; Zhou 1997). In fact, it is one of the primary determinants of immigrants` socioeconomic status in the United States (Camarota 2012). Existing studies highlight a strong effect of educational attainment on income, occupation, and self-employment (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Education is perceived as an important resource. It increases the chances for securing employment, and opens up new occupational opportunities. The likelihood of having sufficient income to support immigrants and their families increases with education (Robila 2010). In addition, human capital of immigrant parents is an important determinant of socioeconomic achievement of their children (Zhou 1997). Eastern European immigrants at the turn of

the century fared considerably worse in educational attainment than their counterparts from Northern and Western Europe. Today, white Americans who trace their origins to Eastern Europe tend to have educational attainment above the nation's average (Waldinger and Richter 1996). This chapter examined where new Eastern European immigrants fit in this picture.

In addition to broader cultural or structural factors, education is the most important micro-level predictor of occupation. Immigrants with higher education are more likely to hold professional or managerial positions at the top of the occupational hierarchy (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

Self-employment is often considered a measure of entrepreneurship. Existing studies emphasize the greater propensity for self-employment among immigrants than among natives (Portes and Zhou 1996). It has been estimated that the number of immigrant businesses in the United States increased from 2.7 million in 1997, to 3.3 million in 2002 (Toussaint-Comeau 2008). However, researchers are not in consensus regarding the extent to which self-employment enhances socioeconomic progress of immigrants. Early studies perceived immigrant self-employment as a necessity, resulting from lack of human and social capital, and discrimination faced by immigrants in the labor market (Light 1972). Later studies emphasized the benefits of self-employment for economic progress of immigrants and ethnic communities (Light 1984; Gold 1988). The positive effects of self-employment on immigrants' income have been extensively documented. Therefore, in this study, self-employment represents an avenue for

socioeconomic achievement and a means for upward social mobility (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Portes and Zhou 1996).

Income is “the best summary measure of the relative position of an immigrant group in the United States” (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). While the importance of educational credentials should not be underestimated, higher education results in better adaptation only if it translates into immigrants` ability to earn sufficient income. Sufficient income allows immigrants to provide education for their children, and therefore contributes to economic mobility of both the first and second generation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

Poverty is the last indicator of immigrants` economic achievement examined in this dissertation. Immigrants are more likely to live in poverty than are natives by virtue of their lower income (Robila 2010). In 2010, 23 percent of American immigrants and their U.S. born children lived in poverty, compared to 14 percent of natives (Camarota 2012). Thus, it is important to examine this aspect of socio-economic adaptation.

This chapter will elaborate on findings of existing studies by providing a more systematic analysis of socioeconomic adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. The following research questions are central to this chapter: First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt socioeconomically to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of socioeconomic adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States? The analyses will consist of descriptive statistics for all dependent variables, correlational analyses, and regression

analyses to determine the overall level of socioeconomic adaptation among new immigrants from Eastern Europe, as well as its determinants.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The descriptive analyses consist of means, medians, and standard deviations of the dependent variables used in this chapter for the pooled sample (Table 15), and for selected groups with sufficient sample sizes (Table 16). The results indicate that, on average, new Eastern European immigrants had 11 years of education. Further examination reveals that only 6 percent of respondents completed less than high school. Additionally, about 26 percent of the pooled sample is comprised of high school graduates, followed by respondents who completed some college (23 percent), received a college degree (24 percent), or an advanced degree (22 percent). Overall, about 69 percent of respondents had some higher education (including some college, college degree, or advanced degree). The three separately examined Eastern European groups followed a similar educational pattern. Consistent with the overall average, Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian immigrants had between 11 and 12 years of schooling. The lowest percentage of immigrants (between 4 and 7 percent) fell in the category “less than high school” for all three countries. One third of Polish immigrants were high school graduates (34 percent), compared to 13 percent of immigrants from Russia, and 19 percent of immigrants from Ukraine. Immigrants from Russia were more likely to have a college degree (31 percent) or advanced degree (34 percent) than immigrants from Ukraine (28 and 23 percent, respectively) or Poland (16 percent). The percentage of

Russian and Ukrainian immigrants with some higher education was higher than the overall average (83 and 77 percent, respectively). Polish immigrants were the least likely to have higher education among the three groups (59 percent).

Results further indicate that about 37 percent of all respondents held professional or managerial occupation, and 53 percent were white-collar workers (including professionals or managers). This pattern is the most consistent with occupational attainment of immigrants from Ukraine, 38 percent of whom were professionals or managers, and 54 percent held a white-collar occupation. Polish immigrants lagged behind the overall average, with 27 percent of respondents being professionals or managers, and 41 percent being white-collar workers. Consistent with their higher level of education, Russian immigrants were more likely to be professionals/managers (49 percent) and white-collar workers (66 percent) than the other two groups.

About 12 percent of all immigrants in the analysis were self-employed, compared to 14 percent of self-employed Polish immigrants, and 11 percent of Ukrainian and Russian immigrants who were entrepreneurs.

The average personal income was \$35,900, with a standard deviation of \$44,184. More than one third of respondents (39 percent) earned between \$20,000 and \$49,000 dollars. The category \$1 -\$9,999 was represented by 17 percent of respondents, followed by the category \$10,000-\$19,999 (16 percent). Only 9 percent of respondents in the pooled sample earned \$80,000 or more. Results presented in Table 16 indicate cross-group differences in income, with immigrants from Russia having the highest income

(\$39,849), followed by immigrants from Ukraine (\$36,464) and Poland (\$33,604). The most frequent income category for immigrants from Poland, Russia, and Ukraine was the category \$20,000 to \$49,000. Only 6 percent of Polish immigrants fell in the category \$80,000 or higher, followed by immigrants from Ukraine (10 percent) and Russia (14 percent).

Based on the income-poverty ratio, about 41 percent of respondents in the analysis were classified as having “high-income,” followed by “middle income” (34 percent) and “low income” respondents (13 percent). Additionally, about 5 percent of respondents in the pooled sample were considered “poor,” and 3 percent were “severely poor” or “near poor.” Poverty status of individual groups is very similar to this overall pattern, with the percentage of immigrants in the “high income” category being the highest for Russian immigrants (50 percent), followed by immigrants from Ukraine (41 percent) and Poland (38 percent).

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

To avoid multicollinearity problems encountered in the previous chapter, the tested regression models are not nested. This approach allows testing the effects of all relevant independent variables while avoiding multicollinearity. I conducted a correlation analysis to evaluate the strength of the associations between all dependent variables and independent variables included in each tested regression model. The results revealed moderate correlations between several pairs of variables. Since all values of Pearson's r were below .500, these are unlikely to bias the regression estimates. Further

examination of tolerance values and Variance Inflation Factors (VIF's) obtained in OLS regression confirmed no multicollinearity problem.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Five indicators were used to assess the level of socioeconomic adaption of new Eastern European immigrants. Education was an ordinal variable with more than five categories (1 = no schooling completed; 16 = doctorate degree), therefore OLS regression was an appropriate technique to use. Two dummy variables were created to examine occupational status of respondents: professional or managerial occupation (1 = managerial, professional, or related occupations; 0 = other), and white-collar occupation (1 = professional, managerial, or related occupations, sales and office occupations; 0 = other). Since both dependent variables are dichotomous, I used logistic regression as an analytical strategy. This technique was also employed to examine the propensity for self-employment (1 = self-employed; 0 = working for wages).

I used two sets of regression models to test the determinants of immigrants' personal income, which was coded at both the interval/ratio and ordinal level. The reason for recoding income variable differently was to ensure robust results and to account for violations of OLS regression assumptions, which usually occur when income is used as a dependent variable. First, income was used as an interval/ratio dependent variable (values of original variable after restrictions ranged from -\$16,499 to \$943,000). When using the original, interval/ratio income variable available in the dataset, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. This violation can be normally corrected by

log transformation of the dependent variable (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). After I log transformed the original variable, the heteroscedasticity persisted. Excluding all values of income lower than \$1 and then log transforming the variable proved helpful. After this modification, the distribution of the dependent variable appeared to meet the assumption of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. In the second set of regression models, I recoded income into an ordinal variable, keeping all values of the original variable. These models also met all OLS regression assumptions.

The ratio of income to poverty was used as a measure of respondents` poverty status (values ranging from 0 to 501). This measure is advantageous, because it can be used not only to determine if people are above or below the poverty line, but also to ascertain the degree (or depth) of poverty. The original variable was recoded, so that a higher value indicates a higher degree of poverty.

To eliminate univariate outliers among dichotomous variables for countries of origin, I combined variables with an uneven split into one single variable as described in the previous chapter. None of the continuous variables contained univariate outliers. Each regression model was also screened for multivariate outliers using the Mahalanobis distance coefficients. Extreme cases were excluded from each regression, but with an exception of slightly higher values of the coefficient of determination and pseudo R² in some models, no significant changes in the results were detected.

Educational Attainment

Educational attainment was measured by an ordinal variable; therefore, OLS regression was used as an analytical strategy (Table 17). To obtain accurate standard errors, I used the “SURVEYREG” procedure available in the statistical software SAS. Five regression models were tested – model 1 included individual-level demographic and socioeconomic variables, model 2 included variables from the first model in addition to dummy variables for countries of origin, and models 3, 4, and 5 included country-level indicators (gross national income per capita, ethnic diversity, and personal/political freedom).

Significant values of constants indicate a good model fit. The examination of values of constants across the five regression models reveals that, after controlling for all predictors, respondents` educational attainment equaled to 12th grade with no diploma. Variables included in the models explain between 14 and 22 percent of the variation in educational attainment.

I will begin with the examination of the effect of individual-level demographic and socioeconomic variables on educational attainment. The comparison of regression coefficients in the first model (Model 1, Table 17) indicates that the length of stay is negatively related to immigrants` educational level. One possible explanation for the unexpected negative relationship is that new Eastern European immigrants were schooled in their home countries, and obtained limited or no education in the United States. Thus, their education does not increase with time spent in the United States. The association

between age and education is positive; for each additional year of age, education tends to increase by .020 levels, controlling for other variables in the model. This result is understandable, since older immigrants are more likely to have acquired higher education than their younger counterparts. Contradicting the hypothesis, immigrant males tend to have lower educational attainment than immigrant females by .125 levels. This result indicates that males have, on average, lower human capital than females, decreasing their potential for successful socioeconomic adaptation. Expectedly, being married, and having a spouse in the U.S. increases education of immigrants by .085 levels. Since married immigrants tend to be older, they may have achieved higher education than their respective counterparts. Immigrants living in the Midwest tend to have lower education than immigrants living in the Northeast. The educational disparities between immigrants living in the West and South and their counterparts in the Northeast did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level. This pattern of regional differences, however, is not consistent across all five regression models and changes when different variables are controlled, preventing any further generalizations about the regional differences in education. Contradicting the hypothesis about higher educational achievement of later immigrant cohorts, results suggest that immigrants who were surveyed in 2009 and 2010 tend to have lower education than those surveyed in 2006, holding other variables constant. The effect of year 2007 and 2008 on the level of education is not statistically significant. The variable English proficiency positively affects immigrants` level of education; as English proficiency increases by one level, educational attainment also

tends to increase by one level. Immigrants who are proficient in English may be more educated on arrival, but they may also be more likely to further their education in the United States than immigrants with limited language skills.

In addition to variables from the previous model, Model 2 (Table 17) included dummies for immigrants` countries of origin (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Russia, and other countries combined). I hypothesized that immigrants from Ukraine adapt less well socioeconomically than immigrants from other Eastern European countries, because originating in a former Soviet Union country with below average gross national income may put immigrants in a disadvantageous position. The result contradicts this expectation. With an exception of Russia, immigrants from all other countries in the analysis had, on average, lower educational attainment than immigrants from Ukraine. The coefficients are significant at the .001 level for all individual countries, but not for Bulgaria. Compared to other models tested, variables included in this model account for the most variation in the dependent variable – about 22 percent.

What are the effects of country-level characteristics? The next model (Model 3, Table 17) tested variables from the first model, in addition to a country-level variable gross national income per capita (GNI). My argument was that immigrants from economically less stable countries tend to have lower education than immigrants originating in countries with stronger economies, decreasing their potential for successful socioeconomic adaptation. This expectation is supported by the results. Immigrants who

originate in countries with GNI below \$4,000 tend to have educational attainment lower by -.369 levels than immigrants from countries with higher GNI, controlling for other predictors.

Model 4 (Table 17) presents the effect of a country-level variable ethnic diversity. I expected that immigrants from ethnically heterogeneous countries would have lower educational attainment than their counterparts from ethnically homogeneous countries, which are generally also economically more stable. Contradicting this expectation, the examination of results indicate that immigrants from ethnically more diverse countries where minorities account for more than 20 percent of the population tend to have higher educational attainment than immigrants from less ethnically diverse countries. In this study, Ukraine and Russia are the largest ethnically heterogeneous countries, and previous results showed that immigrants originating in these countries tend to be highly educated.

The argument that limited personal and political freedom in the country of origin decreases education is only partially supported (Model 5, Table 17). The results indicate that immigrants from countries classified as partly free tend to have lower educational attainment than immigrants from free countries. However, immigrants originating in countries classified as unfree tend to be more educated than their counterparts from free countries. Russia, one of the two unfree countries in the analysis, was found to send immigrants with the above average level of education, which may partially account for this finding.

As a result of large sample size, most of the predictors were significant at the .001 level. Thus, I will now examine the values of partial eta squared (η^2) and squared structure coefficients (r_s^2) to determine the best predictors of education (Table 30). The comparison of eta's indicates that the single best predictor of immigrants' educational attainment was the level of their English proficiency. This independent variable accounted for almost 15 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. The effect of other predictors was rather weak. The variable Bosnia and Herzegovina explained 5 percent of the variance, and variables age, length of stay, and partly free countries between 1 and 2 percent of the variance in education. The explanatory power of all other variables in the analysis falls below 1 percent, indicating very weak effects.

The examination of squared structure coefficients (r_s^2) indicates that among predictors, English proficiency received the largest standardized coefficient and accounted for the highest percentage of observed effect (91 percent). Other predictors accounted for a much lower portion of the effect (age = 5 percent; partly free countries = 11 percent; unfree countries = 23 percent). Bosnia and Herzegovina and Russia accounted for the highest portion of the effect among country dummy variables, explaining 23 and 17 percent, respectively.

To determine possible cross-country differences in determinants of education, the effect of all predictors was tested for Poland, Russia, and Ukraine, which are the three largest Eastern European groups in the analysis (Table 18). I will highlight the deviations from the results for the pooled sample. The length of stay in the United States had no

effect on educational attainment among Russian and Ukrainian immigrants, but it was significant at the .001 level among immigrants from Poland. Consistent with the results for the pooled sample, the effect of variables age and marital status was significant and positive among immigrants from Russia and Ukraine, but did not reach statistical significance among immigrants from Poland. The effect of region deviated from the results for the pooled sample, and there were differences between immigrants from the three counties in educational attainment based on region or residence. Similarly, Polish immigrants differed from their counterparts from Russia and Ukraine depending on the survey year. The variables included in the tested regression models accounted for 17 percent of the variance in education for Ukrainian and Polish immigrants, and 12 percent for Russian immigrants.

Occupation

How likely are new Eastern European immigrants to hold a white-collar occupation? How likely are they to be professionals or managers? Because occupational background of these immigrants has never been systematically examined before, I tested both measures to better ascertain possible variations in occupational attainment and its determinants. I used logistic regression and “SURVEYLOGISTIC,” as both dependent variables were dichotomous. The results of descriptive statistics show that professionals and managers comprised a significant percentage of the pooled sample (37 percent), and more than half of respondents were white-collar workers (52 percent). Results for the pooled sample are presented in Tables 19 and 20. Five regression models were tested for

each dependent variable. All models are a good fit for the data, as indicated by significant values of χ^2 . The values of pseudo R² suggest that all predictor variables explained 33 to 34 percent of the variation in the likelihood of having a white-collar job, and 37 percent of the variation in the likelihood of having a professional or managerial occupation.

The results presented in the first model (Table 19) show a positive association between length of stay in the U.S. and the likelihood of holding a white-collar occupation. Coinciding with my expectation that occupational attainment of immigrants increases with time spent in the United States, results show that for each additional year in the United States, the likelihood of holding a white-collar position increases by 5 percent. Consistent with my prediction, older immigrants are, on average, less likely to hold a white-collar occupation than younger immigrants. More specifically, for each one year increase in age, the probability of holding a white-collar occupation decreases by 2 percent, controlling for other predictors. Perhaps, despite the higher educational attainment of older immigrants, their employment opportunities might be limited due to low acculturation and lack of English proficiency. Gender differences in occupational attainment are partially consistent with my hypothesis. The probability of holding a white-collar job is 49 percent lower for males than for females, which is unexpected. However, later discussion will demonstrate that in terms of their rate of professionalization, males tend to fare better socioeconomically than their female counterparts. Considering their higher educational attainment, it is not surprising that

married immigrants whose spouse is present in the United States are more likely to hold a white-collar occupation than their respective counterparts. As discussed earlier, I anticipated that immigrants in the Northeast would have higher occupational attainment than immigrants in other regions. However, this hypothesis receives little support from the data. The likelihood of holding a white-collar occupation appears to be lower for immigrants in the Midwest, but higher for immigrants in the South, than for those in the Northeast. The disparities in occupational attainment between immigrants in the West and in the Northeast were not statistically significant.

Results reveal that respondents who were surveyed in 2008 and 2009 are more likely to hold a white-collar occupation than immigrants interviewed in 2006. This finding lends support to my prediction that later immigrant cohorts might adapt better socioeconomically than earlier cohorts. As expected, education and English proficiency are strong predictors of occupational attainment, and work in an expected direction. For each level increase in education, the likelihood of being a white-collar worker increases by 46 percent, controlling for other predictors. Additionally, each level of increase in English proficiency results in a 68 percent increase in the likelihood of holding a white-collar occupation.

The second model (Model 2, Table 19) presents coefficients for individual countries of birth. It appears that immigrants from Albania and Poland are less likely to hold a white-collar occupation than Ukrainian immigrants. On the other hand, immigrants from Bulgaria, Romania, and Russia are more likely to be white-collar

workers than immigrants from Ukraine. The effect of dummies Bosnia and Herzegovina and other countries combined did not reach statistical significance. These cross-country differences deviate from my expectation that low socioeconomic stability in the country of origin is associated with low occupational attainment among immigrants, as it is apparent that Ukrainian immigrants tend to fare better occupationally than immigrants from some economically stronger countries.

The results suggest a complex relationship between country-level characteristics and immigrants` occupational attainment. My argument that socioeconomic instability in sending countries decreases occupational attainment is not fully supported, because the effect of GNI on occupation attainment is not statistically significant. However, the direction is expectedly negative, suggesting that immigrants who originate in countries with GNI lower than \$4,000 are less likely to be white-collar workers than immigrants from countries with higher GNI (Model 3, Table 19). Ethnic diversity in a country of origin has an opposite effect on occupational attainment: originating in countries where ethnic minorities account for 20 percent or more of the population increases the likelihood of being a white-collar worker by 18 percent (Model 4, Table 19). To some extent, this result can be attributed to higher occupational attainment of immigrants from Russia, which is a dominant heterogeneous country in the analysis. The degree of freedom in a country of origin also appears to have a complex effect on immigrants` occupational attainment (Model 5, Table 19). The difference between immigrants from partly free countries and free countries in occupational attainment is not statistically

significant. However, originating in a country classified as unfree seems to be associated with a significantly higher likelihood of holding a white-collar job.

Do determinants of professionalization differ from determinants of white-collar status, or are they the same? To answer this question, I tested five regression models, examining the predictors of holding a professional or managerial occupation (Table 20). All models are significant, indicating a good fit for the data. The examination of regression coefficients reveals, for the most part, no change in the direction and significance of the relationships between the dependent variable and independent variables. The variable gender is an exception. It appears that males are less likely to hold a white-collar occupation than females. However, the gender difference in professionalization is not statistically significant. Regional differences in professionalization suggest that immigrants in the West have a higher rate of professionalization than immigrants in the Northeast. Originating in a country with low GNI, or in a partly-free country significantly decreases the level of professionalization among immigrants. These small variations notwithstanding, results indicate that among new Eastern European immigrants, determinants of white-collar status appear to be the same as determinants of professionalization.

The values of partial eta's squared (η^2) presented in Table 30 reveal that all predictors included in the analysis had a somewhat weak effect on the likelihood of holding a white-collar, or a professional/managerial position. English language proficiency and education explained about 2 percent of the variation in occupational

attainment. Gender accounted for 3 percent of the variation in the likelihood of holding a white-collar job, but did not explain any variation in the likelihood of holding a professional or managerial position. All other predictors accounted for less than one percent of the variability in immigrants` occupational attainment.

The results for individual countries are relatively consistent with the results for the pooled sample (Tables 21 and 22). Predictors of occupational attainment work in the same direction when tested for Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian immigrants.

Self-employment

The same five regression models were tested to predict the likelihood of self-employment. The values of χ^2 were significant for each model, suggesting that the models were specified correctly. The amount of explained variance in the dependent variable by all independent variables varied between 3 and 5 percent, depending on a particular model.

Multivariate analysis was conducted in SAS using logistic regression and “SURVEYLOGISTIC” procedure. The effect of length of stay on the likelihood of self-employment is positive (Model 1, Table 23). For each additional year of residence in the U.S., the likelihood of self-employment increases by 2 percent, controlling for other variables. The effect of age is consistent with my prediction, and with the previously discussed findings. With each year increase in age, the probability of self-employment increases by about 1 percent. As I mentioned earlier, older immigrants tend to be less proficient in English, and are less likely to be white-collar workers or professionals.

Considering their constrained employment opportunities, it is not surprising that older immigrants are more likely to be entrepreneurs than their younger counterparts. Gender differences in the likelihood of self-employment are highly consistent with my prediction. The likelihood of self-employment is 69 percent higher for males than for females, contributing to a higher level of socioeconomic adaptation among males. Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. are more likely to be self-employed than immigrants in other categories of marital status. It is evident from the previous discussion that married immigrants are better acculturated, have higher educational attainment, and more resources than their respective counterparts. These characteristics put them in a better position to establish their own business.

Consistent across all models, immigrants living in the Midwest, West, and South are 38, 48, and 16 percent more likely to be self-employed than immigrants residing in the Northeast. This region has a long history of immigration from Eastern Europe, and thus might offer more employment opportunities to new immigrants than other regions where immigrant networks have not been as extensive. The likelihood of self-employment tends to be higher for immigrant cohorts surveyed in 2008 and 2010, than for the 2006 cohort, indicating that among some later immigrants, entrepreneurship is an attractive employment alternative. Results further show that the propensity for entrepreneurship decreases with education, contradicting the original hypothesis that entrepreneurship is indicative of higher socioeconomic status. Each additional level of increase in education lowers the likelihood of self-employment among immigrants by 2

percent. What may be the reasons for this negative relationship? Perhaps better education diminishes the need for self-employment by increasing the chances for securing employment that generates sufficient income to support immigrants and their families. The effect of English proficiency on the likelihood of self-employment did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level.

The second model includes the dummy variables for immigrants` countries of origin (Model 2, Table 23). The coefficients for Bulgaria and Russia did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level, indicating no significant difference between immigrants from these countries and Ukrainian immigrants in their propensity for self-employment. Immigrants from Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina are less likely to be self-employed than immigrants from Ukraine, while the likelihood of self-employment tends to be higher for immigrants from Poland, Romania, and other countries combined. These complex findings indicate that the country of origin is an important predictor of entrepreneurship. Additionally, it appears that not only individual characteristics, but also a variety of country-level factors might explain immigrants` entrepreneurship.

All country-level predictors examined in the analysis affected the propensity for self-employment as hypothesized. The likelihood of self-employment tends to be lower among immigrants from countries with lower GNI (Model 3, Table 23). Similarly, immigrants from ethnically heterogeneous countries are less prone to be entrepreneurs than immigrants from ethnically homogenous countries (Model 4, Table 23). In addition, limited personal and political freedom in countries of origin appears to lower immigrants`

likelihood of self-employment in the United States (Model 5, Table 23). Perhaps, differences in immigration status play a role here. Immigrants from socioeconomically and politically less stable countries are likely to be admitted as refugees, escaping harsh conditions in their homelands. Previous analysis also indicates that these immigrants tend to have limited human capital and resources, which may prevent them from establishing their own enterprise in the United States.

The comparison of partial eta's squared (η^2) in Table 30 indicates that the dummy variable Bosnia and Herzegovina accounted for 6 percent, partial freedom in countries of origin for 3 percent, and gender for 2 percent of the variation in the likelihood of self-employment. All other variables explained even lower amounts of variance, being rather weak predictors.

To examine possible cross-country differences in self-employment, I ran regressions separately for the three largest groups. Some of the findings are interesting, and differ from the findings for the pooled sample. For example, relative to immigrant females, the likelihood of self-employment is the highest for male immigrants from Ukraine, who are 111 percent more likely to be self-employed than their female counterparts. Compared to the other two groups, married immigrants from Ukraine have also the highest propensity to be self-employed rather than their unmarried counterparts. Interestingly, educational attainment has no effect on the likelihood of self-employment among Russian and Ukrainian immigrants, but it negatively affects the propensity for self-employment of Polish immigrants. Consistent with the results for the pooled sample,

English proficiency does not play a role in the likelihood of self-employment among the three groups examined.

Personal Income

This section includes the discussion of income determinants, which were assessed twice: using log-transformed personal income as an interval/ratio variable, and using the same dependent variable at the ordinal level. OLS regression and “SURVEYREG” feature was used to test the effect of predictors on both dependent variables measuring income.

When testing the log-transformed dependent variable, unstandardized coefficients can be interpreted as percentages. The estimates predicting logged personal income are presented in Table 25. The values of coefficients of determination (R^2) indicate that predictors included in the tested regression models explained about 25 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

I will now proceed to the discussion of the effect of individual predictors on log-transformed income included in the first model (Model 1, Table 25). The findings coincide with my expectation that as the number of years in the United States increases, so does the income. For each additional year in the United States, personal income tends to increase by 1 percent, holding other variables constant (Model 1, Table 25). The effect of age on the dependent variable is also positive; for each one year increase in age, the personal income tends to increase by 1 percent. Largely consistent with my expectation that males tend to adapt better socioeconomically, their personal income tends to be 23

percent higher than the income of females. In addition to better education and higher rate of professionalization, the results show a pattern of higher socioeconomic adaptation among married immigrants, who tend to earn 13 percent more than their respective counterparts. As hypothesized, immigrants living in the South tend to earn less than immigrants in the Northeast. However, immigrants in other regions do not differ from their counterparts in the Northeast in their earnings, even though the direction of the relationships is expectedly negative. Respondents surveyed in 2008 and 2009 tend to have higher personal income than those surveyed in 2006, corresponding to my prediction about later cohorts adapting better socioeconomically than earlier cohorts. English proficiency, education, and occupational background are important determinants of income, and work in an expected direction. Each level of increase in English proficiency results in personal income higher by 4 percent, controlling for other predictors. Highly consistent with the hypothesis, immigrants` income increases with education. More specifically, for each level of increase in education, income tends to increase by 4 percent. White-collar immigrant workers earn, on average, 12 percent more than immigrants who hold blue-collar occupations, holding other variables constant. The effect of self-employment on income is not significant.

How does the country of origin affect immigrants` income? The examination of dummy variables for individual countries presented in the second model (Table 25) provides some answers. It appears that immigrants from most countries in the analysis tend to earn more than Ukrainian immigrants. Personal income of immigrants from

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Poland, and Romania is about 10 percent higher than the income of their counterparts from Ukraine.

All country-level predictors work in an expected direction, providing support to my expectation that socioeconomic and political instability in the homelands decrease immigrants income (Models 3-5, Table 25). Immigrants from countries with GNI below \$4,000 earn, on average, only 2 percent less than immigrants from countries with higher GNI. Immigrants from ethnically diverse countries earn 6 percent less than immigrants from countries with ethnically homogeneous populations. Lastly, originating in countries classified as partly free or not free decreases personal income among new Eastern European immigrants by 6 and 9 percent, respectively.

Regression models with personal income coded at the ordinal level are presented in Table 26. The percentage of explained variance increased to 29 percent, but the effect of predictors remained unchanged, so the summary of results will be brief. As can be seen in the first model (Model 1, Table 26), each year of stay in the U.S. increases personal income by about .17 levels, controlling for other predictors in the model. Similarly, for each additional year of age, income tends to increase by .09 levels. Male immigrants tend to have personal income 3 levels higher than immigrant females. Similarly, immigrants who are married and whose spouse is present in the U.S. have, on average, higher personal income by 1 level. Partially consistent with the findings discussed in the previous sections, immigrants in the Midwest and South tend to earn less than immigrants in the Northeast, while the effect of variable West did not reach

statistical significance. Immigrants who were surveyed between 2007 and 2009 tend to earn more than the 2006 cohort. Each level of increase in English proficiency and education increases personal income by .57 and .45 levels, respectively. Having a white-collar occupation increases income by about 2 levels. Unlike the results discussed earlier, self-employment increases personal income of immigrants, but only by .18 levels, indicating a weak relationship.

Largely consistent with previously discussed findings, the second model (Model 2, Table 26) reveals that immigrants from all countries in the analysis tend to have a higher income than immigrants from Ukraine, except for immigrants from Russia, whose income is not significantly different. The effect of GNI remains negative and significant; immigrants originating in countries with GNI below \$4,000 tend to have income lower by .17 levels than immigrants from countries with higher GNI (Model 3, Table 26). Similarly, originating in countries where ethnic minorities account for at least 20 percent of the population decreases income by .44 levels (Model 4, Table 26). In addition, limited or no personal and political freedom in immigrants` countries of origin decreases immigrants' personal income by .66 and .62 levels, respectively (Model 5, Table 26).

The values of partial eta`s squared presented in Table 30 indicate that several predictors were able to independently account for a significant portion of the variation in personal income (length of stay = 3 percent; age = 8 percent; male = 10 percent; education = 5 percent). These predictors also received relatively large squared structure coefficients (between .176 and .371), accounting for 18 to 37 percent of observed effect.

Determinants of personal income for the three largest groups are presented in Table 27. The effect of most predictors is consistent with the results for the pooled sample. However, some predictors appear to have a stronger effect on income for some groups rather than others. For example, education increases income by .61 levels among immigrants from Russia, but only by .27 levels among immigrants from Poland. White-collar workers from Russia have income 2.59 levels higher than blue-collar workers. Among white-collar workers from Poland, however, income is higher by only 1.43 levels. The effect of self-employment on personal income is negative for all three groups, but the relationships are not statistically significant.

Poverty

The last indicator of socioeconomic adaptation tested in this dissertation was the poverty status. It was measured by income-to-poverty ratio. The U.S. Population Census provides the following definition of this measure: “People and families are classified as being in poverty if their income is less than their poverty threshold. If their income is less than half their poverty threshold, they are below 50 percent of poverty; less than the threshold itself, they are in poverty (below 100 percent of poverty); less than 1.25 times the threshold, below 125 percent of poverty, and so on. The greater the ratio of income to poverty, the more people fall under the category, because higher ratios include more people with higher incomes” (U.S. Population Census 2012). The original measure of poverty included in the dataset had 501 categories. Consistent with the definition above, it was originally coded so that higher values indicated lower poverty level. For a more

meaningful interpretation, the variable was reverse coded, so that higher values indicate higher poverty levels. Because the dependent variable is measured at the interval/ratio level, I used OLS regression and the “SURVEYREG” procedure to test the hypotheses.

Significant values of constants indicated a good fit for all five tested regression models (Table 28). All predictors included in the analysis explained between 23 and 24 percent of the variation in the level of poverty. Results presented in the first model (Table 28) indicate that the relationship between length of stay and poverty is negative; for each additional year in the U.S., the poverty decreases by 5 percent of the federal poverty level. Similarly, for each additional year of age, immigrants` poverty level decreases by 1 percent. Expectedly, male immigrants experience less poverty than female immigrants. On average, the poverty level among male immigrants is lower by 35 percent than among their female counterparts. Consistent with the hypothesis, married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. tend to experience poverty lower by 52 percent than unmarried immigrants. The pattern of regional differences suggests that immigrants living in West and South tend to experience higher poverty than immigrants in the Northeast, with the biggest gap between immigrants in the South and the Northeast. The effect of dummy variable Midwest did not reach statistical significance.

Immigrants surveyed in 2007 and 2009 are not significantly different in their poverty level from those surveyed in 2006. However, the 2008 cohort tend to experience less poverty than immigrants surveyed in 2006. Language skills seem to make a difference in immigrants` poverty level. As hypothesized, for each additional level of

English proficiency, poverty decreases by 21 percent of the federal poverty line. Similarly, as education increases by one level, the poverty level tends to decrease by about 10 percent. On average, the poverty level of white-collar workers is 63 percent lower than among blue-collar workers. On the contrary, self-employment appears to increase immigrants` poverty level by 11 percent.

The coefficients for countries of origin included in the second model indicate that, with an exception of immigrants from Albania, immigrants from all other countries tend to experience lower level of poverty than Ukrainian immigrants (Model 3, Table 28). This confirms the hypothesis that immigrants from economically disadvantaged countries may be less adapted socioeconomically in the United States. All country-level characteristics work in an expected direction (Models 3-5, Table 28). Immigrants from countries with GNI below \$4,000 tend to face higher poverty than immigrants from countries with higher GNI. Similarly, originating in ethnically more heterogeneous countries increases the poverty level among immigrants. Additionally, immigrants from countries characterized by limited or no personal freedom tend to experience higher poverty in the United States.

Based on the comparisons of partial eta's squared (η^2) in Table 30, it appears that length of stay, age, education, and white-collar occupation were each able to explain about 3 percent of the variation in the poverty status. All other variables in the analysis accounted for a lower amount of explained variance. Some of the predictors received relatively large squared structure coefficients (r_s^2), indicating they were able to individually account for a substantial percentage of observed effect, including the length

of stay (23 percent), marital status (14 percent), English proficiency (19 percent), education (40 percent), and occupation attainment (41 percent).

Results for individual groups are largely consistent with the findings for the pooled sample, with only few discrepancies in the strength of the effect of some predictors (Table 29). For instance, English proficiency decreases the poverty level by 31 percent among Ukrainian immigrants, but only by 17 percent among immigrants from Poland, and by 20 percent for the pooled sample. Similarly, holding a white-collar position decreases the poverty level of Polish immigrants by 44 percent. The same predictor, however, decreases the poverty level of immigrants from Ukraine by as much as 80 percent, and the poverty level of the pooled sample by 63 percent.

SUMMARY

Results indicate that new Eastern European immigrants tend to be highly educated. About 69 percent of respondents in the analysis completed some college, or held a college or advanced degree. This is comparable with educational attainment of foreign-born Asians, 71 percent of whom had some higher education (Yang 2011). About 46 percent of new Eastern European immigrants in this study had a bachelor's degree or higher. This is higher than 36 percent of all European immigrants with at least a bachelor's degree, or 28 percent of native-born adults who reached this educational level (Russell and Batalova 2012).

Results of this dissertation are consistent with the findings of Portes and Rumbaut (2006), who found that foreign-born individuals have very diverse educational

backgrounds. While some immigrant groups have education comparable to that of natives, other groups lag behind. Among new Eastern European immigrants, the overall educational level is relatively high, but differences across groups are apparent. For example, only 59 percent of immigrants from Poland had some higher education (some college, college degree, or advanced degree), followed by immigrants from Ukraine (77 percent) and Russia (83 percent). In addition, Bulgarians, Russians, Romanians, and immigrants from other countries combined had a higher educational attainment than immigrants from Ukraine, while the educational level of immigrants from Albania, Bosnia/Herzegovina, and Poland was lower.

Portes and Rumbaut (2006) considered a variety of factors when explaining differences in immigrants` educational attainment. In this dissertation, GNI, ethnic diversity, and personal and political freedom were all significant country-level predictors of immigrants` educational level. Several individual characteristics also appeared to be important, specifically English proficiency, length of stay, age, region, and gender. Robila (2010) found no significant gender difference in education among Eastern European groups, with an exception of Russian immigrants, among whom males tend to have lower education than females. The results of this dissertation contradict this finding, and suggest significant cross-group differences in educational attainment depending on gender. Results for the pooled sample and for the three largest groups indicate that male immigrants tend to have lower education than do their female counterparts.

The dependent variable measuring educational attainment does not distinguish between education obtained prior and after immigrating to the United States. Consequently, educational attainment was treated as cumulative, and education was expected to increase with time spent in the United States. The results, however, contradict this hypothesis, indicating a negative relationship between length of stay in the U.S. and education.

I was not able to determine immigrants` class of admission. According to the literature, this could be an important predictor of immigrants` educational level, since coming on an employment-based visa generally requires more human capital than coming as a refugee (Robila 2010). This assumption, albeit not tested, helps to explain lower educational attainment of immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Immigrants from this country originate in the region of former Yugoslavia, and may be more likely to emigrate as refugees, fleeing the economic hardship and political turmoil resulting from the war in the 1990s.

Results reveal a high rate of professionalization among new Eastern European immigrants: 53 percent of all respondents held a white-collar position, and 37 percent were professionals or managers. This suggests that new Eastern European immigrants tend to have an occupational background similar to foreign-born Asians, who are considered to include more professionals and managers than any other racial and ethnic group, and 36 percent of whom are professionals or managers (Yang 2011).

Considering that very little is known about the occupational background of new Eastern Europeans, I examined determinants of two measures of occupational attainment to ascertain possible differences. Interestingly, regression analyses yielded similar results, indicating that the propensity of being a white-collar worker or a professional/manager is influenced by the same factors.

Portes and Rumbaut (2006) found that occupational attainment of American immigrants is just as diverse as their education. Generally, however, groups that are more educated are more likely to include a larger proportion of professionals and managers. In this dissertation, the analysis of occupational background among immigrants from Poland, Russia, and Ukraine indicates significant cross-group differences. Russian immigrants tend to have higher educational attainment, corresponding to their higher rate of professionalization – 49 percent of Russian immigrants were professionals or managers, and 66 percent held a white-collar job. Ukrainian immigrants lagged behind Russians in their educational attainment, and were less likely to be professionals or managers (38 percent), or to hold a white-collar job (54 percent). Being the least educated among the three groups, Polish immigrants tended to have the lowest occupational attainment; their rate of professionalization was only 27 percent, and only 41 percent held a white-collar job.

Researchers attribute occupational diversity among American immigrants to structural factors, such as U.S. immigration or refugee policies, or the demand for labor by American employers (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). On the individual level, educational

attainment (Portes and Rumbaut 2006) and length of stay in the United States (Robila 2010) have been recognized as some of the most important predictors of occupational achievements. In this study, the effect of education and length of stay was positive and significant, as expected. However, both predictors received low partial eta squared (.011 and .000, respectively). Based on the values of effect size, gender (.033) and English proficiency (.020) accounted for a slightly greater portion of observed effect.

Results further indicate that 12 percent of new Eastern European immigrants were self-employed. This is comparable to the self-employment rate among foreign-born Asians (11 percent), native-born non-Hispanic whites (10 percent), natives in general (11.7 percent), or American immigrants in general (11.5 percent) (Camarota 2012; Yang 2011). Generally, it is believed that self-employed immigrants tend to have higher earnings than their counterparts working for wages, making self-employment an important indicator of upward socioeconomic mobility (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006). Among new Eastern European immigrants, the propensity for self-employment was actually higher among those who were less educated, suggesting that entrepreneurs may not necessarily adapt better socioeconomically. In addition, there are variations in the rate of self-employment across immigrant groups. The analysis of cross-country differences in this dissertation reveals that immigrants from Poland were more likely to be self-employed (14 percent) than immigrants from Russia and Ukraine (11 percent).

The average personal income of new Eastern European immigrants was \$35,900. This is almost \$12,000 lower than the average income of foreign-born Asians (Yang

2011). Income of Eastern Europeans is comparable to earnings of Vietnamese immigrants (\$37,976), and it is somewhat higher than the average income of Hispanics and blacks (\$29,694 and \$28,471, respectively) (Yang 2011). This finding is surprising, considering high educational attainment of immigrants from Eastern Europe. According to Robila (2010), one possible explanation of the discrepancy between education and income is that Eastern Europeans are relatively recent immigrants. A limited awareness of their needs as immigrants, stemming from their racial similarity with the white majority, can be another reason for their lower economic success. The unique immigration history of Eastern European immigrants can also affect their socioeconomic adaptation: the flow of immigrants from Eastern Europe has been interrupted for many years during the communist period, unlike the immigration from Asia, which has been relatively continuous (Robila 2010). Yet another explanation could be a different set of values and priorities internalized by these immigrants. Results from the previous chapter indicate that the average age among new Eastern Europeans is 41, suggesting that many of them were born and raised either before, or shortly after the fall of communism, and were subjected to communist ideology at some point in their life. It is unlikely that competitiveness, assertiveness, individualism, and other American values were emphasized by their parents or educators. As a result, the competitive labor market in the U.S. may pose significant challenges for these immigrants.

Portes and Rumbaut (2006) found significant differences in income levels among foreign-born. According to these authors, length of stay in the United States, education,

occupational attainment, age, and English fluency all affect earnings, and were found to be among the most significant predictors of income in this dissertation. All groups in the analysis tended to have higher income than immigrants from Ukraine, except for Albanian and Russian immigrants, whose income was not significantly different. This is interesting, considering that Albanians are among the least established Eastern European groups in the United States, with 93 percent of these immigrants being the most likely to have arrived since 1990 (Russell and Batalova 2012). Consistent with the findings of existing literature (Robila 2010), gender difference in income was significant when tested for the pooled sample, and separately for individual countries.

About 11 percent of all Eastern European immigrants are classified as severely poor, poor, or near poor. This finding is consistent across the three largest Eastern European groups: 9 percent of Polish immigrants and 14 percent of Russian and Ukrainian immigrants fall within these categories. A substantial percentage of respondents fall in the category “high income,” represented by 38 percent of Polish immigrants, 41 percent of Ukrainian immigrants, and 50 percent of immigrants from Russia. Researchers claim that immigrants who experience higher levels of poverty tend to originate in countries of the former Soviet Union (Robila 2010). Findings of this dissertation to some extent support this argument. Immigrants from two former Soviet Union countries - Russia and Ukraine - are more likely to be severely poor, poor, or near poor (14 percent) than immigrants from Poland (9 percent). In addition, except for

Albania, immigrants from all other countries in the analysis tend to experience less poverty than immigrants from Ukraine.

The above discussed findings indicate that the segmented assimilation theory proposed by Portes and Zhou (1993) may be the most applicable to explain socioeconomic adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. While the overall socioeconomic status of these immigrants is relatively high, cross-group differences suggest that upward mobility is not a norm for all groups, and different groups tend to follow different adaptation trajectories. Robila (2010) attributes differences in socioeconomic status to the diverse socioeconomic and historical backgrounds of Eastern European countries. According to this author, immigrants from former Soviet Baltic countries (Latvia and Lithuania) tend to fare better socioeconomically than immigrants from the rest of the former Soviet Union and countries of former Yugoslavia. While some Eastern European groups have achieved socioeconomic mobility, the socioeconomic struggles faced by immigrants from some countries of Eastern Europe (e.g. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina) are comparable to the experiences of immigrants from Mexico. Due to scarcity of research on new Eastern European immigrants, there is no general awareness of the diversity in their socioeconomic situation, and their needs as immigrants.

CHAPTER VII

STRUCTURAL ADAPTATION

Structural adaptation is another adaptation dimension examined in this dissertation. Some indicators of structural adaptation commonly examined by researchers include residential segregation or integration of immigrants (Massey and Denton 1985). Changes in intergenerational relations, delinquency of immigrant children, interaction with other racial/ethnic groups, interracial friendships, or interaction in workplace have been also examined (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008; Thapa-Oli 2011; Yang 2011). Due to scarcity of empirical data available to examine these aspects, the focus of this chapter is on immigrants` memberships in community-based organizations, which is a form of civic engagement (DeSipio 2011). An interaction with neighbors in residential neighborhoods, which reveals the pattern of social interaction and socialization at the individual level, is another measure of structural adaptation examined in this study (White and Sassler 2000).

The limited literature on immigrants` civic engagement documents that contemporary immigrants seek to engage in the civic life in the United States, even though their level of engagement tends to be lower than that of native-born Americans (DeSipio 2011; Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010). Researchers identified several indicators of civic and community engagement among immigrants. According to DeSipio (2011), these include both passive activities (such as watching news), and active

behaviors (memberships or leadership roles in various organizations, contributing time and money to political candidates, or running for an office). Memberships in community-based organizations might be a particularly attractive form of civic engagement for new Eastern European immigrants, because it is open to noncitizens, and oftentimes requires only limited investment of time and resources. This dissertation will examine Eastern European immigrants` memberships in school groups, neighborhood and community organizations, service and civic organizations, sports and recreation organizations, and religious and other organizations. Some of these institutions might particularly attract new Eastern European immigrants. Schools, for example, are commonly present in communities, and participation in school organizations does not require social networks that immigrants often lack (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2006). Generally, religion plays an important role in immigrants` life by providing a sense of belonging to a group or a community (Robila 2010). Eastern Europeans originate in relatively religious countries, even though religions were suppressed during the communist regime. Therefore, participation in religious organizations might be an important form of civic engagement among these immigrants, facilitating their structural adaptation.

Structural adaptation has been described as a multidimensional process, which involves assimilation into a variety of social groups, including the workplace, school, or other settings (Gordon 1964; Yang 2011). Residential interaction and formation of meaningful interpersonal relations, however, is key to successful structural adaptation

(Vang 2012; White and Sassler 2000). An examination of interaction with neighbors in residential neighborhoods can reveal the extent to which new Eastern European immigrants are residentially marginalized, and indicate their willingness or hesitancy to interact, socialize, and form friendships with others. Iceland and Scopilliti (2008) found that, among the foreign born, white immigrants tend to experience the highest degree of neighborhood integration. Therefore, new Eastern Europeans should have a high likelihood of interaction with their neighbors. In addition to racial or ethnic backgrounds, various individual and country-level characteristics are important predictors of spatial adaptation, and will be tested in this study.

This chapter will attempt to answer the following two research questions: First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt structurally to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of structural adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States?

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The 2008-2010 Civic Engagement Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CES-CPS) was used in the analysis. Table 31 presents descriptive statistics for the pooled sample of Eastern European immigrants, including means and standard deviations of the dependent variables in this chapter. The examination of organizational memberships and levels of interaction in residential neighborhoods assessed the level of structural adaptation. Several dichotomous variables measuring memberships in various organizations were dummy coded and combined into a scale. The scale had six

categories, ranging from 0 for no participation, to 5 for total participation. The categories were combined into a single dummy variable, with category 0 indicating no participation, and 1 indicating participation in at least one organization (combining categories 1 to 5 from the scale). Results reveal that 20 percent of respondents were members of a civic organization. The analysis of dummy variables for individual organizations further shows that respondents were the most likely to be members of religious organizations (9 percent), followed by school or sports organizations (6 percent each). Among the three separately analyzed groups (Table 32), immigrants from Ukraine were the most likely to participate in at least one civic organization (22 percent), but their level of participation was higher than the overall average only by 2 percent. Polish immigrants were 6 percent less likely to participate in any civic organization than were immigrants overall. Further examination reveals additional cross-group differences in structural adaptation. Similar to the pooled sample of all Eastern Europeans, immigrants from Ukraine and Poland participated predominantly in religious organizations. Immigrants from Russia, however, were more likely to participate in school organizations.

The dependent variable measuring interaction in residential neighborhoods was a scale created by combining two ordinal predictors - frequency of talking to neighbors, and frequency of doing favors for neighbors. The original variables were reverse coded, so that a higher score indicated more frequent contact with neighbors (coded 1 for no contact with neighbors and 5 for daily contact with neighbors). Descriptive statistics of the two variables composing the scale are presented in Tables 31 and 32. Results for the

pooled sample reveal that the highest percentage of immigrants talked to their neighbors a few times a week (28 percent). Surprisingly, however, almost half of the sample (45 percent) reported doing no favors for their neighbors. About 62 percent of respondents in the pooled sample reported talking to their neighbors between a few times a month and every day, but only 29 percent did favors for their neighbors at least few times a month. Interaction in residential neighborhoods did not differ across groups. Immigrants from all four separately examined countries tended to talk to their neighbors a few times a week, but they were unlikely to do each other favors. For example, 61 percent of immigrants from Russia reported talking to their neighbors a few times a month to every day, but only 25 percent indicated doing favors for their neighbors at least few times a month.

The following predictors of structural adaptation were used in the analysis: length of stay in the U.S., age, gender, marital status and presence of spouse in the U. S., region, survey year, education, occupation, entrepreneurship, and three characteristics of immigrants` countries of origin (gross national income, ethnic diversity, and personal/political freedom). According to researchers, English language fluency and income might be other important predictors of structural adaptation (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008; Stoll and Wong 2007). However, I was unable to examine the effect of these variables. There was no measure of English proficiency available in the dataset, and the available income variables only applied to respondents interviewed in selected years, and thus substantially decreased the sample size if included in the analysis.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Multiple ways were used to assess the strength of the relationships between variables in the analysis. Bivariate correlation coefficients and the values of VIF and tolerance indicated no multicollinearity. All coefficients were within an expected range, and did not exceed the .600 cutting point.

WEIGHTING

The personal weight variable used in the analysis of structural adaptation had four implied decimal places (the decimal point was not included). Using the weighting variable in its original form would result in an extremely high sample size. Therefore, to obtain valid results, the original variable was divided by 10,000 to allow for an analysis in units (individuals).

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

The measure of organizational memberships was recoded into a dummy variable, therefore I used logistic regression to examine this aspect of structural adaptation. The procedure “SURVEYLOGISTIC” available in the statistical software SAS was used to conduct multivariate analyses and to account for potential issues associated with weighting complex survey samples, and to assure correct standard errors. OLS regression was used to examine immigrants` interaction with their neighbors. This is an appropriate statistical technique to use when the dependent variable is ordinal, and it was tested using the SAS procedure “SURVEYREG.”

Each regression model was screened for possible outliers. Because extreme cases did not alter the results, these were not excluded from the analysis. The histogram and scatterplot confirmed that all OLS regression assumptions were met, therefore I will proceed to the interpretation of regression results for each dependent variable.

Organizational Memberships

Five regression models were tested to assess the effect of independent variables on the likelihood of memberships in civic organizations (Table 33). The values of pseudo R² show that all predictors in the analysis explain between 5 and 8 percent of the variation in the likelihood of civic memberships.

The intercepts are significant at the .05 level, indicating that models fit the data well. However, with an exception of variables Albania and GNI, predictors did not reach statistical significance. This can be attributed to a relatively small sample size available for the analysis of this dependent variable (N=464). Using a small sample size to test the effect of multiple predictors (e.g., 12 predictors in Model 1; 19 in Model 2; 13 in Models 3 and 4; and 14 in Model 5) decreases the likelihood of significant results. Even though the effect of most predictors is not significant at the conventional .05 level, I will interpret the magnitudes and directions of the relationships to illustrate the nature of the relationships between the predictors and the likelihood of organizational memberships. The methodological limitation notwithstanding, this analysis provides an important, preliminary insight into the structural adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants, and should be further studied if a larger sample size becomes available.

Consistent with my hypothesis, length of residence in the U.S. appears to increase the odds of organizational memberships (Model 1, Table 33). Specifically, for each additional year of stay in the U.S., immigrants are 3 percent more likely to participate in a civic organization. The relationship is not significant at the .05 level, but the direction is as expected. Memberships in civic organizations were found to be correlated with the degree of acculturation (Ong and Scott 2008). Consequently, it is not surprising that recent immigrants who are the least acculturated tend to have a lower likelihood of participation in civic organizations than later, more acculturated immigrants.

Immigrants' age is negatively related to organizational memberships, but the value of odds ratio suggests a weak relationship that is not significant at the .05 level. Controlling for other predictors in the model, each additional year of age decreases the likelihood of participating in a civic organization by less than 1 percent. This result corresponds to my expectation, and to the findings of existing literature pointing to a higher likelihood of civic engagement among immigrants aged 30 to 54 and a decreased likelihood in older ages (Ong and Scott 2008).

Contradicting the initial hypothesis, the likelihood of being a member of a civic organization is 26 percent lower for males than for females, but the effect of gender is not significant. Researchers believe that female immigrants often give priority to domestic activities, such as taking care of the family, and thus are less likely to engage in civic life (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010). This pattern is apparently not applicable to Eastern European immigrant women. If measured differently, perhaps males would show

a higher degree of structural adaptation than females. For example, researchers found that males are more likely to be interested in politics, or assume leadership positions within civic organizations (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010). These measures of structural adaptation were not available in the datasets, therefore could not be tested. The relationship between marital status and organizational memberships is not statistically significant, but the direction is as expected: married immigrants whose spouse is present in the United States are 50 percent more likely to be members of a civic organization than their respective counterparts. Perhaps married immigrants who are accompanied by their spouse, and possibly children, have stronger ties to the United States than immigrants in other categories of marital status, explaining their higher level of structural adaptation.

Immigrants in the West are about 60 percent more likely to participate in a civic organization than their Northern counterparts, whereas the likelihood of participation is lower among immigrants in the South and Midwest by 3 and 12 percent, respectively. The directions support my hypothesis about regional differences in structural adaptation, but fail to reach statistical significance, and therefore lend limited support to my expectation that immigrants in the Northeast show a highest degree of civic engagement. As I expected, civic engagement tends to be higher for later cohorts, with immigrants surveyed in 2009 and 2010 having a higher likelihood of organizational memberships than those surveyed in 2008. These results, however, are not statistically significant, and the changes in the likelihood of civic participation over time should be further tested.

Researchers found that engagement in civic life increases with socioeconomic status of immigrants (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010; Ramirez and Felix 2010). One plausible explanation for this finding is that civic engagement oftentimes requires time, resources, and abilities to engage in collective action (DeSipio 2011). In this study, all indicators of socioeconomic status appear to increase civic engagement, but their effect is not significant at the conventional .05 level. Education appears to be the strongest predictor, with each year of education resulting in a 10 percent increase in the likelihood of organizational memberships. As hypothesized, white-collar workers and self-employed immigrants also tend to have a higher likelihood of organizational memberships than their respective counterparts.

The odds ratios presented in Model 2 (Table 33) reveal the effect of countries of origin on immigrants` organizational memberships. Albanians, Romanians, and Bulgarians are more likely to be members of a civic organization than Ukrainian immigrants, whereas immigrants from Poland, Bosnia/Herzegovina, Russia, and other countries combined are less likely to be civically engaged. These findings, albeit not statistically significant, point to important cross-country differences in structural adaptation, and are further supported by the results of the remaining three regression models.

Gross national income in countries of origin appears to affect immigrants` organizational memberships, the relationship being significant at the .05 level (Model 3, Table 33). Specifically, the likelihood of being a member of a civic organization is 87

percent higher among immigrants from countries with GNI lower than \$4,000 than among their counterparts from countries with higher GNI. Ethnic diversity in countries of origin appears to increase the likelihood of organizational memberships by 5 percent, but the effect of this predictor is not statistically significant (Model 4, Table 33). The effect of personal and political freedom on immigrants` organizational memberships is also statistically insignificant, but the direction partially supports my hypothesis. Originating in a partly free country increases the likelihood of involvement in a civic organization by 70 percent. However, originating in an unfree country lowers the odds of civic engagement by 3 percent. The analysis of country-level characteristics indicates that originating in economically and politically less stable countries that are ethnically heterogeneous increases immigrants` civic engagement in the United States, and facilitates their structural adaptation. Contradicting my initial hypothesis, this finding reveals that immigrants who experienced economic hardship or some degree of discrimination, whereby it was not plausible for them to return to their home countries, tended to achieve a higher degree of structural adaptation in the United States.

The value of partial eta squared (η^2) for each predictor was calculated using the formula introduced by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). This measure of effect size allows further testing of the effect of individual independent variables on the dependent variable, and the extent to which individual predictors are able to explain the variance in the dependent variable (Table 35). It appears that, with exception for dummy variables West and Albania included in the second model, all other independent variables are relatively

weak predictors of organizational memberships, explaining no more than 1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Cross-group differences in organizational memberships were not examined, because the sample sizes for individual countries were relatively small: Ukraine (N= 53), Russia (N=86), Poland (N=118). Due to small sample sizes, the validity of results could not be assured.

Interaction with Neighbors

Regression models testing the effect of predictors on neighborhood interactions are presented in Table 34. The significant values of F tests indicate a good fit for the data. The values of constants suggest that, controlling for all predictors, respondents tend to interact with their neighbors few times a week. Based on the values of coefficient of determination (R^2), around 5 percent of the variation in the frequency of interaction with neighbors is explained by all independent variables.

Similarly to the findings presented above, most of the results in Table 34 are not significant at the conventional .05 level. While acknowledging this limitation, I will discuss the directions and magnitudes of the relationships, and propose that these should be further tested when larger sample sizes become available.

Consistent with the hypothesis, length of stay in the U.S. is positively related to frequency of interaction with one's neighbors. It appears that for each additional year immigrants reside in the United States, they are more likely to interact with their neighbors by a .05 level (Model 1, Table 34). Although the relationship is not statistically

significant, it confirms the expectation that as immigrants become more familiar with local norms and as their English language ability improves, they may become more comfortable interacting with their neighbors (Vang 2012). The effect of age is expectedly negative; for each year increase in age, the frequency of interaction with neighbors decreases very slightly – by .01 levels – indicating an insignificant relationship. Since older immigrants are less likely to adopt the host society's language, customs, norms, and values than younger immigrants, this result is not surprising.

Males tend to interact with their neighbors less frequently than females, but only by .09 levels. This unexpected, insignificant result could be explained by limited English proficiency and acculturation among immigrant males, which is an important precondition to successful structural adaptation. Highly consistent with the hypothesis, being married increases the frequency of interaction with neighbors by .625 levels, the relationship being significant at the .05 level. Marriage and presence of spouse might increase neighborhood integration among new Eastern European immigrants by promoting their acculturation and increasing socioeconomic status.

An emerging pattern of regional differences in interaction with neighbors is consistent with my prediction, but insignificant coefficients warrant further investigation. Controlling for other variables, it appears that immigrants living in the West, South, and Midwest interact with neighbors less frequently than immigrants in the Northeast. This finding corresponds to a relatively high degree of acculturation and high socioeconomic attainment among immigrants in the Northeast, relative to their counterparts in other

regions. Immigrants surveyed in 2009 tend to interact with neighbors more frequently, while immigrants interviewed in 2010 show a lower frequency of interaction with neighbors than the 2008 cohort. This finding does not reach statistical significance, and contradicts the expectation about better neighborhood integration of each subsequent immigrant cohort.

Researchers found that higher socioeconomic status accompanies better neighborhood integration (Clark 2007; Iceland and Wilkes 2006). Consistent with existing findings, results of this study show a positive effect of all measures of socioeconomic status on interaction with neighbors, but the estimates are not significant at the conventional .05 level. As hypothesized, each additional year of education increases the frequency of interaction with neighbors, but only by a .01 level. Unexpectedly, holding a white-collar job decreases the frequency of interaction with neighbors by a .30 level, controlling for other predictors. Because this result was inconsistent with the effect of other socioeconomic predictors, I tested the variable professional or managerial occupation to further examine the effect of occupational status. Expectedly, professionals and managers tended to interact with their neighbors more frequently than respondents in other occupational categories by a .06 level (this result is not included in Table 34). The effect of self-employment is also expected. Entrepreneurship increases the frequency of interaction with neighbors by .35 level.

In addition to previously discussed predictors, Model 2 (Table 34) includes the dummy variables for individual countries. Results reveal wide cross-group differences,

with immigrants from Albania, Poland, Romania, and other countries combined having a more frequent contact with their neighbors, and immigrants from Bosnia/Herzegovina, Russia, and Bulgaria interacting with their neighbors less frequently than immigrants from Ukraine. Because these relationships are not statistically significant, further examination is needed.

To better understand cross-group differences in interaction with neighbors, I tested the effect of three country-level predictors examined in previous chapters. Model 3 (Table 34) presents the effect of gross national income. It appears that immigrants from countries with GNI below \$4,000 interact with their neighbors more frequently than do immigrants from economically stronger countries, but the effect is not statistically significant. An unexpected direction of the relationship suggests that originating in economically less developed countries may not necessarily decrease the level of immigrants' structural adaptation.

The effect of other country-level characteristics is consistent with my predictions, but also fails to reach statistical significance. Controlling for other variables in the analysis, originating in ethnically more diverse countries appears to decrease the level of structural adaptation measured by frequency of interaction with neighbors (Model 4, Table 34). Lastly, originating in partly free or unfree countries also decreases the frequency of interaction with neighbors (Model 5, Table 34).

The values of partial eta squared (η^2) are presented in Table 35. Except for age, all other predictors were associated with a weak effect. Age was able to explain about 15

percent of the variation in the dependent variable, suggesting a moderate effect ($\eta^2=.149$). Education was the second strongest predictor, and accounted for 8 percent of the variation ($\eta^2=.079$), followed by 5 percent of the variation explained by the variable length of residence ($\eta^2=.047$).

Next, I consulted standardized regression coefficients (β) and squared structure coefficients (r_s^2) for further examination of the effects of individual predictors on the dependent variable (Tables 34 and 35). The results reveal no discrepancies between the values of standardized regression coefficients and squared structure coefficients. Among continuous predictors, year of immigration and age received the largest standardized coefficient. Similarly, relatively high values of squared structure coefficients associated with these two variables indicated that length of stay in the U.S. explained about 9 percent of the variation in the dependent variable, followed by 4 percent of the variance explained by age. Among dichotomous predictors, marital status was associated with the highest value of β , and received the highest structure coefficient. This predictor accounted for approximately 40 percent of the variation in interaction with neighbors.

SUMMARY

Participation in civic organizations is an important aspect of structural adaptation examined in this dissertation. According to researchers, organizational memberships, or any other form of civic engagement, are very beneficial to immigrants on many levels. Not only does this type of engagement promote socioeconomic mobility, but it also leads to greater happiness and better health (Putnam 2000; Stoll and Wong 2007). Importantly,

over time, civic engagement usually increases political participation (Stoll and Wong 2007). Therefore, organizational memberships not only facilitate the process of structural adaptation, but potentially also help to achieve higher stages of overall adaptation.

The results indicate that 1 in 5 immigrants was a member of a civic organization. Researchers found that certain civic institutions, such as schools or religious organizations, are particularly attractive for immigrants. On the contrary, institutions that require more investment of time and money are less popular (DeSipio 2011). Consistent with this finding, religious and school organizations were preferred by immigrants, with the highest percentage of immigrants participating in these organizations.

As part of the structural adaptation, researchers have been interested in examining how well immigrants are integrated within their neighborhoods (Iceland and Scopillini 2008; Thapa-Oli 2011; Yang 2011). Supposedly, the more integrated immigrants are, the better they adapt structurally. Frequency of interaction with neighbors was the only available measure of neighborhood integration among new Eastern European immigrants. Results indicate that respondents reached a substantial degree of structural adaptation measured by the frequency of discussions with neighbors, but not by the frequency of exchanging favors with neighbors. While 1 in 4 respondents talked to their neighbors few times a week, almost half claimed not to exchange favors with their neighbors.

Researchers recognized wide variations among different ethnic groups in their structural adaptation. For example, Iceland and Scopilliti (2008) found differences in neighborhood integration depending on ethnic background, and concluded that individual

characteristics of immigrants largely account for these variations. Regardless of their individual characteristics, various immigrant groups might experience neighborhood integration differently, as it has become increasingly complex. While early immigrants tended to uniformly settle in the cities, this pattern is not always applicable to contemporary immigrants, many of whom move directly to suburbs. It is important to comprehend cross-group disparities in structural adaptation, because these disparities help to perpetuate inequalities (Stoll and Wong 2007). Results of this study show clear differences in organizational memberships and neighborhood interactions across Eastern European groups. Thus, it is crucial to examine not only the level of their structural adaptation, but also its determinants.

The effect of most predictors in the analysis did not reach statistical significance at the conventional .05 level. However, the directions of relationships and magnitudes of regression coefficients provide an important preliminary insight into the degree of structural adaptation among new Eastern European immigrants.

Existing studies found that length of stay in the United States is an important predictor of structural adaptation. The longer immigrants reside in the U.S., the more integrated they tend to be within their neighborhoods. Better adjusted immigrants are also more likely to participate in political and professional organizations than recent immigrants (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008; Jones 2003; White and Glick 1999). Consistent with these findings, as length of residence in the U.S. increases, Eastern European

immigrants are more likely to participate in civic organizations, and interact with their neighbors more frequently.

New Eastern European immigrants differ in the degree of structural adaptation depending on their age. Older immigrants tend to interact with their neighbors less frequently, and are less likely to engage in civic institutions. This is not surprising, considering the findings discussed in previous chapters. Older immigrants tend to be less proficient in English, which can subsequently constrain their social networks, and result in a lower degree of structural adaptation.

The research on gender differences in structural adaptation is inconclusive, and the degree of structural adaptation has been found to depend on the type of activity. For example, women are more likely to volunteer, while men tend to be more interested in following current events and politics (Finlay et al. 2011). The results of this study point to a lower degree of structural adaptation among men than among women: men tend to interact with their neighbors less frequently, and are less likely to be members of civic organizations than women. The dataset only included these two measures of structural adaptation. Therefore, I could not examine if men adapt better structurally, if structural adaptation is measured by different indicators.

Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. adapt better structurally than non-married immigrants. There are several explanations for this finding. Having a spouse (and possibly children) increases the likelihood of direct contact with the native-born population through schools or other institutions. Marriage may help immigrants to

expand their networks and secure access to non-immigrant communities and civic organizations. Additionally, married immigrants tend to be better acculturated and have higher socioeconomic status than non-married immigrants, providing resources necessary for civic engagement.

Researchers suggest that size of immigrant communities is positively related to the degree of structural adaptation among immigrants (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008). Following this argument, Eastern Europeans in the Northeast should reach the highest degree of structural adaptation, because the new immigrants from Eastern Europe tend to concentrate in this region. Partially supporting this expectation, the results indicate that immigrants in the Northeast tend to have more frequent contact with their neighbors than their counterparts living in other regions. However, the likelihood of organizational memberships is higher among immigrants in the West, which is the region with the second highest population of new Eastern Europeans.

Researchers have recognized that human capital and resources are closely linked to the degree of structural adaptation (Putnam 2000). For example, socioeconomic status of immigrants is positively related to their neighborhood integration (Clark 2007; Iceland and Scopilliti 2008). Of all socioeconomic indicators included in the analysis, the effect of education is consistent with this finding. Immigrants who are better educated tend to have more frequent contact with their neighbors, and are more likely to be members of civic organizations than less educated immigrants. A higher degree of structural adaptation among immigrants with more education can be attributed to their better access

to institutions and wider social networks (Putnam 1995). Self-employment, another indicator of higher socioeconomic status, also increases immigrants` level of structural adaptation. Entrepreneurs are perceived as having certain demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, such as being older, married, wealthy, and college educated (Moutray 2007). Some of these characteristics might contribute to their higher community involvement and better structural adaptation. The effect of occupational status is partially consistent with the proposed hypothesis. Immigrants holding white-collar occupations are more likely to participate in civic organizations, but interact with their neighbors less frequently. However, professionals and managers seem to adapt better structurally than white-collar workers – not only are they more likely to participate in civic organizations, but they also tend to interact with their neighbors more frequently.

In addition to immigrants` individual characteristics, country-level variables further impact structural adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. Interestingly, the socioeconomic background of countries of origin appears to work in an opposite direction as expected. Immigrants who originate in countries with low gross national income adapt better structurally than immigrants from economically stronger countries. One possible explanation for this finding is that these immigrants are more involved in their communities because they may intend to stay in the U.S. permanently, as it is less desirable for them to return to their home countries. In addition, more ethnic diversity in a country of origin decreases the frequency of interaction with neighbors, but increases

the likelihood of participation in civic organizations. Immigrants also adapt less well structurally if personal and political freedoms in their countries of origin is limited.

This chapter reveals that new Eastern European immigrants are partially adapted structurally in the United States. They show some degree of participation in civic organizations, and are open to interacting with others in their neighborhood communities. At the same time, it appears that a variety of individual and country-level factors influence the level of immigrants` structural adaptation. In addition, the overall picture of relatively high structural involvement conceals cross-group differences, and suggests pluralism, rather than uniformity in structural adaptation outcomes among new Eastern European immigrants.

CHAPTER VIII

POLITICAL ADAPTATION

Early twentieth century Eastern European immigrants to the United States tended to have limited educational backgrounds and occupational skills, and most of them never intended to settle in the United States permanently. As a result, these immigrants were more interested in political issues in their homelands than in the United States, or lacked political consciousness altogether (Bloemraad 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). The results of the previous chapters indicate that new Eastern European immigrants are better educated and more skilled than their predecessors, and thus should adapt better politically in the United States. At the same time, political adaptation of many recent Eastern European immigrants might be impacted by their experiences of oppressive communist regimes and limited political freedom in their countries of origin prior to 1991. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern Europeans and the possible effect of a variety of factors, including their origins in post-communist countries, on their adaptation process in the United States.

Much research has been devoted to the examination of immigrants` cultural and socioeconomic adaptation. However, research on the political adaptation of immigrants is very limited (Mahler and Siemiatycki 2011; Yang 1994, 2002, 2011). While political adaptation encompasses a variety of processes, one of the most important indicators of this adaptation dimension is citizenship acquisition. Changing citizenship is a first step

towards other forms of political involvement, and “signifies the shift of immigrants` allegiances and commitment to the receiving country, and therefore it also measures the extent to which the American system can absorb immigrants or, from the perspective of immigrants themselves, the extent to which immigrants are willing to become an integral part of American society” (Yang 1994: 449). Citizenship guarantees immigrants the same legal rights and protections as those granted to the native born. Other benefits include civil, social, and political rights, such as voting or eligibility to run for elected offices. Citizenship also facilitates family reunification and immigration of relatives. It provides eligibility for a U.S. passport, and unlocks broader employment, welfare, or educational benefits and opportunities (Bloemraad 2006; Rallu 2011; Simpson-Bueker 2005; Yang 1994).

Citizenship acquisition is a critical and necessary step if immigrants aspire to pursue other forms of political incorporation, most importantly, the right to vote (DeSipio 2011; Pantoja and Gershon 2006). Voting “is the path by which immigrant groups become political communities with the power to alter the American political system, gain representation, and influence the distribution of resources” (Simpson-Bueker 2005). Additionally, voting is an important indicator of political adaptation because, while incentives associated with citizenship acquisition are obvious and immediate, incentives to vote might not be. Thus, immigrants who register to vote, and then actually turn out at the polls, can be considered well adapted politically in American society (Simpson-Bueker 2005).

Researchers recognized that political adaptation of immigrants is influenced by a combination of factors operating at both the individual and country level. While personal characteristics, such as length of stay in the U.S., age, or education play a role in making political decisions, broader contextual factors also influence political adaptation among immigrants (Bloemraad 2006; Pantoja and Gershon 2006). According to the contextual perspective proposed by Yang (1994), three categories of factors potentially affect immigrants` citizenship acquisition: socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of immigrants, social contexts in immigrants` countries of origin, and immigrants` communities in the United States. Yang (1994) tested the applicability of this framework to explaining the experiences of Asian immigrants. The dataset used in this dissertation allows further testing of this framework, and assessing its relevance to explain political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants.

This chapter will be guided by the following two research questions: First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt politically to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States? The following sections describe the data, samples, and present the results of descriptive and multivariate analyses.

SAMPLES

To answer the research questions, I used the 2002-2010 Voting and Registration Supplement of the Current Population Survey (VRS-CPS), which is available biennially. I tested several approaches when constructing the sample. Initially, I merged years 2008

and 2010 because these years were used in the analysis of other dimensions of immigrants` adaptation. The year 2006 could not be included, because the coding of the variable country of birth was inconsistent with the later datasets and merging would result in loss of cases. After restricting the 2008-2010 sample to the dependent variable citizenship acquisition, voter registration, and voting, the sample sizes were relatively small (citizenship acquisition: N = 599; voter registration: N = 143, voting: N = 251). One strategy to increase the number of cases was to add years 2006, 2004, and 2002. Doing so increased the sample sizes (citizenship acquisition: N = 1,101; voter registration: N = 239, voting: N = 392). However, not all Eastern European countries were available in the earlier years, and combining five consecutive years of the supplement eliminated the following countries from the analysis: Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, and Moldova. This disadvantage notwithstanding, merging five years of the supplement proved to be the best strategy, considering the significant increase in sample sizes for each dependent variable.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 36 provides the central tendencies and standard deviations of the dependent variables used in the analysis of political adaptation for the pooled sample and for the individual countries. Three indicators were used to measure the degree of political adaptation: citizenship acquisition (coded 1 for being citizen by naturalization, and 0 for otherwise); voter registration (coded 1 for being registered to vote, and 0 for otherwise); and voting (coded 1 for having voted in elections, and 0 for otherwise). The results

indicated that about 44 percent of Eastern European immigrants in the sample who were eligible for naturalization had become naturalized U.S. citizens, and 56 percent chose either not to change their citizenship, or postponed the naturalization process. Table 36 further reveals cross-country differences in the propensity to naturalize. Among the three separately examined countries, Russian immigrants were the most likely to acquire American citizenship, with 53 percent of these immigrants being American citizens by naturalization. About 48 percent of Ukrainian immigrants changed their citizenship, indicating their above-average propensity for naturalization. However, only 35 percent of immigrants from Poland were naturalized, registering the lowest likelihood of citizenship acquisition among the three groups.

The above discussed descriptive statistics include immigrants who did not meet the five-year residency requirement at the time of interview, and were thus ineligible for naturalization. Therefore, their inclusion in the calculation underestimates naturalization rates. To get a more accurate estimate, I used the 2002-2010 VRS-CPS to determine naturalization rates of only those respondents who immigrated to the United States between 1991 and 1997, excluding those who immigrated later (Table 37). The pattern of citizenship acquisition remained the same, with Russian immigrants being the most likely to acquire citizenship, and Polish immigrants the least likely to do so. After excluding recent immigrants, naturalization rates naturally increased. The results presented in Table 37 indicate that 60 percent of immigrants who arrived between 1990 and 1997 had become U.S. citizens by 2002-2010. Russian immigrants had the highest

propensity to naturalize (72 percent), followed by immigrants from Ukraine (66 percent), and Poland (48 percent.)

Table 36 further demonstrates that about 37 percent of all immigrants who were naturalized American citizens voted in elections. This is lower than the voting likelihood of immigrants from Ukraine (46 percent), and Russia (38 percent). It appears that Polish immigrants were not only the least likely to acquire American citizenship, but they were also the least likely to vote (27 percent). Results further reveal that among all Eastern Europeans who did not vote, 1 in 4 were actually registered to vote. The examination of results for individual groups suggests that immigrants from Ukraine were the most likely to register to vote (36 percent), followed by Russian and Polish immigrants whose voter registration rate was about 22 percent.

A more detailed analysis of voting and voter registration is presented in Table 37. It appears that between 2002 and 2010, Polish immigrants were consistently less likely to vote than Russian and Ukrainian immigrants.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Correlations were examined for all pairs of variables in each tested regression model. No high correlations were detected when testing the effects of predictors on the dependent variable citizenship acquisition. For participation in elections, the highest correlation was detected between variables education and white-collar occupation ($r=.474$). The correlation matrix with the dependent variable voter registration yielded a moderately high correlation between age and marital status ($r=.585$). However, this is

still within an acceptable range, and excluding one of the variables from the analysis did not alter the results.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

All dependent variables in the analysis are dichotomous measures. Therefore, logistic regression, and the procedure “SURVEYLOGISTIC” available in the statistical software SAS was used to examine the likelihood of citizenship acquisition, voting, and voter registration among new Eastern European immigrants. All regression models were tested for possible multivariate outliers. Very few outliers were detected, and because these did not have any impact on the results, outlying cases were not excluded. Due to small sample sizes for Poland, Russia, and Ukraine, I was not able to run separate regression models for these countries. Consequently, similarities and differences in determinants of political adaptation across groups could not be examined.

Citizenship Acquisition

I tested five pooled logistic regression models (Table 39). Model 1 included immigrants` individual demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. The dataset did not include a direct measure of memberships in ethnic networks, which, according to the literature, is an important predictor of naturalization (Yang 1994, 2002). This characteristic was estimated indirectly using the variable region or residence. It was expected that the likelihood of being a member of larger ethnic communities is higher for immigrants living in the North, as this is the region with the highest numbers of new Eastern European immigrants. Model 2 added dummies for individual countries of

origin, with Ukraine being omitted as a reference category. Country dummies were tested in a separate model due to their high degree of correlation with other variables in the analysis. Models 3, 4, and 5 tested the effects of country-level characteristics on political adaptation.

I now turn to the interpretation of the specific coefficients from Model 1 (Table 39). Several coefficients are statistically significant. Since the weighted sample size is relatively large, even small differences can be statistically significant. To account for this possibility and to ensure accurate standard errors, I used the specialized procedure “SURVEYLOGISTIC,” and I will focus on the interpretation of odds ratios and effect sizes. As anticipated, the length of residence in the United States has a positive effect on the likelihood of naturalization, the relationship being significant at the .001 level. Controlling for other variables in the model, each additional year in the United States increases the odds of citizenship acquisition by 64 percent. The results are consistent with my prediction, and with the findings of the existing literature. Immigrants who have resided in the U.S. for a longer period tend to be better acculturated, and have higher socioeconomic attainment. Their cultural and socioeconomic adaptation increases the propensity for naturalization (Yang 2002).

The effect of age on the likelihood of naturalization is in an expected direction. Albeit statistically insignificant, each additional year of age appears to increase the likelihood of naturalization by about 1 percent. One explanation for a weak relationship could be that the effect of age on naturalization is curvilinear. Younger immigrants are

less likely to comprehend the value of citizenship, and thus are less likely to naturalize, while the immigrants who are more mature and active in the labor force are more likely to become American citizens. On the other hand, older immigrants might have limited knowledge of English, and thus fail to meet an important citizenship requirement. Additionally, stronger attachments to native cultures might decrease their interest in citizenship acquisition (Yang 1994).

The effect of gender on the likelihood of citizenship acquisition did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level. However, the direction of the relationship is consistent with my hypothesis; males are 19 percent more likely to acquire citizenship than their female counterparts. Perhaps males are more likely to seek citizenship, because they are more likely to hold jobs where citizenship might be an advantage (Yang 1994). Holding other variables constant, marital status works in an expected direction, but does not reach statistical significance. The value of odds ratio associated with this predictor indicates that being married, and having spouse in the U.S. increases the propensity of citizenship acquisition by 34 percent. The literature consistently points to higher political involvement among married immigrants, arguing that it is less feasible for these immigrants to return to their home countries, especially if they have children (Yang 1994). In addition, social networks of married immigrants tend to be more extensive, because having spouse and children multiplies the avenues for contact with American society, facilitating political adaptation (Bass and Casper 2001).

Regional variations in the likelihood of naturalization partially support the hypothesis about the positive effect of ethnic community size on citizenship acquisition. The negative signs indicate that immigrants in the Midwest, West, and South are less likely to acquire citizenship than immigrants in the Northeast, which is the region with the highest numbers of new Eastern European immigrants. However, only the effect of Midwest is statistically significant. Researchers recognized that larger immigrant communities facilitate circulation of information about the citizenship benefits and procedures, and provide resources to assist with the naturalization process (Yang 1994, 2002). Results further show that the likelihood of naturalization increases with each subsequent survey year, which coincides with my hypothesis. Immigrants who were surveyed between 2006 and 2010 tend to be significantly more likely to naturalize than immigrants surveyed in 2002. The difference between immigrants surveyed in 2004 and their counterparts surveyed in 2010 is not statistically significant.

Socioeconomic adaptation is an important precondition for citizenship acquisition (Yang 2002). Immigrants who adapt successfully have higher commitment to the United States, and are more concerned with protecting their interests through citizenship acquisition (Yang 2002). Results of this study are consistent with these arguments, indicating that socioeconomic advancement in the United States has a positive impact on immigrants` naturalization decisions. Consistent with the hypothesis, each additional year of education increases the odds of acquiring citizenship by 10 percent, holding other variables constant. Expectedly, the likelihood of naturalization among white-collar

workers is 62 percent higher than for blue-collar workers. Surprisingly, however, self-employed immigrants are not significantly different from immigrants working for salaries in the likelihood of citizenship acquisition. This finding contradicts the assumption that economic attainment in the U.S. motivates immigrants to protect what they have acquired.

Model 2 (Table 39) added dummy variables for immigrants` countries of origin. The signs associated with regression estimates reveal that immigrants from Romania and Russia are more likely to change citizenship than Ukrainian immigrants, while Polish immigrants and those from other Eastern European countries combined are less likely to do so. The insignificant effect of variables Poland and Russia notwithstanding, the overall pattern of cross-country differences suggests that naturalization is determined not only by individual characteristics, but also by conditions in the home countries, which further influence perceived costs and benefits associated with naturalization (Yang 1994, 2002). This prediction is further supported by the results in Models 3, 4, and 5 (Table 39), which tested the effect of several country-level characteristics. It appears that immigrants who originate in countries with a gross national income below \$4,000 are 65 percent more likely to acquire citizenship than those from economically stronger countries. Consistent with this finding, researchers have established that unfavorable economic conditions in the home country increase the likelihood of naturalization by deterring return migration (Yang 1994, 2002). A higher degree of ethnic diversity in one`s homeland was found to increase the likelihood of citizenship acquisition.

Considering the inverse relationship between ethnic diversity and economic stability in most Eastern European countries, this result is highly consistent with findings presented in earlier chapters. Further supporting the prediction about the importance of country-level characteristics, results show that immigrants who experienced limited political and personal freedom in their home countries are more prone to acquire citizenship than immigrants who originate in free countries. Less political and personal freedom may discourage return migration, and motivate immigrants to settle permanently (Yang 1994). Immigrants from politically unstable countries tend to be refugees who have little motivation to return to their homelands where they experienced persecution and turmoil (Yang 2002, 1994).

Voter Registration

The remainder of this chapter examines the pattern of political participation among new Eastern European immigrants. Naturalization does not guarantee political participation, which is further impacted by a range of individual and country-level characteristics, including demographic and socioeconomic factors (Jaret and Kolozsvari-Wright 2011; Lien 2004).

The question, “Were you registered to vote in the election?” was asked only of respondents who did not vote, which explains why the sample size associated with this dependent variable is the lowest (N=239). Due to a low sample size, most of the predictors tested in regression models did not reach statistical significance at the conventional .05 level, but the directions of the relationships were as expected. Although

the relationship is insignificant, each additional year of residence in the United States increases the likelihood of voter registration among immigrants by 7 percent, which coincides with my hypothesis. Over time, immigrants adopt new values and customs, and become integrated into social networks. Additionally, length of stay increases the familiarity with social issues and political candidates, and facilitates political involvement (Bass and Casper 2001; Cho 1999).

Controlling for other predictors, older immigrants appear to be slightly less likely to be registered to vote than immigrants who are younger, but the relationship is not statistically significant. One reason for the negative relationship could be that older immigrants have weaker social ties to the United States, decreasing their interest in political life (Lien 2004). The effect of gender on the likelihood of voter registration is insignificant, but the sign and the value of odds ratio indicate that males are 27 percent more likely to be registered to vote than women. Since males are more likely to naturalize, their higher involvement in political networks in the U.S. is not surprising. Consistent with my prediction, married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. have a 77 percent higher likelihood of voter registration than their respective counterparts. Although the relationship is not significant at the .05 level, the sign and the odds ratio suggest more interest in political life among married immigrants, which can be explained by their higher degree of social connectedness and multiple ties to the United States.

Regional differences in voter registration lend only partial support to my initial hypothesis. Because none of the estimates is statistically significant, I will only interpret the directions of the relationships between regional dummies and the likelihood of voter registration. Expectedly, immigrants residing in the South are less likely to register to vote than their counterparts in the Northeast. However, immigrants living in the West and Midwest have a slightly higher likelihood of voter registration than their counterparts in the Northeast. This result demonstrates that states with a long history of hosting immigrants from Eastern Europe, such as New York, New Jersey, or Illinois, fail to register the highest political involvement among immigrants (Jaret and Kolozsvari-Wright 2011). This indicates that factors other than the size of immigrant communities in a region should be considered when explaining political participation.

Combining five consecutive years of data provides an opportunity to examine changes in immigrants` voting behavior over time. Albeit insignificant, the effect of survey year was positive, with an exception of immigrants interviewed in 2004. This cohort was less likely to register to vote than the 2002 cohort, contradicting the previously observed pattern of increased political involvement over time.

Researchers found that immigrants with higher socioeconomic status are more interested in protecting their achievements, have stronger ties to the U.S., and possess more resources to cover the costs associated with political involvement (Bass and Casper 2001; Lien 2004). Consistent with these findings, education and occupation were found to increase the likelihood of voter registration in this study, but their effect was not

statistically significant. Education increases the propensity to register by 14 percent for each additional year of schooling. As anticipated, white-collar workers are 123 percent more likely to be registered to vote than blue-collar workers. However, self-employment displays an unexpected negative sign, suggesting that the odds of voter registration are 15 percent lower for self-employed immigrants than for employees.

As can be seen in Model 2 (Table 40), the pattern of cross-group differences consistently shows that immigrants from all countries in the analysis had lower odds of voter registration than immigrants from Ukraine, but these differences were not statistically significant at the .05 level. Originating in the economically weakest country in the analysis, Ukrainian immigrants might have a strong motivation to remain in the U.S., and thus are more likely to exercise their political rights than immigrants from other Eastern European countries.

The examination of country-level predictors in Models 3, 4, and 5 further elucidates these complex findings. I will emphasize the directions of the relationships and the odds ratios, but the findings should be considered preliminary, because the effects of country-level predictors are not significant at the conventional .05 level. As hypothesized, low gross national income in countries of origin increases the odds of voter registration by 48 percent. The effect of ethnic diversity is also expected, increasing the likelihood of voter registration by 20 percent. Immigrants who experienced limited personal and political freedom in their homelands are more likely to be registered to vote than their respective counterparts. Insignificant values of regression estimates notwithstanding,

these results are highly consistent with the propositions of contextual framework (Yang 1994), providing evidence that limited economic opportunities and minimal freedom in countries of origin result in better political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants in the United States.

Voting

Voting is an important indicator of political participation among immigrants who had become American citizens. Immigrants indicate that the right to vote is the most important motivation for naturalization, but not all of them take advantage of this opportunity once they become naturalized (DeSipio 2011). Earlier discussed results showed that about one third of eligible immigrants in the pooled sample voted in American elections. To ascertain the determinants of voting, I tested five regression models. Most of the relationships did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level, which can be attributed to a small sample size available to examine the likelihood of voting (N=239). However, the signs associated with regression estimates suggest that the effect of most predictors was consistent with the findings discussed in the previous section, indicating that determinants of voter registration and voting are similar. I will briefly summarize the similarities and point to the discrepancies in results presented in Table 41.

The length of U.S. residency, being a male, and being married increase the odds of voting among immigrants. Regional differences in voting are also consistent with the findings discussed in the previous section. The effect of age is positive, but considering a

consistently weak and possibly curvilinear effect of this predictor on political adaptation, this result is not very informative. The dummy variables for year of interview received unusually high odds ratios compared to other predictors in the model, ranging between 2.720 and 15.815. Initially, I suspected that this was caused by high correlations between predictors in the model. The correlation analysis indicated no multicollinearity problem, and the descriptive statistics of all variables also appeared normal. Thus, high odds ratios likely result from a small sample size. I further tested this unexpected finding by excluding the variable survey year from the analysis and rerunning regression. As a result, the value of pseudo R² decreased, and the signs of coefficients associated with the dummy variable Midwest and white-collar occupation have changed. Specifically, consistent with the hypothesis about the effect of ethnic community size, immigrants in the Midwest were 13 percent less likely to vote than immigrants in the Northeast. In addition, the odds of voting were 17 percent higher for immigrants holding a white-collar occupation than for blue-collar workers.

Results partially support the prediction about the positive effect of socioeconomic status on political adaptation. It appears that immigrants who are more educated are significantly more likely to vote than less educated immigrants. However, the effect of the remaining socioeconomic characteristics on voting behavior is unexpected and statistically insignificant. Although the effect of occupational background on voting appears to be weak, white-collar workers are somewhat less likely to vote than blue-collar workers. Not only are the self-employed less likely to be registered to vote than their

employed counterparts, but their odds of voting are also lower. Immigrants from Poland, Romania, and Russia had a lower likelihood of voting than Ukrainian immigrants. However, immigrants from other Eastern European countries combined, including Czech Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, and Slovakia, were more likely to vote than immigrants from Ukraine. There are two possible explanations for this finding. Factors other than economic stability in one's homeland must be considered when explaining political behavior of immigrants. On the other hand, perhaps, immigrants from the most and least economically stable countries are more likely to vote than those from countries in-between. I emphasize that these results should be considered preliminary, considering the insignificant values of regression estimates.

All country-level characteristics worked in an expected direction, but did not reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Consistent with the predictions of contextual framework (Yang 1994), lower gross national income, higher ethnic diversity, and limited personal freedom in immigrants' homelands increase the odds of immigrants' voting, and ultimately facilitate their political adaptation in the United States.

The values of eta squared for all variables included in the analysis are presented in Table 42. It appears that most of the predictors of citizenship, voting, and voter registration explained between 1 and 7 percent of the variation in these dependent variables, and were thus, weak predictors. Dummies for survey year were associated with relatively high eta squared, but because these variables had unusually high odds ratios, the effect sizes are not very informative in this case.

SUMMARY

This chapter examined three measures of political adaptation: citizenship acquisition, voter registration, and voting. About 44 percent of all Eastern European immigrants in the sample were American citizens by naturalization. To obtain a more precise estimate, I calculated the naturalization rate of immigrants who arrived between 1991 and 1997 based on the 2002-2010 VRS-CPS data, excluding the immigrants who arrived later, as these did not meet the five-year residency requirement. The results indicated that 60 percent of Eastern European immigrants eligible for naturalization acquired citizenship by 2002-2010. The naturalization rate of new Eastern European immigrants appears to be lower than the naturalization rate of some other immigrant groups. Yang (2011) found a high rate of naturalization among post-1965 Asians, with 73 percent of immigrants who arrived between 1965-1999 acquiring citizenship by 2006-2008. With a naturalization rate of 36 percent, Hispanics appear to have a lower likelihood to change citizenship than Eastern Europeans. New Eastern Europeans may have a lower rate of citizenship acquisition, but they are not very different from other immigrant groups in their political involvement. About 38 percent of eligible respondents in the sample voted. This percentage is higher than voter turnouts of Hispanic and Asian immigrants (34 percent), but lower than the turnout rate of white naturalized citizens in general (44 percent) (Yang 2011). Among Eastern European immigrants who did not vote, 25 percent were registered to vote.

I examined the effect of several individual and country-level determinants on political adaptation. The effect of most predictors was not statistically significant, especially when examining immigrants` voting behavior. I will discuss all results, including the findings that are not significant, as these provide important preliminary insights into the political adaptation of an understudied immigrant group.

Results indicated that length of stay facilitates political incorporation of new Eastern European immigrants by increasing their likelihood of citizenship acquisition, voter registration, and voting. This is consistent with the findings of existing studies, indicating that as the number of years in the U.S. increases, immigrants become more acculturated, and have a greater opportunity to experience American institutions and to interact with the native-born population (Bass and Casper 2001; Cho 1999; Simpson-Bueker 2005). In addition, political ties to immigrants` home countries tend to diminish over time, as immigrants begin to develop stronger connections to the United States, increasing their political involvement (DeSipio 2011).

In 2010, 57% of all American immigrants were between 25 and 44 years old (Lee 2011). Researchers agree that younger and older immigrants have the lowest propensity to naturalize, and immigrants who are in their working ages are the most enthusiastic about the possibility to become American citizens. One explanation is that middle-aged immigrants are more likely to recognize the rights and benefits associated with citizenship (Bloemraad 2006; DeSipio 2011; Yang 1994). Results of this dissertation are

consistent with these findings, suggesting that among new Eastern Europeans, naturalized citizens tend to be older than non-citizens.

Prior studies recognized gender differences in political adaptation. Women are perceived as more vulnerable and may be more likely to seek citizenship than men. On the other hand, males tend to hold occupations where citizenship is an advantage, and thus, may be more likely to become citizens than women (Yang 1994, 2002). The results of this study are consistent with the second hypothesis, indicating that men tend to have stronger motivations to become citizens, possibly because citizenship is required by their occupations. Complexities in gender differences in political adaptation are evident, and indicate that gender should not be examined without considering other indicators, such as the country of origin, as the likelihood of naturalization among women varies across immigrant groups (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Simpson-Bueker 2005).

Consistent with the existing literature, being married increases the naturalization rate and political involvement. This may be attributed to the higher cost of return migration for married immigrants. In addition, having a spouse and possibly children provides more opportunities for married immigrants to become involved in American institutions (Yang 1994, 2002).

The size of immigrant communities has been recognized as an important predictor of political adaptation. One hypothesis suggests that as the size of immigrant communities increases, immigrants are more likely to become American citizens, possibly because ethnic networks facilitate immigrants` adaptation by diffusing

information about the legalization programs and procedures involved in citizenship acquisition (Bloemraad 2006; Yang 1994, 2002). In addition, belonging to an ethnic network may serve as a motivation for immigrants to vote. Voting is an avenue for accomplishing change within immigrant communities through electing certain officials or promoting preferred agendas (Simpson-Bueker 2005). Results of this study, to some extent, support these arguments. For example, immigrants in all regions are less likely to acquire citizenship than immigrants in the Northeast, a region with the highest concentration of new Eastern European immigrants. In addition, immigrants who live in the South are consistently less likely to vote, or register to vote, than immigrants in the Northeast. The results for the Midwest and West regarding voting behavior are less consistent, indicating that the size of immigrant communities alone does not account for regional differences in political adaptation.

The effect of several socioeconomic predictors was examined. Research found that higher socioeconomic status facilitates immigrants` political adaptation (Bloemraad 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Rallu 2011; Yang 1994, 2002). The effect of education was consistently positive, increasing the degree of political adaptation among immigrants. White-collar workers were more likely to acquire citizenship and register to vote than blue-collar workers, but unexpectedly, their likelihood of voting was lower. Similarly, self-employed immigrants were more prone to change citizenship, but they were less likely to vote, or register to vote, than employees.

The aforementioned predictors affect political adaptation differently depending on a country of origin (Bloemraad 2006; Rallu 2011; Simpson-Bueker 2005). In addition, a range of country-level characteristics appears to affect immigrants` citizenship acquisition and voting behavior. Researchers found that less favorable conditions in countries of origin, such as low economic development or limited political freedom, deter immigrants from migrating back to their homelands and increase their potential for naturalization. Additionally, immigrants for whom the reason for emigration was dissatisfaction with the political regimes in their home countries are more likely to be involved politically in the United States (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Yang 1994, 2002). Consistent with these arguments, results of this dissertation indicate that Eastern European immigrants who originated in oppressive, economically less developed countries adapt better politically than immigrants who arrived from economically stronger democracies where citizens are granted political and personal freedoms.

Due to small sample sizes for individual countries, I was not able to determine cross-country differences in determinants of citizenship acquisition and voting. However, the analyses of dummy variables for various countries indicate that political adaptation of new Eastern-European immigrants is not a uniform process. For example, in terms of their citizenship acquisition and voting, immigrants from Russia and Ukraine tend to adapt better politically than immigrants from Poland.

Overall, results are consistent with the predictions of contextual framework (Yang 1994). It appears that political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants is

determined not only by their individual characteristics, including their demographic and socioeconomic background, but also by larger social contexts in their countries of origin and destination. In addition to factors that have been traditionally associated with the likelihood of citizenship acquisition and voting, such as length of stay in the U.S., gender, or marital status, results reveal that political decisions of new Eastern European immigrants might be influenced by the degree of political and economic stability in their countries of origin, prior experience with undemocratic regimes, and the social capital gained through memberships in ethnic communities in the United States.

CHAPTER IX

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined how post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States adapt culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically in the United States, and what are the determinants of their adaptation. I have presented relevant theories of immigrant adaptation, and tested their applicability using the available data. In this chapter, I present the analysis of findings organized around the two research questions guiding this dissertation. First, to what extent do post-1991 Eastern European immigrants to the United States adapt culturally, socioeconomically, structurally, and politically to American life? Second, what are the major determinants of cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants to the United States? The implications of findings and their relevance to scholars, policy makers, and immigrant groups are discussed. The chapter also includes limitations and contributions of the study, and suggests the directions for future research.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Status of Adaptation

In Chapter 2, I showed that the population of new Eastern European immigrants in the United States has grown rapidly over the past two decades. Despite this increase, their adaptation to American life has not been systematically studied. How well do new

Eastern European immigrants adapt in the United States? Are they similar to other recent immigrant groups in their adaptation experience, or are they different? To answer these questions, I will summarize the findings elucidating cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants in the United States. My basic argument is that overall, new Eastern European immigrants adapt well across all four adaptation dimensions examined in this study, but cross-group variations in their adaptation persist.

Cultural adaptation. As hypothesized, the results show that 66 percent of new Eastern European immigrants speak English well or very well, indicating a relatively high degree of English proficiency. This pattern of language assimilation is similar to experiences of post-1965 Asian immigrants (66 percent), but is unlike the language assimilation of post-1965 Hispanic immigrants (46 percent) (Yang 2011). The overall picture of high English language competence, however, conceals wide cross-group differences. Among the three separately examined groups, immigrants from Ukraine tend to be the least proficient in English, with 11 percent of these immigrants speaking no English, and 5 percent speaking only English. Russian immigrants, on the other hand, appear to have achieved the highest degree of cultural adaptation measured by English proficiency, with only 6 percent having no English skills, and 8 percent speaking only English. Polish immigrants ranked somewhere between these two groups in their English language proficiency.

New Eastern European immigrants had a high likelihood of retaining their native language. Specifically, 93 percent of respondents in the pooled sample reported speaking a language other than English at home. Compared with 95 percent of Hispanics who tend to retain their native language, Eastern Europeans showed slightly lower native language retention. However, they registered higher language retention than 88 percent of post-1965 foreign-born Asians who spoke their native language (Yang 2011). High native language retention rate among new Eastern European immigrants is not surprising, considering that they are very recent immigrants, the majority of whom have resided in the United States for a short period. Native language retention varies, to some extent, across the three separately examined groups, with Ukrainian immigrants being the most likely to retain their native language (96 percent), and Russian immigrants the least likely to do so (92 percent).

Regression analysis further supported the finding that immigrants from Ukraine tend to adapt less well culturally than other groups. Ukrainian immigrants tend to be less proficient in English than immigrants from Albania, Bosnia/Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Russia, and other countries combined. Furthermore, controlling for other predictors, immigrants from Ukraine are also more likely to retain their native language than all other groups, with exception of immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina. This coincides with my hypothesis about heterogeneous experiences and variations in cultural adaptation across different Eastern European groups.

Socioeconomic adaptation. The most important finding is that, overall, new Eastern European immigrants tend to be highly educated and professional. High occupational attainment, however, is inconsistent with their lack of economic success, specifically a surprisingly low average personal income. About 22 percent of new Eastern Europeans had an advanced degree, and 37 percent were professionals or managers, keeping up with the most successful immigrant groups from Asia. However, their average income of \$35,900 makes Eastern Europeans comparable to foreign-born Hispanics, or less successful Asians.

The results lend support to my expectation that new Eastern Europeans are not homogeneous in their socioeconomic characteristics, and variations exist in their socioeconomic achievement. Among the three separately examined groups, Russian immigrants are by far the most educated, with 34 percent of these immigrants holding an advanced degree. Immigrants from Poland fare the worst among the three groups, with only 16 percent having an advanced degree or higher. The comparison of dummy variables in OLS regression is consistent with this finding. Differences in educational background further translate into disparities in occupational attainment and income. About half of all Russian immigrants hold professional or managerial occupations, and their average income of almost \$40,000 is higher than the overall average. Among Polish immigrants, however, professionals and managers constitute only 27 percent, and their average personal income of less than \$34,000 is below the overall average. The regression results reveal that Russians, Romanians, Bulgarians, and immigrants from

other countries combined are more likely to be professionals and managers than Ukrainian immigrants, while immigrants from Albania, Poland, and Bosnia/Herzegovina have a lower likelihood of professionalization. Regression results further confirm cross-group differences in income, with all groups having higher earnings than immigrants from Ukraine.

Overall, new Eastern European immigrants are proficient in English; therefore, they meet an important initial requirement for successful adaptation in the United States (Espenshade and Fu 1997; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). They are also highly educated, professional, and have a large amount of human capital. Why, then, is their average income so low? According to the overeducation hypothesis, non-white minorities receive lower returns for their education than whites due to racial discrimination (Hirschman and Wong 1984). Eastern European immigrants are classified as white, but their racial similarity with the majority group apparently does not reduce their income disadvantage. Zeng and Xie (2004) found that immigrants who received their education abroad tend to obtain lower socioeconomic rewards relative to whites with comparable education. Perhaps new Eastern European immigrants were schooled in Eastern Europe, and their credentials are discounted in the United States. However, considering their very high rate of professionalization, this argument does not fully explain the income disparities, and other factors must be at work. Zeng and Xie (2004) proposed lack of work experience as an alternative explanation. Eastern Europeans are very recent immigrants, and their

experience in the U.S. labor market may be limited, which could account for their lower income.

Structural adaptation. Consistent with the initial hypothesis, new Eastern European immigrants reached some degree of structural adaptation, but they are nevertheless only partially structurally adapted and cross-group differences in structural adaptation are apparent. About 20 percent of respondents in the pooled sample were members of some civic organization, with religious, sports, and school organizations being represented by the highest percentage of immigrants. Surprisingly, despite their relatively low levels of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation, Ukrainian immigrants were the most likely to participate in civic organizations among the three groups (22 percent), and Polish immigrants the least likely (14 percent). However, when controlling for other variables, Albanian, Polish, Romanian, and other immigrants combined, reached a higher degree of civic participation than Ukrainian immigrants, and immigrants from Bosnia/Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Russia were less civically engaged.

Neighborhood interactions of new Eastern European immigrants are somewhat limited. While 82 percent of respondents in the pooled sample talk to their neighbors at least once a month, only 55 percent exchange favors with neighbors at least on a monthly basis. This finding is surprising, considering a relatively high level of English proficiency among these immigrants. Among the three separately studied groups, Russian immigrants were by far the least likely to interact with their neighbors – while 73

percent talked to their neighbors at least monthly, only 46 percent exchanged favors with neighbors at least once a month.

According to Gordon (1964), adaptation occurs in stages, and cultural adaptation precedes structural adaptation. The results of this dissertation imply that, among new Eastern European immigrants, a relatively high degree of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation might not result in better structural adaptation. For example, an overall degree of cultural and socioeconomic adaptation is high among Russian immigrants, relative to other groups. Yet, both measures of structural adaptation indicate that Russian immigrants do not adapt well structurally. Similarly, while immigrants from Ukraine tend to struggle socioeconomically, they reached a substantially higher level of structural adaptation than Russian immigrants. Further illustrating cross-country differences, regression analysis of country dummy variables confirms that Russian immigrants are less likely to be structurally adapted than Ukrainian immigrants. At the same time, Albanian and Romanian immigrants appear to surpass immigrants from Ukraine in their degree of structural adaptation.

Political adaptation. About 44 percent of respondents in the pooled sample were naturalized citizens. According to the Migration Policy Institute (2012), this is comparable to the naturalization rate among American immigrants in general (44 percent), but lower than the naturalization rate among other European (62 percent) and Asian (73 percent) immigrants. Among the three separately examined groups, immigrants from Russia had the highest likelihood of citizenship acquisition (53 percent),

and Polish immigrants the lowest (35 percent). Voting behavior of new Eastern European immigrants is comparable to other American immigrants, and indicates somewhat limited interest in American political issues. Almost 25 percent of the respondents in the pooled sample who did not participate in elections were registered to vote, and 37 percent actually voted. This percentage is slightly higher than 34 percent of Asian and Hispanic immigrants who voted (Yang 2011). Polish immigrants had a lower propensity to vote than Ukrainian and Russian immigrants, making this group the least politically adapted.

Determinants of Adaptation

The second research question this dissertation seeks to answer inquires about the determinants of adaptation among new Eastern European immigrants. A variety of factors identified by researchers as relevant to immigrant adaptation was tested to explain cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political adaptation.

Cultural adaptation. Cultural adaptation of immigrants is affected by a wide range of individual and country-level factors (Espenshade and Fu 1997; Espinosa and Massey 1997; Fennelly and Palasz 2003). Length of stay and age are among the key factors. Expectedly, living in the United States for a longer period facilitates immigrants' acculturation. The effect of age is also consistent with my hypothesis; older immigrants tend to be less adapted culturally than younger immigrants. Gender differences in cultural adaptation contradict my expectation, indicating that females adapt better culturally than males. As hypothesized, marital status seems to affect cultural adaptation

differently, depending on whether or not the spouse is present in the United States. Results suggest, however, that ethnicity of a spouse might further explain acculturation of married immigrants, as those individuals whose spouse is present tend to be less culturally adapted than their counterparts whose spouse is not present. Due to lack of available data, I was not able to determine ethnicity of immigrants' spouses to further test this expectation. Regional differences in cultural adaptation are apparent. Unexpectedly, it appears that high immigrant concentrations tend to inhibit, rather than facilitate cultural adaptation, as it appears that immigrants in the Northeast do not necessarily adapt better culturally than do immigrants in the South. This suggests that regional differences in cultural adaptation are very complex, and factors other than immigrant concentrations must be at work. Characteristics of the region, such as proximity to immigrants' countries of origin, employment opportunities, occupational structure, or languages spoken in the area might play a role. Furthermore, results provide support for my argument that characteristics of the country of origin affect immigrants' acculturation in the United States. As expected, immigrants from economically weaker and ethnically heterogeneous countries, where freedoms of citizens are limited, tend to maintain their native languages, and are less likely to be proficient in English.

Socioeconomic adaptation. Several key determinants of socioeconomic adaptation were examined in this dissertation. Supporting my prediction, length of stay is positively related to all measures of socioeconomic adaptation; the longer immigrants reside in the United States, the more likely they are to hold a white-collar, or a

professional/managerial occupation. The likelihood of self-employment also increases with time spent in the United States. Furthermore, the longer immigrants reside in the United States, the higher their income tends to be, while the poverty level tends to decrease. This is consistent with the findings of existing empirical studies which suggest that immigrants who have stayed longer in the United States adapt better socioeconomically than recent immigrants (Chiswick 1978; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Xie and Gough 2011). Length of residency does not increase immigrants' education. One reason for this could be that new Eastern European immigrants have likely acquired their education in their home countries, and might not further their education in the United States.

The effect of age contradicts the hypothesis that older immigrants adapt less well socioeconomically. The results suggest that older immigrants tend to have more education, higher likelihood of self-employment, higher income, and lower poverty levels than younger immigrants. However, older immigrants are less likely to hold white-collar and professional/managerial occupations. Female immigrants tend to be more educated, but higher educational attainment does not facilitate their socioeconomic adaptation. Consistent with the hypothesis, males seem to adapt better socioeconomically; they are more likely to hold professional or managerial jobs, have a higher propensity to be self-employed, higher income, and lower poverty rate.

As hypothesized, the effect of marital status is consistent across all indicators, facilitating socioeconomic adaptation among married immigrants whose spouse is present

in the United States. Married immigrants tend to be more educated, have a higher rate of professionalization, higher income, lower poverty rate, and higher propensity for self-employment than immigrants in other categories of marital status. Results show regional differences in socioeconomic adaptation. Immigrants in the Midwest, West, and South have a higher propensity for self-employment than their counterparts in the Northeast. Consistent with my expectation, immigrants in these three regions tend to have lower income, and experience more poverty, suggesting that they adapt less well socioeconomically than their counterparts in the Northeast. Although the effect of education and occupational attainment does not fully support this pattern of regional differences, an overall trend lends substantial support to my expectation that immigrants in the Northeast tend to adapt better socioeconomically than immigrants in other regions.

Researchers found that human capital, such as English language skills and education, facilitate socioeconomic adaptation (Chiswick and Miller 1995; Chiswick and Taengnoi 2007; Espenshade and Fu 1997; Xie and Gough 2011). Highly consistent with my hypothesis and with the findings of immigration studies, English proficiency largely influences socioeconomic adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants. Better knowledge of the English language is associated with higher education, higher income, lower poverty level, and increased professionalization. Education has been a strong predictor of socioeconomic adaptation. As expected, education facilitates socioeconomic adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants by increasing professionalization, income, and decreasing immigrants` poverty level. Occupational background further

explains socioeconomic adaptation. White-collar workers are more likely to earn higher incomes, and face less poverty. Self-employment increases immigrants` income, but tends to be associated with higher poverty.

In addition to a variety of individual factors, results show that socioeconomic adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants is affected by socioeconomic and political conditions in their countries of origin. The effect of all country-level characteristics is as hypothesized. Low gross national income in countries of origin decreases immigrants` education, income, propensity for self-employment, and professionalization, in addition to increasing their poverty level. Originating from ethnically heterogeneous countries decreases immigrants` income and propensity for self-employment, and increases their poverty level. Limited freedoms in countries of origin affect all aspects of socioeconomic adaptation. This factor decreases immigrants` education level, professionalization, likelihood of self-employment, income, and increases their poverty level.

Structural adaptation. This study found that several predictors consistently increase the degree of structural adaptation among immigrants. Length of stay is one important predictor; as the length of stay in the United States increases, immigrants tend to adapt better structurally. This result was expected. With time, immigrants develop stronger ties to the U.S., are more likely to speak English, and have more American friends (Kim and Hurh 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010). Because of better acculturation, immigrants may be better integrated in their

neighborhoods, and participate in various civic organizations. Married immigrants whose spouse is present in the U.S. adapt better structurally than unmarried immigrants. One possible explanation could be that married immigrants tend to be better acculturated, and have higher socioeconomic attainment. In addition, being married and possibly having children, expands immigrants` social networks, and provides more opportunities for involvement in school, recreational, or community organizations. Results coincide with the findings of existing literature linking higher socioeconomic status with better structural adaptation (Ramirez and Felix 2011). Expectedly, immigrants that are more educated are more likely to be involved in their neighborhoods, and recognize the importance of civic engagement through participation in various organizations. Self-employed immigrants tend to adapt better structurally than salaried immigrants. Immigrant entrepreneurs might have wide social networks, and their personal traits and experiences might contribute to their community-oriented attitude, and their interest in getting involved. In addition, many studies found that self-employment is associated with significant economic benefits, and that immigrant entrepreneurs tend to have higher incomes and experience more economic progress than salaried immigrants (Gold 1988; Portes and Zhou 1996). Having more resources might facilitate structural adaptation of self-employed immigrants, as civic engagement often requires resources.

As predicted, professionals and managers display a higher degree of structural adaptation than immigrants in other occupational categories, which may stem from their higher educational background, and more resources available to support their civic

engagement. Several predictors tested in this study decrease immigrants` structural adaptation. As hypothesized, older immigrants tend to adapt less well structurally than younger immigrants, which may result from their lower degree of cultural adaptation, especially lower English proficiency. Existing research confirms age differences in structural adaptation, suggesting that middle-aged immigrants adapt better than younger and older immigrants (Ong and Emiko-Scott 2006). Contradicting my expectation, males tend to attain a lower degree of structural adaptation, when measured by neighborhood interactions and civic engagement. Perhaps the degree of structural adaptation among males would be higher if measured by different activities, such as interracial friendships, interaction in workplace, or following the politics. These or similar indicators were not available in the datasets, and thus, their effect could not be tested. Regional differences in structural adaptation provide strong support for my argument that immigrants in the Northeast tend to adapt better structurally than immigrants in other regions, the only exception being a higher involvement in civic organizations among immigrants in the West. Just like their predecessors, large numbers of new Eastern Europeans continue to settle in the Northeast. Living in the region with a long history of immigration from Eastern Europe might facilitate structural adaptation of newcomers through ethnic networks and communities (Jaret and Kolozsvari-Wright 2011).

Among country-level predictors, the effects of ethnic diversity and political/personal freedom vary across the two measures of structural adaptation, lending weak support to my original hypothesis that ethnic heterogeneity and limited freedom in

a home country hinder structural adaptation. Unexpectedly, the effect of gross national income is positive. Contradicting the original hypothesis, this means that immigrants from poorer countries actually adapt better structurally than their counterparts from economically more stable countries. This may be attributable to the fact that limited economic opportunities in home countries deter immigrants from returning, and contribute to their intention to become actively involved within their neighborhoods and participate in community life in the United States.

Political adaptation. Several factors examined in this dissertation consistently increase political adaptation. Consistent with my expectation, and in line with the literature on immigrants` political incorporations (Bloemraad 2006; Simpson-Bueker 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Stepick and Stepick 2002; Yang 1994), immigrants who are well adapted politically tend to reside in the United States for a longer period, are males, have more education, and are married. Age is a weak predictor. This could be explained by a non-linear effect of age; the rate of naturalization tends to be highest among middle-aged immigrants, and decreases in older ages (Lee 2010). Regional differences in political adaptation are unexpected, as immigrants residing in the Northeast tend to adapt less well politically than immigrants in the South. Some researchers found that immigrants living in the states with a long history of immigration and a larger population of immigrants such as New York, New Jersey, and Illinois have much higher naturalization rates than immigrants in other regions (Jang 2009; Jaret and Kolozsvari-Wright 2011). Results of this study contradict this finding and suggest that in the case of

Eastern European immigrants, residing in the Northeast where the co-ethnic population is higher does not motivate immigrants to become politically active. One possibility could be that these immigrants can easily maintain closer connections with the countries of origin, and being surrounded by fellow immigrants might hinder, rather than facilitate their political involvement.

According to the literature, immigrants with higher socioeconomic status tend to have higher rates of political activity (Bass and Casper 2001; Leal 2002). In this study, the effect of occupation and entrepreneurship indicates an unexpected pattern of high citizenship acquisition, but low likelihood of voting. White-collar workers are more likely to acquire citizenship and register to vote, but are less likely to turn out at the polls. Voting behavior of professionals and managers is similar, as this occupational group registers a lower likelihood of voting than immigrants with lower occupational status. Self-employment increases the likelihood of citizenship acquisition, but decreases voting and voter registration. Perhaps the most interesting is the effect of country-level characteristics. Consistent across all measures of political adaptation, immigrants originating in economically less stable countries adapt better politically than immigrants from economically more stable countries. In addition, ethnic diversity and limited political and personal freedom in home countries facilitate immigrants` political adaptation in the United States. These findings support existing research, and my hypothesis, that immigrants who have no desire to leave the United States because of

limited economic opportunities and freedoms in their home countries tend to be more politically engaged (Bloemraad 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Yang 1994).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

In this section, I will discuss which theory of adaptation best captures the adaptation experience of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants in the United States. The classical assimilation theory suggests, “after many generations, all immigrant or ethnic groups will inevitably and completely assimilate into the dominant Anglo culture and institutions” (Yang 2000: 82). If the groups assimilate completely, their ethnic cultures will diminish. However, taking empirical evidence into consideration, new Eastern European immigrants have become only partially assimilated in the United States, while partially maintaining their ethnic cultures. Therefore, this theory has no relevance when explaining diverse adaptation paths and experiences of this immigrant population. However, cultural pluralism theory, revisionist assimilation theory, and segmented assimilation theory appear to be applicable to capture experiences of various Eastern European groups across different adaptation dimensions.

For cultural adaptation, the results of this study are consistent with the propositions of cultural pluralism theory. Two-thirds of new Eastern European immigrants tended to report speaking English very well, indicating their high degree of English proficiency. At the same time, however, 97 percent of respondents in this study spoke a language other than English at home, implying a very high likelihood of native language retention. Speaking a native language does not necessarily imply low

acculturation, but it clearly suggests that native cultures continue to play an important role in immigrants` lives. Following the cultural pluralism perspective, new Eastern European immigrants do not simply blend in, but remain culturally distinct from natives (Yancey 2003). Their ethnic cultures coexist alongside the dominant culture (Yang 2000). This pattern may be stronger for some groups than for others, suggesting partial relevance of segmented and revisionist assimilation theories. For example, based on the degree of English proficiency and native language retention, Russian immigrants tend to adapt better culturally than Ukrainian or Polish immigrants, but they are nevertheless only partially adapted, and their cultural heritage tends to persist. Through learning a new language, customs, and traditions of the United States, the culture of new Eastern Europeans is altered to some extent. At the same time, these immigrants continue to preserve some aspects of their original ethnicity through retaining their native languages (Patchen 1998).

The results for socioeconomic adaptation challenge the myth that socioeconomic success is inevitable for all immigrants (Gans 1992). Not all Eastern European groups are equally destined to experience upward mobility and progress toward higher positions in the social hierarchy. Apparently, a variety of factors tends to either slow or accelerate the status mobility of these immigrants. New Eastern European immigrants are highly educated, and their rate of self-employment and professionalization is comparable to the natives, and the most successful immigrant groups in the United States. At the same time, however, their income does not correspond to their educational and occupation

background. With the average personal income of \$35,900, they fare only slightly better than the U.S. born Hispanics and Blacks. This result refutes the claims that racial similarity with the majority group facilitates immigrants` adaptation. In the case of Eastern European immigrants, their racial background may actually work to their disadvantage. Being indistinguishable from the natives does not alleviate socioeconomic hardships they may face, and results in less recognition than other, more visible immigrant groups tend to receive. Cross-group differences in socioeconomic attainment correspond to the major assumption of segmented assimilation theory, which states that upward mobility is only one possible adaptation outcome (Portes and Zhou 1993). In this dissertation, the examination of the three separate groups indicates diverse adaptation paths. The experience of Russian immigrants corresponds to the pattern of upward mobility. Russian immigrants reached the highest degree of cultural adaptation among the three separately studied groups, and fared better in terms of all socioeconomic indicators examined in this study. Immigrants from Ukraine followed the path of low acculturation, while being somewhere in-between Russian and Polish immigrants in terms of their socioeconomic achievement. Polish immigrants were acculturated to some degree, but lagged behind in their socioeconomic adaptation. These results indicate diverse socioeconomic adaptation outcomes, and seriously challenges predictions that, by virtue of being “white,” all immigrants from Eastern Europe should be on the verge of total assimilation in the United States.

Cultural pluralism intends to explain immigrants` acculturation, but it could be extended to explain structural and political adaptation dimensions as well. Structurally, new Eastern European immigrants are only partially integrated. Through participation in civic organizations and interaction in neighborhood communities, they became partially assimilated into the host country`s social groups. A substantial percentage of immigrants, however, showed no involvement. About 80 percent of new Eastern European immigrants did not participate in any civic organization. In addition, 19 percent of immigrants reported not talking to their neighbors, and as much as 45 percent indicated they never exchanged favors with their neighbors. It appears that, despite cultural differences, some immigrants manage integration into their communities. For others, at least for now, it is more difficult to overcome the barriers of new language, traditions, and value systems.

Political adaptation follows a similar pattern. The naturalization rate of 44 percent (or 60 percent, when immigrants ineligible for citizenship are excluded from calculations) may be comparable to naturalization among American immigrants overall. However, some immigrant groups, such as Asians, reached a substantially higher degree of political incorporation measured by citizenship acquisition. Based on the rates of voter registration and voter turnout, new Eastern European immigrants fare only slightly better than do Asian and Hispanic immigrants, indicating partial integration in the American political system.

Results of this dissertation may be of interest not only to scholars, but also to policy makers, and immigrant groups themselves. It is not plausible to assume that all immigrants from Eastern Europe have equal opportunities for successful adaptation. Results suggest that collectively, they are doing fine, in many respects even better than some immigrant groups from Asia and Latin America. This overall trend, however, conceals the needs of individual groups. Incredible diversity among new Eastern European immigrants makes it impossible for all groups to follow the same adaptation path. In addition to differences in individual characteristics, backgrounds and histories of immigrants` home countries are also vastly different. The experience of a communist regime, which appears to be an important uniting factor for all Eastern Europeans, is also inconsistent across groups. Civil rights and liberties, more harshly suppressed in some former communist countries than in others, influenced the course of development after the fall of communism, including experiences, aspirations, needs, and adaptation trajectories of immigrants. This study will, hopefully, draw the attention of policy makers to this understudied immigrant population, and will lead to an improvement in policies and increased support for groups in need.

Being an immigrant often means living in isolation. Due to perceived racial differences, recent immigrants are especially likely to be isolated from the native population, and immigrant networks may not be accessible to offer support. It is hoped that this study will reach those who struggle. It is hoped that the information on different dimensions of adaptation included in this dissertation may guide these immigrants to

make the correct decisions. This knowledge can help later waves of Eastern European immigrants live lives that are more meaningful.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This dissertation greatly contributes to the existing literature by providing a first systematic analysis of adaptation experiences of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants. It addresses different adaptation dimensions, including the cultural, socioeconomic, structural, and political dimensions. To date, this has not been accomplished. In addition, it uses recent, nationally representative quantitative data, allowing for generalizations of findings to all new Eastern European immigrants in the United States. Each adaptation dimension is measured by several indicators, which have been previously tested by researchers to investigate adaptation experiences of other immigrant groups. This dissertation not only systematically analyzes the status, but also individual and country-level determinants of immigrant adaptation. In addition, it attempts to provide cross-group comparisons by separately investigating the experiences of Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian immigrants. The applicability of existing theories to explain adaptation experiences of contemporary immigrants has been assessed. The results suggest that assumptions of classical assimilation theory are very limited, and largely inconsistent with the experiences of new Eastern European immigrants. This finding may help to understand the adaptation processes of other new immigrant groups, and suggests that the overall adaptation of contemporary immigrants to the United States may be more complex than ever before.

Despite providing a systematic, comprehensive analysis, this study is not without limitations. The datasets did not include the information on some Eastern European immigrant groups, including Serbians, Slovenians, or Estonians. In addition, not all adaptation dimensions could be examined. The datasets did not include measures of marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation. Dimensions that were examined could be measured by indicators other than those used in this study. Not all Eastern European immigrant groups could be analyzed separately, and the cross-country comparisons are limited to the experiences of immigrants from Poland, Russia, and Ukraine. Lastly, sample sizes available to examine the structural and political adaptation were much smaller than sample sizes used in the analysis of other adaptation dimensions, so these adaptation dimensions should be reexamined when larger samples become available.

FUTURE RESEARCH

There are many possible directions for future research on the adaptation of post-1991 Eastern European immigrants. This new immigrant group is greatly understudied, and virtually any work can contribute to the currently limited body of knowledge.

Future research should focus on adaptation dimensions other than those examined in this dissertation, such as marital, identificational, or receptional adaptation. If more robust data with larger samples becomes available, then structural and political adaptation should be reexamined, to ensure generalizability of findings, and to allow for cross-group comparisons. This dissertation included a wide range of measures of different adaptation

dimensions, but future research should test additional indicators. For example, religion was recognized as an important measure of cultural adaptation. Therefore, the examination of the religiosity of new Eastern European immigrants may lead to some fascinating findings. Religions were suppressed during communism. Therefore, it would be interesting to study how immigrants negotiate the religious pluralism in the United States, and to what extent religiosity facilitates their acculturation process.

Transnationalism has been identified by researchers as an important factor in the lives of contemporary immigrants. Some scholars of immigration argue that transnational connections facilitate adaptation, while others believe that transnationalism is detrimental to the adaptation process (Portes 1999; Portes et al. 1999; Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

The datasets used in this dissertation did not allow for examination of different aspects of transnationalism, such as travelling home, sending remittances, or following the events and politics in home countries. If the data becomes available, it would be important to study these aspects, as contemporary Eastern European immigrants have enormous opportunities for transnational experiences, unlike their predecessors.

The results indicate a very interesting and complex effect of some of the predictors on the degree of immigrant adaptation. One of these predictors is region. I expected that the size of ethnic communities in different regions in the United States affects the degree of immigrant adaptation. If this was true, immigrants in the Northeast would be the most adapted across all dimensions. According to the findings, while this may not always be the case, the differences in adaptation across different regions are

apparent. The emerging picture of regional differences indicates that, in addition to ethnic communities, a variety of regional characteristics, such as occupational structure and employment opportunities, possibly impact the adaptation process of immigrants from Eastern Europe.

The results also show that the importance of race in the research on contemporary immigration might be overemphasized. Immigrants from Eastern Europe are in the United States racially classified as white. Whites continue to occupy the dominant position in the U.S. racial hierarchy, and enjoy privileges that are often denied to racial and ethnic minorities, such as access to occupational opportunities, housing, or education. Therefore, based on their racial background, all Eastern European groups should adapt very well. This is, however, not the case. Findings indicate wide cross-group differences in the adaptation of new Eastern European immigrants, implying that the role played by race and the impact of racial and ethnic backgrounds on successful adaptation among contemporary immigrants to the United States should be reconsidered and reevaluated.

This dissertation examined the determinants of adaptation among immigrants from Russia, Poland, and Ukraine, because these were the only groups with sample sizes large enough to be studied separately. While this allowed for uncovering important cross-group differences in the way immigrants experience the adaptation process, future research should examine the experiences of other immigrant groups, as cross-group comparisons are crucial to a better understanding of differences in the adaptation process.

Furthermore, the focus of this dissertation was on the experiences of first generation Eastern European immigrants. If possible, future research should examine the adaptation of the second generation, and the extent to which experiences of Eastern European immigrant children are similar to, or different from the experiences of their parents, and immigrant children more generally.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *International Migration Review* 32(4): 826-874.
- 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Aroian, Karen. 2001. "Immigrant Women's Health." *Annual Review of Nursing Research* 19:179-226.
- Bailey, Thomas, and Roger Waldinger. 1991. "Primary, Secondary, and Enclave Labor Markets: A Training Systems Approach." *American Sociological Review* 56: 432-45.
- Bankston, Carl, Danielle Antoinette Hidalgo, and Kent Rasmussen. 2006. *Immigration in U.S. History: Volume 1*. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press, Inc.
- Barrett, James, and David Roediger. 2005. "How White People Became White." Pp. 35-40 in *White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism*, edited by Paula Rothenberg. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Bass, Loretta, and Lynne Casper. 2001. "Impacting the Political Landscape: Who Registers and Votes among Naturalized Citizens?" *Political Behavior* 23(2): 103-130.

- Batalova, Jeanne, and Alicia Lee. 2012. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States." Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved July 20, 2012 (<http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?ID=886>).
- Batalova, Jeanne, and Lindsay Lowell. 2007. "Immigrant Professionals in the United States." *Society* 44(2): 26-31.
- Belozersky, Irene, and Ariel Borschevsky. 2004. "Building the Russian-Jewish Community in North America: The Case of Boston." Pp. 43-56 in *Russian-Jewish Immigrants after the Cold War: Perspectives from Germany, Israel, Canada and the United States*, edited by Olaf Gloeckner, Evgenija Garbolevsky, and Sabine von Mering. Center for German and European Studies at Brandeis University.
- Berry, John. 1997. "Immigration, Acculturation and Adaptation." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46(1): 5-68.
- 2006. "Stress Perspectives on Acculturation." Pp. 43-57 in *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*, edited by David Sam, and John Berry. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Birman, Dina, Edison Trickett, and Andrey Vinokurov. 2002. "Acculturation and Adaptation of Soviet Jewish Refugee Adolescents: Predictors of Adjustment Across Life Domains." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30(5): 585-607.
- Blau, Peter, and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.

- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. "Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada: Structured Mobilization and Immigrant Political Incorporation." *Social Forces* 85(2): 667-695.
- Blumenthal, Shirley. 1981. *Coming to America: Immigrants from Eastern Europe*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Böcker, Anita, Kees Groenendijk, Tetty Havinga, and Paul Minderhoud. 1998. *Regulation of Migration: International Experiences*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Het Spinhuis Publishers.
- Brodkin, Karen. 2005. "How Jews Became White Folks." Pp. 41-54 in *White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism*, edited by Paula Rothenberg. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Camarota, Steven. 2012. "Immigrants in the United States: A Profile of America's Foreign Born Population." Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved July 25, 2012 (<http://cis.org/2012-profile-of-americas-foreign-born-population>).
- Chinn, Susan. 2000. "A Simple Method for Converting an Odds Ratio to Effect Size for Use in Meta-Analysis." *Statistics in Medicine* 19(22): 3127-3131.
- Chiswick, Barry. 1978. "The Effect of Americanization on Earnings of Foreign-born Men." *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 897-921.
- 1993. "Soviet Jews in the United States: An Analysis of Their Linguistic and Economic Adjustment." *International Migration Review* 27(2): 260-285.

- Chiswick, Barry, and Paul Miller. 1995. "The Endogeneity Between Language and Earnings: International Analysis." *Journal of Labour Economics* 13: 246-288.
- 2004. *Where Immigrants Settle in the United States*. Discussion Paper Series: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Chiswick, Berry, and Sarinda Taengnoi. 2007. "Occupational Choice of High Skilled Immigrants in the United States." *International Migration* 45(5): 3-34.
- Cho, Wendy Tam. 1999. "Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non)-Voting." *Journal of Politics* 61(4): 1140-1155.
- Clark, William. 2007. "Race, Class, and Place." *Urban Affairs Review* 42: 295-314.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Connor, Philip. 2010. "Explaining the Refugee Gap: Economic Outcomes of Refugee versus Other Immigrants." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23(3): 377-397.
- Constant, Amelie, and Douglas Massey. 2002. "Return Migration by German Guestworkers: Neoclassical Versus New Economic Theories." *International Migration* 40(4): 5-36.
- Daniels, Roger. 2002. *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. New York: Perennial.
- DeSipio, Louis. 2011. "Immigrant Incorporation in an Era of Weak Civic Institutions: Immigrant Civic and Political Participation in the United States." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55(9): 1189-1213.

- Dinnerstein, Leonard, and David Reimers. 1999. *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dowty, Alan. 1989. *Closed Borders: The Contemporary Assault on Freedom of Movement*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Easterly, William, and Ross Levine. 1997. "Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 111(4): 1203-1250.
- Erdmans, Mary Patrice. 1998. *Opposite Poles: Immigrants and Ethnics in Polish Chicago, 1976-1990*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Espenshade, Thomas, and Haisham Fu. 1997. "An Analysis of English-Language Proficiency Among U.S. Immigrants." *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 288-305.
- Espinosa, Kristin, and Douglas Massey. 1997. "Determinants of English Proficiency among Mexican Migrants to the United States." *International Migration Review* 31(1): 28-50.
- Fenelly, Catherine, and Nicole Palasz. 2003. "English Language Proficiency of Immigrants and Refugees in the Twin City Metropolitan Area." *International Migration* 41(5): 93-125.
- Finlay, Andrea, Constance Flanagan, and Laura Wray-Lake. 2011. "Civic Engagement Patterns and Transitions over 8 Years: The AmeriCorps National Study." *Developmental Psychology* 47(6): 1728-1743.

- Foner, Nancy. 2001. "Immigrant Commitment to America, Then and Now: Myths and Realities." *Citizenship Studies* 5: 27-40.
- Friedberg, Rachel. 1992. "The Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in the United States: The Role of Age at Arrival." Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA. Retrieved June 2, 2012 (http://www.econ.brown.edu/fac/Rachel_Friedberg/Links/Friedberg%20Age%20at%20Arrival.pdf).
- Gans, Herbert. 1992. "Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2): 173-92.
- Gastil, Raymond. 1980. *Freedom in the World: Political Rights and Civil Liberties*. New York, NY: Freedom House.
- Gold, Steven. 1988. "Refugees and Small Business: The Case of Soviet Jews and Vietnamese." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11(4): 411-38.
- 2004. "Israeli and Russian Jews: Gendered Perspectives on Settlement and Return." Pp. 26-42 in *Russian-Jewish Immigrants after the Cold War: Perspectives from Germany, Israel, Canada and the United States*, edited by Olaf Gloeckner, Evgenija Garbolevsky, and Sabine von Mering. Center for German and European Studies at Brandeis University.
- Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Grant, Madison. 1916. *The Passing of the Great Race, or, the Racial Basis of European History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Greeley, Andrew. 1974. *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Greene, Victor. 1968. *The Slavic Community on Strike*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Hahs-Vaughn, Debbie. 2005. "A Primer for Using and Understanding Weights With National Datasets." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 73(3): 221-248.
- Hahs-Vaughn, Debbie, Christine McWayne, Rebecca Bulotsky-Shearer, Xiaoli Wen and Ann-Marie Faria. 2011. "Methodological Considerations in Using Complex Survey Data: An Applied Example With the Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey." *Evaluation Review* 35(3): 269-303.
- Haller, William, Alejandro Portes, and Scott Lynch. 2011. "Dreams Fulfilled, Dreams Shattered: Determinants of Segmented Assimilation in the Second Generation." *Social Forces* 89(3): 733-762.
- Handlin, Oscar. 1951. *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.
- Healey, Joseph. 2003. *Diversity and Society: Race, Ethnicity and Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Herring, Cedric, and Charles Amissah. 1997. "Advance and Retreat: Racially Based Attitudes and Public Policy." Pp. 121-143 in *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s*:

- Continuity and Change*, edited by Steven A. Tuch, and Jack K. Martin. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Hirschman, Charles, and Morrison Wong. 1984. "Socioeconomic Gains of Asian Americans, Blacks, and Hispanics 1960-76." *American Journal of Sociology* 90: 584-607.
- Huntington, Samuel. 2004. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Huseby-Darvas, Eva. 2003. *Hungarians in Michigan*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Iceland, John, and Melissa Scopilliti. 2008. "Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000." *Demography* 45(1): 79-94.
- Iceland, John, and Rima Wilkes. 2006. "Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? Race, Class and Residential Segregation." *Social Problems* 52: 248-73.
- Jackman, Robert. 1995. "Employment Problems for Non-English Speaking Background Professionals." *People and Place* 3: 40-46.
- Jacobson, Matthew. 1998. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jang, Seung-Jin. 2009. "Get Out on Behalf of Your Group: Electoral Participation of Latinos and Asian Americans." *Political Behavior* 31: 511-535.

- Jaret, Charles. 1999. "Troubled by Newcomers: Anti-Immigrant Attitudes and Action During Two Eras of Mass Immigration to the United States." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18(3): 9-39.
- Jaret, Charles, and Orsolya Kolozsvari-Wright. 2011. "Citizenship and Naturalization Patterns of Immigrants in the Southeastern United States and Their Political Consequences." *Norteamerica* 6: 179-208.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga. 2008. "Long-term Immigrant Adaptation: Eight-Year Follow-Up Study Among Immigrants from Russia and Estonia Living in Finland." *International Journal of Psychology* 43(1): 6-18.
- Jones, Maldwin Allen. 1992. *American Immigration*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, Richard. 2003. "The Segregation of Ancestry Groups in San Antonio." *The Social Science Journal* 40: 213-32.
- Kang, Sun-Mee. 2006. "Measurement of Acculturation, Scale Formats, and Language Competence: Their Implications for Adjustment." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 37(6): 669-693.
- Kim, Kwang Chung, and Won Moo Hurh. 1993. "Beyond Assimilation and Pluralism: Syncretic Sociocultural Adaptation of Korean Immigrants in the U.S." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16(4): 696-713.
- Kisselev, Paulina, Margaret Brown, and Jonathon Brown. 2010. "Gender Differences in Language Acculturation Predict Marital Satisfaction: A Dyadic Analysis of

- Russian-Speaking Immigrant Couples in the United States.” *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 41(5): 767-782.
- Leal, David. 2002. “Political Participation by Latino Non-Citizens in the United States.” *British Journal of Political Science* 32(2): 353-370.
- Lee, James. 2011. “U.S. Naturalizations: 2010.” Retrieved 24 February 2012 (http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/natz_fr_2010.pdf).
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley, and Mary Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lien, Pei-te. 2004. “Asian Americans and Voting Participation: Comparing Racial and Ethnic Differences in Recent U.S. Elections.” *International Migration Review* 38(2): 493-517.
- Light, Ivan. 1972. *Ethnic Enterprises in America: Business Welfare among Chinese, Japanese, and Blacks*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 1984. “Immigrant and Ethnic Enterprise in North America.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 7: 195-216.
- Light, Ivan, and Elizabeth Roach. 1996. “Self-Employment: Mobility Ladder or Economic Lifeboat?” Pp. 193-213 in *Ethnic Los Angeles*, edited by Roger Waldinger, and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Loescher, Gil. 2001. *The UNHCR and World Politics: A Perilous Path*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Logan, John, and Julia Rivera Drew. 2011. "Human Capital, Gender, and Labor Force Incorporation: The Case of Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 52(1-2): 25-44.
- Lucas, Richard, Andrew Clark, Yannis Georgellis, and Ed Diener. 2003. "Reexamining Adaptation and the Set Point Model of Happiness: Reactions to Changes in Marital Status." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84(3): 527-539.
- Lyubansky, Mikhail. 2000. "A Tale of Two Cultures: The Effects of Cultural Involvement on the Adjustment of Older Adult Immigrants from the Former USSR." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University.
- Mahler, Sarah, and Myer Siemiatycki. 2011. "Diverse Pathways to Immigrant Political Incorporation: Comparative Canadian and U.S. Perspectives." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55(9): 1123-1130.
- Martin, Philip, and Elizabeth Midgley. 1999. "Immigration to the United States: 1999 Population Bulletin." Retrieved 26 September 2012 (<http://www.prb.org/source/54.2immigrationtous.pdf>).
- Massey, Douglas. 1995. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 21(3): 631-652.

- Massey, Douglas, and Nancy Denton. 1985. "Spatial Assimilation as a Socioeconomic Outcome." *American Sociological Review* 50: 94-106.
- McManus, Walter, William Gould, and Finis Welch. 1983. "Earnings of Hispanic Men: The Role of English Language Proficiency." *Journal of Labor Economics* 1(2): 101-30.
- Migration Policy Institute. 2012. "Who's Where in the United States?" Retrieved May 30, 2012 (<http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/whoswhere.cfm>).
- Morawska, Ewa. 2001. "Immigrants, Transnationalism, and Ethnicization: A Comparison of This Wave and Last." Pp. 175-212 in *E Pluribus Unum? Immigrants, Civic Life, and Political Incorporation*, edited by Gary Gerstle, and John Mollenkoph. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- 2004. "Exploring Diversity in Immigrant Assimilation and Transnationalism: Poles and Russian Jews in Philadelphia." *International Migration Review* 38(4): 1372-1412.
- Moutray, Chad. 2007. "Educational Attainment and Other Characteristics of the Self-Employed: An Examination Using Data from The Panel Study of Income Dynamics." Office of Economic Research. Retrieved August 5, 2012 (<http://archive.sba.gov/advo/research/rs313tot.pdf>).
- Mucherah, Winnie. 2008. "Immigrants' Perceptions of their Native Language: Challenges to Actual Use and Maintenance." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 7: 188-205.

- Nesturek, Olena, and Loren Marks. 2009. "Grandparents Across the Ocean: Eastern European Immigrants` Struggle to Maintain Intergenerational Relationships." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 40: 77-95.
- Okolski, Marek. 2000. "Illegality of International Population Movements in Poland." *International Migration Special Issue* 38(3): 57-89.
- Olsen, James. 1994. *The Ethnic Dimension in American History*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ong, Paul, and Megan Emiko Scott. 2008. "Asian American Civic and Political Engagement: Patterns, Challenges, and Potentials." *Asian American Policy Review* 18: 25-34.
- Pantoja, Adrian, and Sarah Gershon. 2006. "Political Orientations and Naturalization among Latino and Latina Immigrants." *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5): 1171-1187.
- Parillo, Vincent. 2006. *Strangers to These Shores: Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- 2009. *Diversity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Patchen, Martin. 1998. *Diversity and Unity: Relations between Racial and Ethnic Groups*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Perlman, Joel, and Roger Waldinger. 1997. "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present – A Reconsideration." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 893-922.

- Portes, Alejandro. 1999. "Conclusion: Towards a New World: The Origins and Effects of Transnational Activities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 463-477.
- Portes, Alejandro, Luis Guarnizo, and Patricia Landolt. 1999. "The Study of Transnationalism: The Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 217-237.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Lingxin Hao. 2002. "The Price of Uniformity: Language, Family, and Personality Adjustment in the Immigrant Second Generation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(6): 889-912.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- , 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530: 74-98.
- , 1996. "Self-employment and the Earnings of Immigrants." *American Sociological Review* 61: 219-230.
- Putnam, Robert. 1995 "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 28(4): 664-683.
- , 2000 *Bowling Alone*. New York: Touchstone.

- Rallu, Jean Louis. 2011. "Naturalization Policies in France and the USA and Their Impact on Migrants` Characteristics and Strategies." *Population Review* 50(1): 40-61.
- Ramakrishnan, Karthick, and Celia Viramontes. 2006. *Civic Inequalities: Immigrant Volunteerism and Community Organizations in California*. Oakland, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- , 2010. "Civic Spaces: Mexican Hometown Associations and Immigrant Participation." *Journal of Social Issues* 66(1): 155-173.
- Ramirez, Ricardo, and Adrian Felix. 2011. "Transnational Stakeholders: Latin American Migrant Transnationalism and Civic Engagement in the United States." *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy* 23: 59-82.
- Remennick, Larissa. 2005. "Being a Woman is Different Here: Changing Perceptions of Femininity and Gender Relations among Former Soviet Women Living in Greater Boston." *Women's Studies International Forum* 30(4): 326-341.
- Renner, Walter, Anton-Rupert Laireiter, and Marco Maier. 2012. "Social Support as a Moderator of Acculturative Stress among Refugees and Asylum Seekers." *Social Behavior and Personality* 40(1): 129-146.
- Robila, Mihaela. 2007. "Eastern European Immigrants in the United States: A Socio-Demographic Profile." *The Social Science Journal* 44(1): 113-125.
- , 2008. "Characteristics of Eastern European Immigration in the United States." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 39(4): 545-557.

- . 2010. *Eastern European Immigrant Families*. New York: Routledge.
- Rumbaut, Rubén. 1994. "Origins and Destinies: Immigration to the United States since World War II." *Sociological Forum* 9(4): 583-621.
- . 2005. "Turning Points in the Transition to Adulthood: Determinants of Educational Attainment, Incarceration, and Early Childbearing among Children of Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1041-86.
- Russell, Joseph, and Jeanne Batalova. 2012. "European Immigrants in the United States." Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved April 10, 2012
(<http://www.migrationinformation.org/USFocus/display.cfm?id=901>).
- Ryan, Allen. 2009. "Benefit or Burden? Social Capital, Gender, and the Economic Adaptation of Refugees." *International Migration Review* 43(2): 332-365.
- Sakamoto, Arthur, and Yu Xie. 2006. "The Socioeconomic Attainment of Asian Americans." Pp. 26-42 in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues*, edited by Pyong Gap Min. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sanallutov, Marat. 2004. "Slavic-Speaking Young Adult Refugees' Experiences of Acculturation in the Midwest United States: A Multiple Case Study." Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska.
- Schaefer, Richard. 2010. *Racial and Ethnic Groups*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Simpson-Bueker, Catherine. 2005. "Political Incorporation among Immigrants from Ten Areas of Origin: The Persistence of Source Country Effects." *International Migration Review* 39(1): 103-140.
- 2006. *From Immigrant to Naturalized Citizen: Political Incorporation in the United States*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Stepick, Alex, and Carol Dutton Stepick. 2002. "Becoming American, Constructing Ethnicity: Immigrant Youth and Civic Engagement." *Applied Developmental Science* 6(4): 246-257.
- Stevens, Gillian. 1992. "The Social and Demographic Context of Language Use in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 57(2): 171-85.
- Stodolska, Monika. 2008. "Adaptation Problems among Adolescent Immigrants from Korea, Mexico, and Poland." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 6(2): 197-229.
- Stoll, Michael, and Janelle Wong. 2007. "Immigration and Civic Participation in a Multiracial and Multiethnic Context." *International Migration Review* 41(4): 880-908.
- Tabachnick, Barbara, and Linda Fidell. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Tartakovsky, Eugene. 2012. "Factors Affecting Immigrants' Acculturation Intentions: A Theoretical Model and its Assessment among Adolescent Immigrants from Russia

- and Ukraine in Israel.” *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36(1): 83-99.
- Thapa-Oli, Soni. 2011. “Adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States.” Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Texas Woman’s University.
- Thomas, Tania. 1995. “Acculturative Stress in the Adjustment of Immigrant Families.” *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 4(2): 131-142.
- Thomas, William, and Florian Znaniecki. 1927. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopp.
- Toussaint-Comeau, Maude. 2008. “Do Ethnic Enclaves and Networks Promote Immigrant Self-Employment?” *Economic Perspectives* 32(4): 30-50.
- Trusty, Jerry, Bruce Thompson, and John Petrocelli. 2004. “Practical Guide for Reporting Effect Size in Quantitative Research.” *Journal of Counseling and Development* 82(1): 107-10.
- United Nations Statistics Division. 2012. “Composition of Macro Geographical (Continental) Regions, Geographical Sub-regions, and Selected Economic and other Groupings.” Retrieved February 24, 2012 (<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#europe>).
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2009. “Place of birth of the Foreign Born Population: 2009.” Retrieved February 27, 2012 (<http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acsbr09-15.pdf>).

- 2012. "Poverty." Retrieved April 6, 2012
(<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/methods/definitions.html>).
- Vang, Zoua. 2012. "The Limits of Spatial Assimilation for Immigrants' Full Integration: Emerging Evidence from African Immigrants in Boston and Dublin." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 6(41): 220-246.
- Waldinger, Roger, and Michael Richter. 1996. "Anglos: Beyond Ethnicity?" Pp. 413-441 in *Ethnic Los Angeles*, edited by Roger Waldinger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Waldorf, Brigitte. 1995. "Determinants of International Return Migration Intentions." *Professional Geographer* 47(2): 125-136.
- Weeks, John. 2009. *Population: An Introduction to Concepts and Issues*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Wepman, Dennis. 2002. *Immigration: From the Founding of Virginia to the Closing of Ellis Island*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.
- White, Michael, and Jennifer Glick. 1999. "The Impact of Immigration on Residential Segregation." Pp. 345-72 in *Immigration and Opportunity*, edited by Frank Bean and Stephanie Bell-Rose. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- White, Michael, and Sharon Sassler. 2000. "Judging Not Only by Color: Ethnicity, Nativity, and Neighborhood Attainment." *Social Science Quarterly* 81(4): 997-1013.

- World Bank. 2005. "GNI per Capita 2005, Atlas Method and PPP." Retrieved May 19, 2012 (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/Atlas_2005.pdf).
- Xie, Yu, and Margaret Gough. 2011. "Ethnic Enclaves and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Demography* 48: 1293-1315.
- Yancey, George. 2003. *Who is White?: Latinos, Asians, and the New Black/Non-black Divide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Yang, Philip. 1994. "Explaining Immigrant Naturalization." *International Migration Review* 28(3): 449-477.
- 2000. *Ethnic Studies: Issues and Approaches*. New York: SUNY.
- 2002. "Citizenship Acquisition of Post-1965 Asian Immigrants." *Population and Environment* 23(4): 377-404.
- 2011. *Asian Immigration to the United States*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Zeng, Zhen, and Yu Xie. 2004. "Asian Americans` Earnings Disadvantage Reexamined: The Role of Place of Education." *American Journal of Sociology* 109: 1075-1108.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 63-95.
- 2002. "The Changing Face of America: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Social Mobility." Pp. 65-98 in *Mass Migration to the United States: Classical and Contemporary Periods*, edited by Pyong Gap Min. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Znaniecky, Helena Lopata. 1976. *Polish Americans: Status Competition in an Ethnic Community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A

Tables

Table 1. Trends in Eastern European Immigration, Selected Countries, 1880-2010

	1880- 1919	1920- 1929	1930- 1949	1950- 1989	1990- 1999	2000- 2010
Bulgaria	61,883	2,824	1,511	2,830	16,948	42,468
Czechoslovakia	-	101,182	26,232	15,714	8,970	20,201
Hungary	1,564,452	29,499	12,405	52,891	9,295	13,784
Poland	150,703	223,316	33,132	159,386	172,249	125,312
Romania	83,538	67,810	6,518	38,780	48,136	55,889
Russia	3,241,098	61,604	3,068	64,225	433,427	174,654

Source: 2010 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics

Table 2. Trends in Eastern European Immigration by Country of Birth, 1991-2010

Country	1991-1995	1996-2000	2001-2005	2006-2010	Total
Albania	5,133	21,058	21,272	29,253	76,716
Belarus	17,146*	11,844	13,440	12,249	54,679
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4,756*	34,373	79,704	9,296	128,129
Bulgaria	5,907	17,672	21,721	17,472	62,772
Croatia	1,467*	3,741	11,095	2,735	19,038
Czech Republic	83**	884	1,774	1,194	3,935
Hungary	5,709	4,664	6,397	6,433	23,203
Latvia	2,631	2,717	3,225	2,794	11,367
Lithuania	2,536	5,586	10,681	6,267	25,070
Macedonia	1,033***	3,796	4,240	5,742	14,811
Moldova	8,467*	5,785	10,335	10,360	34,947
Poland	114,421	55,191	64,667	52,158	286,437
Romania	28,512	29,023	26,844	26,782	111,161
Russia	50,745*	77,286	90,484	49,265	267,780
Slovakia	734**	2,825	3,973	3,771	11,303
Ukraine	71,141*	70,156	90,638	58,656	290,591

Source: 2010 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics

*Not applicable before 1992

**Not applicable before 1993

***Not applicable before 1994

Table 3. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Eastern European Immigrants by Country of Birth, 2006-2010 (values in percent)

	Age			Marital Status		Total
	Under 18	18-34 years	35-64 years	Married	Single	
Average	15	46	34	66	28	294,427
Albania	14	34	39	64	29	29,253
Belarus	16	50	29	62	31	12,249
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11	48	36	62	28	9,296
Bulgaria	11	49	35	68	25	17,472
Croatia	9	45	40	68	25	2,735
Czech Republic	12	53	33	69	26	1,194
Hungary	9	51	37	77	17	6,433
Latvia	17	55	26	65	29	2,794
Lithuania	14	48	35	71	23	6,267
Macedonia	15	44	36	71	25	5,742
Moldova	24	44	28	56	39	10,360
Poland	11	48	38	71	23	52,158
Romania	9	48	36	74	18	26,782
Russia	40	25	28	41	51	49,265
Slovakia	6	62	30	77	18	3,771
Ukraine	24	39	31	56	37	58,656

Source: Department of Homeland Security

Table 4. Ten States With the Largest Foreign-Born Population from Eastern Europe, 2000

Area	Number	Percent
United States	1,906,056	100.0
New York	425,742	22.3
Illinois	256,927	13.5
California	232,715	12.2
New Jersey	136,131	7.1
Florida	100,205	5.3
Michigan	71,146	3.7
Pennsylvania	70,439	3.7
Massachusetts	62,665	3.3
Ohio	61,952	3.3
Washington	58,727	3.1

Source: U.S. Population Census

Table 5. Leading States of Residence of Immigrants from Eastern Europe, 2006-2010

Country of Birth	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Albania	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY
Belarus	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY
Bosnia and Herzegovina	MO	IL	FL	IL	NY
Bulgaria	IL	CA	NY	NY	NY
Croatia	NY	CA/NY	CA	NY	CA/NY
Czech Republic	FL	FL	FL	FL	FL
Hungary	FL	NY	NY	NY	NY
Latvia	NY	IL	IL	IL	IL
Lithuania	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL
Macedonia	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	WA
Moldova	WA	CA	CA	CA	IL
Poland	IL	IL	IL	CA	CA
Romania	CA	CA	CA	CA	CA
Russia	CA	CA	CA	CA	CA
Slovakia	NJ	NY	NY	NJ	NY
Ukraine	NY	NY	NY	CA	NY

Source: Department of Homeland Security

Table 6. Class of Admission of Immigrants from Eastern Europe, 2006-2010 (values in percent)

Country	Family-sponsored preferences	Employment-based preferences	Immediate relatives of U.S. citizens	Diversity	Refugees and asylees	Total
Average	5	15	48	13	20	294,427
Albania	3	2	36	28	30	29,253
Belarus	2	9	31	24	29	12,249
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	4	39	2	54	9,296
Bulgaria	3	13	47	31	D	17,472
Croatia	3	17	49	5	25	2,735
Czech Republic	D	45	41	9	D	1,194
Hungary	2	21	68	6	1	6,433
Latvia	3	10	64	6	14	2,794
Lithuania	4	11	68	15	3	6,267
Macedonia	15	6	55	15	8	5,742
Moldova	1	4	24	11	46	10,360
Poland	20	20	54	5	.3	52,158
Romania	5	19	58	14	3	26,782
Russia	2	21	45	3	27	49,265
Slovakia	D	28	58	10	D	3,771
Ukraine	3	7	36	20	25	58,656

Source: Department of Homeland Security

Table 7. Dependent and Independent Variables Used in the Analysis

Dependent Variables	Variable Name	Measurement	Independent Variables
Cultural Adaptation	Native language retention	1. Yes, speaks other language 0. No, speaks only English	Length of residence Age Gender Marital status Region Survey year Country of origin Gross national income Ethnic diversity Personal/political freedom
	English proficiency	1. Not at all 2. Yes, but not well 3. Well 4. Very well 5. Speaks only English	
Socio-economic Adaptation	Educational attainment	No schooling – Doctorate degree	Length of residence Age Gender Marital status Region Survey year Country of origin English proficiency Education (predictor of occupation, self-employment, income, and poverty)
	Occupation	1. Professional/Managerial 0. Non-professional/Non-managerial 1. White collar 0. Blue collar	
	Self-employed	1. Self-employed 0. Working for wages	Occupation (predictor of income and poverty) Self-employment (predictor of income and poverty)
	Personal income	Interval/ratio var. measured in dollars	Gross national income Ethnic diversity Personal/political freedom
	Poverty status	Interval/ratio var. measured in percent	
Structural Adaptation	In the past 12 months, have you participated in: -A school group, neighborhood, or community association such as PTA or neighborhood watch groups? -A service or civic organization such as American Legion or Lions Club? -A sports or recreation organization such as a soccer or tennis club?	1.Yes 0.No	Length of residence Age Gender Marital status Region Survey year Country of origin English proficiency Education Occupation Self-employment Gross national income Ethnic diversity Personal/political freedom

(Continued on next page)

Dependent Variables	Variable Name	Measurement	Independent Variables
	-A church, synagogue, mosque or other religious institutions or organizations, not counting your attendance at religious services		
	How often do you talk with any of your neighbors?	1.Not at all 2.Once a month 3.A few times a month 4.A few times a week 5.Basically every day	
	How often do you and your neighbors do favors for each other, such as watching each other's children, helping with shopping, house sitting, lending garden or house tools, and other small acts of kindness?	1.Not at all 2.Once a month 3.A few times a month 4.A few times a week 5.Basically every day	
Political Adaptation	Citizenship status	1.U.S. citizen by Naturalization 0. Not a U.S. citizen	Length of residence Age Gender
	Registered to vote	1.Yes 0.No	Marital status Region
	Participated in elections	1.Yes 0.No	Survey year Country of origin English proficiency Education Occupation Self-employment Gross national income Ethnic diversity Personal/political freedom
Independent Variables	Variable Name	Measurement	
	Length of residence	Years	
	Age	Years	
	Gender	1. Male 0. Female	
	Marital status	1. Married - spouse present 0. Married - spouse absent, widowed, divorced, separated, never married	
	Region	Northeast (ref. category), Midwest, South, West	

(Continued on next page)

Independent Variables	Variable Name	Measurement
	Survey year	2002-2010, depending on a dataset
	Education	No schooling – doctorate degree
	Occupation	1. Professional/Managerial 0. Non-professional/Non-managerial 1. White-collar 0. Blue-collar
	Self-employment	1. Self-employed 0. Working for wages
	Personal income	Interval/ratio var. measured in dollars
	Country of origin	Dummy variables for countries of Origin (ref. category Ukraine)
	Gross national income	1. Less than \$4,000 0. \$4,000 or higher
	Ethnic diversity	1. Minorities >20 percent of the population 0. Other
	Personal/political freedom	1. Countries classified as partly free 0. Other 1. Countries classified as not free 0. Other

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Cultural Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants, 2006-2010 ACS

Variable	Mean	Median	S.D.
<i>Dependent Variables</i>			
English Proficiency	3.20	3.00	1.05
Do not speak English at all	.07	--	.25
Speak English, but not well	.19	--	.40
Speak English well	.28	--	.45
Speak English very well	.38	--	.49
Speak only English	.07	--	.30
Native Language Retention	.93	--	.26
<i>Independent Variables</i>			
Length of Stay in the U.S.	12.60	13.00	4.72
Age	40.85	38.00	15.89
Male	.44	--	.50
Married, Spouse Present	.60	--	.49
Midwest	.26	--	.44
West	.22	--	.42
South	.17	--	.38
Survey Year 2007	.20	--	.40
Survey Year 2008	.20	--	.40
Survey Year 2009	.20	--	.40
Survey Year 2010	.21	--	.41
Albania	.05	--	.22
Bulgaria	.04	--	.20
Poland	.20	--	.40
Romania	.08	--	.26
Bosnia and Herzegovina	.09	--	.29
Russia	.22	--	.41
Other Eastern European Countries	.14	--	.35
GNI Per Capita <\$4,000	.51	--	.50
Minorities >20% of the Country's Population	.53	--	.50
Partly Free Countries	.35	--	.48
Not Free Countries	.25	--	.43

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Cultural Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants from Selected Countries, 2006-2010 ACS

Variable	Poland			Russia			Ukraine			
	Mean	Median	S.D.	N weighted	Mean	Median	S.D. N weighted	Mean	Median	S.D. N weighted
Dependent Variables										
English Proficiency	3.12	3.00	1.04	208,800	3.24	3.00	1.05 230,638	2.94	3.00	1.08 194,165
Do not speak English	.07	---	.25	208,800	.06	---	.24 230,638	.11	---	.31 194,165
Speak English, but not well	.23	---	.42	208,800	.19	---	.39 230,638	.25	---	.43 194,165
Speak English well	.30	---	.46	208,800	.28	---	.45 230,638	.29	---	.45 194,165
Speak English very well	.35	---	.48	208,800	.39	---	.48 230,638	.31	---	.46 194,165
Speak only English	.06	---	.24	208,800	.08	---	.27 230,638	.05	---	.21 194,165
Native Language	.94	---	.24	208,800	.92	---	.27 230,638	.96	---	.21 194,165
Retention										
Independent Variables										
Length of Stay in the U.S.	12.84	13.00	4.85	208,800	13.12	14.00	4.96 230,638	13.36	14.00	4.71 194,165
Age	38.45	35.00	13.36	208,800	42.93	40.00	17.23 230,638	44.88	42.00	18.47 194,165
Male	.45	---	.50	208,800	.41	---	.49 230,638	.44	---	.50 194,165
Married, Spouse Present	.59	---	.49	208,800	.57	---	.49 230,638	.62	---	.49 194,165
Midwest	.44	---	.50	208,800	.13	---	.33 230,638	.15	---	.36 194,165
West	.06	---	.25	208,800	.30	---	.46 230,638	.33	---	.47 194,165
South	.08	---	.27	208,800	.17	---	.38 230,638	.13	---	.34 194,165
Survey Year 2007	.21	---	.40	208,800	.20	---	.40 230,638	.18	---	.38 194,165
Survey Year 2008	.20	---	.40	208,800	.21	---	.41 230,638	.20	---	.40 194,165
Survey Year 2009	.18	---	.38	208,800	.21	---	.40 230,638	.21	---	.41 194,165
Survey Year 2010	.21	---	.41	208,800	.20	---	.40 230,638	.21	---	.41 194,165

**Table 10. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting English Proficiency of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older,
2006-2010 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)**

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β								
Constant	4.039***		3.850***		4.056***		4.072***		4.093***	
Length of Stay	.051*** (.001)	.229 (.001)	.054*** (.001)	.244 (.001)	.051*** (.001)	.228 (.001)	.052*** (.001)	.234 (.001)	.051*** (.001)	.231 (.001)
Age	-.039*** (.000)	-.590 (.000)	-.039*** (.000)	-.587 (.000)	-.039*** (.000)	-.590 (.000)	-.038*** (.000)	-.585 (.000)	-.038*** (.000)	-.583 (.000)
Male	-.065*** (.010)	-.031 (.009)	-.062*** (.009)	-.029 (.010)	-.063*** (.010)	-.030 (.010)	-.066*** (.010)	-.031 (.010)	-.058*** (.010)	-.028 (.010)
Married, Spouse Present	-.024* (.010)	-.011 (.010)	-.021* (.010)	-.010 (.010)	-.023* (.010)	-.011 (.010)	-.026* (.010)	-.012 (.010)	-.019 (.010)	-.009 (.010)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.096*** (.013)	-.040 (.013)	-.090*** (.013)	-.038 (.013)	-.095*** (.013)	-.040 (.013)	-.110*** (.013)	-.046 (.013)	-.108*** (.013)	-.045 (.013)
West	.044*** (.013)	.018 (.013)	.008 (.013)	.003 (.013)	.049*** (.013)	.020 (.013)	.065*** (.013)	.026 (.013)	.059*** (.013)	.023 (.013)
South	.251*** (.014)	.090 (.014)	.204*** (.014)	.073 (.014)	.255*** (.014)	.092 (.014)	.256*** (.014)	.092 (.014)	.255*** (.014)	.092 (.014)
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.069*** (.016)	.026 (.016)	.063*** (.016)	.024 (.016)	.068*** (.016)	.026 (.016)	.067*** (.016)	.026 (.016)	.065*** (.016)	.025 (.016)
Survey Year 2008	.111*** (.016)	.043 (.016)	.107*** (.016)	.041 (.016)	.111*** (.016)	.043 (.016)	.110*** (.016)	.043 (.016)	.111*** (.016)	.043 (.016)
Survey Year 2009	.179*** (.016)	.068 (.016)	.173*** (.016)	.066 (.016)	.179*** (.016)	.069 (.016)	.180*** (.016)	.069 (.016)	.183*** (.016)	.070 (.016)
Survey Year 2010	.242*** (.015)	.095 (.015)	.242*** (.015)	.095 (.015)	.242*** (.015)	.095 (.015)	.241*** (.015)	.095 (.015)	.244*** (.015)	.096 (.015)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania	.159*** (.024)		.034							
Bosnia/Herzegovina	.010 (.019)		.003							
Bulgaria	.492*** (.023)		.095							
Poland	.002 (.016)		.001							
Romania	.484*** (.019)		.122							
Russia	.228*** (.014)		.090							
Other	.251*** (.016)		.084							
GNI per capita <\$4,000										
Minorities >20%										
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
R ² (adjusted)	.36		.38							
F	53,298.16***		36,026.34***							
N	1,062,372		1,062,372							
N before weighting	45,900		45,900							

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 11. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting English Proficiency of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older from Selected Countries, ACS 2006-2010 (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	3.882***		4.006***		3.886***	
Length of Stay	.052*** (.003)	.245	.051*** (.002)	.241	.059*** (.002)	.260
Age	-.038*** (.000)	-.488	-.038*** (.000)	-.629	-.040*** (.001)	-.680
Male	-.157*** (.023)	-.075	-.059*** (.020)	-.028	-.087*** (.021)	-.040
Married, Spouse Present	-.059* (.025)	-.028	.063*** (.021)	.030	.006 (.022)	.003
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	-.159*** (.025)	-.076	.148*** (.033)	.047	-.033 (.031)	-.011
West	.599*** (.046)	.142	-.023 (.024)	-.010	-.159*** (.025)	-.070
South	.543*** (.041)	.141	.223*** (.028)	.080	.191*** (.032)	.061
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.013 (.039)	.005	.107*** (.033)	.041	.046 (.035)	.016
Survey Year 2008	.117*** (.037)	.045	.119*** (.032)	.046	.088** (.033)	.033
Survey Year 2009	.180*** (.038)	.066	.215*** (.032)	.083	.165*** (.034)	.063
Survey Year 2010	.251*** (.036)	.099	.267*** (.032)	.102	.197*** (.032)	.075
R² (adjusted)	.305		.396		.446	
F	8,326.346***		13,737.447***		14,183.843***	
N	208,800		230,683		194,165	
N before weighting	8,329		10,133		8,831	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 12. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Native Language Retention of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2006-2010 ACS

Predictor	Model 1					Model 2					Model 3					Model 4					Model 5				
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio													
Length of Stay	-.019*** (.005)	.981 (.005)	-.025*** (.005)	.975 (.005)	-.019*** (.005)	.982 (.005)	-.023*** (.005)	.977 (.005)	-.022*** (.005)	.978 (.005)															
Age	.026*** (.001)	1.027 (.001)	.026*** (.001)	1.026 (.001)	.026*** (.001)	1.027 (.001)	.026*** (.002)	1.026 (.002)	.026*** (.002)	1.026 (.002)															
Male	.218*** (.046)	1.244 (.046)	.204*** (.046)	1.227 (.046)	.205*** (.046)	1.228 (.046)	.221*** (.046)	1.248 (.046)	.201*** (.046)	1.223 (.046)															
Married, Spouse Present	.454*** (.047)	1.575 (.048)	.454*** (.048)	1.574 (.047)	.446*** (.047)	1.562 (.047)	.463*** (.047)	1.589 (.047)	.451*** (.047)	1.570 (.047)															
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)																									
Midwest	.219*** (.066)	1.245 (.067)	.230*** (.067)	1.259 (.066)	.214*** (.066)	1.239 (.066)	.264*** (.067)	1.303 (.067)	.276*** (.068)	1.318 (.068)															
West	-.172* (.060)	.842 (.064)	-.139* (.064)	.870 (.060)	-.208* (.060)	.812 (.060)	-.243*** (.062)	.784 (.062)	-.231*** (.061)	.794 (.061)															
South	-.482*** (.060)	.618 (.063)	-.431*** (.063)	.650 (.060)	-.516*** (.060)	.597 (.060)	-.505*** (.060)	.603 (.060)	-.502*** (.060)	.606 (.060)															
Survey Year (ref.=2006)																									
Survey Year 2007	-.092 (.074)	.912 (.075)	-.079 (.074)	.924 (.074)	-.086 (.074)	.917 (.074)	-.091 (.075)	.913 (.075)	-.087 (.075)	.917 (.075)															
Survey Year 2008	-.018 (.075)	.982 (.075)	-.010 (.075)	.990 (.075)	-.018 (.075)	.982 (.075)	-.018 (.075)	.982 (.075)	-.025 (.075)	.975 (.075)															
Survey Year 2009	-.190** (.074)	.827 (.074)	-.185* (.074)	.831 (.074)	-.197** (.074)	.821 (.074)	-.203** (.074)	.816 (.074)	-.216** (.074)	.806 (.074)															
Survey Year 2010	-.282*** (.070)	.754 (.070)	-.287*** (.070)	.751 (.070)	-.287*** (.070)	.751 (.070)	-.286*** (.070)	.751 (.070)	-.299*** (.070)	.741 (.070)															

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1 B	Model 1 Odds Ratio	Model 2 B	Model 2 Odds Ratio	Model 3 B	Model 3 Odds Ratio	Model 4 B	Model 4 Odds Ratio	Model 5 B	Model 5 Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania	.319*	(.137)	.727							
Bosnia/Herzegovina	.063	(.122)	1.065							
Bulgaria	-.735***	(.117)	.480							
Poland	-.373***	(.091)	.688							
Romania	-.1040***	(.093)	.353							
Russia	-.566***	(.080)	.568							
Other	-.690***	(.083)	.501							
GNI per capita <\$4,000				.292*** (.035)		.1339 (.048)				
Minorities >20%							.372*** (.048)		1.451	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	1.661***		2.196***		1.544***		1.555***			
-2log likelihood	531,789.75		524,793.80		530,336.33		529,509.78			
Model χ^2	21,715.18***		28,711,13***		23,168.60***		23,995.15			
Pseudo R ²	.05		.07		.05		.06			
Degrees of freedom	8		18		12		12			
N	1,062,372		1,062,372		1,062,372		1,062,372			
N before weighting	45,900		45,900		45,900		45,900			

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table 13. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Native Language
Retention of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older from
Selected Countries, 2006-2010 ACS**

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	-.003 (.012)	.997	-.033*** (.010)	.968	.025 (.014)	1.025
Age	.010* (.004)	1.010	.037*** (.004)	1.038	.031*** (.005)	1.032
Male	.283* (.015)	1.328	.298** (.096)	1.347	.348* (.136)	1.416
Married, Spouse Present	.489*** (.013)	1.631	.399*** (.097)	1.491	.271* (.136)	1.311
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	.349* (.139)	1.418	-.202 (.147)	.817	-.044 (.194)	.957
West	-1.313*** (.161)	.269	.082 (.118)	1.085	.138 (.169)	1.148
South	-.942*** (.159)	.390	-.494*** (.121)	.610	-.327 (.186)	.721
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.178 (.180)	1.195	-.286 (.152)	.751	-.190 (.229)	.827
Survey Year 2008	.018 (.178)	1.018	-.088 (.156)	.916	.027 (.216)	1.027
Survey Year 2009	-.108 (.178)	.897	-.396* (.154)	.673	-.197 (.207)	.821
Survey Year 2010	-.117 (.166)	.890	-.416** (.149)	.660	.030 (.212)	1.031
Constant	2.115***		1.462***		1.268***	
-2log likelihood	92,609.238		122,055.966		67,838.815	
Model χ^2	5,433.31***		8,195.13***		3,425.35***	
Pseudo R²	.069		.081		.057	
Degrees of freedom	11		11		11	
N	208,800		230,683		194,165	
N before weighting	8,329		10,133		8,831	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 14. Comparisons of Squared Structure Coefficients and Partial Eta's Squared for All Predictors in the Analysis of Cultural Adaptation of Post- 1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2006-2010 ACS

Predictor	English Proficiency									
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2
Length of Stay	.021	.071	.019	.082	.021	.071	.020	.074	.020	.073
Age	.824	.338	.774	.339	.824	.337	.819	.332	.806	.331
Male	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001
Married, Spouse Present	.026	.002	.024	.001	.026	.002	.026	.001	.026	.001
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.007	.002	.006	.002	.007	.002	.007	.002	.006	.002
West	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001
South	.033	.010	.031	.007	.032	.010	.032	.010	.032	.010
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.001	.001	.000	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
Survey Year 2008	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002
Survey Year 2009	.001	.004	.001	.004	.001	.004	.001	.005	.001	.005
Survey Year 2010	.002	.008	.002	.008	.002	.008	.002	.008	.002	.008
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		.001	.001							
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.001	.000							
Bulgaria		.017	.011							
Poland		.004	.000							
Romania		.029	.016							
Russia		.001	.000							
Other		.007	.007							
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.005	.000				
Minorities >20%							.020	.003		
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)									.039	.010
Partly free									.000	.000
Not free										

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Native Language Retention				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
Married, Spouse Present	.015	.015	.015	.016	.015
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.004	.004	.004	.005	.005
West	.002	.001	.002	.004	.004
South	.018	.014	.020	.018	.018
Survey Year (ref.=2006)					
Survey Year 2007	.001	.000	.001	.001	.001
Survey Year 2008	.002	.000	.002	.002	.002
Survey Year 2009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.004
Survey Year 2010	.006	.006	.006	.006	.007
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania		.008			
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.000			
Bulgaria		.040			
Poland		.011			
Romania		.076			
Russia		.024			
Other		.035			
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.006		
Minorities >20%				.010	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					.111
Not free					.005

Table 15. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Socioeconomic Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants, 2006-2010 ACS

Dependent Variable	Mean	Median	S.D.	N	N weighted
Education	11.44	12.00	2.61	34,823	807,087
Less than High School	.06	---	.23	34,823	807,087
High School	.26	---	.44	34,823	807,087
Some College	.23	---	.42	34,823	807,087
College Completion	.24	---	.42	34,823	807,087
Advanced Degree	.22	---	.41	34,823	807,087
Occupation: White-collar	.53	---	.50	29,032	679363
Occupation: Professional /Managerial	.37	---	.48	29,032	679363
Self-employed	.12	---	.32	37,015	852,449
Personal Income	35,900	25,400	44,184	671,867	671,867
\$0 or less	.05	---	.22	28,741	671,867
\$1 - \$9,999	.17	---	.38	28,741	671,867
\$10,000 - \$19,999	.16	---	.37	28,741	671,867
\$20,000 - 49,999	.39	---	.49	28,741	671,867
\$50,000 - \$79,999	.14	---	.35	28,741	671,867
\$80,000 - \$99,999	.04	---	.19	28,741	671,867
\$100,000 or higher	.05	---	.23	28,741	671,867
Poverty level					
Severely poor	.03	---	.18	12,946	303,786
Poor	.05	---	.22	12,946	303,786
Near poor	.03	---	.18	12,946	303,786
Low income	.13	---	.33	12,946	303,786
Middle income	.34	---	.47	12,946	303,786
High income	.41	---	.49	12,946	303,786

Table 16. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Socioeconomic Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants from Selected Countries, 2006-2010 ACS

Predictor	Poland			Russia			Ukraine					
	Mean	Median	S.D.	N weighted	Mean	Median	S.D.	N weighted	Mean	Median	S.D.	N weighted
Education	10.87	11	2.47	173,167	12.43	13	2.39	164,976	11.83	13	2.37	132,005
Less than High School	.07	---	.25	173,167	.04	---	.19	164,976	.04	---	.20	132,005
High School	.34	---	.48	173,167	.13	---	.33	164,976	.19	---	.39	132,005
Some College	.27	---	.44	173,167	.18	---	.39	164,976	.26	---	.44	132,005
College Completion	.16	---	.37	173,167	.31	---	.46	164,976	.28	---	.45	132,005
Advanced Degree	.16	---	.37	173,167	.34	---	.47	164,976	.23	---	.42	132,005
White-collar	.41	---	.50	137,862	.66	---	.47	143,882	.54	---	.50	111,452
Professional/Managerial	.27	---	.49	137,862	.49	---	.50	143,882	.38	---	.49	111,452
Self-employed	.14	---	.35	172,307	.11	---	.31	175,970	.11	---	.32	140,099
Personal Income	33,604	27,000	35,608	136,107	39,849	26,600	51.4	142,362	36,46	25,000	48,368	110,004
\$0 or less	.05	---	.22	136,107	.07	---	.25	142,362	.05	---	.21	110,004
\$1 - \$9,999	.14	---	.35	136,107	.18	---	.39	142,362	.19	---	.39	110,004
\$10,000 - \$19,999	.16	---	.37	136,107	.14	---	.35	142,362	.16	---	.37	110,004
\$20,000 - \$49,999	.43	---	.50	136,107	.33	---	.47	142,362	.36	---	.48	110,004
\$50,000 - \$79,999	.15	---	.36	136,107	.15	---	.36	142,362	.14	---	.35	110,004
\$80,000 - \$99,999	.03	---	.17	136,107	.06	---	.23	142,362	.05	---	.22	110,004
\$100,000 or higher	.03	---	.18	136,107	.08	---	.27	142,362	.05	---	.22	110,004
Poverty level												
Severely poor	.02	---	.14	60,847	.04	---	.20	65,535	.03	---	.16	51,606
Poor	.04	---	.19	60,847	.06	---	.23	65,535	.07	---	.26	51,606
Near poor	.03	---	.16	60,847	.04	---	.20	65,535	.04	---	.19	51,606
Low income	.14	---	.34	60,847	.09	---	.28	65,535	.14	---	.34	51,606
Middle income	.40	---	.49	60,847	.28	---	.45	65,535	.32	---	.47	51,606
High income	.38	---	.49	60,847	.50	---	.50	65,535	.41	---	.50	51,606

Table 17. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Educational Attainment of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 25 to 64, 2006-2010 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	7.750***		8.545***		7.905***		7.615***		7.784***	
Length of Stay	-.024*** (.004)	-.043 (.004)	-.024*** (.004)	-.042 (.004)	-.026*** (.004)	-.046 (.004)	-.028*** (.004)	-.049 (.004)	-.028*** (.004)	-.049
Age	.020*** (.002)	.080 (.002)	.015*** (.002)	.061 (.002)	.020*** (.002)	.082 (.002)	.019*** (.002)	.076 (.002)	.017*** (.002)	.069
Male	-.125*** (.031)	-.024 (.031)	-.052 (.030)	-.010 (.031)	-.108*** (.031)	-.021 (.031)	-.120*** (.031)	-.023 (.031)	-.085** (.031)	-.016
Married, Spouse Present	.085* (.035)	.015 (.034)	.124*** (.034)	.022 (.035)	.107** (.035)	.019 (.035)	.078* (.035)	.014 (.035)	.108** (.035)	.019
U.S. Region (ref=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.398*** (.041)	-.067 (.040)	-.098* (.040)	-.017 (.041)	-.394*** (.041)	-.066 (.041)	-.346*** (.041)	-.058 (.041)	-.261*** (.041)	-.044
West	.033 (.040)	.005 (.040)	-.129*** (.040)	-.020 (.040)	.078 (.040)	.012 (.040)	-.038 (.041)	-.006 (.041)	-.012 (.040)	-.002
South	-.072 (.046)	-.010 (.044)	.051 (.044)	.007 (.046)	-.028 (.046)	-.004 (.046)	-.095* (.046)	-.014 (.046)	-.031 (.045)	-.004
Survey Year (ref=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	-.019 (.051)	-.003 (.048)	-.011 (.048)	-.002 (.050)	-.024 (.050)	-.004 (.050)	-.015 (.050)	-.002 (.050)	-.033 (.049)	-.005
Survey Year 2008	-.033 (.052)	-.005 (.049)	-.046 (.049)	-.007 (.051)	-.036 (.051)	-.006 (.052)	-.033 (.052)	-.005 (.051)	-.048 (.051)	-.008
Survey Year 2009	-.144* (.051)	-.022 (.049)	-.151** (.049)	-.023 (.050)	-.139** (.050)	-.021 (.050)	-.150** (.050)	-.023 (.050)	-.156** (.050)	-.024
Survey Year 2010	-.320*** (.050)	-.051 (.047)	-.274*** (.047)	-.043 (.049)	-.315*** (.049)	-.050 (.049)	-.322*** (.049)	-.051 (.049)	-.308*** (.049)	-.049
English Proficiency	1.049*** (.021)	.393 (.021)	.990*** (.021)	.371 (.021)	1.048*** (.021)	.392 (.021)	1.062*** (.021)	.398 (.021)	1.018*** (.021)	.381

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania					-1.449*** (.084)					
Bosnia/Herzegovina					-2.200*** (.062)					
Bulgaria					-.150* (.073)					
Poland					-.925					
Romania					-.146 (.048)					
Russia					-.592*** (.063)					
Other					.343*** (.047)					
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.053 -.555*** (.051)					
Minorities >20%										
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
R² (adjusted)	.141		.217							
F	11,072.94***		11,789.71***							
N	807,087		807,087							
N before weighting	34,823		34,823							

Table 18. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Educational Attainment of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 25 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2010 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	9.339***		8.142***		7.924***	
Length of Stay	-.060*** (.007)	-.115	.000 (.008)	.000	-.003 (.008)	-.005
Age	-.006 (.004)	-.027	.029*** (.004)	.129	.023*** (.004)	.105
Male	-.333*** (.064)	-.067	-.068 (.069)	-.014	-.048 (.068)	-.010
Married, Spouse Present	-.035 (.070)	-.007	.362*** (.073)	.070	.244** (.081)	.046
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	-.039 (.069)	-.008	.280** (.101)	.039	.103 (.099)	.016
West	.630*** (.129)	.063	-.131 (.077)	-.025	-.530*** (.083)	-.104
South	.755*** (.115)	.082	.307*** (.093)	.049	.043 (.103)	.006
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.101 (.105)	.017	-.031 (.103)	-.005	-.044 (.113)	-.007
Survey Year 2008	.114 (.104)	.019	-.112 (.104)	-.019	-.140 (.107)	-.024
Survey Year 2009	.048 (.107)	.007	-.377*** (.104)	-.064	-.287** (.108)	-.049
Survey Year 2010	-.261* (.108)	-.043	-.275** (.102)	-.046	.361*** (.104)	-.062
English Proficiency	.842*** (.042)	.351	.896*** (.049)	.353	1.017*** (.042)	.412
R² (adjusted)	.174		.123		.172	
F	3,040.051***		1,934.633***		2,289.070***	
N	173,167		164,976		132,005	
N before weighting	6,885		7,249		5,923	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 19. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Holding a White-Collar Occupation, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64, 2006-2009 ACS

Predictor	Model 1						Model 2						Model 3						Model 4					
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio												
Length of Stay	.048*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)	.050*** (.004)	1.051 (.004)	.048*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)	.046*** (.004)	1.047 (.004)	.046*** (.004)	1.047 (.004)	.046*** (.004)	1.048 (.004)												
Age	-.023*** (.002)	.977 (.002)	-.024*** (.002)	.977 (.002)	-.023*** (.002)	.977 (.002)	-.023*** (.002)	.977 (.002)	-.023*** (.002)	.977 (.002)	-.023*** (.002)	.977 (.002)												
Male	-.667*** (.033)	.513 (.033)	-.657*** (.033)	.518 (.033)	-.664*** (.033)	.515 (.033)	-.665*** (.033)	.514 (.033)	-.656*** (.033)	.514 (.033)	-.656*** (.033)	.519 (.033)												
Married, Spouse Present	.134*** (.037)	1.143 (.037)	.154*** (.037)	1.166 (.037)	.137*** (.037)	1.146 (.037)	.137*** (.037)	1.147 (.037)	.137*** (.037)	1.147 (.037)	.137*** (.037)	1.162 (.037)												
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)																								
Midwest	-.261*** (.044)	.771 (.044)	-.220*** (.044)	.803 (.044)	-.260*** (.044)	.771 (.044)	-.240*** (.044)	.787 (.044)	-.240*** (.044)	.787 (.044)	-.216*** (.044)	.806 (.044)												
West	.039 (.044)	1.040 (.044)	-.051 (.046)	.951 (.046)	.045 (.045)	1.046 (.045)	.046 (.045)	1.046 (.045)	.046 (.045)	1.046 (.045)	.046 (.045)	1.021 (.045)												
South	.102* (.048)	1.107 (.049)	.051 (.048)	1.052 (.048)	.108* (.048)	1.114 (.048)	.092 (.048)	1.096 (.048)	.092 (.048)	1.096 (.048)	.092 (.048)	1.117 (.048)												
Survey Year (ref.=2006)																								
Survey Year 2007	.019 (.046)	1.019 (.047)	.016 (.047)	1.016 (.046)	.018 (.046)	1.018 (.046)	.020 (.046)	1.020 (.046)	.020 (.046)	1.020 (.046)	.020 (.046)	1.013 (.047)												
Survey Year 2008	.164*** (.047)	1.178 (.047)	.164*** (.047)	1.178 (.047)	.163*** (.047)	1.177 (.047)	.164*** (.047)	1.178 (.047)	.164*** (.047)	1.178 (.047)	.164*** (.047)	1.172 (.047)												
Survey Year 2009	.106* (.047)	1.112 (.047)	.105* (.047)	1.111 (.047)	.106* (.047)	1.112 (.047)	.106* (.047)	1.112 (.047)	.106* (.047)	1.112 (.047)	.106* (.047)	1.106 (.047)												
English Proficiency	.517*** (.024)	1.676 (.024)	.504*** (.024)	1.655 (.024)	.518*** (.024)	1.678 (.024)	.525*** (.024)	1.690 (.024)	.525*** (.024)	1.690 (.024)	.523*** (.024)	1.687 (.024)												
Education	.377*** (.009)	1.458 (.009)	.363*** (.009)	1.438 (.009)	.376*** (.009)	1.457 (.009)	.375*** (.009)	1.456 (.009)	.375*** (.009)	1.456 (.009)	.367*** (.009)	1.443 (.009)												

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania			-.224*		.799					
Bosnia/Herzegovina			(.090)		.943					
Bulgaria			-.059		.943					
Poland			(.069)		1.193					
Romania			.176*		(.084)					
Russia			.173*		1.189					
Other			(.070)		1.411					
GNI per capita <\$4,000			344***		(.054)					
Minorities>20%					.103		1.109			
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	-5.483***		-5.321***		740,000.63		-5.452***			
-2log likelihood	744,579.05		195,124.10***		199,702.52***		744,486.70			
Model χ^2					195,216.46***		195,922.70***			
Pseudo R ²	.333						.333			
Degrees of freedom	12						19			
N	679,363						679,363			
N before weighting	29,032						29,032			

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 20. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Holding a Professional or Managerial Occupation, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64, 2006-2009 ACS

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio								
Length of Stay	.048*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)	.050*** (.004)	1.051 (.004)	.048*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)	.047*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)	.048*** (.004)	1.049 (.004)
Age	-.007*** (.002)	.993 (.002)								
Male	.012 (.034)	1.012 (.034)	.023 (.034)	1.023 (.034)	.016 (.034)	1.016 (.034)	.013 (.034)	1.013 (.034)	.023 (.034)	1.023 (.034)
Married, Spouse Present	.213*** (.038)	1.237 (.038)	.223*** (.038)	1.250 (.038)	.215*** (.038)	1.240 (.038)	.214*** (.038)	1.239 (.038)	.222*** (.038)	1.248 (.038)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.193*** (.046)	.824 (.047)	-.169*** (.047)	.845 (.046)	-.192*** (.046)	.825 (.046)	-.183*** (.046)	.833 (.046)	-.175*** (.046)	.840 (.046)
West	.097* (.045)	1.102 (.046)	.026 (.046)	1.026 (.046)	.104* (.045)	1.110 (.045)	.087 (.045)	1.091 (.045)	.093* (.045)	1.098 (.045)
South	.062 (.048)	1.064 (.049)	.019 (.049)	1.020 (.049)	.069 (.048)	1.071 (.048)	.058 (.048)	1.060 (.048)	.067 (.048)	1.069 (.048)
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	-.017 (.048)	.983 (.048)	-.024 (.048)	.976 (.048)	-.018 (.048)	.982 (.048)	-.017 (.048)	.983 (.048)	-.023 (.048)	.977 (.048)
Survey Year 2008	.186*** (.048)	1.205 (.048)	.184*** (.048)	1.202 (.048)	.186*** (.048)	1.204 (.048)	.186*** (.048)	1.205 (.048)	.183*** (.048)	1.201 (.048)
Survey Year 2009	.115* (.048)	1.122 (.048)	.110* (.048)	1.117 (.048)	.116* (.048)	1.123 (.048)	.114* (.048)	1.121 (.048)	.115* (.048)	1.121 (.048)
English Proficiency	.475*** (.024)	1.609 (.025)	.464*** (.025)	1.591 (.024)	.476*** (.024)	1.610 (.024)	.479*** (.024)	1.615 (.025)	.476*** (.025)	1.610 (.025)
Education	.526*** (.011)	1.692 (.011)	.513*** (.011)	1.670 (.011)	.525*** (.011)	1.690 (.011)	.525*** (.011)	1.690 (.011)	.518*** (.011)	1.678 (.011)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania	-.294** (.097)	.745			
Bosnia/Herzegovina	-.122 (.078)	.886			
Bulgaria	.047 (.081)	1.048			
Poland	-.151** (.058)	.860			
Romania	.313*** (.069)	1.367			
Russia	.237*** (.052)	1.267			
Other	.155** (.059)	1.168			
GNI per capita >\$4,000			-.068* (.034)	.934	
Minorities>20%				.071* (.035)	1.073
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					
Not free					
Constant	-.959*** 680,080,42	-8.806*** 676,839,42	-8.920*** 215,994,75***	-8.988*** 679,951,60	.043 -8.879*** 678,755,29
-2log likelihood	212,753,75***	212,882,58***	212,886,139***	212,886,139***	214,078,89***
Model χ^2					
Pseudo R ²	.368	.372	.368	.368	.370
Degrees of freedom	12	19	13	13	14
N	679,363	679,363	679,363	679,363	679,363
N before weighting	2,032	29,032	29,032	29,032	29,032

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 21. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Holding a White-Collar Occupation, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2009 ACS

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay		1.050	.023**	1.024	.059***	1.060
	(.009)		(.009)		(.010)	
Age	-.024***	.976	-.022***	.979	-.020***	.980
	(.004)		(.004)		(.004)	
Male	-.671***	.511	-.476***	.621	-.672***	.511
	(.075)		(.075)		(.080)	
Married, Spouse Present	-.004	.996	.174*	1.190	.131	1.139
	(.082)		(.082)		(.090)	
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	-.010	.990	-.149	.862	-.309**	.734
	(.083)		(.117)		(.119)	
West	.077	1.081	-.031	.970	-.085	.919
	(.148)		(.091)		(.097)	
South	.401**	1.493	-.014	.986	-.093	.911
	(.134)		(.106)		(.125)	
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.044	1.045	.173	1.189	.059	1.061
	(.107)		(.102)		(.112)	
Survey Year 2008	.447***	1.564	.164	1.178	.116	1.123
	(.107)		(.104)		(.109)	
Survey Year 2009	.360***	1.433	.221*	1.248	.053	1.055
	(.109)		(.108)		(.110)	
English Proficiency	.573***	1.774	.481***	1.617	.615***	1.850
	(.051)		(.052)		(.058)	
Education	.359***	1.431	.385***	1.470	.366***	1.441
	(.020)		(.022)		(.022)	
Constant	-5.852***		-5.062***		-5.867***	
-2log likelihood	145,318.564		152,419.195		122,546.951	
Model χ^2	42,075.79***		31,686.12***		31,411.16***	
Pseudo R²	.354		.274		.328	
Degrees of freedom	12		12		12	
N	137,862		143,882		111,452	
N before weighting	5,438		6,309		5,012	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 22. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Holding a Professional or Managerial Occupation, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2009 ACS

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	.036*** (.009)	1.037	.039*** (.009)	1.040	.053*** (.010)	1.054
Age	.001 (.004)	1.001	-.011** (.004)	.989	-.009* (.004)	.991
Male	.077 (.082)	1.080	.115 (.072)	1.122	.018 (.080)	1.018
Married, Spouse Present	.167 (.087)	1.181	.146 (.079)	1.158	.164 (.090)	1.179
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	-.049 (.090)	.952	-.158 (.111)	.854	-.110 (.119)	.896
West	.111 (.149)	1.117	-.022 (.089)	.978	.098 (.098)	1.103
South	.238 (.130)	1.268	-.156 (.096)	.855	.037 (.121)	1.038
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.105 (.115)	1.111	.144 (.099)	1.155	-.001 (.113)	.999
Survey Year 2008	.396*** (.112)	1.486	.198* (.099)	1.219	.173 (.112)	1.189
Survey Year 2009	.228 (.120)	1.256	.316** (.103)	1.371	.075 (.110)	1.078
English Proficiency	.581*** (.054)	1.787	.383*** (.051)	1.467	.555*** (.059)	1.741
Education	.461*** (.024)	1.586	.567*** (.027)	1.762	.531*** (.029)	1.700
Constant	-9.054***		-8.717		-9.295***	
-2log likelihood	126,279.044		155,234.849		115,149.407	
Model χ^2	35,147.164***		44,130.105***		33,144.537***	
Pseudo R²	.326		.352		.350	
Degrees of freedom	12		12		12	
N	137,862		143,882		111,452	
N before weighting	5,438		6,309		5,012	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 23. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Self-employment of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64, 2006-2010 ACS

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	.021*** (.005)	1.021 (.005)	.021*** (.005)	1.021 (.005)	.018*** (.005)	1.018 (.005)	.025*** (.005)	1.025 (.005)	.024*** (.005)	1.024
Age	.014*** (.002)	1.014 (.002)	.015*** (.002)	1.016 (.002)	.014*** (.002)	1.014 (.002)	.014*** (.002)	1.014 (.002)	.014*** (.002)	1.014
Male	.524*** (.039)	1.688 (.040)	.540*** (.040)	1.716 (.039)	.541*** (.039)	1.717 (.040)	.520*** (.040)	1.682 (.040)	.532*** (.040)	1.703
Married, Spouse Present	.184*** (.048)	1.202 (.048)	.205*** (.048)	1.228 (.048)	.210*** (.048)	1.233 (.048)	.188*** (.048)	1.207 (.048)	.206*** (.048)	1.228
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.321*** (.052)	1.379 (.053)	.330*** (.053)	1.391 (.052)	.325*** (.052)	1.384 (.052)	.273*** (.052)	1.314 (.052)	.252*** (.053)	1.287
West	.395*** (.053)	1.484 (.055)	.436*** (.055)	1.546 (.053)	.446*** (.053)	1.562 (.054)	.475*** (.054)	1.608 (.054)	.453*** (.053)	1.573
South	.147* (.059)	1.158 (.060)	.226*** (.060)	1.254 (.059)	.195*** (.059)	1.215 (.059)	.177** (.059)	1.194 (.059)	.168** (.059)	1.183
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.054 (.065)	1.055 (.065)	.055 (.065)	1.057 (.065)	.051 (.065)	1.052 (.065)	.053 (.065)	1.054 (.065)	.056 (.065)	1.058
Survey Year 2008	.138* (.063)	1.148 (.064)	.136* (.064)	1.146 (.064)	.136* (.063)	1.146 (.063)	.140* (.063)	1.150 (.063)	.147* (.063)	1.158
Survey Year 2009	.015 (.065)	1.015 (.065)	.002 (.065)	1.002 (.065)	.021 (.065)	1.021 (.065)	.023 (.065)	1.023 (.065)	.036 (.065)	1.037
Survey Year 2010	.226*** (.062)	1.254 (.062)	.225*** (.062)	1.253 (.062)	.233*** (.062)	1.263 (.062)	.231*** (.062)	1.260 (.062)	.243*** (.062)	1.276
English Proficiency	-.046 (.027)	.955 (.028)	-.040 (.028)	.961 (.027)	-.040 (.027)	.961 (.027)	-.064* (.027)	.938 (.027)	-.070* (.027)	.933
Education	-.023** (.008)	.978 (.008)	-.041*** (.008)	.960 (.008)	-.029*** (.008)	.972 (.008)	-.019* (.008)	.981 (.008)	-.026** (.008)	.974

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania	-.327** (.114)	.721								
Bosnia/Herzegovina	-.890*** (.094)	.411								
Bulgaria	.017 (.109)	1.017								
Poland	.253*** (.066)	1.288								
Romania	.182* (.081)	1.200								
Russia	.010 (.065)	1.010								
Other	.368*** (.067)	1.445								
GNI per capita <\$4,000			-.390*** (.040)		.677					
Minorities >20%						-.407*** (.040)		.666		
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	-3.111*** 597,816.80		-3.081*** 589,742.73		-2.902*** 594,663.58		-2.959*** 594,529.18			
-2log likelihood	15,110.12***		23,184.19***		18,263.34***		18,397.74***			
Model χ^2	.034		.052		.041		.042			
Pseudo R ²										
Degrees of freedom	13		20		14		14			
N	852,449		852,449		852,449		852,449			
N before weighting	37,015		37,015		37,015		37,015			

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 24. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Self-employment of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2010 ACS

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	-.003 (.009)	.997	.031** (.010)	1.031	.018 (.012)	1.018
Age	.019*** (.004)	1.020	.018*** (.004)	1.018	.005 (.005)	1.005
Male	.200* (.084)	1.221	.458*** (.088)	1.581	.749*** (.096)	2.114
Married, Spouse Present	.108 (.092)	1.114	.103 (.111)	1.108	.471*** (.119)	1.602
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	.364*** (.090)	1.440	-.055 (.159)	.946	.108 (.151)	1.114
West	.313 (.169)	1.368	.349** (.107)	1.418	.449*** (.117)	1.566
South	.071 (.180)	1.073	.148 (.126)	1.159	.012 (.156)	1.012
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.001 (.135)	1.001	.030 (.146)	1.031	.146 (.161)	1.157
Survey Year 2008	-.154 (.133)	.857	.151 (.142)	1.163	.163 (.156)	1.177
Survey Year 2009	-.228 (.136)	.796	-.093 (.151)	.911	.309 (.159)	1.362
Survey Year 2010	.139 (.125)	1.149	.142 (.143)	1.152	.282 (.155)	1.325
English Proficiency	.084 (.053)	1.087	-.101 (.062)	.904	-.108 (.070)	.898
Education	-.038* (.017)	.963	.000 (.019)	1.000	-.034 (.021)	.967
Constant	-2.701***		-3.356***		-2.830***	
-2log likelihood	137,529.464		116,525.840		95,314.746	
Model χ^2	2,273.351***		3,466.773***		4,200.097***	
Pseudo R²	.024		.039		.058	
Degrees of freedom	13		13		13	
N	172,307		175,970		140,099	
N before weighting	6,955		7,811		6,346	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table 25. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Logged Personal Income of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64,
2006-2009 ACS (Standard Errors in Parenthesis)**

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β								
Constant	2.919***		2.845***		2.930***		2.944**		2.957***	
Length of Stay	.012*** (.001)	.101 (.001)	.012*** (.001)	.102 (.001)	.012*** (.001)	.100 (.001)	.013*** (.001)	.106 (.001)	.013*** (.001)	.107 (.001)
Age	.011*** (.000)	.242 (.000)	.011*** (.000)	.243 (.000)	.011*** (.000)	.242 (.000)	.011*** (.000)	.241 (.000)	.011*** (.000)	.242 (.000)
Male	.229*** (.007)	.218 (.007)	.228*** (.007)	.218 (.007)	.230*** (.007)	.219 (.007)	.229*** (.007)	.218 (.007)	.229*** (.007)	.218 (.007)
Married, Spouse Present	.132*** (.007)	.123 (.007)	.130*** (.007)	.121 (.007)	.133*** (.007)	.124 (.007)	.132*** (.007)	.123 (.007)	.132*** (.007)	.124 (.007)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.016 (.009)	-.014 (.009)	-.038*** (.009)	-.032 (.009)	-.016 (.009)	-.013 (.009)	-.023** (.009)	-.020 (.009)	-.030*** (.009)	-.026 (.009)
West	-.023* (.009)	-.018 (.009)	-.015 (.009)	-.012 (.009)	-.020* (.009)	-.016 (.009)	-.012 (.009)	-.010 (.009)	-.015 (.009)	-.011 (.009)
South	-.044*** (.009)	-.032 (.009)	-.049*** (.009)	-.036 (.009)	-.042*** (.009)	-.030 (.009)	-.041*** (.009)	-.030 (.009)	-.044*** (.009)	-.032 (.009)
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.010 (.009)	.008 (.009)	.011 (.009)	.009 (.009)	.010 (.009)	.008 (.009)	.010 (.009)	.008 (.009)	.011 (.009)	.009 (.009)
Survey Year 2008	.053*** (.009)	.044 (.009)	.055*** (.009)	.046 (.009)	.053*** (.009)	.044 (.009)	.053*** (.009)	.044 (.009)	.055*** (.009)	.046 (.009)
Survey Year 2009	.043*** (.010)	.036 (.010)	.046*** (.010)	.038 (.010)	.043*** (.010)	.036 (.010)	.044*** (.010)	.037 (.010)	.047*** (.010)	.038 (.010)
English Proficiency	.035*** (.004)	.062 (.004)	.033*** (.005)	.058 (.005)	.035*** (.004)	.062 (.004)	.032*** (.004)	.057 (.004)	.032*** (.004)	.056 (.004)
Education	.044*** (.002)	.211 (.002)	.046*** (.002)	.224 (.002)	.043*** (.002)	.209 (.002)	.044*** (.002)	.212 (.002)	.044*** (.002)	.214 (.002)
White-collar occupation	.117*** (.008)	.111 (.008)	.122*** (.008)	.116 (.008)	.116*** (.008)	.110 (.008)	.119*** (.008)	.113 (.008)	.120*** (.008)	.114 (.008)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	B	β	B	β	B
Self-employed	-.001 (.012)	.000 (.012)	-.001 (.012)	-.003 (.012)	-.002 (.012)
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania		.007 (.017)		.003	
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.101*** (.012)		.058	
Bulgaria		.047** (.017)		.019	
Poland		.104*** (.011)		.079	
Romania		.100*** (.014)		.052	
Russia		.003 (.011)		.002	
Other		.057*** (.012)		.038	
GNI per capita <\$4,000			-.019** (.007)	-.018 (.007)	
Minorities >20%				-.056*** (.007)	-.053
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					-.064*** (.008)
Not free					-.058 (.009)
R ² (adjusted)	.249	.255	.249	.251	.253
F	15,078.01***	10,409.49***	14,095.984***	14,271.62***	13,530.822***
N	638,274	638,274	638,274	638,274	638,274
N before weighting	27,176	27,176	27,176	27,176	27,176

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 26. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Personal Income of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 16 to 64,
2006-2009 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5		
	B	β	B	B	β	B	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	
Constant	-7.429***		-7.784***			-7.335***			-7.238***			-7.034***			
Length of Stay	.166*** (.008)	.139	.168*** (.008)	.141	.165*** (.008)	.138	.170*** (.008)	.143	.171*** (.008)	.143	.171*** (.008)	.143	.171*** (.008)	.143	
Age	.087*** (.003)	.188	.087*** (.003)	.189	.087*** (.003)	.189	.086*** (.003)	.188	.086*** (.003)	.188	.086*** (.003)	.188	.086*** (.003)	.188	
Male	3.045*** (.063)	.284	3.046*** (.063)	.284	3.052*** (.063)	.285	3.042*** (.063)	.284	3.052*** (.063)	.284	3.052*** (.063)	.285	3.052*** (.063)	.285	
Married, Spouse Present	1.067*** (.070)	.098	1.065*** (.070)	.097	1.077*** (.070)	.098	1.065*** (.070)	.097	1.078*** (.070)	.097	1.078*** (.070)	.099	1.078*** (.070)	.099	
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)															
Midwest	-.332*** (.081)	-.028	-.479*** (.082)	-.040	-.329*** (.081)	-.027	-.385*** (.081)	-.032	-.437*** (.081)	-.032	-.437*** (.081)	-.032	-.437*** (.081)	-.032	
West	-.169	-.013	-.167	-.013	-.149	-.011	-.086	-.007	-.097	-.007	-.097	-.007	-.097	-.007	
South	-.635*** (.089)	-.045	-.691*** (.091)	-.049	-.616*** (.089)	-.044	-.607*** (.089)	-.043	-.625*** (.089)	-.043	-.625*** (.089)	-.045	-.625*** (.089)	-.045	
Survey Year (ref.=2006)															
Survey Year 2007	.171* (.086)	.014	.178* (.086)	.014	.169 (.086)	.014	.170* (.086)	.014	.176* (.086)	.014	.176* (.086)	.014	.176* (.086)	.014	
Survey Year 2008	.595*** (.089)	.049	.614*** (.089)	.050	.594*** (.089)	.049	.597*** (.089)	.049	.608*** (.089)	.049	.608*** (.089)	.049	.608*** (.089)	.050	
Survey Year 2009	.523*** (.088)	.042	.546*** (.088)	.044	.525*** (.088)	.043	.534*** (.088)	.043	.553*** (.088)	.043	.553*** (.088)	.045	.553*** (.088)	.045	
English Proficiency	.568*** (.042)	.098	.541*** (.043)	.093	.571*** (.042)	.099	.548*** (.042)	.095	.540*** (.042)	.095	.540*** (.042)	.093	.540*** (.042)	.093	
Education	.447*** (.014)	.212	.454*** (.015)	.215	.445*** (.014)	.211	.450*** (.014)	.213	.447*** (.014)	.213	.447*** (.014)	.212	.447*** (.014)	.212	
White-collar occupation	1.865*** (.070)	.174	1.877*** (.070)	.175	1.862*** (.070)	.174	1.883*** (.070)	.176	1.882*** (.070)	.176	1.882*** (.070)	.175	1.882*** (.070)	.175	

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Self-employed	.179 (.116)	.011 (.116)	.145 (.116)	.009 (.117)	.162 (.117)	.010 (.116)	.139 (.116)	.008 (.116)	.104 (.116)	.006
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania										
Bosnia/Herzegovina										
Bulgaria										
Poland										
Romania										
Russia										
Other										
GNI per capita <\$4,000										
Minorities >20%										
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
R ² (adjusted)	.287		.291		.287		.288		.290	
F	19,299.48***		13,122.32***		18,034.07***		18,149.13***		17,164.70***	
N before weighting	28,741		28,741		28,741		28,741		28,741	
N	671,867		671,867		671,867		671,867		671,867	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 27. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Personal Income of Post-1991 Immigrants Aged 25 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2009 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	-3.841***		-10.508***		-8.990***	
Length of Stay	.102*** (.016)	.099	.191*** (.017)	.153	.151*** (.018)	.125
Age	.081*** (.007)	.188	.080*** (.008)	.167	.085*** (.008)	.188
Male	3.602*** (.136)	.370	3.123*** (.151)	.260	2.981*** (.151)	.271
Married, Spouse Present	1.081*** (.139)	.109	.953*** (.166)	.079	1.149*** (.170)	.101
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	-.334* (.146)	-.034	-.964*** (.221)	-.055	-.530* (.221)	-.035
West	-.256 (.295)	-.013	-.228 (.179)	-.018	-.204 (.190)	-.017
South	-.577* (.252)	-.032	-.895*** (.203)	-.059	-1.063*** (.233)	-.069
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	.279 (.182)	.025	.192 (.202)	.014	.504* (.211)	.038
Survey Year 2008	.872*** (.188)	.079	.562** (.208)	.042	.815*** (.213)	.065
Survey Year 2009	.154 (.192)	.013	1.010*** (.202)	.074	1.079*** (.213)	.087
English Proficiency	.427*** (.090)	.089	.671*** (.098)	.100	.700*** (.107)	.117
Education	.273*** (.031)	.134	.614*** (.037)	.252	.512*** (.035)	.224
White-collar	1.425*** (.160)	.145	2.588*** (.161)	.205	2.173*** (.170)	.197
Self-employed	-.070 (.205)	-.005	-.175 (.271)	-.009	-.404 (.299)	-.023
R² (adjusted)	.235		.341		.318	
F	2,984.596***		5,258.473***		3,662.039***	
N	136,107		142,362		110,004	
N before weighting	5,377		6,246		4,955	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 28. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Poverty Status of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrant Householders, 2006-2009 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β								
Constant	565.424***		586.165***		558.685***		560.320***		550.345***	
Length of Stay	-5.315*** (.366)	-.152	-5.258*** (.372)	-.150	-5.202*** (.367)	-.149	-5.483*** (.367)	-.157	-5.482*** (.365)	-.157
Age	-1.247*** (.153)	-.092	-1.340*** (.154)	-.099	-1.271*** (.153)	-.094	-1.274*** (.153)	-.094	-1.307*** (.152)	-.097
Male	-35.360*** (2.976)	-.115	-35.840*** (2.968)	-.116	-36.063*** (2.971)	-.117	-35.221*** (2.974)	-.114	-35.899*** (2.962)	-.116
Married, Spouse Present	-51.792*** (3.138)	-.166	-52.737*** (3.129)	-.169	-52.831*** (3.132)	-.169	-52.128*** (3.133)	-.167	-53.503*** (3.125)	-.171
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	4.653 (3.795)	.014	10.975** (3.842)	.032	4.425 (3.789)	.013	6.934 (3.803)	.020	9.056* (3.815)	.026
West	10.889** (3.816)	.029	10.493** (3.906)	.028	9.128* (3.836)	.025	8.046* (3.843)	.022	8.121* (3.808)	.022
South	15.834*** (4.001)	.039	17.808*** (4.091)	.044	14.283*** (4.008)	.035	15.139*** (4.003)	.037	15.613*** (3.999)	.038
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	-.681 (4.025)	-.002	-.580 (3.990)	-.002	-.335 (4.015)	-.001	-.603 (4.014)	-.002	-.582 (3.994)	-.002
Survey Year 2008	-11.619** (4.023)	-.034	-12.179** (3.995)	-.035	-11.410** (4.014)	-.033	-11.522** (4.016)	-.033	-11.785** (4.000)	-.034
Survey Year 2009	-5.006 (4.082)	-.014	-5.979 (4.066)	-.017	-4.827 (4.075)	-.014	-5.358 (4.080)	-.015	-5.864 (4.069)	-.017
English Proficiency	-20.729*** (1.986)	-.125	-20.312*** (2.012)	-.123	-21.227*** (1.979)	-.128	-19.936*** (1.992)	-.121	-19.670*** (1.977)	-.119
Education	-10.438*** (.684)	-.174	-10.755*** (.701)	-.179	-10.239*** (.685)	-.170	-10.646*** (.685)	-.177	-10.385*** (.689)	-.173
White-collar	-63.008*** (3.524)	-.206	-63.190*** (3.509)	-.207	-62.629*** (3.515)	-.205	-63.628*** (3.525)	-.208	-63.133*** (3.511)	-.207

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Self-employed	10.842*	.024	12.080**	.027	12.008**	.027	12.363**	.027	14.140**	.031
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		22.576** (7.608)		.032						
Bosnia/Herzegovina		-20.988*** (5.823)		-.040						
Bulgaria		-22.125** (7.256)		-.032						
Poland		-34.227*** (4.716)		-.090						
Romania		-37.441*** (5.828)		-.067						
Russia		-9.704* (4.526)		-.026						
Other		-17.032*** (4.987)		-.039						
GNI per capita <\$4,000			13.518*** (2.862)		.044		16.738*** (2.926)		.055	
Minorities >20%										
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
R ² (adjusted)	.229	.239		.231						
F	6,450.58***	4,536.91***		6,085.403***						
N before weighting	12,946	12,946		12,946						
N	303,786	303,786		303,786						

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 29. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Poverty Status of Post-1991 Immigrant Householders Aged 25 to 64 from Selected Countries, 2006-2009 ACS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Predictor	Poland		Russia		Ukraine	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	460.759***		634.068***		631.589***	
Length of Stay	-3.717*** (.762)	-.121	-5.061*** (.844)	-.142	-5.539*** (.826)	-.154
Age	-.861* (.338)	-.068	-.960** (.342)	-.072	-1.555*** (.357)	-.117
Male	-34.213*** (6.475)	-.120	-37.885*** (6.387)	-.118	-27.365*** (6.787)	-.086
Married, Spouse Present	-46.218*** (6.703)	-.160	-62.655*** (6.748)	-.193	-53.422*** (7.354)	-.162
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	8.445 (6.851)	.030	25.895* (10.772)	.056	6.670 (9.748)	.015
West	12.711 (13.523)	.022	5.357 (7.401)	.015	27.029*** (7.932)	.080
South	24.872* (11.509)	.048	2.511 (8.682)	.006	32.751* (10.192)	.072
Survey Year (ref.=2006)						
Survey Year 2007	-2.586 (8.826)	-.008	5.406 (8.978)	.015	-6.299 (9.282)	-.017
Survey Year 2008	-28.868*** (8.439)	-.090	-4.751 (8.748)	-.013	-13.183 (9.417)	-.037
Survey Year 2009	-3.707 (9.265)	-.011	-7.010 (8.987)	-.019	-14.984 (9.334)	-.043
English Proficiency	-17.118*** (4.345)	-.122	-24.742*** (4.393)	-.136	-31.054*** (4.995)	-.178
Education	-7.857*** (1.511)	-.134	-14.370*** (1.704)	-.209	-10.507*** (1.604)	-.156
White-collar	-43.880*** (7.693)	-.154	-76.943*** (8.416)	-.221	-80.335*** (7.764)	-.255
Self-employed	20.874* (8.981)	.054	10.267 (10.088)	.021	18.763 (11.994)	.039
R² (adjusted)	.158		.296		.303	
F	818.280***		1,971.726***		1,603.673***	
N	60,847		65,535		51,606	
N before weighting	2,392		2,803		2,296	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 30. Comparisons of Structure Coefficients and Partial Eta's Squared for All Predictors in the Analysis of Socioeconomic Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants, ACS

Predictor	Education									
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2
Length of Stay	.011	.014	.007	.008	.010	.014	.010	.016	.009	.012
Age	.046	.015	.030	.012	.045	.015	.045	.014	.038	.013
Male	.011	.001	.007	.000	.011	.000	.011	.001	.009	.000
Married, Spouse Present	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.075	.004	.049	.000	.073	.004	.072	.003	.062	.002
West	.010	.000	.007	.000	.010	.000	.010	.000	.008	.000
South	.017	.000	.011	.000	.016	.000	.016	.000	.013	.000
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2008	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000
Survey Year 2009	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001
Survey Year 2010	.005	.003	.003	.002	.005	.003	.005	.003	.004	.003
English Proficiency	.910	.145	.591	.138	.880	.146	.878	.148	.741	.142
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		.032	.015							
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.232	.047							
Bulgaria		.018	.000							
Poland		.061	.013							
Romania		.006	.004							
Russia		.170	.002							
Other		.002	.004							
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.035	.005				
Minorities >20%							.028	.007		
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free									.112	.001
Not free									.234	.024

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Self-employment				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.020	.022	.022	.020	.021
Married, Spouse Present	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.008	.008	.008	.006	.005
West	.012	.014	.015	.017	.015
South	.002	.004	.003	.002	.002
Survey Year (ref.=2006)					
Survey Year 2007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2008	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
Survey Year 2009	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2010	.004	.004	.004	.004	.005
English Proficiency	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Education	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania					
Bosnia/Herzegovina	.057				
Bulgaria	.000				
Poland	.005				
Romania	.003				
Russia	.000				
Other	.010				
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.011		
Minorities >20%				.012	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					.026
Not free					.008

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	White-collar Occupation				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.033	.032	.033	.033	.032
Married, Spouse Present	.001	.002	.001	.001	.002
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.005	.004	.005	.004	.004
West	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
South	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year (ref.=2006)					
Survey Year 2007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2008	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
Survey Year 2009	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
English Proficiency	.020	.019	.020	.021	.021
Education	.011	.010	.011	.011	.010
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania	.004				
Bosnia/Herzegovina	.000				
Bulgaria	.002				
Poland	.004				
Romania	.002				
Russia	.009				
Other	.000				
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.000		
Minorities >20%				.002	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly Free					.000
Not Free					.009

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Professional/Managerial Occupation				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Married, Spouse Present	.003	.004	.004	.004	.004
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.003	.002	.003	.003	.003
West	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
South	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year (ref.=2006)					
Survey Year 2007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2008	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
Survey Year 2009	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
English Proficiency	.017	.016	.017	.017	.017
Education	.021	.020	.021	.021	.020
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Albania		.007			
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.001			
Bulgaria		.000			
Poland		.002			
Romania		.007			
Russia		.004			
Other		.002			
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.000		
Minorities >20%				.000	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly Free					.001
Not Free					.002

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Income									
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	r_s^2	η^2								
Length of Stay	.187	.030	.184	.029	.187	.030	.186	.030	.184	.031
Age	.176	.083	.173	.080	.176	.083	.176	.081	.174	.080
Male	.202	.099	.199	.100	.202	.100	.201	.099	.199	.100
Married, Spouse Pres.	.105	.000	.104	.000	.105	.000	.104	.000	.104	.000
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.012	.001	.012	.001	.012	.001	.012	.001	.012	.001
West	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000
South	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000
Survey Year 2008	.005	.003	.005	.003	.005	.003	.005	.003	.005	.003
Survey Year 2009	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
English Proficiency	.045	.010	.045	.009	.045	.010	.045	.009	.045	.009
Education	.371	.050	.366	.048	.371	.050	.368	.051	.367	.050
White-collar	.196	.023	.193	.023	.195	.023	.194	.023	.194	.023
Self-employment	.005	.000	.005	.000	.005	.000	.005	.000	.005	.000
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		.009	.001							
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.011	.000							
Bulgaria		.000	.000							
Poland		.001	.001							
Romania		.008	.001							
Russia		.007	.000							
Other		.000	.000							
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.003	.000				
Minorities >20%							.000	.001		
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free									.016	.002
Not free									.007	.001

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Poverty									
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	r_s^2	η^2								
Length of Stay	.231	.030	.222	.029	.229	.029	.228	.031	.229	.032
Age	.031	.032	.030	.033	.030	.033	.030	.032	.030	.033
Male	.042	.015	.041	.016	.042	.016	.042	.015	.041	.016
Married, Spouse Pres.	.141	.024	.135	.026	.139	.025	.138	.025	.135	.026
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.012	.000	.011	.001	.012	.000	.012	.000	.011	.001
West	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
South	.000	.002	.000	.002	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.002
Survey Year (ref.=2006)										
Survey Year 2007	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000
Survey Year 2008	.005	.001	.005	.002	.005	.001	.005	.001	.005	.001
Survey Year 2009	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
English Proficiency	.191	.013	.183	.012	.189	.014	.188	.012	.185	.012
Education	.404	.034	.388	.034	.401	.033	.399	.036	.391	.034
White-collar	.413	.030	.397	.030	.411	.030	.408	.031	.399	.030
Self-employment	.006	.001	.005	.002	.006	.002	.006	.002	.005	.002
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		.031	.002							
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.010	.001							
Bulgaria		.001	.001							
Poland		.000	.005							
Romania		.013	.004							
Russia		.013	.000							
Other		.000	.001							
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.013	.003				
Minorities >20%							.000	.004		
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)									.041	.010
Partly free									.014	.004
Not free										

Table 31. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Structural Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2008-2010 CES-CPS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Dependent Variable	Mean	S.D.	N	N weighted
Participated in any organization	.20	.40	464	1,211,608
School group, neighborhood, or community Association	.06	.23	464	1,211,608
Service or civic organization	.01	.09	464	1,211,608
Sports or recreation organization	.06	.24	464	1,211,608
Church, synagogue, mosque or other religious organization institution or organization	.09	.29	464	1,211,608
Any other type of organization	.02	.14	464	1,211,608
Talk to neighbors				
Not at all	.19	.39	449	1,182,113
Once a month	.20	.40	449	1,182,113
Few times a month	.22	.42	449	1,182,113
Few times a week	.28	.48	449	1,182,113
Basically every day	.12	.32	449	1,182,113
Do favors to neighbors				
Not at all	.45	.50	449	1,182,113
Once a month	.26	.44	449	1,182,113
Few times a month	.18	.38	449	1,182,113
Few times a week	.09	.29	449	1,182,113
Basically every day	.02	.15	449	1,182,113

Table 32. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Structural Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants from Selected Countries Aged 18 or Older, 2008-2010 CES-CPS

Dependent Variable	Poland			Russia			Ukraine		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Participated in any organization	.14	.35	122	346,593	.20	.40	.89	.22	.42
School group, neighborhood, or community association	.02	.14	122	346,593	.08	.26	.89	.245,921	.07
Service or civic organization	.00	.00	122	346,593	.02	.15	.89	.245,921	.00
Sports or recreation organization	.03	.16	122	346,593	.04	.19	.89	.245,921	.05
Church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious organization	.10	.31	122	346,593	.05	.22	.89	.245,921	.15
Any other type of organization	.01	.10	122	346,593	.06	.23	.89	.245,921	.00
Talk to neighbors									
Not at all	.15	.35	118	339,972	.27	.45	.86	.234,965	.18
Once a month	.22	.41	118	339,972	.12	.32	.86	.234,965	.32
Few times a month	.26	.44	118	339,972	.23	.42	.86	.234,965	.12
Few times a week	.26	.44	118	339,972	.27	.45	.86	.234,965	.31
Basically every day	.12	.32	118	339,972	.11	.31	.86	.234,965	.07
Do favors to neighbors									
Not at all	.39	.49	118	339,972	.53	.50	.86	.234,965	.41
Once a month	.28	.45	118	339,972	.21	.41	.86	.234,965	.28
Few times a month	.22	.42	118	339,972	.16	.37	.86	.234,965	.16
Few times a week	.09	.28	118	339,972	.07	.26	.86	.234,965	.10
Basically every day	.02	.14	118	339,972	.02	.15	.86	.234,965	.05

Table 33. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Participating in Various Organizations, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2008-2010 CES-CPS

Predictor	Model 1						Model 2						Model 3						Model 4					
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio		
Length of Stay	.032 (.057)	1.033 (.061)	.048 -.002	.049 (.057)	.021 -.002	1.022 -.002	.031 -.004	.031 -.004	.031 -.004	.031 -.004	.031 -.004	.024 (.058)												
Age	-.004 (.012)	.996 (.013)	.002 -.302	.998 -.740	-.002 -.321	.998 .726	-.004 -.295	.996 .744	-.004 -.295	.996 .744	-.004 -.295	.996 .744	-.002 (.012)											
Male	-.294 (.268)	.745 (.274)	-.302 -.321	.740 (.269)	-.302 -.321	.726 (.269)	-.295 (.289)	.726 (.289)	-.295 (.289)	.726 (.289)	-.295 (.289)	.726 (.289)	-.345 (.271)	.708 (.271)	-.345 (.271)									
Married, Spouse Present	.392 (.288)	1.480 (.293)	.358 1.431	1.431 (.287)	.357 1.430	1.431 (.287)	.396 (.288)	1.486 (.288)	.396 (.288)	1.486 (.288)	.396 (.288)	1.486 (.288)	.381 (.286)	1.463 (.286)										
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)																								
Midwest	-.122 (.369)	.885 (.388)	-.196 1.565	.822 1.565	-.196 1.565	.822 1.565	-.195 1.350	.823 1.350	-.195 1.350	.823 1.350	-.195 1.350	.823 1.350	-.114 (.373)	.833 (.373)	-.114 (.373)									
West	.465 (.341)	1.591 (.346)	.448 -.021	1.565 -.200	.448 -.021	1.565 -.200	.300 -.200	.300 -.200	.300 -.200	.300 -.200	.300 -.200	.300 -.200	.458 (.343)	1.479 (.343)	.458 (.343)									
South	-.025 (.412)	.975 (.404)	.980 -.021	.980 -.021	.980 -.021	.980 -.021	.819 -.033	.819 -.033	.819 -.033	.819 -.033	.819 -.033	.819 -.033	.968 (.411)	.841 (.401)	.968 (.401)									
Survey Year (ref.=2008)																								
Survey Year 2009	.047 (.400)	1.049 (.402)	.148 1.246	1.159 1.144	.090 1.144	.090 1.155	.095 1.155	.095 1.155	.095 1.155	.095 1.155	.095 1.155	.095 1.155	.041 (.404)	1.060 (.402)	.041 (.402)									
Survey Year 2010	.137 (.287)	1.147 (.298)	.220 1.079	1.246 1.096	.220 1.079	1.246 1.096	.144 1.101	.144 1.101	.144 1.101	.144 1.101	.144 1.101	.144 1.101	.139 (.289)	1.167 (.292)	.139 (.289)									
Education	.094 (.062)	1.099 (.065)	.076 1.067	1.079 1.182	.076 1.067	1.079 1.182	.096 1.194	.096 1.194	.096 1.194	.096 1.194	.096 1.194	.096 1.194	.094 (.062)	1.107 (.062)	.094 (.062)									
White-collar	.154 (.297)	1.167 (.301)	.167 1.117	1.182 1.117	.167 1.117	1.182 1.117	.194 .104	.194 .104	.194 .104	.194 .104	.194 .104	.194 .104	.155 (.299)	1.210 (.300)	.155 (.299)									
Self-employed	.043 (.401)	1.044 (.414)	.111 1.117	1.117 1.117	.111 1.117	1.117 1.117	.104 1.109	.104 1.109	.104 1.109	.104 1.109	.104 1.109	.104 1.109	.037 (.398)	1.052 (.400)	.037 (.398)									

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio						
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania	1.716*	(.740)	.5562							
Bosnia/Herzegovina	-.034	(.778)	.967							
Bulgaria	.138	(.465)	1.148							
Poland	-.336	(.465)	.715							
Romania	.317	(.547)	1.372							
Russia	-.221	(.461)	.801							
Other	-.120	(.494)	.887							
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.624*	(.264)			1.866			
Minorities >20%					.051	(.271)			1.052	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free									.530	1.698
Not free									(.304)	.974
Constant	-5.732*		-5.106		-6.042*		-5.750*			
-2log likelihood	1,181,488.36		1,151,398.69		1,164,665.99		1,181,379.18			
Model χ^2	36,349.36***		66,439.53***		53,172.22***		36,459.04***			
Pseudo R ²	.047		.084		.068		.047			
Degrees of freedom	12		19		13		13			
N	1,211,608		1,211,608		1,211,608		1,211,608			
N before weighting	464		464		464		464			

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table 34. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Interaction with Neighbors, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants
Aged 18 or Older, 2008-2010 CES-CPS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)**

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β								
Constant	4.674*		4.617		4.644*		4.733*		4.302	
Length of Stay	.048 (.050)	.054 (.050)	.061 (.050)	.069 (.049)	.047 (.049)	.053 (.049)	.057 (.049)	.065 (.049)	.050 (.049)	.057 (.049)
Age	-.011 (.012)	-.062 (.012)	-.011 (.012)	-.065 (.012)	-.011 (.012)	-.061 (.011)	-.011 (.011)	-.064 (.011)	-.010 (.012)	-.059 (.012)
Male	-.086 (.230)	-.020 (.233)	-.106 (.233)	-.025 (.231)	-.088 (.231)	-.021 (.231)	-.075 (.231)	-.018 (.231)	-.102 (.230)	-.024 (.230)
Married, Spouse Present	.625* (.247)	.141 (.248)	.573* (.248)	.129 (.247)	.622* (.247)	.140 (.245)	.597* (.245)	.135 (.245)	.579* (.246)	.131 (.246)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.521 (.315)	-.106 (.324)	-.602 (.324)	-.123 (.316)	-.526 (.316)	-.108 (.312)	-.568 (.312)	-.116 (.312)	-.618 (.317)	-.126 (.317)
West	-.591 (.313)	-.122 (.324)	-.554 (.324)	-.115 (.319)	-.608 (.319)	-.126 (.311)	-.525 (.311)	-.109 (.311)	-.587 (.313)	-.122 (.313)
South	-.514 (.321)	-.089 (.343)	-.504 (.343)	-.088 (.331)	-.534 (.331)	-.093 (.321)	-.439 (.321)	-.076 (.321)	-.570 (.328)	-.099 (.328)
Survey Year (ref.=2008)										
Survey Year 2009	.358 (.350)	.059 (.357)	.433 (.357)	.072 (.351)	.363 (.351)	.060 (.353)	.393 (.353)	.065 (.349)	.406 (.349)	.067 (.349)
Survey Year 2010	-.156 (.244)	-.036 (.247)	-.130 (.247)	-.030 (.245)	-.155 (.245)	-.036 (.243)	-.176 (.243)	-.041 (.245)	-.188 (.245)	-.044 (.245)
Education	.012 (.057)	.014 (.059)	.013 (.059)	.015 (.057)	.013 (.057)	.014 (.057)	.014 (.057)	.016 (.057)	.026 (.057)	.029 (.057)
White-collar	.302 (.266)	-.071 (.266)	-.287 (.266)	-.067 (.266)	-.299 (.266)	-.070 (.262)	-.318 (.262)	-.074 (.264)	-.294 (.264)	-.069 (.264)
Self-employed	.349 (.302)	.055 (.306)	.447 (.306)	.071 (.303)	.357 (.303)	.057 (.303)	.383 (.303)	.061 (.303)	.417 (.304)	.066 (.304)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Albania		.868		.068						
Bosnia/Herzegovina		(.725)		-.182		-.028				
Bulgaria		(.428)		-.453		-.036				
Poland		(.719)		.064		.014				
Romania		(.382)		.378		.046				
Russia		(.513)		-.354		-.066				
Other		(.407)		.032		.005				
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.061		.014			
Minorities >20%					(.224)		-.359		-.084	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
R ² (adjusted)	.049		.063			.050		.056		
F	5,117.557***		4,174.596***			4,741.998***		5,360.448***		
N	1,182,113		1,182,113			1,182,113		1,182,113		
N before weighting	449		449			449		449		

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 35. Comparisons of Squared Structure Coefficients and Partial Eta's Squared for All Predictors in the Analysis of Structural Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2008-2010 CES-CPS

Predictor	Interaction with Neighbors					Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		
	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	r_s^2	η^2	η^2
Length of Stay	.089	.047	.070	.050	.089	.047	.079
Age	.039	.149	.031	.147	.039	.149	.035
Male	.013	.005	.010	.006	.013	.005	.012
Married, Spouse Present	.394	.009	.309	.008	.394	.009	.349
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)							
Midwest	.018	.007	.014	.009	.018	.007	.016
West	.113	.015	.088	.013	.113	.015	.100
South	.029	.010	.023	.010	.029	.010	.026
Survey Year (ref.=2008)							
Survey Year 2009	.110	.001	.086	.002	.110	.001	.097
Survey Year 2010	.105	.000	.083	.000	.105	.000	.094
Education	.003	.079	.002	.078	.003	.079	.002
White-collar	.062	.009	.048	.008	.062	.009	.055
Self-employment	.055	.003	.043	.004	.055	.003	.049
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)							
Albania		.078			.001		
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.010			.002		
Bulgaria		.048			.005		
Poland		.027			.000		
Romania		.029			.000		
Russia		.046			.003		
Other		.000			.000		
GNI per capita <\$4,000					.004	.000	.107
Minorities >20%							.004
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)							
Partly free							.000
Not free							.091

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Participation in Civic Organizations					Model 5 η^2
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2		
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.007	.007	.008	.007	.009	.009
Married, Spouse Present	.012	.010	.010	.012	.011	.011
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)						
Midwest	.001	.003	.003	.001	.001	.003
West	.016	.062	.007	.016	.012	.012
South	.000	.000	.003	.000	.003	.003
Survey Year (ref.=2008)						
Survey Year 2009	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000
Survey Year 2010	.001	.004	.002	.001	.002	.002
Education	.001	.000	.001	.001	.001	.001
White-collar	.002	.002	.003	.002	.003	.003
Self-employment	.000	.001	.001	.000	.000	.000
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)						
Albania		.183				
Bosnia/Herzegovina		.000				
Bulgaria		.001				
Poland		.008				
Romania		.007				
Russia		.004				
Other		.001				
GNI per capita <\$4,000						
Minorities >20%						
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)						
Partly free						.021
Not free						.000

**Table 36. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used in the Analysis of Political
Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older,
2002-2010 VRS-CPS (Standard Errors in Parentheses)**

Dependent Variable	Mean	S.D.	N	N weighted
Naturalized Citizen				
All Eastern Europeans	.44	.50	1,101	2,804,447
Poland	.35	.48	341	896,767
Russia	.53	.50	356	929,165
Ukraine	.48	.50	196	472,183
Voter Registration				
All Eastern Europeans	.25	.43	239	634,763
Poland	.22	.41	70	202,670
Russia	.22	.42	95	250,586
Ukraine	.36	.48	39	94,964
Voting				
All Eastern Europeans	.37	.48	392	1,027,658
Poland	.27	.44	100	280,377
Russia	.38	.49	155	406,884
Ukraine	.46	.50	76	189,097

Table 37. Naturalization Rates of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older by Immigration Cohort, 2002-2010 VRS-CPS

	1990-93	1994-97	1990-97 Total
All EE immigrants			
%	67	55	60
N/N weighted	307/771,430	315/844,104	622/1,615,534
Poland			
%	44	52	48
N/N weighted	102/263,584	89/246,801	191/510,385
Russia			
%	83	62	72
N/N weighted	115/288,554	106/292,309	221/580,862
Ukraine			
%	75	58	66
N/N weighted	72/124,253	53/133,971	105/258,223

Table 38. Voting and Voter Registration of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants, 2002-2010 VRS-CPS

Table 20. Voting and Voter Registration of 11,771 Electors in European Union countries, 2002-2010 (in %)						
	2002		2004		2006	
	Voted	Registered	Voted	Registered	Voted	Registered
All Eastern Europeans	11	17	61	12	23	26
Poland	9	0	37	0	19	11
Russia	15	20	61	16	33	27
Ukraine	0	37	59	0	17	56
					49	23
					36	34
						2010

**Table 39. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Naturalization, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18
or Older, 2002-2010 VRS-CPS**

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	.493*** (.043)	1.637 (.045)	.494*** (.008)	1.639 (.044)	.493*** (.007)	1.641 (.044)	.491*** (.007)	1.634 (.044)	.491*** (.009)	1.634 (.044)
Age	.009 (.007)	1.009 (.008)	.008 (.156)	1.008 (.163)	.009 (.162)	1.009 (.162)	.009 (.163)	1.009 (.163)	.009 (.164)	1.009 (.164)
Male	.173 (.162)	1.188 (.165)	.156 (.165)	1.169 (.162)	.163 (.162)	1.177 (.162)	.166 (.163)	1.181 (.163)	.166 (.163)	1.179 (.163)
Married, Spouse Present	.293 (.175)	1.340 (.181)	.369* (.181)	1.447 (.176)	.273 (.176)	1.314 (.175)	.300 (.175)	1.349 (.176)	.315 (.176)	1.370 (.176)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	-.976*** (.206)	.377 (.220)	-.913*** (.220)	.401 (.207)	-.963*** (.207)	.382 (.215)	-.839*** (.215)	.432 (.215)	-.834*** (.215)	.434 (.215)
West	-.346 (.201)	.707 (.214)	-.549* (.214)	.577 (.209)	-.457* (.209)	.633 (.204)	-.389 (.204)	.678 (.205)	-.386 (.205)	.680 (.205)
South	-.429 (.268)	.651 (.273)	-.508 (.273)	.602 (.268)	-.457 (.268)	.633 (.270)	-.425 (.270)	.654 (.271)	-.426 (.271)	.653 (.271)
Survey Year (ref.=2002)										
Survey Year 2004	.417 (.230)	1.517 (.233)	.446 (.233)	1.562 (.230)	.368 (.230)	1.445 (.229)	.410 (.229)	1.507 (.229)	.427 (.229)	1.533 (.229)
Survey Year 2006	.943*** (.227)	2.567 (.233)	.976*** (.233)	2.653 (.229)	.917*** (.229)	2.502 (.227)	.988*** (.227)	2.686 (.227)	1.002*** (.227)	2.723 (.227)
Survey Year 2008	1.338*** (.244)	3.812 (.259)	1.433*** (.259)	4.190 (.245)	1.310*** (.245)	3.706 (.251)	1.402*** (.251)	4.063 (.251)	1.433*** (.251)	4.193 (.251)
Survey Year 2010	1.925*** (.288)	6.852 (.310)	2.096*** (.310)	8.136 (.288)	1.877*** (.288)	6.535 (.291)	1.979*** (.291)	7.234 (.291)	2.016*** (.291)	7.508 (.291)
Education	.096** (.037)	1.100 (.039)	.094* (.372)	1.099 (.466*)	.099** (.466*)	1.104 (.473*)	.083* (.473*)	1.087 (.473*)	.080* (.463*)	1.083 (.463*)
White-collar	.483** (.185)	1.620 (.191)	1.620 (.191)	1.451 (.187)	1.451 (.187)	1.594 (.187)	1.605 (.187)	1.605 (.187)	1.605 (.187)	1.588 (.187)
Self-employed	.126 (.236)	1.134 (.242)	.095 (.242)	1.099 (.237)	.138 (.238)	1.148 (.238)	.129 (.238)	1.137 (.238)	.114 (.239)	1.121 (.239)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Poland	.380	(.258)			.684					
Romania	.783*	(.332)			2.188					
Russia	.184	(.232)			1.202					
Other	-1.534***	(.380)			.216					
GNI per capita >\$4,000					.502**	(.185)			.411*	(.174)
Minorities>20%										1.508
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	-9.153***		-8.955***		-9.345***		-9.345***		-8.884***	
-2log likelihood	2,943,571.30		2,823,882.25		2,921,155.33		2,926,541.50		2,922,860.42	
Model χ^2	897,220.80***		1,016,909.85***		919,636.76***		914,250.59***		917,931.67***	
Pseudo R ²	.37		.41		.38		.37		.37	
Degrees of freedom	14		18		15		15		16	
N	2,804,447		2,804,447		2,804,447		2,804,447		2,804,447	
N before weighting	1,101		1,101		1,101		1,101		1,101	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 40. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Voter Registration, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2002-2010 VRS-CPS

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Length of Stay	.069 (.102)	1.072	.065 (.105)	1.067 (.104)	.074 -.012	1.076 (.019)	.065 -.012	1.067 (.020)	.065 (.103)	1.067 (.105)
Age	-.012 (.019)	.988	-.013 (.019)	.987 (.019)	.988 (.019)	.988 (.020)	.988 (.020)	.988 (.020)	-.013 (.020)	.987 (.020)
Male	.238 (.376)	1.269	.205 (.382)	1.227 (.382)	.225 (.378)	1.253 (.379)	.230 (.379)	1.259 (.381)	.205 (.381)	1.227 (.381)
Married, Spouse Present	.569 (.474)	1.766	.581 (.475)	1.788 (.475)	.578 (.476)	1.783 (.477)	.574 (.477)	1.775 (.483)	.582 (.483)	1.790 (.483)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.028 (.484)	1.028	.099 (.504)	1.105 (.490)	.000 (.490)	1.000 (.495)	.088 (.495)	1.092 (.502)	.098 (.502)	1.103 (.502)
West	.061 (.486)	1.063	.075 (.539)	1.078 (.514)	-.056 (.514)	.945 (.485)	.051 (.485)	1.053 (.498)	.056 (.498)	1.057 (.498)
South	-.321 (.636)	.726	-.372 (.650)	.689 (.612)	-.415 (.612)	.660 (.672)	-.355 (.672)	.702 (.671)	-.386 (.671)	.680 (.671)
Survey Year (ref.=2002)										
Survey Year 2004	-.501 (.836)	.606	-.635 (.914)	.530 (.851)	-.592 (.851)	.553 (.841)	-.497 (.841)	.609 (.913)	-.639 (.913)	.528 (.913)
Survey Year 2006	.718 (.552)	2.051	.720 (.578)	2.055 (.555)	.645 (.555)	1.906 (.558)	.762 (.558)	2.142 (.564)	.715 (.564)	2.044 (.564)
Survey Year 2008	.537 (.674)	1.711	.594 (.687)	1.812 (.683)	.503 (.683)	1.654 (.667)	.582 (.667)	1.790 (.667)	.591 (.667)	1.806 (.667)
Survey Year 2010	1.224* (.601)	3.402	1.255* (.620)	3.509 (.602)	1.214* (.602)	3.367 (.614)	1.271 (.614)	3.566 (.618)	1.257* (.618)	3.516 (.618)
Education	.130 (.124)	1.138	.111 (.138)	1.117 (.128)	.113 (.128)	1.120 (.127)	.123 (.127)	1.131 (.130)	.109 (.130)	1.115 (.130)
White-collar	.801 (.474)	2.229	.815 (.480)	2.259 (.484)	.779 (.484)	2.180 (.476)	.797 (.476)	2.218 (.485)	.811 (.485)	2.249 (.485)
Self-employed	-.167 (.501)	.846	-.100 (.503)	.905 (.503)	-.162 (.503)	.850 (.501)	-.158 (.501)	.854 (.502)	-.103 (.502)	.902 (.502)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Poland	-.703 (.646)	.495								
Romania	-.769 (.758)	.464								
Russia	-.697 (.506)	.498								
Other	-.711 (1.447)	.491								
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.394 (.397)		1.482					
Minorities >20%					.179 (.457)					
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	-8.205		-6.774		-7.547		-8.020			
-2log likelihood	647,380.07		640,491.53		644,452.25		644,744.08			
Model χ^2	61,026.86***		67,915.40***		63,954.68***		61,662.85***			
Pseudo R ²	.14		.15		.14		.14			
Degrees of freedom	14		18		15		15			
N	634,763		634,763		634,763		634,763			
N before weighting	239		239		239		239			

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table 41. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Probability of Voting, Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older,
2002-2010 VRS-CPS**

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio								
Length of Stay	.130 (.074)	1.138 (.075)	.126 .005	1.134 (.074)	.130 .006	1.139 (.075)	.128 .005	1.136 (.075)	.128 .005	1.136 (.075)
Age	.006 (.012)	1.006 (.012)	.005 (.012)	1.005 (.012)	.006 (.012)	1.006 (.012)	.005 (.012)	1.005 (.012)	.005 (.012)	1.005 (.012)
Male	.280 (.271)	1.323 (.275)	.270 (.275)	1.309 (.273)	.277 (.273)	1.319 (.271)	.280 (.271)	1.324 (.271)	.282 (.271)	1.326 (.271)
Married, Spouse Present	.454 (.299)	1.575 (.301)	.454 (.299)	1.575 (.299)	.454 (.299)	1.575 (.299)	.450 (.299)	1.568 (.299)	.449 (.299)	1.566 (.299)
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)										
Midwest	.148 (.347)	1.160 (.359)	.206 (.359)	1.228 (.349)	.147 (.349)	1.158 (.352)	.198 (.352)	1.219 (.354)	.207 (.354)	1.229 (.354)
West	.947* (.329)	2.579 (.365)	.911* (.365)	2.487 (.344)	.938** (.344)	2.554 (.329)	.944** (.329)	2.570 (.329)	.942** (.329)	2.565 (.329)
South	-.189 (.466)	.828 (.491)	-.201 (.491)	.818 (.468)	-.193 (.468)	.825 (.470)	-.192 (.470)	.825 (.474)	-.193 (.474)	.824 (.474)
Survey Year (ref.=2002)										
Survey Year 2004	2.761*** (.554)	15.815 (.563)	2.749*** (.563)	15.628 (.561)	2.750*** (.561)	15.636 (.556)	2.768*** (.556)	15.919 (.560)	2.763*** (.560)	15.853 (.560)
Survey Year 2006	1.001 (.547)	2.720 (.560)	1.034 (.560)	2.813 (.554)	.993 (.554)	2.699 (.552)	1.026 (.552)	2.789 (.556)	1.025 (.556)	2.787 (.556)
Survey Year 2008	2.396*** (.546)	10.977 (.556)	2.428*** (.556)	11.336 (.549)	2.389*** (.549)	10.903 (.552)	2.429*** (.552)	11.350 (.555)	2.433*** (.555)	11.391 (.555)
Survey Year 2010	1.951*** (.531)	7.034 (.540)	1.966*** (.540)	7.143 (.532)	1.946*** (.532)	7.000 (.538)	1.982*** (.538)	7.258 (.540)	1.984*** (.540)	7.269 (.540)
Education	.176* (.075)	1.192 (.077)	.166* (.077)	1.180 (.075)	.175* (.075)	1.191 (.075)	.173* (.075)	1.189 (.076)	.172* (.076)	.172* (.076)
White-collar	-.034 (.306)	.967 (.309)	-.038 (.309)	.962 (.306)	-.037 (.306)	.963 (.306)	-.048 (.306)	.953 (.306)	-.049 (.306)	.952 (.306)
Self-employed	-.648 (.404)	.523 (.405)	-.651 (.405)	.521 (.405)	-.645 (.405)	.525 (.403)	-.648 (.403)	.523 (.403)	-.649 (.406)	.523 (.406)

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio	B	Odds Ratio
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)										
Poland	-.237 (.412)	.789								
Romania	-.115 (.458)	.891								
Russia	-.013 (.349)	.988								
Other	.202 (.639)	1.224								
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.032 (.279)		1.032 (.279)		1.130 (.273)			
Minorities >20%										
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)										
Partly free										
Not free										
Constant	-11.597*** 1,150,372.20	-11.066*** 1,148,434.68	-11.582*** 1,150,333.99	-11.564*** 1,149,722.70						
-2log likelihood					209,687.03*** 207,787.71***					
Model χ^2						207,787.71***				
Pseudo R ²	.25	.25	.25	.25						
Degrees of freedom	14	18	15	15						
N	1,027,658	1,027,658	1,027,658	1,027,658						
N before weighting	392	392	392	392						

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (two-tailed test)

Table 42. Comparisons of Partial Eta's Squared for All Predictors in the Analysis of Political Adaptation of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants Aged 18 or Older, 2002-2010 VRS-CPS

Predictor	Naturalized Citizen				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.018	.018	.018	.018	.018
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.002	.001	.002	.002	.002
Married, Spouse Present	.007	.010	.006	.007	.008
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.068	.060	.068	.051	.051
West	.009	.023	.016	.011	.011
South	.014	.019	.016	.014	.014
Survey Year (ref.=2002)					
Survey Year 2004	.013	.015	.010	.013	.014
Survey Year 2006	.064	.068	.060	.069	.071
Survey Year 2008	.120	.135	.116	.131	.135
Survey Year 2010	.221	.252	.212	.230	.237
Education	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
White-collar	.017	.010	.016	.017	.016
Self-employment	.001	.000	.001	.001	.001
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Poland		.014			
Romania		.045			
Russia		.003			
Other		.021			
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.019		
Minorities >20%				.013	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free				.008	
Not free				.019	

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Voter Registration				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.004	.003	.004	.004	.003
Married, Spouse Present	.024	.025	.025	.025	.025
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
West	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
South	.008	.011	.013	.009	.011
Survey Year (ref.=2002)					
Survey Year 2004	.019	.031	.026	.019	.031
Survey Year 2006	.038	.038	.031	.042	.038
Survey Year 2008	.022	.026	.024	.025	.026
Survey Year 2010	.103	.107	.101	.110	.108
Education	.001	.000	.000	.001	.000
White-collar	.047	.048	.045	.046	.048
Self-employment	.003	.000	.003	.004	.000
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Poland		.036			
Romania		.043			
Russia		.036			
Other		.037			
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.012		
Minorities >20%				.002	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					.039
Not free					.000

(Continued on next page)

Predictor	Voting				
	Model 1 η^2	Model 2 η^2	Model 3 η^2	Model 4 η^2	Model 5 η^2
Length of Stay	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
Age	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Male	.006	.006	.006	.006	.006
Married, Spouse Present	.016	.016	.016	.016	.016
U.S. Region (ref.=Northeast)					
Midwest	.001	.003	.001	.003	.003
West	.064	.059	.063	.064	.064
South	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
Survey Year (ref.=2002)					
Survey Year 2004	.368	.366	.366	.369	.368
Survey Year 2006	.071	.075	.070	.074	.074
Survey Year 2008	.304	.310	.303	.310	.311
Survey Year 2010	.225	.228	.224	.231	.231
Education	.002	.001	.002	.001	.002
White-collar	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Self-employment	.031	.031	.031	.031	.031
Country of Origin (ref.=Ukraine)					
Poland		.004			
Romania		.000			
Russia		.000			
Other		.003			
GNI per capita <\$4,000			.000		
Minorities >20%				.001	
Personal freedom (ref.=free countries)					
Partly free					.001
Not free					.001

APPENDIX B

IRB Approval Letter



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
P.O. Box 425619, Denton, TX 76204-5619
940-898-3378 FAX 940-898-4416
e-mail: IRB@twu.edu

April 13, 2012

Ms. Nina Michalikova
Department of Sociology and Social Work

Dear Ms. Michalikova:

*Re: Adaptation Experience of Post-1991 Eastern European Immigrants in the United States
(Protocol #: 17034)*

The above referenced study has been reviewed by the TWU Institutional Review Board (IRB) and was determined to be exempt from further review.

If applicable, agency approval letters must be submitted to the IRB upon receipt PRIOR to any data collection at that agency. Because a signed consent form is not required for exempt studies, the filing of signatures of participants with the TWU IRB is not necessary.

Any modifications to this study must be submitted for review to the IRB using the Modification Request Form. Additionally, the IRB must be notified immediately of any unanticipated incidents. If you have any questions, please contact the TWU IRB.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathy DeOrnellas, PhD."

Dr. Kathy DeOrnellas, Chair
Institutional Review Board - Denton

cc. Dr. James Williams, Department of Sociology & Social Work
Dr. Philip Q. Yang, Department of Sociology & Social Work
Graduate School