ADAPTATION OF THE NEPALESE 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 & SOCIAL WORK

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

SONI THAPA-OLI, M.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 2011

DEDICATION

To my father Dr. Rana Bahadur Thapa and mother Suprava Thapa. Thank you for instilling in me the importance of hard work, higher education, and perseverance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the endless guidance and support of my committee chair, Dr. Philip Yang. I am thankful to him for believing in me and bringing his expertise to this pioneer study. I am so grateful to him for allowing me the opportunity to give back to my community.

I am forever indebted to my committee members, Drs. Mahmoud Sadri, Lisa Zottarelli, and George Yancey. Thank you for your encouragement, comments, and suggestions. Without your support this dissertation would have been impossible. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. James Williams who always guided me in the right direction throughout my academic career.

This dissertation would have been impossible without help of eighteen Nepalese organizations and my friends who helped me to collect my data. Without their help and support, this study would have been impossible. I am eternally grateful to those participants who filled out my questionnaires.

I would like to thank my husband, Suresh Oli, for his support, encouragement, and unwavering love. I am so grateful to my son, Swikar Oli, who has become so patient throughout my academic career over the last eighteen years. Thank you so much for being such a supportive and understanding son and not troubling me throughout my

ABSTRACT

SONI THAPA-OLI

ADAPTATION OF THE NEPALESE IN THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 2011

Despite the rapid growth of the Nepalese population, presently very little is
known about the Nepalese in the United States. This dissertation examines the adaptation
of the Nepalese in the United States. It focuses on the following three research questions:
1. How do the Nepalese in the United States adapt culturally, structurally, maritally,
identificationally, and receptionally to American life? 2. What factors influence the
cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese in
the United States? 3. Which factors play a more important role in the adaptation of the
Nepalese in the United States?

The theoretical framework for guiding this study is built upon the synthesis of the
following theories: classical assimilation, melting pot, cultural pluralism, selective
assimilation, revisionist assimilation, and transnationalism. I proposed a series of
hypotheses related to Nepalese's cultural, structural, identificational, marital, and
receptional adaptation for testing.

The data were collected through an online survey using the online survey software tool, PsychData. The sample (N= 768) was collected from the Nepalese who were 18 years old or older and currently living in the United States. I tested the hypotheses using ordinary least squares regression, logistic regression, multinomial logistic regression, and ordinal regression depending on the measurements of the dependent variables.

The results show that the majority of the Nepalese celebrated both Hindu and American holidays/festivals. Nepali was the dominant language spoken at home and with children. Most of them had friendship with Nepalese and socialized with Nepalese. The majority of the Nepalese interacted with whites in the workplace and lived in white neighborhoods. The majority of the respondents had a Nepalese spouse and consistently preferred to marry Nepali, if given a choice. More than half of the respondents would allow their children to marry non-Nepalese. The Nepalese not only identified themselves as Nepalese, but also felt closeness to their own ethnic group. The majority of the Nepalese had been mistaken as "Hispanics." Half of the respondents had been treated well in the host country but discriminated sometimes, and had never had unwelcomed feelings.

The results also reveal that age of entry is a significant predictor of celebrating Hindu festivals, attending Hindu religious services, attending Nepali functions, having a Nepalese spouse, disallowing children to marry non-Nepalese, and identifying self as Nepalese. Legal status significantly contributes to celebrating American holidays, identifying self as Nepalese American or Asian American, and facing less discrimination

and prejudice. Length of stay increases proficiency in English language; it facilitates living in white neighborhoods, having friendship and socialization with whites, obtaining membership in Nepalese organizations, marrying a non-Nepalese, and self-identifying as Nepalese American or American/other. Education in the United States facilitates working mostly with whites and obtaining membership in American organizations. Travel to homeland increases attending Hindu religious services, being close to Nepalese, working mostly with whites, and living in white neighborhoods. Sending remittance is associated with closeness to one's own ethnic group. Similarly, reading Nepali newspapers contributes to attendance of Hindu religious services, attendance of Nepali functions, cooking of Nepali food, retention of ethnic language, self-identification as Nepalese, and closeness to one's own ethnic group.

It is found that the relative importance of the predictors in predicting Nepalese adaptation varies depending on the dependent variables. Age of entry has the strongest effect on celebrating Hindu festivals, attending Hindu religious services, attending Nepali functions, and disallowing children to marry non-Nepalese. Gender has the strongest effect on attending religious services, cooking Nepali food, and obtaining membership in Nepalese organizations. Legal status not only has the strongest effect on celebrating American holidays and attending Nepali functions, but it also has an effect on a lack of racial/ethnic discrimination experience. Length of stay has the strongest effect on speaking English at home and with children, having friendships and socialization with whites, living in white neighborhoods, and marrying a non-Nepalese, if given a choice.

The highest level of education has the strongest effect on socializing and working with whites, and allowing children to marry a non-Nepalese. Interestingly, education in the United States has the strongest effect on working with whites and obtaining membership in an American organization. Travel to homeland has the strongest positive effect on living in white neighborhoods and experiencing less racial/ethnic discrimination. Reading Nepali newspapers has the strongest positive effect on cooking Nepali food, having a Nepalese spouse, speaking Nepali language at home and with children, hindering English speaking ability, and socializing with Nepalese.

This dissertation is the first large-scale survey study of Nepalese in the United States. It offers wealth of information on the adaptation of Nepalese unavailable elsewhere. In particular, it systematically analyzes the status and determinants of Nepalese's cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation. In addition, this dissertation proposes a multidimensional theoretical framework to depict the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. It tests this theoretical framework and its derived hypotheses using data from Nepalese, a brand new group of immigrants in America. The results provide support for cultural pluralism theory and challenge classical assimilation theory. It also analyzes the role of transnational activities in adaptation. The results may help the understanding of the adaptation experiences of other new immigrant groups. In addition, it may help to reduce prejudice and discrimination against the Nepalese in America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table   Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, the Nepalese comprise a relatively small, but rapidly

growing community. The arrival of the Nepalese in the United States is a recent

phenomenon (Hada 1995; Shrestha 1995). Data from the U.S. Department of Homeland

Security (various years) indicate that the first Nepalese immigrant came to the United

States in 1956. Before 1990, the annual admission of Nepalese immigrants was quite

small with only 1,572 Nepalese who immigrated to the United States in the period

between1956-1989. However, the Diversity Immigrants Program, created by the

Immigration Act of 1990, gave a boost to Nepalese immigration. Since 2003, Nepal has

emerged as a large beneficiary of the Diversity Immigrants Program (Yang 2011). From

1956 to 2010, a total of 38,505 Nepalese immigrants were admitted to the United States

(U.S. Department of Homeland Security, various years); however, unofficial data indicate

that there may be as many as 60,000 Nepalese living in the United States as of 2002

(Pradhan 2002). This was possible because many Nepalese entered as nonimmigrants,

and furthermore, Nepalese students comprise a large number of the Nepalese population.

The Institute of International Education (IIE various years) recorded that a total of 73,261

Nepalese students had entered the United States from 1995/96 to 2009/10. A significant

number of these students have become immigrants by changing their status to permanent

resident (Ranjeet and Purkayastha 2007; Tamot 2008). Similarly, "many 'H1B workers'

1

eventually manage to shift their status to permanent residents" (Porters 2009:13). As a result, students and other nonimmigrants (e.g., temporary workers and asylees) make up a large portion of the Nepalese population in the United States. If nonimmigrants are included, the total Nepalese population in America could currently be as high as 100,000.

Despite the rapid growth of the Nepalese population, presently very little is known about the Nepalese in the United States, since there has been no published systematic study of Nepalese adaptation to American life. There are, however, very few published articles and unpublished dissertations concerning the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States, but they do not provide a comprehensive overview of Nepalese experiences in the United States. For example, a qualitative study by Pratima Upadhyay (1991) focuses on the social assimilation of Nepalese immigrants in the United States, but with an emphasis on the impact that English language training has on their adaptation experiences. Similarly, Shabnam Koirala (2004) explores the intersection of education, immigration, and transnationalism through her three-year research project on the Nepali immigrant community in the San Francisco Bay area and Nepalese students in Nepal. Another example would be Raju Tamot's (2008) dissertation that examines how Nepal's professional cadre has contributed to the brain drain in Nepal through immigration to the United States. Tamot (2008) conducted both an ethnographic study (n=46) and a mailed survey (n=132) of Nepalese graduate students and professionals working and residing in the United States. This appears to be the only survey of the Nepalese in the United States, but Tamot's survey had a modest sample size and was

2

limited to graduate students and professionals. Presently, there is no large-scale survey of the general Nepalese population in America. A study conducted by the Manhattan Institute (Garland 2008) examined the cultural, political, and civic assimilation of Nepalese immigrants, but it was limited to New York only. However, no studies have addressed the cultural, structural, socioeconomic, identificational, marital, and receptional adaptation of Nepalese, simultaneously, at the national level. Additionally, the small and scattered Nepalese population has largely remained on the cultural and social sidelines of U.S. society. Even within South Asian American studies, the Nepalese are often overlooked by scholars who tend to concentrate on the dominant South Asian groups, such as Indians, Pakistanis, and Bangladeshis.

In addition, in the age of globalization, the adaptation experience of post-1965 immigrants is very different from that of their earlier counterparts. Multiculturalism has largely been accepted as a guiding principle of immigrant incorporation in major immigrant-receiving countries, such as Canada, Australia, the United States, and some European countries. Furthermore, transnational connections play a much more important role in immigrant adaptation today than ever before. As Yang (2006) contends, transnationalism has increasingly become a new mode of immigrant labor market incorporation in the age of globalization. As a brand new immigrant group, the Nepalese in America provide a rare opportunity to shed light on whether and to what extent new immigrant groups are different from older immigrant groups in the experience of assimilation, multiculturalism, and transnationalism.

Consequently, with the significantly increasing Nepalese population in the United States, the lack of research and empirical data on this population, and an exclusive opportunity to examine the experience of a new post-1965 immigrant group in conjunction with assimilation, multiculturalism, and transnationalism calls for a comprehensive study of the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. The Nepalese in the United States are defined as immigrants from Nepal living in the United States, which includes U.S citizens or immigrants, and non-citizens/immigrants, such as students and temporary workers, but excluding short-term visitors for business or pleasure. Unlike other migrant groups who have been in the United States for two or more generations, such as the Chinese, Japanese Filipinos, or Koreans, the Nepalese are the first generation migrants in the United States. Although Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians are largely first-generation immigrants, the majority of them came to this country as political refugees. But the Nepalese are a non-refugee group. Hence, the adaptation experience of Nepalese could be largely different from other migrant groups and therefore may carry unique significance. There are some Nepalese born in the United States, but the number is very small and they are mostly minors. The rationale for including Nepalese students studying in American colleges and universities along with temporary workers is that they are an integral part of the Nepalese community in America and are most likely to become immigrants in the

4

near future. Short-term visitors for business or pleasure are not included since they do not have a permanent residence in America and normally have to return to Nepal after a short period of time.

Adaptation refers to the adjustment of migrants to life in their host country. I use the term adaptation instead of assimilation because, unlike the latter, the term does not imply the one-way absorption into the dominant culture or the cultural superiority of the host society. Adaptation includes many dimensions. This dissertation focuses on the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese in America. Cultural adaptation refers to change in cultural patterns, such as language, religion, custom, and so forth in the host society. Structural adaptation is defined as interaction with and adjustment to the social groups and institutions of the host society. Marital adaptation means the extent of intermarriage with other groups. Identificational adaptation refers to change in identity attributed to the host society. Receptional adaptation is defined as the way migrants are received or accepted by the host society, which includes attitudinal acceptance or prejudice and behavioral acceptance or discrimination.

Specifically, this dissertation seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How do Nepalese in the United States adapt culturally, structurally, maritally, identificationally, and receptionally to American life?

2. What factors influence the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of Nepalese in the United States?

5

3. Which factors play a more important role in the adaptation of Nepalese in the United States?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Theoretical Significance

The theoretical framework relies on the classical assimilation theory, melting-pot theory, cultural pluralism theory, selective assimilation theory, revisionist assimilation theory, and transnationalism theory. This dissertation takes the framework one step further by synthesizing useful elements of old and new assimilation theories to better understand the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States. The major proponent of classical assimilation theory, Robert E. Park (1924), developed the concept of race relation cycle: contact, competition, accommodation, and assimilation. He argues that assimilation is a gradual process and a universal phenomenon (Park 1924). Unlike the assimilation theory and melting-pot theory that advocate for a homogenized society, cultural pluralism expects a differentiated society (Greeley 1974) in which there is "partial assimilation" and "partial retention" of ethnic cultures and institutions (Yang 2011:182). Guided by Milton Gordon's (1964) "Seven Stages of Adaptation," this dissertation focuses on the cultural, structural, marital, receptional, and identificational adaptation to depict the experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. Immigrants become selective where they tend to choose ethnic identities more so than majority identities (Gibson 1998). Revisionist assimilation theory contends that assimilation is a two-way street as opposed to a one-way process; it is a "bumpy-line" rather than a

6

straight-line process; and it is avoidable and modifiable (Alba and Nee 2003).

Transnationalism, for the purpose of this dissertation, involves "individuals, their networks of social relations, and their communities" (Portes et al. 1999:220). A complete understanding of Nepalese adaptation to the United States demands a theory that incorporates all of the important components of adaptation. Conversely, the synergy of these various theories attempt to answer the three central research questions stated earlier. This dissertation is important because none of the previous studies ever attempted to address adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States. For the first time, this study will empirically analyze the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States by incorporating various aspects of adaptation, including cultural, structural, marital, identification, and receptional.

Practical Significance

Despite the plethora of studies of Asian immigrants, including South Asian immigrants, the experiences of Nepalese immigrants have never been adequately addressed. For the most part, immigration studies in the United States overlook the Nepalese experience. Past publications on immigrants' adaptation solely focused on other dominant Asians and South Asian groups, but not the Nepalese who adhere to a unique immigration pattern coupled with an array of distinctive cultural, social, economic, and political backgrounds. Hence, to fill in the gap in the post-1965 immigration of Asians, most importantly South Asians, this is the first large-scale empirical study of the Nepalese living in the United States. This study has a sizable sample size to empirically

test adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States and simultaneously offers various dimensions of adaptation, including cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese that in the past has never been addressed. This dissertation is important because the findings have significant policy implications for improving services to the Nepalese community in the United States, as well as for reducing and preventing prejudice and discrimination against the Nepalese in America.

Contributions to the Literature

Just as it is important to extensively study other immigrant groups, it is equally important to study a new emerging immigrant group like the Nepalese in the United States. I propose an integrated theoretical model to explain adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States. This dissertation includes five dependent variables: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional, which have never been examined empirically in the case of Nepalese immigrants. In addition, for the first time, this dissertation analyzes the factors that influence adaptation of the Nepalese, such as age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, highest level of education, years of education in the United States, and transnationalism. In so doing, this study will fill a large gap in the literature on the Nepalese in the United States, and will also contribute to the literature on South Asian Americans and Asian Americans as it relates to the various aspects of the adaptation processes. The findings will help shed light on the adaptation, assimilation, multiculturalism, and transnationalism of new immigrant groups. This is a pioneering

study that seeks to explore the experiences of the Nepalese in the United States for the very first time.

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

Chapter 2 begins with a brief overview of the Nepalese people: their country of origin, their ethnicity, Nepal's brief political history, its diplomatic relationship with the United States. It then describes Nepalese emigration to other parts of the word. Finally, this chapter focuses on Nepalese movement in the United States. Chapter 3 reviews the literature on the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States, offers a conceptual framework for guiding the empirical analysis of this dissertation, and proposes hypotheses for testing. Chapter 4 explicates the data, variables and measurements, and methods of analysis. Chapters 5 through 9 present the findings of cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation, respectively. Each chapter includes descriptive analysis and multivariate analyses. The final chapter summarizes the major findings of this study, discusses their implications, addresses the contributions and limitations of this study, and suggests directions for future research.

CHAPTER II

NEPALESE AND MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

This chapter provides a brief overview of Nepal, its people, their ethnicity, and political history. Subsequently, this chapter offers a description of Nepal's diplomatic relations with the United States, followed by the Nepalese movement to the United States.

THE NEPALESE PEOPLE

The Country of Origin

Nepal is a small, landlocked country sandwiched between India and China with a total area of 54,563 square miles. According to the Census Bureau of Statistics (CBS) 2001, the Nepalese population is approximately 26 million (CBS 2001). The population projection for 2011 is approximately 28 million (CBS 2003). More than half of the population is illiterate with male literacy at about 66 percent and female literacy about 43 percent (CBS 2001). Nepal ranks among the world's poorest countries, with a per capita GDP of around $470 for the year 2007/2008 ("Nepal in Figure 2008", CBS). Poverty in Nepal is deeply entrenched. Nearly one third of the population (30.8 percent) lives below the poverty line, as per the Nepal Living Standard Survey 2003/2004. The Ginni Coefficient, which indicates inequality between the poor and rich, was 41.4 ("Nepal in Figure 2008", CBS). Approximately 85 percent of the population lives from subsistence agriculture in rural areas, coping with great disparities, like castes, gender, and geography

10

(Thieme et al. 2005). The implication is that the marginalized groups "suffer from poverty, illiteracy, high infant mortality, low life expectancy and the lack of basic services" (Lawoti 2005).

Ethnicity

Nepal is ethnically diverse and culturally rich. It is a home to numerous languages and dialects (Gurung 1997). According to the 1991 Census, there were 32 languages and 60 ethnic/caste groups in Nepal (Gurung 1997). By the Census of 2001, 92 known languages and a handful of unidentified languages became visible (CBS 2001). Nepali is spoken by approximately 49 percent of the population as their mother tongue, followed by Maithali (12.3 percent), Tamang (5.19 percent), Newari (3.63 percent), and other (29.88 percent) (CBS 2001).

In censuses, ethnicity is subsumed under caste. There are 103 caste/ethnic groups in which Chhetri and Brahman together comprise about 29 percent, followed by approximately 20 percent of Mongolian descent, (Magar, Tamang, Gurung, Rai, and Limbu), Newar with roughly 6 percent, and other castes about 55 percent (CBS 2001). In addition, the Nepalese population is divided along ethnic lines that run parallel with its geographical zones (Mihaly 1965). Geographically, in the high mountainous regions, people are primarily of pure Mongolian decent; and their language and customs are similar to those of Tibetian people (Mihaly 1965). The southern side of Nepal is flat and their culture and appearance are similar to people from India (Mihaly 1965). People in

the middle hill area are mainly comprised of Bahun-Chetris (Indo-Aryan) or privileged castes (Dhungel 1999).

Religion, caste, and ethnicity are determining factors in the spatial and social stratification of the Nepalese people. "Castes are vertically stratified by ritual status" (Gurung 2003:3). In Hinduism, caste defines certain groups in a hierarchy of ritual purity and pollution (Bennett 1983). Most of the people follow Hinduism as their religion (80.62 percent), followed by Buddhism (10.4 percent), Islam (4.2 percent), Christian (0.45 percent), and other (4.01 percent) (CBS 2001). According to Hinduism, there are four varnas: Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, and Shudra. At the top, the Brahamans and Kastriya varnas are those who traditionally filled the roles of priests and warriors, respectively (Bennett 1983). The middle range groups belong to the Vaisya varna (Gurung, Magar, and Newar). Sudra belongs to the bottom of the varna classifications. They are considered as lower castes or untouchables. In 1964, the progressive New Legal Code (Naya Mulki Ain) was introduced to eliminate the caste system. However, in practice, discrimination still prevails where contact with lower caste people is avoided by those members of the upper caste.

Brief Political History

Nepal became a nation-state in 1768-69 when King Prithvi Narayan Shah conquered the Kathmandu valley (Thapa and Sijapati 2004). In 1846, Rana Prime Minister, Janga Bahadur Rana usurped the Shah regime. Janga Bahadur Rana retained the Prime Minister position for his family by passing on this position to his brothers until the

12

regime came to an end in 1951. During the Rana regime, many Nepalese who were against the totalitarian form of governance were exiled to India. In 1946, some exiles established the Nepali National Congress party in Banaras, India. King Tribhuvan, who went into exile in India, allied with the congress party and dethroned the autocratic Rana regime. In 1951, for the first time, the Nepalese people experienced the dawn of democracy when the 104-year rule of the Ranas ended. In 1959, the country held the first general election; and the Nepali Congress won a two-third majority in the 109-seat parliament (Thapa and Sijapati 2004). In spite of this progress, King Mahendra, a successor of King Tribhuvan in 1960, dissolved the democratic government. King Mahendra introduced a feudal Panchayat (councils), which "was his own form of 'guided democracy' that was in vogue in many Third World countries at that time" (Thapa and Sijapati 2004:18). After nearly three decades, the popular People's Movement of 1990 established a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy (Bohara et al. 2006). Thereafter, "the king [Birendra] was forced to institute a constitutional monarchy with an elected parliament' (Onesto 2005).

The political transformation in the 1990s did not bring any development in the socio-political arena. In the midst of failed development and unprecedented inequality, once again, Nepal found itself in a political altercation, this time the Maoist insurgency. The Communist Party of Nepal-Maoists (CPN- M) initiated the decade long (1996- 2006) "people's war" on the 13th of February, 1996. The Maoists launched an armed revolt by executing coordinated raids on government offices, police posts, and private businesses

in various parts of Nepal (Bohara et al. 2006; Joshi and Mason 2007; Thapa and Sijapati 2004). One of the primary reasons for the Maoist insurgency was the outcry of poor people who were marginalized in Nepalese society for a long period of time. The Maoists mobilized vulnerable people, such as poor peasants, ethnic minorities, and women to fight for them. Joshi (2010) underscores that "In order to gain support from ethnic minorities, Maoists demanded cultural rights, ethnic federalism and elimination of gender and caste-based inequalities" (p. 106). Similarly, Hachhethu (2004) argues that "Some see [the Maoist insurgency] as a consequence of failed development, [while] other[s] view it as an ethnic uprising, and [still] many attribute it to bad governance" (p. 58). However, "it is basically an ideological and political offensive against the present political system of the country" (Hachhethu 2004:59). Although, the roles of the Maoists have been instrumental in mobilizing people, it failed to bring justice to their lives.

Once again Nepal encountered political upheaval when on June 1, 2001, King Birendra and his immediate family members were massacred in a domestic killing spree (Bohara et al. 2005). In the midst of doubt and political crisis, King Gyanendra (brother of the late King Birendra) was crowned. In 2001, the Maoists agreed to have a ceasefire; however, they pulled out of the talks and launched ferocious attacks against the military and government infrastructure on the 23rd of November, 2001. The government declared a state of emergency on the 26th of November, 2001. In October 2002, King Gyanendra dismissed the government and sacked the prime minister. Again, for the second time, in January 2003, both parties agreed to a cease-fire, but it lasted for only seven-months

(Bohara et al. 2005). In February of 2005, the king suspended democracy and imposed "'direct rule,' [which] restricted press freedom, and imprisoned hundreds, claiming that the country needed peace and security before it could have democracy" (Bohara et al. 2005). While assuming autocratic power with a series of demonstrations, King Gynendra was forced to restore the parliament in April 2006 (Joshi 2010). The Maoists became a legal political party on November 21, 2006 (Joshi and Mason 2011). Nepal became a Federal Democratic Republic from May 28, 2008 onward when the Constituent Assembly overwhelmingly voted for ending the country's 240 year monarchy. As a result, King Gyanendra's reign ended in 2008, as did the Shah dynasty in Nepal. The Maoists gained the majority of the votes in 2008's Constitutional Assembly election.

The Maoist leader, Pushpa Kamal Dahal, became the prime minster of Nepal in August 18, 2008 and held the position for less than a year. Within that three year period from 2008-2011, Nepal had three prime ministers, each holding a term of less than a year. Nepal's so-called political parties had not yet been able to establish a stable government. Political stability in Nepal seems an impossible feat amid a volatile government. The Maoists still threaten the future of the peace process if their demands and interests are not fulfilled.

Despite all of the political transformations in the post-1951 period until today, people's lives have not progressed in any significant way. In reality, social, economic, and political progress appears farfetched, particularly to those who are poor. In addition, even after 1990, "the marginalized sociocultural groups have achieved nothing

15

substantive in terms of public policies and participation in governance" (Lawoti 2005: 64). Although cease-fires took place in 2001 and 2003, the grisly battle was reinstated when the Maoists and the government failed to come to a compromise. The implication is that the country once known as a "Shangri-La" turned into a gruesome battlefield. The "People's War," which vowed to bring justice to the poor, bestowed many irreparable physical, social, economic, and emotional casualties for them and their families. The war led to the death of more than 13,000 people, including many other costs such as destruction, displacement, and gross human rights abuse (Lawoti 2005; Lawoti and Pahari 2010). The price that innocent people paid was colossal and irreconcilable.

Nepal's Diplomatic Relations with the United States

After the signing of the Anglo treaty of 1816, not only foreigners were restricted to visit Nepal except the British, but also the Nepalese were not allowed to emigrate to any countries except India (Dhungel 1999; Shrestha 1995). During the Rana regime (1846-1951) in Nepal, contact with Western society was virtually impossible for Nepalese citizens (Dhungel 1999). The autocratic Rana regime restricted any contact with the outside world in order to exclude foreign influences on Nepal (Mihaly 1965). Soon after India's independence from British imperialism in 1947 and the end of the Rana regime in Nepal in 1951, the diplomatic relationship between Nepal and the U.S. was established. As a result, the Embassy of Nepal in Washington, D. C. was established in 1958.

After World War II, the U.S. was the first country to grant aid to the least

developed countries like Nepal. Since the 1950s, Nepal was one of the first to receive

U.S. foreign aid (Khadka 2000). Nepal received U.S. aid because primarily the country

was poor and Nepali people desperately needed improvements in their living conditions

(Khadka 2000) and secondly, the U.S envisioned that Nepal, as a diverse group in terms

of language and religion, "could better promote national unity through faster economic

development" (Khadka 2000:78). For Nepal, this was an excellent opportunity to

"counter undue" the influence of neighboring countries India and China (Khadka

2000:78). Apart from economic and infrastructural development, in an ulterior way, the

U.S. interest in Nepal was to halt communism from its neighboring country China

(Khadka 2000). Although the diplomatic relationship with the United States helped Nepal

receive foreign aid, it did not contribute much in terms of Nepalese immigration to the

United States like other Asian groups.

NEPALESE EMIGRATION

The migration of Nepalese for foreign employment began early in the nineteenth

century (Joshi et al. 2011). In recent years, the political turmoil in Nepal not only

destroyed the social and economic lives of people, but it also forced people to seek

shelter in foreign countries, more specifically, in India, the Middle East, and to some

extent, in the United States. Nepalese migration to India has a long history; Nepalese and

Indians cross the borders freely (Thieme et al. 2005). CBS (2001) indicated that the rate

of migration is higher for females (50 percent) than for males (22 percent). Most of the

people migrated from rural areas (81 percent), followed by urban areas (6 percent) and other countries (13 percent) to their current locations. Out of "26 million people in Nepal, it is estimated that as many as seven million live and work in India and around 100,000 work in Gulf countries [Middle East]" (Onesto 2005:49). For most of the Nepalese, Middle Eastern countries, such as Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and United Arab Emirates have become the prime destinations for their migration. Those who migrate to these countries are mainly from the rural areas of Nepal and people who lack education or vocational training (Thieme et al. 2005). Nepalese women who migrated to these gulf countries are vulnerable to sexual and financial exploitation. Thieme et al. (2005) argue, "Migrants work primarily in low-paid and unskilled jobs and must cope with unsafe and inadequate means of remittance transfer" (p. 110). During their temporary stay in these countries, the Nepalese maintain their connections with family in Nepal (Thieme et al. 2005). In recent years, as I mentioned earlier, Nepalese migration is not limited to India or the Middle East, it has expanded to the United States as well. The reason for migration is due to the "People's War" coupled with a low rate of agricultural growth and the lack of alternative income sources (Thapa and Sijapati 2004).

NEPALESE MOVEMENT TO THE UNITED STATES

An exact count of Nepalese in the United States is unavailable. The estimated number of Nepalese in the United States is higher than the official data. Table 1 provides the numbers of Nepalese that have entered the United States from 1954 to 2010. Interestingly, it took more than three decades to reach a total of 106 Nepalese immigrants

in the United States. Later, the number increased significantly (Leonard 1997). The considerable growth of the Nepalese in the U.S. can be seen after 2003 where the admissions of Nepalese immigrants reached a total of 2099, ten times higher than 1988. Interestingly, within a sixty-year period, 38,506 Nepalese immigrants were admitted into the United States and the number nearly doubled from 2009 to 2010 (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, various years). The main destinations for the Nepalese were California, New York, Texas, and Virginia (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, various years).

Table 1. Nepalese Immigrants Admitted to United States from 1954 - 2010

Year	No	Year	No	Year	No	Year	No
1954	0	1968	19	1982	97	1996	431
1955	0	1969	32	1983	105	1997	447
1956	1	1970	25	1984	75	1998	476
1957	5	1971	40	1985	63	1999	453
1958	0	1972	39	1986	86	2000	617
1959	4	1973	46	1987	78	2001	949
1960	4	1974	43	1988	106	2002	1138
1961	5	1975	56	1989	134	2003	2099
1962	5	1976	68	1990	184	2004	2842
1963	3	1977	80	1991	174	2005	3158
1964	7	1978	68	1992	212	2006	3733
1965	4	1979	79	1993	257	2007	3472
1966	8	1980	95	1994	257	2008	4093
1967	9	1981	83	1995	312	2009	4514
						2010	7115
Total	55		773		2140		35538
Grand Total							38506

Source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Significant numbers of Nepalese immigrants in the United States are first-generation immigrants (Thapa-Oli et al. 2009). Table 2 indicates that from 2003 to 2010, a total of 31,026 Nepalese were granted 'Permanent Residency' under various categories (U.S Department of Homeland Security, various years). The majority of the Nepalese received their 'Permanent Residency' through diversity visa programs; for example, 12,890 received residency from 2003 to 2010. Diversity visa programs ascended the possibility of having the diverse backgrounds of Nepalese immigrants in the United States. The minimum criteria for eligibility to apply for the diversity visa lottery include high school graduation and two years of work experience. In recent years, the Nepalese are the second highest in receiving permanent residency through diversity visa programs.

Table 2. Nepalese Admitted as Legal Permanent Residents by Type of Admission, Fiscal Years 2003 - 2010

Year	Family sponsors	Emp. based pref.	Immed. relat. of U.S. citz.	Diversity programs	Refugee and asylee adjust.	Other	Total
2003	18	261	311	1495	12	2	2099
2004	53	479	415	1875	15	5	2842
2005	58	961	518	1545	72	4	3158
2006	88	864	668	1715	395	3	3733
2007	128	837	643	1175	683	6	3472
2008	97	765	650	1663	911	7	4093
2009	145	751	1013	1778	812	15	4514
2010	269	788	1312	1644	3093	9	7115
Total	856	5706	5530	12890	5993	51	31026

Source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Interestingly, Table 3 shows that a significant number of Nepalese were granted asylum from 2000 to 2010 (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, various years). Based on my calculations, a total of 2394 persons were granted asylum from 2000 to 2010 (U.S Department of Homeland Security, various years). The number of Nepalese asylees in the United States increases every year. For instance, in 2000, the number was 18, but by 2010, it had increased to 410 asylees (Table 3). Yang (2011) underlines, "Political conditions are pertinent to international migration because personal safety, freedom, and democracy are some of the basic human needs" (p. 36). Nepalese who were categorized under the refugees and asylees criteria became permanent residents. Almost six thousand (5,993) Nepali asylees became permanent residents from 2003 to 2010 (Table 2). Note that in 2010, the number of refugees and asylees who became permanent residents was almost four times higher than 2009 (Table 2).

Table 3. Number of Nepalese Granted Asylum, Fiscal Years 2000 - 2010

Year	Number	Year	Number
2000	18	2006	211
2001	19	2007	283
2002	69	2008	350
2003	144	2009	496
2004	163	2010	410
2005	231		
Total		2394	

Source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security

The Institute of International Education (IIE), a non-profit organization, shows that 73,261 Nepalese students were admitted to various universities in the U.S from 1995/96 to 2009/10 (Table 4). In 2008/2009, there was a notable 29.6 percent increase in the enrollment of Nepalese students, followed by increases of 15.2 percent in 2007/08, 27.9 percent in 2006/07 and 25 percent in 2005/06. In 2009/2010, only 11,233 Nepalese students entered the United States, indicating a decrease of 3 percent in enrollment ("Open Door Fact Sheet: Nepal" 2010). According to the Institute of International Education (IIE), Nepal is the eleventh leading country in students coming to the United States for higher education. Students coming from Nepal have increased dramatically over the past decade (Open Doors various years). For example, in the Dallas Community College District, there are 1,366 Nepalese students enrolled out of a total of 4,313 (Unmuth 2009). North Lake College alone has 832 Nepalese Students (Unmuth 2009). Therefore, data presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4 suggest a significant growth in the number of Nepalese immigrants in the United States. Students are an important source of immigration (Yang 2011). Some Nepalese students have become and are likely to become immigrants while adjusting their status. A majority of students and other non-immigrants changed their status to permanent residents (Yang 2011). Therefore, a significant number of non-immigrant categories and the probability of staying in the United States pave the way for an inclusion of non-immigrants in my study.

Table 4. Nepalese Students in the United States, 1995/96 - 2009/10

Year	No. of Students From Nepal
2009/2010	11,233
2008/09	11,581
2007/08	8,936
2006/07	7,754
2005/06	6,061
2004/05	4,861
2003/04	4,384
2002/03	3,729
2001/02	3,019
2000/01	2,618
1999/00	2,411
1998/99	2,358
1997/98	1,697
1996/97	1,400
1995/96	1,219
Total	73,261

Source: Institute of International Education

Since Nepalese immigration to the U.S. has only recently grown, the size of the population is comparatively small as compared to other Asian and South Asian groups. There are various theories as to why there is a very small number of Nepalese in the United States despite having some liberalizing immigration laws. For a long time, until 1947, Nepalese did not get a chance to immigrate to the U.S. due to their own government's internal policies and the absence of a diplomatic relationship with the United States (Dhungel 1999). On the other hand, the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States did not directly favor Nepalese immigration (Shrestha 1995). For example, the quota system established by national origin and family reunification

policies deterred the Nepalese from immigrating to the United States. Moreover, family

reunification restricted the Nepalese from coming to the United States. The Nepalese did

not directly fit into either criterion as other Asians. Yang (1995) attests that the U.S. gears

immigration more towards the capitalist countries, which explains why the significantly

lesser-developed countries, like Guinea, Somalia, and Nepal, had no significant

immigration. In addition, the small, sporadic, and late arrival of the Nepalese into the

United States basically depends on the country's economic disadvantages, such as

illiteracy, poverty, and cultural and linguistic disparities (Dhungel 1999; Shrestha 1995).

Conversely, the history of Nepalese immigration to the U.S. is not consistent with other

prominent Asian groups.

Furthermore, the immigration patterns of Nepalese immigrants entering the U.S.

differ from those of other South Asians (Thapa-Oli et al. 2009). Even though Nepalese

immigration to the U.S. began in 1956 as Table 1 indicates, the number did not grow

significantly until the 1990s. Nepalese immigrants who immigrated to the United States

during the1980s were mainly for the purpose of higher education (Dhungel 1999). Those

who emigrated from Nepal were predominantly from the upper castes, which are the

Bahuns and Chettris (Gubhaju 1999). Later, the number of Nepalese immigrants began

to expand through the diversity visa programs. The implication is that the lottery system

brought relatively less educated Nepalese populations to the U.S. (Dhungel 1999).

Nonetheless, Dhungel (1999) states, "Nepalese are still better educated…less educated

people cannot even get access to apply for lottery or regular visa applications" (p. 121).

Consequently, people with less educational and financial capabilities are not likely to emigrate from Nepal (Dhungel 1999; Gubhaju 1999).

The ethnic/caste landscape of Nepalese immigrants in the U.S indicates that they come to the U.S. from all three geographic regions in which the Bahun-Chetris represents about 45 percent of the total Nepalese population in the U.S., followed by Newar comprising 40 percent, Himalayan Mongolian at 10 percent, and Terrain Madhese at 5 percent (Dhungel 1999). Despite the variation in ethnic/caste groups, the primary language of communication is Nepali in the United States (Dhungel 1999). Within the U.S. Nepalese community, regardless of vertical hierarchies in caste, lower caste people do not feel discriminated against by their fellow higher caste Nepalese like in the home country (Gubhaju 1999). Therefore, the population within castes became waxed and waned while ethnicity as Nepalese becomes more prominent in the United States. Most of the Nepalese speak both Nepali and English fluently (Dhungel 1999). The majority of the Nepalese who are residing in the U.S. are Hindu, followed by Buddhist, and they celebrate religious festivals, both collectively and individually (Dhungel 1999).

SUMMARY

This chapter describes the Nepalese people, their ethnicity, a brief political history of Nepal, its diplomatic relations with the United States, Nepalese emigration, and their movement to the United States. Nepal's decade long "People's War" not only brought human casualties, but it also forced many people to leave their villages and country. For employment opportunities and safety concerns, they migrated to India and Middle

Eastern countries, as well as to the United States. The Nepalese in the United States is a relatively new immigrant group. The Nepalese in the United States are diverse socially, culturally, economic, and politically. Despite a significant growth of Nepalese in the United States, Nepalese immigration never became a part of immigrant studies. Most of the past studies looked at the immigration patterns of other Asians or South Asians, but never discussed the Nepalese in the United States in any single study. This dissertation seeks to fill in the gaps in the literature by examining the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK, AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter reviews the literature regarding the adaptation of Nepalese in the United States. In addition, an analytical framework for this study and hypotheses for testing is proposed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Limited available studies of the Nepalese in the United States prevent scholars from fully understanding the adaptation processes of the Nepalese population. Relying on only a scant available dissertations and articles, this section reviews the existing research on the various dimensions of the adaptation processes of the Nepalese in the United States, including cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation.

Cultural Adaptation

Immersing into a new society and culture not only generates geo-political and economic dilemmas, but also creates socio-cultural stigmas for the Nepalese in the United States. Amid such perplexity, Nepalese immigrants "see the social and cultural differences between Nepal and the United States and the importance of preserving our [Nepalese] culture" (Hada 1995:143). The Nepalese community in the United States is a minority, especially when considering that within immigrant groups, "[Nepalese] are often seen as very passive people who simply try to maintain our identity in the U.S by promoting our 'exotic' culture and heritage" (Koirala 2004:121). South Asian

27

immigrants, along with Nepalese immigrants, persevere in their efforts to retain and transmit their culture to the United States' dominant culture as they study, work, and live in the United States (Leonard 1997). As a result, new immigrants are eager to maintain their culture (Dasgupta 2000). Nepalese immigrants pass their language and culture on to the next generation, their children (Koirala 2004). In the United States, Nepalese gather and partake in various cultural programs that include Nepali dances, songs, and comedic skits two to three times a year in an effort to preserve and celebrate Nepalese culture (Koirala 2004). For example, the Nepalese in the United States regularly have gatherings with other Nepalese immigrants to celebrate Dashin and Tihar - Nepalese main religious festivals - and the Nepalese New Year (Koirala 2004; Tamot 2008). Consequently, Nepalese parents encourage their children to wear ethnic Nepali dresses (Koirala 2004). In the United States, the Nepalese decorate their houses with Nepali arts and crafts, collectively celebrate their culture, and frequently visit their native country (Koirala 2004). These shared cultural activities encourage some Nepalese in the United States to retain their culture rather than assimilating into American culture. While useful, these studies are mainly descriptive, lack empirical evidence, and are based on anecdotal observations rather than systematic evidence. No prior study has empirically analyzed the determinants of Nepalese cultural adaptation to the United States.

Structural Adaptation

The magnitude of cultural adaptation of Nepalese immigrants to American culture is more than that of their structural adaptation (Upadhyay 1991). The respondents who

were trained in formal English language for years were more structurally assimilated than other respondents who did not have such training or exposure (Upadhyay 1991). In contrast, Tamot (2008) argued that regardless of English language proficiency, Nepalese immigrants did not structurally adapt to American society. The Nepalese in the United States prefer to spend time and share moments with other Nepalese; therefore, they fail to structurally assimilate in the United States (Tamot 2008:248). Nepalese prefer to limit social gatherings among themselves in most cases. For example, Nepalese students meet at least once a week at one of the city's Nepalese restaurants, Himalayan Aroma or Temptation in Irving, Texas (Unmuth 2009). Similarly, Nepalese have limited contact with Americans as they mostly limit their contacts to other Nepalese immigrants (Upadhyay 1991). Even though scholars have conducted some ethnographic studies on Nepalese immigrants, these studies tend to examine who the Nepalese spend their leisure time with in the United States.

From a sociological standpoint, Nepalese immigrants' levels of structural assimilation differ before the 1980s as opposed to the immigrants who arrived in the United States after the 1980s. Therefore, within the Nepalese community, the Nepalese in the United States undergo two waves of immigration. Nepalese immigrants who arrived in the United States before the 1980s were well-educated and primarily held professional jobs (Dhungel 1999; Tamot 2008). The shift in the immigration pattern among Nepalese immigrants brings two different groups: one as highly educated and professional, the other as less educated and semi-professional. As a result, "Nepali

Americans are from mixed educational and class backgrounds" (Ranjeet and Purkayastha 2007:40); therefore, they undergo different experiences. In this scenario, structural assimilation within occupations becomes difficult for those Nepalese immigrants who come with fewer resources; therefore, in the United States, structural assimilation in occupations has become easier for those Nepalese immigrants who have attained higher levels of education and have become fluent in English. On the other hand, Nepalese immigrants who arrived in the United States after the 1980s are not well-educated or qualified to acquire professional jobs to the extent achieved by those who came to the United States prior to the 1980s. As a result, "More than 60% of late immigrants (as opposed to 20% of earlier arrivals) are unskilled workers who earn subsistence salaries" (Dhungel 1999:126). Nepalese immigrants who came to the United States prior to the 1980s primarily run small businesses, like consultancies, food stores, and restaurants, as compared to those who came to the United States after 1980s with fewer resources (Dhungel 1999). Approximately 80 percent of the Nepalese who arrived prior the 1980s have "comfortable life styles owning apartments, town houses or some time even mansions to live" (Dhungel 1999:126). On the contrary, those who migrated after the 1980s either rent apartments or own less expensive townhouses (Dhungel 1999). Since Nepalese immigrants within themselves comprise two types of immigrants before the 1980s and after the 1980s - there needs to be a comparative study on how these two different groups, one with greater resources and one with less resources, structurally

adapt to American life. Likewise, there has never been an empirical study on Nepalese non-citizens/immigrants that examines their structural adaptation.

Structural adaptation, particularly occupational, differs by gender. While intersecting gender and work, the majority of South Asian women were employed as domestic workers in the New York metropolitan areas (Gupta 2006:218). Women's participation in the labor force is higher among Nepalese (66 percent) and Sri Lankan (69 percent) when compared to other South Asian groups (Kibria 2006). The study conducted by Thapa-Oli et al. (2009) in the New York metropolitan areas demonstrated that more than half of these Nepalese women respondents (55.6 percent) were wage laborers, followed by academicians (20 percent). Married Nepalese immigrant women are not only more likely to get lower paying jobs than their husbands, but these women are also geographically restricted to stay in the area where their spouses are employed (Ranjeet and Purkayastha 2007). While considering immigrant and nonimmigrant women's structural adaptation, there has not been any specific study conducted to date on Nepalese women in the United States. Since the most Nepalese women are limited to semi-professional or wage labor jobs, occupational assimilation is less likely to take place. Given that Nepalese women in the United States are engaged in both white collar and blue collar jobs, it is important to examine the structural adaptation of Nepalese women in the United States. Particularly, the level of education, age of entry, legal status, and length of stay in the host country significantly impact Nepalese women's structural adaptation.

Marital Adaptation

Intermarriage intersects with cultural adaptation because marriage and culture both tend to preserve language, religion, and other cultural components (Yang 2011). In terms of marriage, in most cases, Nepalese immigrants were married before coming to the United States (Dhungel 1999). Like other South Asian communities, Nepalese men also prefer submissive wives from the native country rather than Nepalese women who have grown up in the United States. Men believe that girls who grow up in the United States may lose the essence of Nepalese culture and tradition. On the other hand, there are some incidents where Nepalese men married American and other international women (Dhungel 1999). Nepalese are more likely to accept an international matrimonial relationship than an inter-caste marriage (Dhungel 1999; Gubhaju 1999). Based on the fact that Nepalese traditionalists believe in the caste system, there are mixed opinions about whom their children should marry. In addition, Nepalese parents choose a bride or groom that belongs to the same caste. However, there are some parents who prefer that their children marry someone from Nepal regardless of castes (Gubhaju 1999). Nepalese parents constantly insist on the tradition of arranged marriages (Tamot 2008). While these assertions are important, the findings lack well-supported studies to substantiate the ongoing trend of intermarriage among Nepalese immigrants and nonimmigrants. Furthermore, it is important to measure whether marital adaptation varies by gender, age of entry, legal status, length of U.S. residence, level of education, citizenship status, and/or transnational connections.

Identificational Adaptation

Even though the first generation tends to maintain their ethnic identities, identification change is evident (Yang 2011). Among the Nepalese who live in the United States, the "identity of being a Nepalese seems to remain very strong" (Dhungel 1999:130). A new ethnic identity is inevitable, and "ethnic boundaries and meaning are also constructed from within and from without, propped up by internal and external pressures" (Nagel 1994:167). A hyphenated identity "is likely to indicate that these Americans cannot be American in the same way as their white peers" (Purkayastha 2005: 9). The implication is that the boundaries define whether one is a member of a particular group or not (Nagel 1994). Shrestha (1995:123) emphasized that "Nepal is the county of our birth, the United States is the country of our choice, and we are American with Nepalese identity." Nevertheless, none of the past studies examined the identificational adaptation of Nepalese in the United States.

Receptional Adaptation

The Nepalese in the United States face both attitudinal prejudice and behavioral discrimination. How the Nepalese are received in the host country is still understudied. Nepalese immigrants are often mistakenly identified as Hispanic (Tamot 2008). Dhungel (1999) states, "There is also deep feeling of discrimination among both the Nepalese educated elites and unskilled workers on the job and on the process of findings job" (p. 130). Furthermore, "Nepalese immigrants have experienced taboos at work particularly from American co-workers, supervisors, or sometimes from other senior employees"

(Dhungel 1990:130). Likewise, in the United States, racism is higher towards Nepalese immigrant women (21 percent) than Nepalese immigrant men (4 percent) (Tamot 2008). One of the participants expressed that "You [Nepalese] will never be a part of this country" (Tamot 2008:244). While these data and narratives are useful, the receptional adaptation of Nepalese in the United States has never been systematically analyzed.

The lack of the literature on the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States reveals that there is a need to conduct a systematic empirical study. The literature lacks not only adequate descriptions about the adaptation processes of Nepalese immigrants in the United States, but also an in-depth and empirical analysis of various dimensions of adaptation. The existing literature has completely neglected the gender issues of the adaptation processes of the Nepalese in the United States. There is a gap in research that addresses Nepalese non-citizens/immigrants that also spend significant amounts of time in the United States while they study, work, and wait for the approval of their asylum applications. There are insignificant empirical data on the various adaptation processes of the Nepalese residing in the United States. Thapa (2007) underlined, "The recently growing Nepalese population in the United States demands extensive research not only to find out how they assimilate and adapt in the American society, but also to fill the gaps in academic discourse" (p. 47). In the midst of shortcomings on the adaptation processes of the Nepalese in the United States, this study offers a pioneering systematic empirical study of Nepalese adaptation to American life.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Based on my observations and experience, the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States cannot be completely captured by the Anglo-conformity and the melting pot perspectives. Anglo conformity expects a homogeneous society, "a total absorption of the new immigrant group by the dominant group" (Yang 2000:82). The melting pot perspective is the eruption of a common "American culture" with the combination of two cultures: host and immigrant (Greeley 1974:305). In the context of the Nepalese in the United States, they tend to stay away from American culture; therefore, they are preserving their own culture and heritage. With that being said, several theories are useful, including Milton Gordon's "Seven Stages of Assimilation," cultural pluralism, and selective assimilation. Gordon (1964) proposed a framework of the seven stages of assimilation, including cultural, structural, marital, identification, attitude receptional, behavior receptional, and civic assimilation. Cultural assimilation is the relinquishment of immigrants' traditional way of life and (e.g., norms, beliefs, values, religion, customs) and the adoption of the dominant culture. Structural assimilation allows immigrants to gain entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society on a primary group level (Gordon 1964). Marital assimilation (amalgamation) refers to large-scale intermarriage (Gordon 1964). Identificational assimilation involves the development of a sense of people-hood based exclusively on the host society. Attitude receptional assimilation means the absence of prejudice. Behavior receptional assimilation means the absence of discrimination (Gordon 1964:70-71). Civic

35

assimilation refers to the absence of value and power conflict. This framework captures the major dimensions of immigrant adaptation. However, the term "assimilation" suggests one-way absorption of the new group by the dominant group or the melting together of different groups and should be replaced by a neutral term, such as "adaptation" or "integration." Structural assimilation should not be limited to the primary group level and should be extended to the institutional level. Civic assimilation is normally difficult to measure.

Another useful theory is cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism acknowledges partial assimilation to the dominant culture, but emphasizes the retention of the ethnic culture. Cultural pluralism embraces diversity and can better capture the "American reality" (Yang 2000:86). Cultural pluralism was a fact in the United States before becoming a theory (Gordon 1961). Cultural pluralism maintains "distinctiveness between racial and ethnic groups" (George and Yancey 2004:3) and rejects "the inevitability of cultural assimilation" (Yetman 1999:232). However, cultural pluralism is confined to the cultural dimension. The structural, marital, identificational, and receptional dimensions ought to be considered with regards to the adaptation experience of Nepalese immigrants.

Gibson's (1998) theory of selective assimilation is another perspective that could shed light on the experience of Nepalese adaptation. It is a way of adapting to American society based on what is good for one's advancement (Gibson 1988). An individual selects the segments of society that benefit the self and vehemently bypasses prejudices and discriminations that hinder one's overall development. She argues that immigrants

36

could possibly adapt to American culture without completely assimilating into American society (Gibson 1998: 628). Similar to the cultural pluralism perspective, selective assimilation theory is limited to the cultural dimension.

Another theory that emerges while analyzing the adaptation processes of Nepalese immigrants in the United States is transnationalism. Transnationalism is "the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement" (Basch, Schiller and Blanc 2003:7). Transnationalism "represents cross-country networking and interpersonal networking undertaken by immigrants" (Yang 2006:176). Portes and Rumbaut (2006) argued, "While it is possible that transnational activities may slow the acquisition of new loyalties and identities in some cases [...] transnationalism end up *accelerating* the political integration of immigrants in the United States" (p. 138).

By integrating the above theories, I propose a multidimensional adaptation theoretical framework to depict the adaptation experience of the Nepalese in the United States. This framework maintains that the Nepalese in America will undergo five major dimensions of adaptation to American life, including cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation. However, they have not relinquished their ethnic culture and traditions, nor have they become totally assimilated into American culture. In fact, as a virtually first-generation migrant group, the Nepalese in America tend to retain their ethnic culture to a great degree. They do become partly assimilated to American culture and society, but they tend to select the elements that meet their needs.

In this age of globalization, first generation Nepalese in America also maintain close transnational connections with their homeland.

HYPOTHESES

For the first research question, I expect to find that total assimilation has not occurred for the Nepalese in the United States, and that the Nepalese in America maintain their ethnic culture to a large extent. In terms of cultural adaptation, the Nepalese tend to cook Nepalese food; celebrate Nepalese festivals and religious holidays with their Nepalese friends and families; attend Nepalese functions; speak Nepalese language at home and to their children; and transmit Nepalese culture, language, and religion to their children to a greater extent. Nepalese people also celebrate American holidays and festivals, but they tend to celebrate them among themselves. Structurally, the Nepalese in the United States are more likely to join their own social cliques, clubs, and organizations than those of other racial/ethnic groups. They feel closer to their own group than to other groups and tend to socialize more with other Nepalese. The Nepalese in the United States are more likely to work with other Nepalese. They are more likely to live in a predominantly Nepalese neighborhood. The degree of intermarriage among the Nepalese in the United States tends to be much lower compared to other racial/ethnic groups. They tend to limit their marriages to their own group, either finding suitable brides or grooms in the home country or in the United States. In terms of identificational adaptation, the Nepalese in the United States are more likely to identify themselves as Nepali than with Nepalese American, Asian American, and/or American. Although there are some

38

incidents where the Nepalese have faced prejudices and discriminations, the number and incidents may be relatively low.

H1: The Nepalese who enter the United States at an early age are more likely to experience a higher degree of adaptation to American life culturally, structurally, maritally, identificationally, and receptionally than the Nepalese who arrive at an older age, controlling for other variables.

H2: Nepalese men have a higher degree of cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation to American life than Nepalese women because of gender differences in social status.

H3: Legal status is connected with a higher degree of cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation for the Nepalese than non-immigrants, controlling for other variables.

H4: A longer U.S. residency is associated with a higher degree of the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese to the host country than a shorter U.S. residency, all else being equal.

H5: The higher the level of education, the greater the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese to the host country, holding other variables constant.

H6: The higher the level of education in the United States, the greater the cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of the Nepalese to the host country, holding other variables constant.

H7: Nepalese people who maintain a higher degree of transnational connections are less likely to experience cultural, structural, identificational, marital, and receptional adaptation than those with a lower degree of transnational connections.

For the third question, I expect to find that age of entry, gender, the highest level of education, years of education in the United States, length of residence, legal status, and transnational connections play a significant role in the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. However, important determinants are likely to vary across different dimensions of adaptation. For example, length of U.S. residency is likely to be very important in cultural, structural, marital, and identificational assimilation, but may not matter much in receptional adaptation because the Nepalese are likely to be treated as "perpetual foreigners" like other Asian groups regardless of how long they have been here.

SUMMARY

The theoretical framework that I painted for the Nepalese is a synthesis of the old assimilation theory, cultural pluralism, selective assimilation, revisionist theory, and transnationalism. Nepalese cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation experiences differ from the majority of immigrant groups in the United States. This dissertation proposes a multidimensional theoretical framework to fully portray the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States. I hypothesized that a complete assimilation has not occurred for Nepalese immigrants as they maintain their ethnic culture by speaking ethnic language, celebrating Hindu festivals/holidays, and join their

40

own cliques, clubs, and organizations. Although they celebrate American holidays/festivals, they celebrate mostly with Nepalese families and friends. They prefer to live predominantly in Nepalese neighborhoods, marry fellow Nepali, and identify themselves as Nepali or Nepalese American rather than other identities. They are often mistaken for Hispanic and frequently face prejudice and discrimination. Based on the various adaptation theories, this study proposes to test the hypotheses that age of entry, gender, length of residence, legal status, highest level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers have a significant effect on the cultural, social, marital, identification, and receptional adaptation processes. This is the first quantitative study with a large sample size that measures the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States.

The next chapter focuses on the methods and data used in this dissertation, followed by a description of the variables used in this analysis, a discussion of statistical methods, and analytical strategies.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND METHODS

This chapter details the data and methodology, including the population, survey, pilot study, variables, and measurements. The chapter closes with a discussion of statistical methods and analytical strategies.

DATA

Sample

In order to examine the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States, I collected data through an online survey. I considered an online survey as the best feasible method of data collection for this under-studied population. By doing so, I was able to recruit as many Nepalese in the United States as possible with the limited resources that I had available. The questionnaire consisted of both close-ended and open-ended questions.

The sample was collected from the Nepalese population who were 18 years-old or older and currently living in the United States. The sample included both Nepalese immigrants and nonimmigrants that had relatively permanent addresses. The reasons for including Nepalese nonimmigrants in this study were, first, due to lack of official data of Nepalese immigrants in the United States, it was impossible to select immigrants only. Second, certain types of nonimmigrants, such as temporary workers (H1B), college students (F1), and asylees are very likely to become immigrants later and go through the adaptation process. In particular, students who pursue a college or graduate degree in the

United States spend at least four to six years to obtain their degrees and often tend to change their non-immigrant status to permanent resident status after graduation. Therefore, it is likely that they also undergo the adaptation processes in the United States. Likewise, temporary working professionals (H1B) also stay in the United States for quite a long time and go through the adaptation processes; the similar process occurs for the Nepalese who are seeking political asylum in the United States. These Nepalese nonimmigrants are part of a larger Nepalese community in the United States. However, I excluded the respondents who were under visitor visas for business or pleasure because they are here for a short period of time and may not go through adaptation processes in the United States.

The Pilot Study

Before conducting an actual survey, I conducted a pilot study among the Nepalese (N= 10) in Denton. The respondents were under the status of immigrants and non-immigrants. For the pilot study, I conducted a paper-and-pencil based survey, even though my actual survey was conducted online. All the respondents (100 percent) completed and returned the survey within 10 days. The respondents did not show any major concerns about the questionnaire except for two questions. Following their suggestions, I revised question number 17 where I asked, "Who would you marry, if you had a choice?" It was pointed out that this particular question might be confusing to those who lack proficiency in English and may understand differently, if they were already married, for example. As a result, I revised the question and asked, "Hypothetically, if

43

you had a choice, who would you marry?" Furthermore, one of the respondents brought to my attention that people might not want to disclose their income. Since they had an option to skip the question, I kept it. The respondents (100 percent) mentioned that it took only 10-15 minutes for them to complete the survey.

Data Collection

I conducted an online survey using the online survey software tool: PsychData. I used email addresses to collect my data. This was the most efficient way to contact my population in the U.S. given the fact that as there is no systematic and accurate information about the Nepalese living in the United States. Therefore, I decided to use two approaches to reach the Nepalese population, first, through Nepalese organizations in the U.S. and, secondly, through my personal friends who had have connections with the Nepalese living in the United States. To begin, I sent request letters to the presidents of 18 Nepalese organizations (Appendix A) asking them to help recruit the Nepalese living in the United States. Once I received their approval to recruit the participants, I asked the president of each of these organizations to forward the URL link to the questionnaire (Appendix B), which was attached to the participants' email addresses. Second, I asked 30 of my personal friends who had personal connections with other Nepalese residing in the United States to forward the URL link to the questionnaire, which was attached to the participants' email addresses. Once the respondent had chosen to consent to the survey, then he/she filled out the survey.

44

The online survey questionnaire consisted of 56 close-ended questions and 3 open-ended questions. Close-ended questions contain five dimensions of adaption and demographic information. Three open-ended questions were designed to encourage the participants to describe their adaptation experiences in the United States. Although I collected the open-ended questionnaire for this dissertation, I did not analyze the open-ended questions because of time constraints; however, I will use the data for future research.

A total of three months were allowed to fill out the questionnaire (August 2 – November 2, 2010). Respondents received two reminders within a three-month period. For the first time, the respondents had a month to fill out the questionnaire (August 2 – September 2, 2010). Once the deadline passed, I sent the first email reminder (September 9, 2010) with a link to the questionnaire to the aforementioned organizations and my personal friends. I asked them to forward the questionnaire one more time to the participants. All the participants received both the reminders from the aforementioned organizations and my personal friends. In the first reminder email, I "thanked" those respondents who had already filled out the questionnaire for their participation; and those who had not yet filled out the questionnaire were asked to complete the survey. This time the participants had almost seven weeks to fill out the survey (September 9 – November 2, 2010). The reason for giving a little extra time was to encourage more participation. During the first phase of data collection (August 2 – September 2, 2010), the response was very low; only about 200 people filled out the questionnaire. After the first reminder,

an additional 200 people filled out the survey, yielding a total of 400 responses. I sent a second email reminder three weeks before the deadline, on the 10th of October 2010, to the aforementioned organizations and my personal friends requesting them to forward reminders to the participants (since there is no mechanism to identify who had completed the survey and who had not; once again all the participants received the reminder). Again, in the email, the researcher "thanked" those respondents who had already filled out the questionnaire for their participation; and those who had not yet filled out the questionnaire were asked to complete the survey. Finally, after the second reminder, the number of responses increased to 775. After omitting the duplicate cases, a total of 768 cases were available for the study.

I expected that a total of 6,000 questionnaires would be sent through organizations and my personal friends. However, I was unable to track precisely how many people received the questionnaire. I anticipated receiving a minimum of 3,000 completed questionnaires, yielding a response rate of at least 50 percent. However, in practice, it became impossible for me to track down the number of surveys sent out. One of the reasons was that the same person was a member of multiple Nepalese organizations; in this case, the same person might have received my questionnaire multiple times. In addition, these organizations do not have a record of how many email addresses are currently active. Since I do not know how many people received my questionnaire, I was unable to calculate the exact response rate. However, I assumed that based on my expectations, which was 6,000, I speculated that the response rate was about

13 percent (12.91 percent). I estimated that my 30 friends forwarded the information to at least 30 people (N= 900). Out of 18 organizations, I assumed that each organization forwarded the information to at least 283 people (N = 5094).

The survey was conducted in English. The total time commitment was approximately 30 minutes on a computer. Respondents were made aware of the effort to maintain their confidentiality. Participants were told that their participation was completely voluntary and that they could decide not to answer any questions at any time. Prior to the survey, I obtained the approval from the TWU IRB (Appendix C) to conduct a survey on human subjects.

Instrument

A 30-minute online survey in English was administered using PsychData. The single questionnaire consisted of close-ended and open–ended questions (see Appendix B). There were a total of 58 close-ended questions (20 questions on demographics, eight on cultural adaption, eight on structural adaptation, three on marital adaptation, seven on receptional adaptation, two on identificational adaptation, and seven on transnationalism) and three open-ended questions.

VARIABLES AND MEASUREMENTS

Dependent Variables

My dependent variables are cultural adaptation, structural adaptation, marital adaptation, identificational adaptation, and receptional adaptation.

Cultural adaptation. My first dependent variable was cultural adaptation and consisted of eight indicators. Celebrating Hindu festivals is a dichotomous variable, coded 1 for the designated category and 0 otherwise. Celebrating American holidays/festivals was coded 1 and 0 otherwise. Attending Nepalese functions, attending Hindu religious services, and cooking Nepalese food are ordinal level variables with seven categories ("never," "once a year," "several times a year," "once a month," "2-3 times a month," "nearly every week," and "more than once a week"). Speaking Nepalese language at home is a nominal variable ("English, "Nepali," "Both Nepali and English," and "other"). Speaking Nepali language with children is also a nominal variable ("no children", "English," "Nepali," both "Nepali and English," and "other") where I excluded "no children" and recoded accordingly. English speaking ability is an ordinal variable and recoded ("not well, "well," "very well," and "English only").

Structural adaptation. Structural adaptation has a total of eight indicators. Among these indicators, interaction with other racial/ethnic group, membership in Nepalese organizations, membership in South Asian organizations, and membership in American organizations are all dichotomous variables, coded 1 for the designated category and 0 otherwise. Note that variables, such as socialization, interaction in the work place, interaction in residential neighborhood, each category is dichotomous. Therefore, for each category in each indicator, designated categories are coded 1 (white, black, Hispanic, other Asian, and Asian) and 0 otherwise, respectively. Friendship (best or close friend) is a nominal variable and recoded ("Nepalese," "white," "black/Hispanic," "other

48

Asian," and "other"). Here, I combined blacks and Hispanics as they had very low responses.

Marital adaptation. Marital adaptation has three indicators. The first indicator, which was "spouse," had three categories where I excluded "not married." If the respondent was married to a "non-Nepalese", it was coded 1 and 0 "Nepalese." Hypothetical marital choice is a nominal level variable and recoded ("Nepali," "white," "black/Hispanic," "other Asian," and "other"). Allowing children for intermarriage is a nominal variable and recoded ("no," "unsure/undecided," and "yes") where the "no children" category was excluded.

Identificational adaptation. Two indicators were used to measure identificational adaptation. Identifying self is a nominal variable where I combined American and other ("Nepalese," "Nepalese American," "Asian," "Asian American," and "American/other"). Feeling close to own ethnic group is an ordinal variable and provides three response categories: "not close at all," "close," and "very close."

Receptional adaptation. Receptional adaptation measures whether or not the Nepalese in the United States face prejudice and discrimination. Respondents "reception by the host country" is an ordinal variable and consists of three categories "not well," "well," and "very well." Other questionnaire items measured: "experience of racial/ethnic discrimination," "social exclusion by co-workers," "experience in housing discrimination," "judgment based on appearances," "perception of less competent," and "unwelcome feeling in public places." All are ordinal level variables with four categories

49

("never," "sometimes," "often," and "all the time"). Since "often" and "all the time" have few cases, I lumped them together ("never," "sometimes," "often/all the time"). Nepalese are often mistaken as Hispanic in their day-to-day life; respondents were asked, "Have you ever been mistaken as ("never," 'Hispanic," "black," "Asian," and "other")?" I dropped one of the categories: "black" as it has very few responses (0.7 percent) and reverse coded ("never," "Hispanic," "other Asian," and "other").

Independent Variables

Age of entry. Respondent age of entry is an interval-ratio variable.

Sex. Sex was coded as a dummy variable, with 1 indicating male and 0 female.

Legal status. Legal status is a nominal variable, coded 1 for immigrant/citizens and 0 for non-immigrant.

Length of residence. Length of residence is a continuous variable that measures the number of years a respondent has lived in the United States.

Highest Level of education. Level of education is an ordinal variable with eight categories (no schooling to PhD).

Years of education in the United States. Year of schooling in the United States is a continuous variable (0 to 20 years).

Transnationalism. Transnationalism has 4 indicators with an ordinal level of measurement. In all four indicators, there was an option of "other" where respondents gave various responses in this category. I recoded and dropped the "it depends" response. The recoded categories are as follows: traveling to home ("never," "5 years and more,"

50

"3-4 year" "once a year," and "2- 4 times a year"); sending money ("never," "once in several years," "every two years" "once a year," "2-3 times a year," "every month); taking part in chat/discussion ("never," "once a month," "several times a month," "once a week," "every day"), and reading Nepali newspaper ("never," "several times a year," "once a month," "several times a month," "once a week," and "every day").

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Despite having numerous strengths in this survey, some limitations in the data set should be noted. First, the sample was not selected randomly and may not be able to be generalized to the larger population. Second, due to the lack of a systematic record of the Nepalese population, it is very difficult to estimate accurately how many people actually received the questionnaire, thus failing to give an accurate response rate. Third, this survey was collected online in English (PsychData does not accept Nepali language), which excluded many Nepalese who did not have access to a computer and lacked English language proficiency. Having a more diverse group of people would have shed more light on the adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States. I was somewhat limited by not having a person who has both English language ability and computer literacy. Fourth, apart from collecting several aspects of adaptation, the data did not cover other aspects of adaptation, for example civic assimilation.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND ANALYTICAL STRATEGIES

Descriptive statistics, such as mean, median, mode, and standard deviation were used to describe the various dimensions of adaption of the Nepalese to American life and their demographic, assimilation, and transnational characteristics.

Cultural Adaptation

To test the effects of the explanatory variables on the dependent variables, celebrating Hindu festivals and celebrating American holidays/festivals, logistic regression was employed, separately. Both the dependent variables are dichotomous nominal levels of measurement, suggesting logistic regression is the best method. Each dependent variable was run separately to determine the relative contribution of each variable. The first model included the demographic variables (age of entry and gender); and the second model includes demographic and assimilation variables (legal status, length of stay, highest level of education, and years of education in the United States). The third model is a full model which included demographic, assimilation, and transnational variables (travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers). In logistic regression, the odds ratio explains the likelihood that the predictor will affect the dependent variable. In logistic regression, a change in pseudo R^2 from one model to another indicates the relative contribution of each independent variable. Nagelkerke R^2 is the pseudo R^2 in this analysis. I performed a special χ^2 test to determine the best fitting model.

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used to determine the effects of the predictor variables on attending Hindu religious services, Nepali functions, and cooking Nepali food. These indicators have 7 categories, thus appropriate to use OLS regression. To determine the effect of predictors on the dependent variables, I tested three different models. The first model includes demographic variables, the second model adds assimilation variables on the first model, and the last model consists of demographic, assimilation, and transnational predictors. Beta indicates which independent variable has the largest impact on the dependent variable and the change in R^2 indicates the relative contribution of each variable to the variance explained in the dependent variable. I calculated a special F test to find out the best fitting model. The best model is the one that explains the largest amount of variance while being the most parsimonious. For spoken language at home, spoken language with children, and English language ability, I executed multinomial logistic regression to determine the relationships between the dependent variables (multiple categories) and multiple predictors. Each dependent variable was run separately; each individual analysis included demographic, assimilation and the transnational variable.

Structural Adaptation

I performed logistic regression to test the determinants of some of the indicators of structural adaptation, such as interaction with other racial/ethnic groups, friendship, socialization, interaction in the workplace, interaction in residential neighborhood, membership in Nepalese organization, membership in Asian organization, and

membership in American organization. The indicator, "friendship," has a nominal level of measurement with 5 categories; therefore it is appropriate to perform multinomial regression. To determine the best fitting model, I conducted a special χ^2 test.

Marital Adaptation

For marital adaptation, the first indicator is "spouse," where I employed logistic regression given the fact it is a dichotomous variable. The three models were tested, each having predictors: demographic, assimilation, and transnational. The next indicator is hypothetical "choice of marriage" (reference category = Nepali), I employed multinomial logistic regression. Marital adaptation is also measured by "allowing children to marry a non-Nepalese." Although ordinal regression is the most appropriate method for this indicator, I did multinomial logistic regression (reference category = no) as the parallel line assumption is not met. Each category contained predicators including, demographic, assimilation, transnational. Pseudo R^2 of all the predictors included in the model explained the variance in the dependent variable. Model χ^2, -2 log likelihood, and pseudo R^2 are goodness-of-fit statistics that indicate how well the models fit the data.

Identification Adaptation

I employed multinomial logistic regression for "self-identity" because it is a nominal variable with five categories. The reference category is "Nepalese." Likewise, I calculated multinomial logistic regression (reference category = "not close at all") for "feeling close to Nepalese," an ordinal level of measurement because the test of the parallel line was violated.

Receptional Adaptation

Receptional adaptation included eight indicators. Ordinal regression was used to predict the dependent variable "reception by the host country" "experience of racial/ethnic discrimination," "social exclusion by co-workers," "experience in housing discrimination," "judgment based on appearances," "perception of less competence," and "unwelcomed feeling in public places" with a set of independent predictors. Each dependent variable was run separately and consisted of three models, Model 1 consisted of demographic variables, Model 2 added assimilation variables to Model 1, and Model 3 added transnational variables to Model 2. Here, the parallel line assumption was met; therefore, it was appropriate to conduct ordinal regression for the dependent variables. Multinomial regression was employed to predict mistaken identity where "never" was the reference category.

Before each regression model is tested, a bivariate correlation was conducted to check the associations among the variables and to determine if there were any multicollinearity problems.

To determine which variables had a stronger effect on the adaptation variables, β's in OLS regression models and odds ratios in logistic regression, ordinal regression, and multinomial logistic regression were used.

The next chapter will provide the results of cultural adaptation.

CHAPTER V

CULTURAL ADAPTATION

The current chapter and the following four chapters present the results of data analysis in order to answer the three research questions of this study. Each of these five chapters addresses one of the five dimensions of adaptation: cultural adaptation, structural adaptation, marital adaptation, identificational adaptation, and receptional adaptation. For each dimension, I will first present the descriptive statistics on the characteristics of the sample and all the variables in the analysis and then the results of regression analyses. In this chapter, I begin with cultural adaptation.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 5.1 shows the means, medians, and standard deviations of the variables used in the analysis. In this analysis, the cultural adaptation of Nepalese in the United States is used as the dependent variable. The mean of the dummy variable can be interpreted as a percentage if multiplying by 100. Table 5.1 reveals that 95 percent (.95 multiply by 100) of the respondents celebrated Hindu religious festivals. Likewise, among the respondents, 92 percent (.92 multiply by 100) celebrated American holidays. Half of the respondents attended Hindu religious services several times a year (median = 2). Half of the respondents attended Hindu religious services and Nepali functions several times a year (median = 2). Similarly, half of the respondents cooked Nepali food once a week (median = 6). Most of the respondents spoke Nepali (mode = 2) at home and with

56

their children. Interestingly, half of the respondents self-claimed that their proficiency of spoken English was "very well" (median = 3). The average age of the respondents when entering the United States was 24.3 years of age with a SD of 7.5. Among the respondents, 59 percent were male and 41 percent were female. In this sample, 57 percent of the respondents were either U.S. citizens or permanent residents (green card holders) with a SD of .49. On average, the respondents had resided in the United States for approximately nine years. In terms of the highest level of education, half of the respondents had a bachelor's degree. The average years of education completed in the United States was about 4 years with a SD of 3.36. Half of the respondents visited Nepal every two years (median = 3), sent money every two years (median = 3), and never chatted/discussed online (median = 0). Half of the respondents read Nepali newspapers once a week (median = 4).

Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Analysis, Cultural Adaptation, 2010

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	N
Dependent Variable				
Cultural Adaptation				
Celebrating Hindu festivals (=1)	.95		.22	762
Celebrating American holidays (=1)	.92		.27	768
Attending Hindu religious ser. (7-point scale)	2.17	2.00	1.20	756
Attending Nepali functions (7-point scale)	1.65	2.00	1.04	755
Cooking Nepali food (7-point scale)	5.35	6.00	1.22	754
Language spoken at home	2.44	2.00[a]	.63	758

Table 5.1 (continued)

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	N
Language spoken with children	2.40	2.00[a]	.74	418
English language ability (4-point scale)	2.69	3.00	.53	700
Independent Variables				
Age of entry in the U.S.	24.31		7.52	687
Male (=1)	.59		.49	708
U.S. citizen or immigrants (=1)	.57		.49	683
Length of stay in the U.S.	8.56		6.43	694
Education (8-point scale)	6.25	6.00	1.04	701
Years of education in the U.S.	3.98		3.36	680
Travel to Nepal (6-point scale)	2.38	3.00	1.28	664
Sending money (6-point scale)	1.84	2.00	1.56	633
Discussion/chat (5-point scale)	.80	0.00	1.34	708
Reading Nepali newspapers (6-point scale)	3.30	4.00	1.83	707

[a]Mode

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Since cultural adaptation has eight indicators, I used different statistical techniques based on the level of measurements of each dependent variable, such as logistic regression, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, and multinomial logistic regression. I used logistic regression to determine the probability of celebrating Hindu festivals and celebrating American holidays, separately. This was the most appropriate technique given the dichotomous, nominal level of measurement of the dependent variable. Logistic regression was used to assess how well the independent variables

predict the dichotomous dependent variable (Pallant 2007). Multicollinearity was tested to see whether or not there is a strong correlation between two predictor variables in the regression model. No multicollinearity was evident. "Goodness of fit" statistics tell the adequacy of the predictor variables in the model (Pallant 2007).

OLS regression was used to test the determinants of attending religious Hindu services, attending Nepali functions, and cooking Nepali food. All three indictors are ordinal variables with 7 categories (0 = never, 1 = once a year, 2 = several times a year, 3 = once a month, 4 = 2-3 times a month, 5 = nearly every week, and 6 = more than once a week). Although multiple regression is most appropriate when the dependent variable is an interval/ratio variable, it is also applicable when the dependent variable has at least five categories. Multiple regression was used to test how much variance in the dependent variable is explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables or predictors (age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discuss, and read Nepali newspapers). Multicollinearity was checked before analyzing data. Field (2009) suggests, "Multicollinearity exists when there is a strong correlation between two or more predictors in regression model" (p. 223). Variables with a correlation above .80 were considered highly correlated; no multicollinearity was found. Furthermore, to check the assumption of multicollinearity, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was taken into consideration. VIF enables the understanding of whether or not an independent variable has a strong linear relationship with other predictors used in the analysis (Field 2009). A

59

VIF value of 10 and a tolerance value of 0.10 are considered cut-off points to determine the multicollinearity (Pallant 2007).

In addition, to meet the assumption of OLS regression, normality of variability was performed to assess skewness (the symmetry of the distribution) and kurtosis (the peakedness of a distribution). When a distribution is normal, the values of skewness and kurtosis are zero (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001:73). In a large sample (200 or more), "it is more important to look at the shape of the distribution visually and to look at the value of the skewness and kurtosis statistics rather than calculate their significance" (Field 2009:139). Consequently, in a large sample, a significance test of skewness and kurtosis should not be used to measure normality (Field 2009; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). The skewness and kurtosis for attending Hindu religious services (skewness = .734 and kurtosis = .975), attending Nepali functions (skewness = .942 and kurtosis = 2.766), and cooking Nepali food (skewness -2.288 and kurtosis 4.688) fall within a range. Natural log transformations were performed to see if it made the model better; however, it increased both the skewness and kurtosis.

Likewise, for normality, I performed a log transformation and checked for the normal distribution of both dependent variables and independent variables. After the log transformations, only two variables, years of education in the United States, and length of stay had better normal distribution than the original variables with less skewness and/or no outliers. However, when used in the regression analysis, the log transformation did not make the model better. Transformation "may not work for a truly multivariate outlier

60

because the problem is with the combination of scores on two or more variables, not with the score on any one variable" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001:66).

"An outlier is a case with such an extreme value on one variable (a univariate outlier) or such a strange combination of scores on two or more variables (multivariate outlier) that they distort statistics" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001:66). In order to check univariate outliers among continuous variables, I performed a z scores test. Univariate outliers are cases with very large standardized scores. The cases with standardized scores in excess of 3.29 (p < .0001, two-tailed test) are considered as potential outliers (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). To identify multivariate outliers, I requested a Mahalannobis distance. It is "one measure of that multivariate distance and it can be evaluated for each case using χ^2 distribution" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001:68). The Mahalannobis indicated a few outliers; however, restricting the outliers did not make the models better ($\chi_c^2 = 29.588$, df = 10). I also used the Kolmogprov-Smirnov (K-S) test. In this test, "if the test is non-significant (p > .05) it tells us that the distribution of the sample is not significantly different from a normal distribution (i.e. it is probably normal). If, however, the test is significant (p < .05) then the distribution in question is significantly different from a normal distribution (i.e. it is non-normal)" (Field 2009:144). The percentage on attending religious services (D (756) = .305, p < .001), attending Nepali functions (D (755) = .285, p < .001), and cooking Nepali food (D (754) = .372 p < .001) were significantly different from a normal distribution, that is, non-normal.

According to Field (2009), the K-S test has its limitations with large sample sizes where it is possible to get significant results from small deviations from normality.

Once both univariate and multivariate outliers were identified, I first restricted cases that were outliers of the univariate predictor. I ran an OLS regression to see if the models looked better; however, the models did not appear better. Second, I restricted multivariate outliers and ran the regression, and again, the models did not become better. Subsequently, I ran analysis using the predictors "log10 years of education in the United States" and "log 10 for length of stay in the United States" to see if the models looked better. Since the restriction of outliers and the log transformation did not create any changes in the model, but actually made the model worse, I used the original variables without any changes for attending Hindu religious services, attending Nepali functions, and cooking Nepali food.

For the three indicators of cultural adaptation: spoken language at home, spoken language with children, and English language ability, I performed multinomial logistic regression for each indicator, separately. I used multinomial logistic regression to determine the relationships between the dependent variables (multiple categories) and multiple predictors. Before running multinomial logistic regression, I conducted bivariate correlation to check multicollinearity. Bivariate correlations explore the association between dependent and independent variables and enable us to determine whether or not two or more predictors are highly correlated. The bivariate table indicated that there is no multicollinearity.

I used logistic regression to determine the probability of celebrating Hindu festivals. The goodness-of-fit statistics associated with the three models are shown in Table 5.2. The explanatory power of each model is reflected by model χ^2 statistics. The model χ^2s of the two models (Model 1 and Model 3) are all significant at the .01 and .05 levels, indicating that these are good models. To find out the best fitting model, I conducted special χ^2 tests.[1] The results indicate that none of these models are significant. However, Models 2 and 3 are not better than Model 1, which is the most parsimonious. Note that only age of entry in Model 1 is significant at the .01 level, as expected. For each year of increase in the age of entry, the likelihood of celebrating Hindu festivals increases by about 8 percent (1.076 - 1 = .076), suggesting the older the age of entry, the Nepalese are more likely to celebrate Hindu festivals than a younger age of entry. None of the assimilation and transnational variables has a significant effect on the celebrating Hindu festivals; therefore, my hypotheses are not supported.

In Model 1, demographic variables, with a pseudo R^2 of .039, account for about 4 percent of the variation in celebrating Hindu festivals. Adding assimilation variables increases the pseudo R^2 to .051 from .039, indicating that an additional 1.2 percent of the variation in celebrating Hindu festivals is due to assimilation variables. Including

---

[1] The formula for the special χ^2 test is $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi_2^2 - \chi_1^2$ where χ_2^2 is the model Chi Square of the more complex model, and χ_1^2 is the model Chi Square of the simpler model.

transnational variables increases the predictive power of the model by another 4.2

percent. None of the assimilation and transnational variables has a significant effect on

predicting Hindu religious services, thus rejecting the hypotheses.

Table 5.2. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Celebrating Hindu Festivals Nepali
Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Age of entry	.073**	.071	.057
	(.026)	(.039)	(.046)
	[1.076]	[1.073]	[1.058]
Sex	-.431	-.248	-.412
(Male =1)	(.382)	(.393)	(.426)
	[.650]	[.780]	[.663]
Legal status		.755	.568
(U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		(.445)	(.460)
		[2.128]	[1.765]
Length of stay		-.002	.008
		(.041)	(.044)
		[.998]	[1.008]
Education		-.086	-.102
		(.221)	(.241)
		[.917]	[.903]
Years of educ. in the U. S.		-.019	-.014
		(.075)	(.085)
		[.981]	[.986]

Continued on next page

Table 5.2 (continued)

Model #		B (SE) [Odds Ratio]	
	1	2	3
Travel to Nepal			.206 (.139) [1.229]
Sending money			.102 (.133) [1.108]
Chat/Discussion			.415 (.230) [1.515]
Reading Nepali newspapers			.017 (.116) [1.017]
Constant	1.573**	1.811	1.279
-2Log Likelihood	255.286	237.720	213.897
Model Chi-Square	8.575**	10.656	17.826*
Pseudo R^2	.039	.051	.093
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	678	642	628

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Celebrating American Holidays

Table 5.3 presents the results of logistic regression that explore the probability of celebrating American holidays. The model χ^2s of Model 2 and Model 3 are significant at the .01 level, indicating that these are good models. However, the model χ^2 of Model 1 is not significant, suggesting this model is not a good model. To find out the best fitting model, I did special χ^2 tests. The difference in model χ^2 between Model 3 with Model 1

and Model 3 with Model 2 indicates that Model 3 with Model 1 is statistically significant at the .05 level (for formula, see endnote 1). Nonetheless, in terms of parsimony, Model 2 is better than Model 3 and Model 1. Hence, Model 2 is the focus of my interpretations.

As hypothesized, legal status is significant (Model 2) at the .05 level, and remains consistent in Model 3, all else being equal. As anticipated, U.S. citizens or immigrants celebrate American holidays more than non-citizens/immigrants. This suggests that U.S. citizens or immigrants may assimilate to American society when it comes to celebrating American holidays more so than non-citizens/immigrants. Note that other predictors, such as age of entry, gender, length of stay, level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers on predicting celebrating American holidays remain insignificant and consistent across the models, thus failing to support the hypotheses.

Model 1 explains about 1 percent of the variation in celebrating American holidays (Pseudo R^2 =.010). Including the assimilation variables in Model 2 increases the pseudo R^2 to .078 from .010, suggesting that an additional 7 percent of the variation in celebrating American holidays/festivals is due to assimilation variables. Including transnational variables increases the predictive power of the model by additional 2.5 percent.

Table 5.3. Logistic Regression Estimation Predicting Celebrating American Holidays, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Age of entry	.014 (.021) [1.015]	.012 (.031) [1.1012]	.009 (.038) [1.009]
Sex (Male =1)	-.511 (.327) [.600]	-.351 (.337) [.704]	-.567 (.401) [.567]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		.854* (.386) [2.348]	.863* (.437) [2.369]
Length of stay		.086 (.051) [1.090]	.108 (.059) [1.114]
Education		-.098 (.190) [.907]	-.158 (.217) [.854]
Years of education in the U. S.		-.052 (.077) [.949]	-.050 (.089) [.951]
Travel to Nepal			-.018 (.126) [.982]

Table 5.3 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Sending money			.128 (.118) [1.136]
Chat/Discussion			.152 (.146) [1.164]
Reading Nepali newspapers			.020 (.110) [1.020]
Constant	2.551***	2.345*	2.444*
-2Log Likelihood	344.120	310.878	252.347
Model Chi-Square	2.748	20.400**	22.762**
Pseudo R^2	.010	.078	.103
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	679	643	627

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Attending Hindu Religious Services

Table 5.4 shows OLS regression models predicting attending Hindu religious

services. I tested three models to assess the determinants of attending Hindu religious

services. The F values indicate that all three models are good models, since they are all

significant at the .001 level. To find out the best fitting model, I performed special F tests

by comparing Model 3 with Model 1 and Model 3 with Model 2 (see formula below[2]).

The special F tests show that the increase in the R^2 of Model 3 is significant at the .01

level compared to the R^2 of either Model 1 or Model 2. Hence, the interpretations are

focused on Model 3.

Consistent with the hypothesis, age of entry is significant and positive in Model 3

and any other models, holding other variables constant, suggesting the older the age of

entry, the Nepalese are more likely to attend Hindu religious services. Gender is

significant only in Model 3, all else being equal, contrary to the hypothesis. On average,

men are less likely to attend Hindu religious services than women (B= -.258). As

hypothesized, education is significant holding other variables constant, a consistent effect

across models. For each level increase in education, on average, attending religious

services decreases by .149, all else being equal. As anticipated, travel to Nepal is positive

and significant at the .05 level. Among Nepalese adults, on average, the level of attending

Hindu religious services is predicted to increase by .087 for each level increase in travel

to Nepal, holding other variables constant. Thus, as hypothesized, Nepalese who maintain

high transnational connections are more likely to attend Hindu religious services,

suggesting that transnational activities, such as travel to homeland may increase attending

Hindu religious services. However, legal status, years of education in the United States,

---

[2] $F = \dfrac{(R_2^2 - R_1^2)/(K_2 - K_1)}{(1 - R_2^2)/(N_2 - K_2 - 1)}$

where R_2^2 is the R^2 of the more complex model,
R_1^2 is the R^2 of the simpler model,
K_2 is the number of predictors in the more complex model,
K_1 is the number of predictors in the simpler model, and
N_2 is the number of cases in the complex model.

sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not contribute to attending Hindu religious services; therefore, the hypotheses are not supported.

Considering the pseudo R^2 of demographic variables (Model 1), it accounts for about 2 percent of the variation in attending Hindu religious services. Assimilation variables (Model 2) add about 2 percent of the variation explained on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 = .017). The Model 3 explains 6 percent of the variation in attending Hindu religious services with its linear relationship to the demographic variables, assimilation variables, and transnational variables. The transnational variables add about 3 percent of the variation explained on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 = .032).

A comparison of standardized regression coefficients (β's), among interval ratio variables, indicates that age of entry (β = .144) in Model 3 has the strongest effect on attending Hindu religious services.

Table 5.4. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Attending Hindu Religious Services, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010. (Standard errors in parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	1.764*** (.157)		2.255*** (.313)		1.974*** (.347)	
Age of entry	.022*** (.006)	.136***	.026** (.008)	.156**	.024** (.010)	.144**
Sex (Male = 1)	-.157 (.094)	-.064	-.126 (.099)	-.052	-.258* (.115)	-.105*
Legal status (US citz/immigrant=1)			.210* (.109)	.086*	.142 (.119)	.058
Length of stay			.003 (.010)	.014	.013 (.011)	.068
Education			-.117* (.051)	-.100*	-.149** (.057)	-.127**
Years of edu. in the U.S.			-.006 (.019)	-.017	-.003 (.021)	-.009
Travel to Nepal					.087* (.039)	.094*
Sending money					.047 (.034)	.061
Chat/Discussion					.048 (.041)	.055
Reading Nepali newspapers					.061 (.033)	.092
R^2	.017		.032		.060	
F	6.738***		4.469***		4.405***	
N	676		640		529	

*p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .01   *** p ≤ .001

71

Attending Nepali Functions

Table 5.5 shows OLS regression models predicting attendance of Nepali functions. The F values indicate that all three models are good models significant at the .001 level. I performed special F tests by comparing Model 3 with Model 1 and Model 3 with Model 2 (for formula, see endnote 2). The results showed that the increase in the R^2 of Model 3 is significant at the .01 level (df = 10) compared to the R^2s of Model 1 and Model 2. Thus, Model 3 is the best fitting model and the emphasis of interpretations.

Consistent with my hypothesis, the effect of age of entry is positive and significant across all three models, all else being equal. Each additional year in age of entry increases attending Nepali functions by .017. Contrary to the hypothesis, U.S citizens or immigrants are more likely to attend Nepali functions than non-citizens/immigrants. This is possible because studies indicate that first generation immigrants are still connected with their home country's culture. It appears that U.S citizens or immigrants are still maintaining their culture by attending Nepali functions more so than non-citizens/immigrants. Another possible reason for U.S. immigrants or citizens attending more Nepali functions could be that they have become more well-adjusted in the United States than non-citizens/immigrants who are mostly students and never had a chance to attend such functions due to money and time constraints. As anticipated, among Nepalese adults, on average, for each additional level of education, the level of attending Nepalese functions is predicted to decrease by .126 (Model 3). Years of education in the United States does not influence attending Nepali functions.

As hypothesized, the coefficients for chat/discussion and reading Nepali newspapers are positive and significant at the .01 level (Model 3). The level of attending Nepali functions is predicted to increase by .095 for each level increase in chat/discussion, all else being equal. Likewise, for each level increase in reading Nepali newspapers is connected to an increase of .067 in attending Nepali functions, holding other variables constant. Years of education in the United States does not influence attending Nepali functions. In Model 3, gender, length of stay, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, and sending money have no effect on attending Nepali functions.

The demographic variables (Model 1) explains about 4 percent of the variation in attending Nepali functions (Pseudo R^2 = .038). Similarly, the assimilation variables (Model 2) add 3.1 percent of the variation explained on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 = .038). Model 3 accounts for about 11 percent of the variation in attending Nepali functions (R^2 = .106). The transnational variables add about 4 percent (3.7 percent) of the variation explained on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 = .069).

Table 5.5. Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Attending Nepali Functions, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010. (Standard errors in parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Constant	.983*** (.136)		1.543*** (.268)		1.422*** (.289)	
Age of entry	.025*** (.005)	.180***	.025*** (.007)	.176***	.017* (.008)	.122*
Sex (Male = 1)	.142 (.082)	.067	.219** (.084)	.103**	.050 (.096)	.024
Legal status (US citz/immigrant=1)			.275** (.093)	.130**	.203* (.100)	.113*[a]
Length of stay			-.004 (.008)	-.024	-.002 (.009)	-.012
Education			-.107** (.044)	-.105**	-.126** (.047)	-.126**
Years of edu. in the U.S.			-.016 (.016)	-.050	-.011 (.018)	-.037
Travel to Nepal					.052 (.033)	.066
Sending money					.044 (.028)	.066
Chat/Discussion					.095** (.021)	.126**
Reading Nepali newspapers					.067** (.031)	.120**
R^2	.038		.069		.106	
F	14.407***		8.874***		7.342***	
N	674		639		538	

*$p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Note: [a]I replaced age of entry by age to see if there is any change in the effect of legal status in attending Nepali functions. However, the results remain essentially the same, suggesting that the finding that U.S. citizens or immigrants of Nepalese attend Nepalese functions more than non-immigrants is not due to age.

Cooking Nepali Food

Table 5.6 presents OLS regression models predicting cooking Nepali food. The F values indicate that only Model 3 is a good model and significant at the .001. To find out the best fitting model, I conducted special F tests by comparing Model 3 with Model 1 and Model 3 with Model 2 (for the formula, see endnote 2). The test results showed that the increase in the R^2 of Model 3 is significant at the .01 level compared to the R^2s of Model 1 and Model 2. Thus, Model 3 is the best fitting model and the focus of interpretations.

Gender appears to be significant in Model 3, which indicates that men are less likely to cook Nepali food than women, supporting the hypothesis. Note that legal status, length of stay, level of education, and years of education in the United States are not significant across models, suggesting these predictors do not contribute to cooking Nepali food. Among the transnational variables, only the effect of reading Nepali newspapers is positive and significant at the .001 level. The level of likelihood of cooking Nepali food is predicted to increase by .128 with each level increase in reading Nepali newspapers, all else being equal. Contrary to my hypotheses, age of entry, legal status, length of stay, highest level of education, years of education in the United States are insignificant in all three models and do not influence in cooking Nepali food.

The demographic variables accounts for only 0.2 percent of the variation in cooking Nepali food; 0.5 percent is due to the assimilation variables, and 3.8 percent from the transnational variables.

Table.5.6: Estimates of OLS Regression Models Predicting Cooking Nepali Food, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010. (Standard errors in parentheses)

Predictor	Model 1			Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β		B	β	B	β
Constant	5.344*** (.152)			5.641*** (.307)		5.483*** (.331)	
Age of entry	.007 (.006)	.046		-.001 (.008)	.007	-.009 (.009)	-.057
Sex (Male = 1)	-.154 (.091)	-.066		-.172 (.097)	-.072	-.366** (.111)	.157***
Legal status (US citz/immigrant=1)				-.095 (.107)	-.040	-.040 (.115)	-.017
Length of stay				-.004 (.009)	-.021	.003 (.010)	.018
Education				.016 (.050)	.014	.022 (.054)	.020
Years of educ. in the U.S.				-.031 (.019)	-.087	-.038 (.021)	-.110
Travel to Nepal						-.059 (.038)	-.068
Sending money						.059 (.032)	.081
Chat/Discussion						-.020 (.039)	-.024
Reading Nepali newspapers						.128*** (.032)	.260***
R^2	.002		.007			.045	
F	1.893		1.736			3.499***	
N	672		636			534	

*p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .01   *** p ≤ .001

Table 5.7 shows a multinomial regression model predicting spoken language at home. My dependent variable consists of four categories (English, Nepali, both Nepali and English, and other language). Since my emphasis is on the likelihood of speaking "Nepali" (category 2), I chose "English" (category 1) as a reference category. Column 1 in Table 5.7 indicates the likelihood that respondents speak "Nepali" versus "English." Column 2 shows the probability of speaking both "Nepali" and "English" versus "English." Finally, column 3 reveals the likelihood of speaking "other language" (ethnic) versus "English."

For all three columns, the model χ^2 is significant at the .001 ($\chi^2 = 113.203$). The estimated pseudo R^2 reveals that all explanatory variables included in this model explain about 23 percent (Pseudo $R^2 = 22.5$ percent) of the variation in spoken language at home. Column 1 shows respondents' likelihood to speak "Nepali" versus "English." Consistent with my hypothesis, the longer the length of stay in the United States, the likelihood of speaking "Nepali" versus "English" at home decreases by 16.2 percent. As anticipated, reading Nepali newspapers significantly affects Nepalese language preference. The likelihood of speaking "Nepali" versus "English" is predicted to increase by 66.6 percent for each level increase in reading Nepali newspapers. Note that predictors, such as gender, legal status, level of education, years of education in the United States, sending money, and chat/discussion are not significant, indicating these predictors do not contribute to predicting the likelihood of speaking "English" versus "Nepali."

Column 2 consists of logistic coefficients and log odds for speaking "both Nepali and English" versus "English." Note that only length of stay and reading Nepali newspapers are significant at the .001 and .05 levels, respectively. As anticipated, respondents who stay in the United States longer are less likely to speak "both Nepali and English" versus "English." Again, each additional level of increase in reading Nepali newspapers increases the likelihood of speaking "both Nepali and English" language by 13.1 percent (.869-1 = .131) versus "English." Surprisingly, age of entry, gender, legal status, level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion are insignificant, suggesting these predictors do not influence speaking "both Nepali and English" versus "English."

Interestingly, in column 3, none of the demographic variables, assimilation variables, or transnational variables is significant indicating that these predictors do not contribute to predicting preference of spoken language at home ("ethnic" versus "English").

Table 5.7. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Spoken Language at Home, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	Nepali Vs. English	Both Nepali &English Vs. English	Other Vs. English
Age of entry	.116 (.065) [1.123]	.082 (.064) [1.086]	.107 (.082) [1.113]
Sex (Male =1)	-.392 (.577) [.676]	-.808 (.572) [.446]	.515 (.894) [1.674]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	.643 (.684) [1.902]	.670 (.681) [1.954]	-.518 (.980) [.594]
Length of stay	-.177*** (.043) [.838]	-.141*** (.041) [.869]	-.073 (.063) [.930]
Education	-.485 (.365) [.616]	-.437 (.367) [.646]	-.560 (.479) [.571]
Years of educ. in the U. S.	-.027 (.089) [.973]	-.012 (.086) [.998]	.071 (.124) [1.074]
Travel to Nepal	.072 (.202) [1.075]	.193 (.201) [1.213]	.201 (.291) [1.223]

Table 5.7 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	Nepali Vs. English	Both Nepali &English Vs. English	Other Vs. English
Sending money	.075 (.177) [1.078]	-.020 (.176) [.981]	.204 (.254) [1.226]
Chat/Discussion	-.172 (.285) [.842]	-.075 (.285) [.927]	-.302 (.402) [.739]
Reading Nepali newspaper	.511** (.178) [1.666]	.396* (.177) [1.486]	.237 (.249) [1.267]
Constant	3.650	3.944	.130
-2Log Likelihood	878.559		
Model Chi-Square	113.203***		
Pseudo R^2	.225		
Degree of Freedom	30		
N	538		

*P ≤ .05   **P ≤ .01   ***P ≤ .001

Spoken Language with Children

Table 5.8 shows the multinomial logistic regression, which predicts spoken language with children. English is used as the reference category. The model Chi Square is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 92.313$). The pseudo R^2 indicates that all predictors included in this model explain about 31 percent of the variation in spoken language with children. In column 1, only two predictors, length of stay and reading Nepali newspapers, are significant. As hypothesized, for each level increase in the length of stay, the

likelihood of speaking "Nepali" versus "English" with children lessens by 15.1 percent (.849 -1 = .151). Similarly, the level of reading Nepali newspapers increases the likelihood of speaking "Nepali" versus "English" by 72.4 percent. Note that age of entry, gender, legal status, level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion do not have a significant effect on spoken language "Nepali" versus "English" with their children.

In column 2, out of 10 predictors, only length of stay is significant. As hypothesized, for each level increase in the length of stay, the likelihood of speaking "both Nepali & English" versus "English" with children lessens by 9 percent. Nepalese parents are more likely to speak "both Nepali & English" versus "English" with their children as their length of stay in the United States increases. Unexpectedly, age of entry, gender, legal status, level of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not contribute to predicting speaking "both Nepali & English" versus "English" with their children.

Surprisingly, no significant effects are discovered in column 3, meaning demographic variables, assimilation variables, and transnational variables do not have a significant influence on spoken language with children. It also revealed that Nepalese parents prefer using the English language to speak with their child versus ethnic languages. In most cases, ethnic language becomes the third language, as it is generally spoken after "English" and/or "Nepali."

Table 5.8. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Spoken Language with Children, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	Nepali Vs. English	Both Nepali &English Vs. English	Other Vs. English
Age of entry	.042 (.041) [1.043]	.053 (.040) [1.054]	-.011 (.078) [.989]
Sex (Male =1)	-.426 (.526) [.653]	-.026 (.502) [.974]	-.193 (.905) [.825]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	-.073 (.675) [.930]	-.212 (.667) [.809]	-1.792 (1.011) [.167]
Length of stay	-.164*** (.040) [.849]	-.094** (.034) [.910]	-.118 (.080) [.888]
Education	-.277 (.261) [.758]	-.104 (.260) [.901]	.326 (.521) [1.385]
Years of educ. in the U. S.	-.055 (.077) [.947]	-.067 (.070) [.935]	-.138 (.162) [.871]
Travel to Nepal	.154 (.178) [1.166]	.258 (.173) [1.295]	-.109 (.277) [1.115]

Continued on next page

Table 5.8 (continued)

| | B (SE) [Odds Ratio] | | |
	Nepali Vs. English	Both Nepali &English Vs. English	Other Vs. English
Sending money	.075 (.115) [1.078]	.099 (.149) [1.105]	-.354 (.295) [.702]
Chat/Discussion	-.345 (.196) [.707]	-.306 (.196) [.737]	-.099 (.339) [.906]
Reading Nepali newspaper	.545*** (.147) [1.724]	.192 (.137) [1.212]	.021 (.248) [.979]
Constant	2.527	1.265	.677
-2Log Likelihood	535.312		
Model Chi-Square	92.313***		
Pseudo R^2	.310		
Degree of Freedom	30		
N	286		

*P ≤ .05 ** P ≤ .01 *** P ≤ .001

English Speaking Ability

Even though an ordinal regression is the best technique for this analysis, I did a multinomial regression for predicting the likelihood of English speaking ability. The reason for using multinomial regression versus ordinal regression is that the parallel line assumption is not met. Consequently, ordinal regression was not an appropriate technique for this analysis. Here, English speaking ability is the dependent variable, which consists of four categories ("not well," "well," "very well," and "English only"). I chose "not

83

well" (category 1) as a reference category. The model χ^2 is significant at the .001 (χ^2= 138.574). The estimated pseudo R^2 conveys that all predictors included in this model explain about 29.0 percent of the variation in English speaking ability.

Column 1 shows the respondents' likelihood of speaking English "well" versus "not well." There is a positive and significant relationship between the level of education and years of education in the United States in speaking English "well" versus "not well," respectively. Each additional year in the level of education increases the likelihood of speaking English "well" versus "not well" by 110 percent. This suggests that the higher the level of education, the more likely the Nepalese are to speak English "well," suggesting language assimilation to the host society. Similarly, as anticipated, each additional year of education in the United States increases English speaking ability. Interestingly, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers have no significant impact on English speaking ability.

The second column shows the probability of speaking English "very well" versus "not well." Again, level of education and years of education in the United States are significant. Each additional year in the level of education increases the likelihood of speaking English "very well" versus "not well" by 162 percent. Likewise, years of education in the United States increases the likelihood of speaking English "very well" versus "not well" by 214 percent. Yet again, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of

stay, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not contribute to predicting the dependent variable.

In column 3, only years of education in the United States and reading Nepali newspapers are significant. As expected, years of education in the United States increased the likelihood of speaking "English only" versus "not well" by 276.6 percent, suggesting that years of education in the United States may enable language assimilation in the host country. The level of reading Nepali newspapers significantly affects English speaking ability. Each additional level of reading Nepali newspapers decreases the likelihood of speaking "English only" versus "not well" by 50.4 percent. Once again, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, level of education, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion have no significant influence on English speaking ability.

Table 5.9. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting English Speaking Ability, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
	Well Vs. Not Well	Very Well Vs. Not Well	English Only Vs. Not Well
Age of entry	.008 (.046) [1.008]	-.034 (.047) [.967]	-.028 (.084) [.973]
Sex (Male =1)	.141 (.923) [1.151]	.477 (.926) [1.612]	1.273 (1.221) [3.570]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	-.174 (1.045) [.841]	-.258 (1.046) [.772]	.572 (1.371) [1.771]
Length of stay	.036 (.104) [1.036]	.095 (.104) [1.099]	.082 (.119) [1.086]
Education	.742* (.352) [2.101]	.963** (.354) [2.620]	.828 (.488) [2.288]
Years of educ. in the U. S.	.989* (.433) [2.688]	1.143** (.433) [3.135]	1.326** (.447) [3.766]

Continued on next page

Table 5.9 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
	Well Vs. Not Well	Very Well Vs. Not Well	English Only Vs. Not Well
Travel to Nepal	.241 (.273) [1.273]	.328 (.273) [1.388]	.137 (.370) [1.147]
Sending money	.611 (.314) [1.843]	.586 (.337) [1.798]	.306 (.427) [1.359]
Chat/Discussion	-.389 (.289) [.678]	-.406 (.290) [.666]	.261 (.405) [1.298]
Reading Nepali newspaper	-.022 (.284) [.978]	-.198 (.284) [.820]	-.702* (.371) [.496]
Constant	-3.641	-3.710	-7.235*
-2Log Likelihood		678.591	
Model Chi-Square		138.574***	
Pseudo R²		.290	
Degree of Freedom		30	
N		539	
*P ≤ .05	** P ≤ .01	*** P ≤ .001	

SUMMARY

This chapter analyzes to what extent the Nepalese culturally adapt to American life. The descriptive statistics indicate that 95 percent of the respondents celebrate Hindu festivals and 92 percent celebrate American holidays. Half of the respondents attended Hindu religious services and Nepali functions several times a year. Half of the respondents cooked Nepali food more than once a week. In the population being studied, half of the respondents speak "Nepali" at home and with their children. Interestingly, half of the respondents claimed that their proficiency of spoken English is very good.

I used different statistical techniques to find out the effects of independent variables on the following dependent variables: celebrating Hindu festivals, celebrating American holidays/festivals, attending Hindu religious services, attending Nepali functions, cooking Nepali food, language spoken at home, language spoken with children, and the ability to speak English. In Table 5.2, as predicted, the older the age of entry, the more likely the respondents are to celebrate Hindu festivals (Model 1). Similarly, controlling for both demographic and assimilation variables in Model 3 (Tables 5.4 and 5.5), age of entry has a significant effect on attending Hindu religious services and attending Nepali functions, respectively. Also, based on β's, while comparing interval ratio variables, age of entry has the strongest effect on attending Hindu religious services (Table 5.4) and attending Nepali functions (Table 5.5). The implication is that the age of entry is a significant factor in determining the retention of

Nepalese culture, mainly, celebrating Hindu festivals, attending Hindu religious services, and attending Nepali functions.

As expected, Nepalese women are more likely to attend Hindu religious services and cook Nepali food than Nepalese men, indicating Nepalese women may retain Nepalese culture more so than men when it comes to attending Hindu religious services and cooking Nepali food.

Consistent with my hypothesis, legal status has a significant effect on celebrating American holidays (Model 3 of Table 5.3). The implication is that U.S. citizens or immigrants have probably assimilated to the host society more so than non-citizens/immigrants regarding celebrating American holidays. However, to my surprise, controlling for demographic variables and assimilation variables, U.S citizens or immigrants attend Nepali functions (Models 2 and 3 of Table 5.5) more than non-citizens/immigrants, meaning that regardless of citizenship/immigrant status, Nepalese immigrants attend Nepali functions more so than non-immigrants. Consequently, these inconsistent results indicate that Nepalese immigrants probably like to assimilate to the host culture by celebrating American holidays, as well as they conceivably like to preserve their culture by attending Nepali functions.

As anticipated, the length of stay is associated with spoken language at home (Table 5.7 and Table 5.8) indicating that the longer Nepalese live in the United States, the less likely they are to speak "Nepali" versus "English" and the less likely they are to speak "both Nepali & English" at home and with children, respectively. The implication

is that the length of stay is associated with the preference of English language versus Nepali, meaning Nepalese probably become more proficient in speaking English with an increase in the U.S. residency (Table 5.8).

As expected, the higher the level of education, the less likely the Nepalese are to attend both Hindu religious services (Table 5.4) and Nepali functions (Table 5.5). Likewise, the higher the level of education, the Nepalese are more likely to speak English "well" (Column 1 of Table 5.9) and "very well" (Column 2 of Table 5.9) versus "not well," as hypothesized.

Similarly, years of education in the United States is positively associated with the ability to speak English. As years of education in the United States increases, the Nepalese become more proficient in English ("well", "very well", or "English only"). This supports my hypothesis, the higher the years of education, the higher the level of English language acquisition.

Transnational variables, such as travel to Nepal, have a significant effect on attending Hindu religious services (Table 5.4) while controlling for demographic and assimilation variables. In addition, the level of reading Nepali newspapers is positively associated with attending Nepali functions (Table 5.5), and cooking Nepali food (Table 5.6).

Likewise, the level of reading Nepali newspapers is associated with speaking at home ("Nepali" vs. "English" and "both Nepali & English" vs. "English", Table 5.7) and with children ("Nepali" vs. "English", Table 5.8), meaning the connection with the home

90

country contributes to ethnic language retention, more specifically speaking "Nepali" or "both Nepali and English" versus "English" only. As anticipated, the higher the level of reading Nepali newspapers, the lower the English speaking ability ("English only" vs. "not well"), suggesting reading Nepali newspapers negatively impacts English language acquisition.

The next chapter provides the results of structural adaptation.

CHAPTER VI

STRUCTURAL ADAPTATION

This chapter examines the structural adaptation of Nepalese to American life. Eight questions were asked to measure the structural adaptation of Nepalese (for details see Appendix B). 1. "Do you feel hesitant to interact with people of other racial/ethnic groups (check the appropriate box)?" 2. "Now thinking of your best friend, or friend you feel closest to, is this friend."3. "In general, whom do you mainly socialize with (apart from your family) (check the appropriate box)?" 4. "Whom do you mostly work with (check the appropriate box)?" 5. "The people in your neighborhood are mostly (check the appropriate box)." 6. "Are you a member of one or more Nepalese organizations in the United States (check the appropriate box)?" 7. "Are you a member of any other Asian organizations in the United States (check the appropriate box)?" 8. "Are you a member of any American organization in the United States (check the appropriate box)?" Questions 1, 6, 7, and 8 are dichotomous variables, so I conducted a logistic regression using 3 models. Model 1 consists of demographic variables; Model 2 adds assimilation variables to Model 1; and Model 3 adds transnational variables to Model 2. Note that the categories of each question in 3, 4, and 5 are coded as dummy variables. For these items, I ran full models logistic regression for each dummy category. For question number 2, which is a nominal variable with several categories, I ran a multinomial logistic regression. Bivariate correlations indicated no multicollinearity between the independent

variables. Results of descriptive statistics are reported in Table 6.1. Independent variables are the same as in Chapter V (see Table 5.1).

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 6.1 shows the means, modes, and standard deviations of the variables used in the analysis. The mean of a dummy variable can be interpreted as a percentage by multiplying by 100. Only 8 percent of the respondents were hesitant to interact with other racial/ethnic groups (.08 multiplied by 100). Most of the respondents had friendship (best or close friends) with other Nepalese. Not surprisingly, the respondents mostly socialized with other Nepalese (72 percent). They also socialized with other racial/ethnic groups, such as white (48 percent), other Asian (41 percent), black (19 percent), Hispanic (19 percent), and other (7 percent). In terms of whom do they mostly worked with, among the respondents, they mostly worked or interacted with whites (75 percent), followed by other Asians (48 percent), blacks (29 percent), Hispanics (27 percent), and others (9 percent). Interestingly, the Nepalese predominantly lived or had interaction in the neighborhood with whites (75 percent), followed by other Asians (25 percent), Hispanics (22 percent), blacks (19 percent), Nepalese (14 percent), and others (10 percent). More than half of the respondents were members of Nepalese organization(s) (52 percent), followed by 14 percent that were members of American organization(s), and only 13 percent were members of Asian organization(s) in the United States.

Table 6.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Analysis, Structural Adaptation, 2010

Variable	Mean	Mode	SD	N
Dependent Variable				
Structural Adaptation				
Hesitant to interact with other racial/ethnic grp. (=1)	.08		.28	747
Friendship (best or close)		1.00		746
Mostly socialize with				
Nepalese (=1)	.72		.45	759
White (=1)	.48		.50	759
Black (=1)	.19		.39	759
Hispanic (=1)	.19		.39	759
Other Asian (=1)	.41		.49	759
Other (=1)	.07		.25	759
Mostly work with				
White (=1)	.75		.43	759
Black (=1)	.29		.46	759
Hispanic (=1)	.27		.44	759
Other Asian (=1)	.48		.50	759
Other (=1)	.09		.28	759
Neighborhood predominantly				
Nepalese (=1)	.14		.35	759
White (=1)	.75		.43	759
Black (=1)	.19		.40	759
Hispanic (=1)	.22		.41	759
Other Asian (=1)	.25		.44	759
Other (=1)	.10		.24	759
Membership in Nepali organization (=1)	.52		.50	759
Membership in an Asian organization (=1)	.13		.34	746
Membership in an American organization (=1)	.14		.35	759

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Interaction with Other Racial/Ethnic Groups

Respondents' hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups explains whether or not the respondents gain entrance to social cliques of the dominant group. Table 6.2 presents estimates predicting the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups in the United States. In Model 1, none of the demographic variables has a significant effect on the dependent variable. This model explains about 1% of the variation in the likelihood of hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. In Model 2, education appears to reduce hesitancy to interact with other groups, but no other predictors make any significant difference in the dependent variable. This model explains about 3 percent of the variation in the dependent variable on top of Model 1. After controlling for transnational variables, education loses significance at the .05 level, but travel to homeland has a significant effect on the dependent variable. The likelihood of hesitation to interact with other racial/ethnic groups is predicted to decrease by 19.2 percent for each level of increase in the level of travel to Nepal. Demographic variables, assimilation variables, and the remaining transnational variables are insignificant and do not contribute in predicting the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. Model 3 explains about 2 percent of the variation in the dependent variable on top of Model 2.

Table 6.2. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Hesitancy to Interact with other Racial/Ethnic Groups, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #			
	1	2	3
Age of entry	.001 (.019) [1.001]	.020 (.024) [1.020]	.031 (.027) [1.031
Sex (Male =1)	.518 (.306) [1.679]	.481 (.318) [1.618]	.518 (.364) [1.678]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		.028 (.338) [1.029]	.249 (.359) [1.283]
Length of stay		-.043 (.036) [.958]	-.048 (.039) [.953]
Education		-.282* (.135) [.755]	-.222 (.150) [.801]
Years of education in U. S.		-.009 (.066) [.991]	-.010 (.074) [.990]
Travel to Nepal			-.213* (.111) [.808]

Continued on next page

Table 6.2 (continued)

Model #	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	1	2	3
Sending money			-.109 (.104) [.896]
Chat/discussion			-.022 (.117) [.978]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.021 (.101) [.979]
Constant	-2.757***	-1.138	-1.008
-2Log Likelihood	383.891	349.932	309.031
Model Chi-Square	3.138	10.618	14.366
Pseudo R^2	.011	.038	.058
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	675	639	537

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Friendship

An interracial friendship with whites, blacks, Hispanics, other Asians, and others

is one of the indicators for structural adaptation. Here, friendship shows interracial ties.

Table 6.3 shows the multinomial logistic regression predicting friendship. Nepalese is

used as the reference category. The model Chi Square is statistically significant ($\chi^2 =$

79.903). The pseudo R^2 indicates that all predictors included in this model explain about

17 percent of the variation in predicting friendship. In column 1, only length of stay is

significant. As hypothesized, for each level increase in the length of stay, the likelihood of having whites as the best or close friend versus Nepalese increases by 5.4 percent (1.054 - 1= .054). Note that other predictors do not have a significant effect on having whites as the best or close friends versus Nepalese.

In Column 2, only three transnational variables are significant. As hypothesized, for each level increase in travel to Nepal, the likelihood of having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese lessens by 37.3 percent. Likewise, as anticipated, the level of reading Nepali newspapers lessens the probability of having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese by about 48 percent. On the contrary, chat/discussion is positively associated with having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese. Inconsistent with the hypothesis, the level of chat/discussion increases the likelihood of having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese by 69 percent. Other predictors, such as age of entry, gender, legal status, level of education, years of education in the United States, and sending money do not contribute to having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese.

In Column 3, as anticipated, reading Nepali newspapers is negative and significant. For each level increase in reading newspapers, the likelihood of having blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends versus Nepalese decreases by about 24.2 percent. There is no effect of demographic, assimilation, and transnational variables except reading Nepali newspapers on predicting other Asian as the best or close friends versus Nepalese.

98

In Column 4, only travel to Nepal is negative and significantly associated with having other as the best or close friends versus Nepalese. Age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, sending money, chat/discussion, and read Nepali newspapers do not impact on having other as the best or close friends versus Nepalese.

Table 6.3. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Friendship, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]			
	White Vs. Nepalese	Black/Hispanic Vs. Nepalese	Other Asian Vs. Nepalese	Other Vs. Nepalese
Age of entry	-.002 (.029) [.979]	-.061 (.075) [.940]	.029 (.030) [1.030]	.028 (.040) [1.028]
Sex (Male =1)	-.029 (.340) [.972]	-.226 (.674) [.789]	-.067 (.359) [.935]	.836 (.589) [2.307]
Legal status (Cit/immi= 1)	.214 (.354) [1.238]	.773 (.720) [2.167]	.046 (.373) [1.047]	.055 (.558) [1.057]
Length of stay	.053* (.027) [1.054]	-.029 (-.029) [.971]	.027 (.031) [1.027]	.066 (.044) [1.069]

Table 6.3 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]			
	White Vs. Nepalese	Black/Hispanic Vs. Nepalese	Other Asian Vs. Nepalese	Other Vs. Nepalese
Education	.197 (.183) [1.218]	.604 (.420) [1.829]	-.100 (.163) [.905]	.466 (.330) [1.594]
Years. Edu. in U.S.	.046 (.055) [1.047]	.074 (.074) [1.077]	.063 (.061) [1.065]	.018 (.090) [1.018]
Travel to Nepal	-.037 (.118) [.964]	-.466* (.227) [.627]	.059 (.123) [1.061]	-.362* (.172) [.696]
Sending money	.002 (.098) [1.002]	.123 (.202) [1.131]	-.197 (.109) [.821]	.055 (.156) [1.057]
Chat/discussion	161 (.118) [1.175]	.525* (.267) [1.690]	.079 (.143) [1.082]	.097 (.179) [1.102]
Read Nepali newspapers	-.071 (.098) [.932]	-.650** (.221) [.522]	-2.78** (.101) [.758]	-.156 (.153) [.856]
Constant	-3.358**	-4.545	-1.760	-6.816***
-2Log Likelihood	870.780			
Model Chi-Square	79.903***			
Pseudo R^2	.166			
Degree of Freedom	40			
N	539			

*$p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

100

Socialization

Another indicator of structural adaptation is socialization with other racial/ethnic groups. Table 6.4 shows three logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of mostly socializing with Nepalese, white, black, Hispanic, other Asian, and other. Each model is a full model consisting of demographic, assimilation, and transnational variables.

In Model 1, that is Nepalese, education in the United States is significant. As predicted, each additional year of education in the United States decreases the likelihood of socializing with the Nepalese by about 9 percent, holding other variables constant. It suggests that a U.S. education reduces the Nepalese association with their coethnics. As anticipated, the level of reading Nepali newspapers increases the likelihood of socializing with fellow Nepalese, suggesting transnational activity, reading Nepali newspapers contributes to socializing with fellow Nepalese. In this model, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, highest years of education, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion are insignificant, thus do not support my hypotheses. The pseudo R^2 indicates that all explanatory variables in Model 1 explain about 9 percent of the variation in socializing mostly with fellow Nepalese.

In Model 2, as anticipated, age of entry, length of stay, and highest years of education are significant, all else being equal. Each additional year in age of entry reduces the likelihood of socializing with whites, as hypothesized. Respondents who reside in the United States longer are more likely to socialize with whites than those

101

whose residency is shorter. Similarly, as predicted, education increases the likelihood of socializing with whites. Inconsistent with the hypotheses, gender, legal status, years of education in the United States, and transnational variables do not impact on respondents socializing mostly with whites. This model explains about 12 percent of the variation in socializing mostly with whites (pseudo $R^2 = .12$).

In Model 3, none of the demographic variables, assimilation variables, and transnational variables is significant; therefore, this model does not contribute to predicting socialization with friends. Nonetheless, this model explains about 4 percent of the variation in socializing mostly with blacks (pseudo $R^2 = .042$).

Again, in Model 4, inconsistent with the hypotheses, all the predictors are insignificant, but the model explains about 4 percent of the variation in socializing mostly with Hispanics (pseudo $R^2 = .044$).

In Model 5, education in the United States is positively associated with the likelihood of socializing mostly with other Asians, all else being equal, as anticipated. This model with a pseudo R^2 of .038 explains about 4 percent of variation in socializing mostly with other Asians.

The last model is, again, inconsistent with my hypotheses, but it explains about 5 percent of variation in socializing mostly with others (pseudo $R^2 = .054$).

Table 6.4. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Socialization, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]					
Model #	1 Nepalese	2 White	3 Black	4 Hispanic	5 Other Asian	6 Other
Age of entry	-.022 (.020) [.978]	-.040* (.018) [.961]	-.021 (.022) [.979]	-.030 (.023) [.970]	.001 (.017) [1.001]	.053 (.032) [1.055]
Sex (Male =1)	.313 (.225) [1.367]	.036 (.205) [1.037]	.461 (.255) [1.586]	.393 (.251) [1.481]	-.089 (.201) [.914]	-.595 (.414) [.551]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immig= 1)	.195 (.235) [1.215]	-.313 (.211) [.731]	.120 (.259) [1.128]	-.384 (.258) [.681]	-.257 (.208) [.773]	-.278 (.425) [.758]
Length of stay	.000 (.021) [1.000]	.042* (.020) [1.043]	.002 (.023) [1.002]	.005 (.024) [1.005]	.012 (.019) [1.012]	.015 (.037) [1.015]
Education	.101 (.111) [1.107]	.278** (.107) [1.320]	-.062 (.120) [.940]	-.164 .119 [.849]	.056 (.101) [1.057]	-.145 (.194) [.865]
Years of educ. in U. S.	-.092* (.041) [.912]	.070 (.041) [1.072]	.049 (.044) [1.051]	.021 (.046) [1.022]	.075* (.038) [1.077]	.055 (.072) [1.057]
Travel to Nepal	.073 (.076) [1.075]	.120 (.070) [1.128]	.049 (.086) [1.051]	.021 (.084) [1.021]	.041 (.069) [1.042]	-.118 (.133) [.889]
Sending money	-.058 (.066) [.943]	.001 (.060) [1.001]	-.059 (.074) [.943]	.071 (.073) [1.074]	.031 (.059) [1.031]	.137 (.118) [1.147]

Continued on next page

103

Table 6.4 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]					
Model #	1 Nepalese	2 White	3 Black	4 Hispanic	5 Other Asian	6 Other
Chat/discussion	-.073 (.083) [.930]	.054 (.072) [1.055]	-.044 (.092) [.957]	-.081 (.092) [.922]	-.050 (.072) [.951]	.069 (.153) [1.071]
Reading Nep. newsp.	.235*** (.064) [1.266]	-.052 (.058) [.949]	-.056 (.071) [.945]	-.047 (.070) [.954]	-.038 (.057) [.963]	-.202 (.115) [.817]
Constant	.264	-1.503**	-.926	.144	-.932	-2.452*
-2Log Likelihood	597.308	697.744	515.096	514.680	15.637	242.882
Model Chi-Square	33.639***	51.085***	14.488	14.905	717.580	11.095
Pseudo R²	.088	.120	.042	.044	.038	.054
Degree of Freedom	10	10	10		10	10
N	541	541	541	541	541	541

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Interaction in Workplace

Interaction in the workplace tells us that with which racial/ethnic groups the respondents mostly work. Table 6.5 shows the likelihood of mostly working with whites, blacks, Hispanics, other Asians, and others. Each model is a full model consisting of demographic, assimilation, and transnational variables.

Model 1 predicts the probability of mostly working with whites. Here, highest years of education, years of education in the United States, and travel to Nepal are significant, holding other variables constant. As predicted, each additional level of education increases the likelihood of working with whites by 45.4 percent (1.454 - 1=

.454), holding other variables constant. Likewise, as expected, each additional year of education in the United States increases the likelihood of working with whites, indicating education enables Nepalese to work mostly with whites. Contrary to my hypothesis, level of travel to Nepal increases the likelihood of mostly working with whites by 24.3 percent (1.243 -1 = 24.3), indicating that travel to homeland may assist in working with whites. The other predictors are insignificant; therefore, inconsistent with the hypotheses. All explanatory variables in Model 1 explain about 13 percent of the variation in predicting mostly working with whites.

Model 2 predicts the likelihood of mostly working with blacks. None of the predictors is significant in Model 2, but it explains about 2.4 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

In Model 3, only the highest level of education is negative and significant, inconsistent with my hypothesis. Level of education decreases the likelihood of mostly working with Hispanics by 21 percent. It suggests that Nepalese are more likely to work with other racial/ethnic groups than Hispanics as their level of education increases. In this model again, other predictors do not influence in predicting mostly working with Hispanics. With a pseudo R^2 of .032, this model explains about 3.2 percent of the variation in mostly working Hispanics.

Model 4 predicts the likelihood of mostly working with other Asians. Only length of stay and age are significant. As hypothesized, each additional year in age of entry increases the likelihood of mostly working with other Asians by 3.8 percent. As

hypothesized, each level increase in the length of stay decreases the likelihood of mostly

working with other Asians by 4.4 percent, all else being equal. This model with a pseudo

R^2 of .056 explains about 6 percent of variation in explaining mostly working with other

Asians. None of the other predictors contribute in predicting mostly working with other

Asians.

In Model 5, none of the predictors have a significant impact on the dependent

variable; however, the model explains about 10.2 percent of the variation in the

dependent variable.

Table 6.5. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Interaction in Workplace, Nepali Adults,
United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]				
Model #	1 White	2 Black	3 Hispanic	4 Other Asian	5 Other
Age of entry	.004 (.020) [1.004] [1.050]	.019 (.018) [1.019]	.023 (.019) [1.023]	.037* (.017) [1.038]	.049 (.028)
Sex (Male =1)	.125 (.239) [1.134]	.053 (.216) [1.054]	.151 (.223) [1.163]	.133 (.199) [1.142]	-.249 (.374) [.779]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	-.179 (.249) [.836]	.095 (.224) [1.100]	.039 (.231) [1.040]	-.116 (.206) [.890]	.612 (.412) [1.844]

Continued on next page

Table 6.5 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]				
Model #	1 White	2 Black	3 Hispanic	4 Other Asian	5 Other
Length of stay	.021 (.025) [1.021]	.010 (.020) [1.010]	-.020 (.022) [.980]	-.045* (.020) [.956]	.038 (.031) [1.039]
Education	.347*** (.111) [1.454]	.112 (.110) [1.119]	.-236* (.106) [.790]	-.001 (.098) [.999]	-.059 (.173) [.942]
Years of educ. in U. S.	.128** (.052) [1.136]	.003 (.040) [1.003]	.014 (.043) [1.014]	-.009 (.038) [.991]	-.091 (.074) [.913]
Travel to Nepal	.217** (.079) [1.243]	-.009 (.073) [.991]	-.051 (.075) [.951]	-.003 (.068) [.997]	-.133 (.124) [.876]
Sending money	-.010 (.071) [.990]	.074 (.063) [1.077]	.072 (.065) [1.075]	-.028 (.058) [.972]	.165 (.107) [1.179]
Chat/discussion	-.067 (.083) [.935]	-.056 (.078) [.945]	-.150 (.082) [.861]	-.109 (.070) [.897]	.140 (.123) [1.150]
Reading Nep. newsp.	.104 (.067) [1.109]	-.089 (.061) [.915]	-.029 (.063) [.972]	-.041 (.057) [.960]	-.156 (.107) [.856]
Constant	-2.549***	-1.994**	.085	-.155	-3.239
-2Log Likelihood	543.983	649.648	726.475	613.041	280.794
Model Chi-Square	48.010***	9.090	23.360**	11.849	24.338**
Pseudo R^2	.128	.024	.056	.032	.102
Degree of Freedom	10	10	10	10	10
N	541	541	541	541	541

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Interaction in Residential Neighborhood

Another indicator of structural adaptation is interaction in residential neighborhood, in other words, in what type of neighborhood do Nepalese live. In Model 1, length of stay and highest years of education are negative and significant, as hypothesized. With each additional year of stay in United States, the likelihood of living in a predominantly Nepalese neighborhood decreases by 11.1 percent (.889 – 1 = -.111), suggesting as length of stay increases, the Nepalese are more likely to assimilate to the host society by moving perhaps to a white or other racially mixed neighborhood. As predicted, education is negatively associated with living in a predominantly Nepalese neighborhood. In this model, age of entry, gender, legal status, years of education and transnational variables do not impact the dependent variable. A pseudo R^2 of .132 indicates that all predictors included in this model explain about 13.2 percent of the variation on living in predominantly Nepalese neighborhoods.

The next model predicts the likelihood of living in a predominantly white neighborhood. Length of stay and travel home are positive and significant, holding other variables constant. For each additional year of stay in the United States, the probability of living in a predominantly white neighborhood increases by 11.4 percent. Contrary to the hypothesis, each additional level of travel to Nepal increases the likelihood of living in a predominantly white neighborhood by 20.3 percent (1.203 - 1 = .203), suggesting transnational connection, such as travelling to homeland, may facilitate living in a predominantly white neighborhood. A pseudo R^2 of .105 indicates that all predictors

In Model 5, consistent with the hypothesis, legal status is positive and significant, holding other variables constant. As anticipated, the Nepalese who are U.S. citizens or immigrants are likely to live in a predominantly other Asian neighborhoods than their non-citizen/immigrant counterparts. As anticipated, with each additional year of residence in the United States, the probability of living in a predominantly "other Asian" neighborhood decreases by 8.1 percent, suggesting Nepalese may move to predominantly white neighborhoods or other non-white neighborhoods. This model explains about 8.4 percent (Pseudo $R^2 = .084$) of the variation on living in predominantly other Asian neighborhoods.

Model 6, inconsistent with the hypotheses, none of the predictors is significant, but the model explains about 7 percent of the variation on living in predominantly other neighborhoods.

Table 6.6. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Interaction in Residential Neighborhood, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]					
Model #	1 Nepalese	2 White	3 Black	4 Hispanic	5 Other Asian	6 Other
Age of entry	.018 (.022) [1.019]	.008 (.021) [1.008]	.015 (.021) [1.015]	.015 (.020) [1.015]	.010 (.019) [1.010]	.055 (.033) [1.057
Sex (Male =1)	.198 (.293) [1.219]	.065 (.242) [1.067]	.309 (.252) [1.361]	.508* (.247) [1.663]	.173 (.232) [1.189]	-.156 (.448) [.856]

Table 6.6 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]					
Model #	1 Nepalese	2 White	3 Black	4 Hispanic	5 Other Asian	6 Other
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	.267 (.295) [1.307]	-.040 (.248) [.960]	.168 (.257) [1.183]	.196 (.248) [1.216]	.674** (.238) [1.962]	.874 (.485) [2.396]
Length of stay	-.117** (.039) [.889]	.108** (.032) [1.114]	-.037 (.027) [.963]	-.058* (.027) [.944]	-.084*** (.026) [.919]	-.046 (.045) [.955]
Education	-.312** (.126) [.732]	.073 (.118) [1.075]	-.095 (.119) [.910]	-.108 (.115) [.898]	.023 (.112) [1.023]	.132 (.227) [1.141]
Years of educ. in U. S.	-.015 (.066) [.985]	.041 (.054) [1.042]	-.003 (.050) [.997]	.030 (.048) [1.030]	-.029 (.048) [.972]	-.011 (.089) [.989]
Travel Nepal	-.152 (.092) [.859]	.185** (.079) [1.203]	-.160* (.082) [.852]	-.138 (.079) [.871]	-.075 (.077) [.927]	-.105 (.147) [.900]
Sending money	-.046 (.085) [.955]	-.110 (.071) [.896]	.098 (.073) [1.103]	.073 (.071) [1.076]	.082 (.067) [1.086]	.008 (.128) [1.008]
Chat/discussion	.066 (.090) [1.068]	.012 (.083) [1.012]	-.116 (.088) [.891]	-.125 (.085) [.882]	-.016 (.077) [.984]	-.007 (.157) [.993]
Reading Nep. newsp.	.159 (.089) [1.172]	.013 (.069) [1.013]	-.008 (.071) [.993]	-.009 (.069) [.991]	.048 (.067) [1.049]	-.144 (.126) [.866]
Constant	.126	-.590	-.875	-.771	-1.303*	-4.468**
-2Log Likelihood	411.114	534.346	519.020	542.471	586.707	213.677
Model Chi-Square	42.249***	38.239***	13.424	17.292	31.955***	12.456
Pseudo R²	.132	.105	.039	.049	.084	.067
Degree of Freedom	10	10	10	10	10	10
N	541	541	541	541	541	541

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

111

Organizational Memberships

Membership in an organization indicates an association with that particular organization. A respondent being a member of a Nepalese organization indicates his/her association with an ethnic organization. The membership in an Asian organization is associated with an affiliation with panethnic organizations. Finally, membership in an American organization illustrates an attempt to structurally assimilate with the host society, perhaps, by attaining a membership in an American organization.

Membership in Nepalese organizations. Table 6.7 presents the results of logistic regression models that predict the probability of membership in Nepalese organizations in the United States. To find out the best fitting model, I conducted special χ^2 tests by comparing Model 3 with Model 1 and Model 3 with Model 2. The differences in model χ^2 between Model 3 and Model 1 and Model 3 and Model 2 are not statistically significant at the .05 level (for the formula, see endnote 1). Nonetheless, Model 2 is better than Model 3 in terms of parsimony, hence, Model 2 is the best fitting model, and the focus of my interpretations.

Inconsistent with the hypothesis, men are more likely to have a membership in a Nepalese organization than women in Model 2 and any other models, holding other variables constant. Membership in a Nepalese organization indicates strong ties with their own community and the less likely they are to assimilate to the host society, perhaps by attaining a membership in an American organization. Contrary to the hypothesis, length of stay is positive and significantly associated with membership in a Nepalese

112

organization in Model 2, a consistent effect across all models. Again, like other Asian immigrants, the Nepalese are also willing to have a membership in their own ethnic organizations. However, age of entry, legal status, highest years of education, and years of education are insignificant and do not contribute to attaining membership in Nepalese organizations, inconsistent with my hypotheses.

Model 1 explains about 2 percent of the variation in having membership in Nepalese organizations. The assimilation variables add 2.2 percent of the variation in the dependent variable on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 =.018). Likewise, transnational variables contributes less than 1 percent on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 =.040) to membership in Nepalese organizations.

Table 6.7. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Membership in Nepalese Organizations, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #			
	1	2	3
Age of entry	.009	.019	.016
	(.010)	(.015)	(.017)
	[1.009]	[1.019]	[1.016]
Sex	.434**	.409**	.387*
(Male =1	(.159)	(.168)	(.197)
	[1.544]	[1.505]	[1.473]
Legal status		-.156	-1.94
(U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		(.187)	(.205)
		[.856]	(.824)

Continued on next page

Table 6.7 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Length of stay		.052** (.017) [1.053]	.048** (.019) [1.049]
Education		-.041 (.088) [.959]	-.061 (.098) [.941]
Years of education in U. S.		-.010 (.033) [.990]	.001 (.037) [1.001]
Travel Nepal			.004 (.067) [1.004]
Sending money			.021 (.058) [1.022]
Chat/discussion			.020 (.070) [1.020]
Reading Nepali newspaper			.040 (.057) [1.041]
Constant	-.366	-.635	-.675
-2Log Likelihood	930.206	870.356	733.634
Model Chi-Square	9.283**	19.337**	16.128
Pseudo R^2	.018	.040	.039
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	679	643	541

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

114

Membership in Asian organizations. Table 6.8 indicates the likelihood of membership in Asian organizations. The model χ^2 s is not significant in all three models, signifying that these models are not good. The special χ^2 tests revealed that none of the model is significant. In addition, neither of the predictors in all three models is significant, inconsistent with the hypothesis. However, a pseudo R^2 shows about 1 percent of the variation in having a membership in an Asian organization in Model 1. The assimilation variables add about 1.3 percent of the variation in the dependent variable on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 =.001). Likewise, transnational variables contributes about 1.4 percent on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 =.014) in having a membership in an Asian organization.

Table 6.8. Logistic Regression Estimation Predicting Membership in Asian Organizations, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Age of entry	-.007 (.015) [.993]	.018 (.020) [1.018]	.029 (.023) [1.030]
Sex (Male =1)	.027 (.232) [1.027]	-.020 (.244) [.980]	-.077 (.298) [.926]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		.045 (.270) [1.046]	-.162 (.306) [.850]

Continued on next page

115

Table 6.8 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Length of stay		.016 (.022) [1.016]	.019 (.026) [1.019]
Education		-.085 (.120) [.919]	-.133 (.136) [.876]
Years of education in U. S.		.063 (.042) [1.065]	.084 (.049) [1.088]
Travel Nepal			.065 (.101) [1.067]
Sending money		.	-.089 (.087) [.915]
Chat/discussion			.118 (.101) [1.125]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.021 (.085) [.979]
Constant	-1.698	-2.142**	-2.185**
-2Log Likelihood	537.345	507.089	407.510
Model Chi-Square	.202	5.126	8.191
Pseudo R^2	.001	.014	.028
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	675	639	537

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

116

Membership in American organizations. Table 6.9 presents the results of logistic regression predicting the probability of membership in an American organization. The model χ^2s of Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3 are significant at the .01 and .001 levels, indicating that these are good models. To find out the best fitting model, I calculated special χ^2 tests by comparing Model 3 with Model 1 and Model 3 with Model 2 (for the formula, see endnote 1). The difference in model χ^2 between Model 3 and Model 1 is statistically significant at the .01 level. However, in terms of parsimony, Model 2 is the best fitting Model; therefore, the emphasis of my interpretations.

In Model 2, as anticipated, years of education is positive and significant, a consistent effect across all models, holding other variables constant. For each year of increase in education in the United States, membership in an American organization increases by 14.8 percent, suggesting having an American education enables Nepalese to participate in American organizations.

Following the pseudo R^2 across the models reveals that the demographic variables account for about 2 percent of the variation in membership in American organization, 6 percent from assimilation variables, and less than 1 percent from transnational variables.

Table 6.9. Logistic Regression Estimation Predicting Membership in American
Organizations, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Age of entry	-.028** (.011) [.973]	.000 (.016) [1.000]	.001 (.019) [1.001]
Sex (Male =1)	.335* (.171) [1.398]	.197 (.181) [1.218]	.235 (.217) [1.265]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.152 (.199) [.859]	-.255 (.223) [.775]
Length of stay		.010 (.017) [1.010]	.009 (.020) [1.009]
Education		.074 (.099) [1.076]	.057 (.114) [1.059]
Years of education in U. S.		.138*** (.036) [1.148]	.116** (.040) [1.124]
Travel Nepal			-.114 (.072) [.892]
Sending money			-.015 (.063) [.985]

Continued on next page

Table 6.9 (continued)

| | B (SE) [Odds Ratio] | | |
Model #	1	2	3
Chat/discussion			-.065 (.079) [.937]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.083 (.061) [.920]
Constant	-.206	-1.780**	-1.053
-2Log Likelihood	850.317	784.218	642.327
Model Chi-Square	8.431**	36.481***	34.028***
Pseudo R^2	.017	.077	.086
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	671	635	535
*P ≤ .05	** P ≤ .01	*** P ≤ .001	

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I analyze the structural adaptation of the Nepalese in the United

States. The demographic table reveals that only 8 percent of the respondents were

hesitant to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. The majority of people had friendships

(best or close friends) with other Nepalese. Nepalese mostly socialize with fellow

Nepalese followed by whites, other Asians, blacks, Hispanics, and other. In the

workplace, the Nepalese mostly interacted with whites, then other Asians, blacks,

Hispanics, and other. Nepalese predominantly lived in "white" neighborhoods. One

quarter of the Nepalese live with other Asians followed by Hispanics, blacks, Nepalese, and other. More than half of the respondents are members of a Nepalese organization/s followed by American organization/s, and Asian organization/s in the United States.

I employed different statistical techniques to explore the effects of several independent predictors on various dependent variables of structural adaptation. The results revealed some interesting findings that are worth mentioning here. Age has only impacted socializing mostly with whites, suggesting that the Nepalese who arrived at an older age are less likely to socialize with whites (Model 2 of Table 6.4). Gender contributes to living predominantly in Hispanic neighborhoods and membership in Nepalese organizations. As predicted, men are more likely to live in a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood than women (Model 5 Model 6.6); however, this is not a strong indicator that men are structurally assimilating to the host country because some of the groups, such as Hispanics and blacks are not welcomed in white neighborhoods. Inconsistent with the hypothesis, men are more likely to have membership in Nepalese organizations than women, holding other variables constant (Model 2 of Table 6.7). It is possible that first generation Nepalese are still connected with the home country. Additionally, being a member of an ethnic organization is very common among immigrants.

Consistent with the hypothesis, legal status is positive and significant, holding other variables constant. As anticipated, U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to live in a predominantly other Asian neighborhood than non-citizens/immigrants,

suggesting citizens/immigrants may assimilate to American society more than non-citizens/immigrants (Model 3 of Table 6.6). However, again, living in other Asian neighborhoods does not mean they are assimilating to the host country. Interestingly length of stay positively contributes to the likelihood of having white as the best or close friends (Column 1 of Table 6.3), socializing with whites (Model 2 of Table 6.4), and living in white neighborhoods (Model 2 of Table 6.6). It indicates that length of stay contributes to assimilation to American society by having whites as closest friends, socializing mostly with whites, and living in the white neighborhoods. However, length of stay is also positively associated with membership in Nepalese organizations. It is possible that first-generation immigrants are still more likely to connect with the home country and to take part in many homeland events in the United States than second or third generation immigrants.

Education has been a good predictor of adaptation to American society. The level of education decreases the likelihood of mostly working with Hispanics (Model 3 Table 6.5) and the likelihood of living in a predominantly Nepalese neighborhood (Model 1 of Table 6.6). It suggests that the Nepalese may work with other racial/ethnic groups besides Hispanic. Furthermore, they may possibly live in other racial/ethnic groups' neighborhoods rather than a predominantly Nepalese neighborhood.

Similarly, as predicted, each additional year of education in the United States increases the likelihood of mostly working with whites (Model 1 of Table 6.5) and having a membership in American organizations (Model 2 of Table 6.9). Interestingly,

121

education in the United States decreases the likelihood of socializing with other Nepalese (Model 1 of Table 6.4), but increases the likelihood of socializing with other Asians (Model 3 of Table 6.4). Education in the United States decreases living in predominantly other Asian neighborhoods (Model 3 of Table 6.6.). In other words, Nepalese are more likely to work with whites and be a member of an American organization. Conversely, they are less likely to socialize with Nepalese. Interestingly, they are more likely to socialize with other Asians, but less likely to live in a predominantly other Asian neighborhoods. It appears that education may enable the Nepalese to partially assimilate to the host society.

Contrary to the hypothesis, travel to Nepal lessens the likelihood of hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. As hypothesized, travel to Nepal is negatively associated with having friendship (best or close friends) with blacks/Hispanics versus other Nepalese (2 of Table 6.3), suggesting that the Nepalese are less likely to have blacks/Hispanics as the best or close friends when they have more transnational connection, that is, travel to home country. Interestingly, contrary to the hypothesis, each additional level of travel to Nepal increases the likelihood of mostly working with whites (Model 1 of Table 6.5) and living predominantly white neighborhoods (Model 2 of Table 6.6). Consistent with the hypothesis, each level increase in travel to Nepal, living in predominantly black neighborhoods decreases, suggesting the Nepalese are less likely to live in predominantly black neighborhoods (Model 4 of Table 6.6) and perhaps they prefer living in the white neighborhoods (Model 2 of Table 6.6) and mostly work with

122

whites (Model 1 of Table 6.5). Likewise, as anticipated, reading Nepali newspapers decreases the probability of having blacks/Hispanics versus fellow Nepalese as the best or close friends (Column 2 of Table 6.3).

On the contrary, inconsistent with the hypothesis chat/discussion is positively associated with having the best or close friends as blacks/Hispanics (column 2 of Table 6.3). However, this does not mean that the Nepalese are structurally assimilating to the host because blacks/Hispanics are also minority groups. However, as anticipated, each level increase in reading Nepali newspapers reduces the likelihood of having blacks/Hispanics and other Asians versus fellow Nepalese as the best or close friends (Columns 2 and 3 of Table 6.3) and increases the likelihood of socializing with other Nepalese (Model 1 Table 6.4), suggesting that reading ethnic newspapers helps maintain relationship with their own ethnic groups.

The next chapter will discuss the results of marital adaptation.

CHAPTER VII

MARITAL ADAPTATION

To analyze marital adaptation, the following three questions were asked, first, "Is your spouse Nepali?"; second, "Hypothetically, if you had a choice, who would you marry?"; and third "Do you allow your children to marry a non-Nepalese?" The first question is a dichotomous variable, so I used logistic regression to explore the probability of a spouse being non-Nepalese. Multinomial logistic regressions were administered for the second and the third questions. Even though "allowing children to marry non-Nepalese" is categorical, I did a multinomial regression because the postulation of the parallel line assumption is not met. The correlation matrix did not show the possibility of collinearity between independent variables.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Results of the descriptive statistics are reported in Table 7.1. Only 11 percent were married to non-Nepalese as compared to 89 percent who were married to Nepalese. The vast majority of the respondents expressed that if they had a choice, they would marry Nepali (79.4 percent). Interestingly, a little more than half of the respondents agreed that they would allow their children to marry a non-Nepalese (54.5 percent), where almost one third of the respondents were unsure, and about 10 percent (9.9 percent) quickly denied allowing their children to marry a non-Nepalese.

Independent variables are the same as in Chapter V (see Table 5.1).

Table 7.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Analysis, Marital Adaptation, 2010

Variable	Percent	N
Dependent Variable		
Marital Adaptation		
Non-Nepalese spouse (= 1)	56(11%)	511
Hypothetical choice of marry		
Nepali	566(79.4%)	713
White	51(7.2%)	
Blacks/Hispanics	16(2.2%)	
Other Asian	17(2.4%)	
Other	63(8.8%)	
Allowing Children to Marry Non-Nepalese		574
No	57(9.9%)	
Unsure	204(35.5%)	
Yes	313(54.5%)	

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Non-Nepalese Spouse

It is very important to learn whether first generation Nepalese are out-marrying. I tested three models to assess the determinants of having a non-Nepalese spouse. The goodness-of-fit statistics associated with the three models are shown in Table 7.2. The model χ^2s of all three models are significant at the .01 and .001 levels, suggesting these models are good models. Each later model improves the fit versus the previous models with increasing model χ^2 and decreasing -2 in log likelihood.

Model 1 consists of demographic variables. Consistent with the hypothesis, age of entry is negative and significant. Each additional year in age of entry decreases the likelihood of having a non-Nepalese spouse by 7.4 percent. Gender does not reach significance at the .05 level.

Yet again, age of entry is significant and negative in Model 2, holding other variables constant, consistent with my hypothesis. The Nepalese who arrived at an older age are less likely to have a non-Nepalese spouse, meaning they are less likely to maritally assimilate to the host society. As predicted, each additional increase in length of stay in the United States, the likelihood of having a non-Nepalese spouse increases by 7 percent. This indicates that as length of stay increases, the Nepalese are more likely to assimilate to the host society by possibly marrying a non-Nepalese. Gender, legal status, highest years of education and education in the United States do not vary, as expected.

Model 3 is a full model. As predicted, men are 146 percent more likely to marry a non-Nepalese spouse than women, holding other variables constant. Consistent with my hypothesis, the effect of the length of stay is positive and significant, all else being equal. With each year of increase in the length of stay, the predicted odds of having a non-Nepalese spouse increases by about 9 percent, as anticipated. Among the transnational variables, only reading Nepali newspapers is significant and negative, as hypothesized. For each additional level increase in reading Nepali newspapers, the likelihood of having a non-Nepalese spouse decreases by 27.1 percent, all else being equal. There is no support for the hypothesis that age of entry, legal status, highest level of education, years

126

of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion has an effect on having a non-Nepalese spouse.

In Model 1, demographic variables with a pseudo R^2 of .054 account for 5.4 percent of the variation in predicting a spouse being non-Nepalese. Including the assimilation variables in Model 2 increases the pseudo R^2 to .103 from .054, suggesting that an additional 4.9 percent of the variation in predicting a spouse as non-Nepalese is due to the assimilation variables. Including transnational variables increases the predictive power of the model by another 8.2 percent.

Table 7.2. Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Non-Nepalese Spouse, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Age of entry	.077***	-.074**	-.049
	(.023)	(.031)	(.039)
	[.926]	[.929]	[.952]
Sex	.164	.174	.900*
(Male =1)	(.330)	(.350)	(.444)
	[1.179]	[1.190]	[2.461]
Legal status		-.069	-.340
(U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		(.420)	(.481)
		[.933]	[.712]

Continued on next page

127

Table 7.2 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Length of stay		.067** (.025) [1.070]	.084* (.032) [1.088]
Education		.285 (.221) [1.330]	.226 (.266) [1.253]
Years of education in U. S.		-.033 (.056) [.968]	-.035 (.066) [.966]
Travel to Nepal			.149 (.150) [.862]
Sending money			-.003 (.129) [.997]
Chat/discussion			-.021 (.192) [.979]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.316** (.121) [.729]
Constant	-.451	-2.948*	-2.246
-2Log Likelihood	278.501	254.344***	195.888
Model Chi-Square	11.889**	21.625***	32.716***
Pseudo R²	.054	.103	.185
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	461	434	355

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Hypothetical Choice of Marriage

A hypothetical choice of marriage, that is, who a person would marry, is an indicator for accepting intermarriage. Table 7.3 shows a multinomial logistic regression model predicting the choice of marriage (hypothetical). The category "Nepalese" is the reference category. The model χ^2 is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 117.253$). The pseudo R^2 indicates that all predictors included in this model explain 25.4 percent of the variation in the hypothetical choice of marriage. In Column 1, only reading Nepali newspapers is significant, as anticipated. The level of reading Nepali newspapers decreases the likelihood of marrying whites versus other Nepalese by about 29 percent ($.709 - 1 = -.291$). Interestingly, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, highest years of education, years of education in the United States, travel to Nepal, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not have a significant effect on hypothetically marrying whites versus other Nepalese.

In Column 2, age of entry, gender, and legal status are significant. Consistent with my hypothesis, each additional year in age of entry reduces the probability of hypothetically marrying blacks/Hispanics versus other Nepalese by about 6 percent. Gender is associated with interracial marriage. Men are more likely to marry blacks/Hispanics versus Nepalese than are women. Unexpectedly, immigrants are less likely to marry blacks/Hispanics versus Nepalese than are non-immigrants. The reason could be that much like other races, the Nepalese may not prefer to marry blacks/Hispanics regardless of their legal status in the United States. Among the

assimilation variables, only legal status is significant; none of the transnational variables contribute to hypothetically marrying blacks/Hispanics versus Nepalese.

In Column 3, only reading Nepali newspapers is significant. As anticipated, the level of reading Nepali newspapers decreases the probability of choice of marrying other Asians versus Nepalese by 31.3 percent (.687 -1 = -.313). Notably, none of the demographic variables, assimilation variables, and transnational variables (travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion) is significant, suggesting these variables do not contribute to predicting the choice of marrying other Asians versus Nepalese.

In Column 4, education in the United States is associated with marrying others versus Nepalese, if given a choice. Each additional year in education increases the likelihood of hypothetically marrying others versus Nepalese, suggesting a higher level of education is associated with a higher degree of marital assimilation, mainly marrying others versus Nepalese. Yet again, none of the other predictors contribute to hypothetically marrying others versus Nepalese.

Table 7.3. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Hypothetical Choice of Marriage, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

| | B (SE) [Odds Ratio] | | | |
	White Vs. Nepalese	Black/Hispanic Vs. Nepalese	Other Asian Vs. Nepalese	Other Vs. Nepalese
Age of entry	-.026	-.231**	.054	-.013
	(.040)	(.091)	(.053)	(.037)
	[.975]	[.794]	[1.056]	[.987]
Sex	-.266	2.517*	1.224	-.567
(Male =1)	(.391)	(1.088)	(.675)	(.399)
	[.797]	[12.387]	[3.402]	[.567]
Legal status	-.242	-2.663*	.828	-.054
(Cit/immi= 1)	(.401)	(1.350)	(.675)	(.426)
	[.785]	[.070]	[2.288]	[.948]
Length of stay	.010	-.327	-.043	.056
	(.037)	(.207)	(.064)	(.030)
	[1.010]	[.721]	[.958]	[1.057]
Education	.089	.251	-.098	.371
	(.209)	(.390)	(.304)	(.238)
	[1.094]	[1.286]	[.907]	[1.449]
Educ. in U.S.	.043	.137	.177	.113*
	(.074)	(.227)	(.103)	(.060)
	[1.044]	[1.147]	[1.194]	[1.120]

Table 7.3 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]			
	White Vs. Nepalese	Black/Hispanic Vs. Nepalese	Other Asian Vs. Nepalese	Other Vs. Nepalese
Travel to Nepal	-.196	.372	-.260	-.053
	(.126)	(.205)	(.200)	(.140)
	[.822]	[.690]	[.771]	[.948]
Sending money	-.003	.413	-.051	-.033
	(.115)	(.223)	(.192)	(.117)
	[.997]	[1.512]	[.950]	[.968]
Chat/discussion	.213	-.182	-.217	-.224
	(.146)	(.238)	(.285)	(.109)
	[1.237]	[.833]	[.805]	[.799]
Read Nepali newspapers	-.343**	-.050	-.376*	-.107
	(.110)	(.195)	(.174)	(.109)
	[.709]	[.951]	[.687]	[.898]
Constant	-1.138	.142	-3.929*	-4.597***

-2Log Likelihood	688.164
Model Chi-Square	117.253**
Pseudo R²	.254
Degree of Freedom	40
N	532

*p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .01   *** p ≤ .001

Permission for Children to Marry Non-Nepalese

Another indicator for martial assimilation is whether Nepalese parents would allow

their children to marry non-Nepalese. Table 7.4 indicates whether Nepalese parents are

allowing children to marry non-Nepalese (reference = "no"). The model χ^2 is statistically

significant ($\chi^2 = 84.046$). The pseudo R^2 indicates that all predictors included in this model explain 21.2 percent of the variation in allowing children to marry non-Nepalese. The first column shows the respondents likelihood of being "unsure" in allowing children to marry non-Nepalese versus "no". As hypothesized, with each additional year in age of entry, the likelihood of "unsure" on allowing children to marry non-Nepalese versus "no" lessens by 11.3 percent. As anticipated, the higher the level of education, the likelihood of "unsure" on permission for children to marry non-Nepalese versus "no" increases by 41.4 percent (1.414 -1 = .414). The level of chat/discussion decreases the likelihood of "unsure" in allowing children to marry non-Nepalese versus "no" by about 41 percent (.592 – 1 = -.408).

Again, age of entry, highest years of education, and chat/discussion are significant in Column 2, suggesting these predictors contribute in allowing children to marry non-Nepalese, that is, "yes" versus "no." For each year of increase in age of entry, the likelihood of allowing children to marry non-Nepalese ("yes" versus "no") decreases by about 11 percent. The level of education significantly contributes to marital assimilation by allowing children to marry non-Nepalese, that is, "yes" versus "no". As hypothesized, for each level increase in education, the likelihood of allowing children to marry non-Nepalese ("yes" versus "no") increases by 43.3 percent. As anticipated, the level of chat/discussion lessens the probability of allowing children to marry, that is, "yes" versus "no".

Table 7.4. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Permission for Children to Marry Non-Nepalese, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]	
	Unsure Vs. No	Yes Vs. No
Age of entry	-.120*** (.033) [.887]	-.111*** (.032) [.895]
Sex (Male =1)	-.206 (.440) [.814]	.127 (.430) [1.135]
Legal status (Cit/immi= 1)	.750 (.455) [2.116]	.000 (.439) [1.000]
Length of stay	.011 (.048) [.989]	085 (.045) [1.088]
Education	.347* (.184) [1.414]	.360* (.175) [1.433]
Years of Education in U.S.	-.103 (.084) [.902]	-.081 (.079) [.923]
Travel to Nepal	.077 (.147) [.926]	-.061 (.142) [.941]

Continued on next page

Table 7.4 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]	
	Unsure Vs. No	Yes Vs. No
Sending money	.211 (.127) [1.235]	.129 (.123) [1.137]
Chat/discussion	-.524*** (.130) [.592]	-.350** (.121) [.705]
Read Nepali newspapers	-.045 (.151) [.956]	-.199 (.148) [.819]
Constant	2.919*	2.920**
-2Log Likelihood	706.944	
Model Chi-Square	84.046***	
Pseudo R^2	.212	
Degree of Freedom	20	
N	425	

*p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .01   *** p ≤ .001

SUMMARY

This section analyzes the marital adaptation of the Nepalese in the United States.
This is measured by administrating three questions that explore marital adaptation. The
descriptive statistics revealed that the majority of the respondents were married to Nepali
spouses. They consistently preferred to marry Nepali, if given a choice. More than half of
the respondents agreed that they would allow their children to marry non-Nepalese (Table

135

7.1). It is interesting to note that although first generation Nepalese preferred to marry Nepali spouses even if they were given a choice, more than of the respondents are allowing their children to marry non-Nepalese.

It appears that the older the age of entry, the less likely marital assimilation will occur. For example, as the age entry increases, respondents are less likely to have a non-Nepalese spouse (Models 1 and 2 of Table 7.2), are not willing to marry blacks/Hispanics (Column 2 of Table7.3), and become unsure (Column 1 of Table of 7.4) in "allowing children to marry non-Nepalese" (Column 2 of Table 7.4).

As anticipated, men are more likely to marry blacks/Hispanics than women (Column 2 of Table 7.3), if they are given a choice, indicating some degree of marital assimilation amongst men.

Interestingly, legal status does not contribute in terms of martial adaptation, particularly; if they are given a choice of marriage. Length of stay appears to be associated with having a non-Nepalese spouse, as hypothesized. It appears that length of stay possibly contributes to marrying non-Nepalese. Education enables immigrants to assimilate to the host society in many ways. Here, education in the U.S. is associated with a hypothetical choice of marriage ("other" versus "Nepalese"). Likewise, the highest level of education contributes to allowing children to marry a non-Nepalese (Column 2 of Table 7.4). Among the transnational variables only chat/discussion (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 7.4) is significant and support my hypotheses. Similarly, chat/discussion reduces

the likelihood of allowing children to marry non-Nepalese "unsure" versus "no" (Column 1 of Table 7.4 and Column 2 of Table 7.4) and from 'yes" versus "no"

In conclusion, the Nepalese still support marrying among fellow Nepalese, but have become a little more flexible on interracial marriage when it comes to their children.

The next chapter will discuss the results of identificational adaptation.

CHAPTER VIII

IDENTIFICATIONAL ADAPTATION

This chapter discusses the empirical results of identificational adaptation. To measure identificational adaptation, I asked two questions (see Appendix B): 1. "How do you identify yourself, that is, what do you call yourself?" 2. "How close do you feel to your ethnic group (Nepalese)?" For the first question, I performed a multinomial regression to determine the relationship between the dependent variable (categorical variables with more than two categories) and multiple predictors. I also conducted a multinomial regression for "feeling closer to Nepalese," an ordinal variable, since the test of parallel lines is significant, meaning that the location parameters are not the same across response categories. To check multicollinearity, I ran bivariate correlations to examine whether or not two or more independent predictors were highly correlated. The results indicated that there was no multicollinearity. For each dependent variable, descriptive results are reported and discussed. Independent variables are the same as in Chapter V (see Table 5.1).

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 8.1 shows the descriptive statistical results of the two dependent variables used in the analysis: "self-identification" and "feeling closer to Nepalese." When asked how do they identify or call themselves, most respondents (71.8 percent) in this sample identified themselves as Nepalese. Only about 20 percent would like to be identified as

Nepalese American (20.1 percent). Identifying self as Asian American (2.6 percent) and American/other had the least amount of responses. The second question reflects feeling closeness to own ethnic group, which is Nepalese. About four percent (4.2 percent) of the respondents expressed that they did not feel close at all. On the contrary, almost one third of the respondents expressed that they felt "close" (33.60 percent) to their own ethnic group followed by more than half of the respondents who agreed that they felt "very close" to Nepalese (62.1 percent).

Table 8.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Analysis, Identificational Adaptation, 2010

Variable	Percent	N
Dependent Variable		
Identification Adaptation		
Self-identification		708
Nepalese	508 (71.8%)	
Nepalese American	142 (20.1 %)	
Asian	26 (3.7%)	
Asian American	20(2.8%)	
American/Other	12(1.7%)	
Feeling closer to Nepalese		708
Not close at all	30(4.2%)	
Close	238(33.6%)	
Very close	440(62.1%)	

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Self-identification

I analyzed self-identification in terms of how the respondents would like to

identify themselves (self-identification). Column 1 of Table 8.2 presents the respondents'

likelihood of self-identification as Nepalese American versus Nepalese. Column 2 shows

the probability of identifying self as Asian versus Nepalese. Column 3 indicates the

likelihood of identifying self as Asian American versus Nepalese. Column 4 shows the

probability of self-identification as American/other versus Nepalese. The model χ^2 is

statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 153.239$). The estimated pseudo R^2 indicates that all

predictors included in this model explain about 31 percent (30.8 percent) of the variation

in "self-identification."

Column 1 shows that age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay,

chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers significantly influence "self-

identification." Inconsistent with my hypothesis, age of entry is positive and significant.

The older the age of entry, the more likely the Nepalese are to identify as Nepalese

American versus Nepalese. It suggests that a preference of identifying self as Nepalese

American appears strong for the Nepalese who enter at an older age. As anticipated, men

prefer to be identified as Nepalese American versus Nepalese more so than women,

indicating men are willing to assimilate to the host country by identifying themselves as

Nepalese American. Similarly, as hypothesized, legal status appears to be an important

predictor to integrate into the American Society, particularly in the case of self-

identification. Nepalese who are U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to identify as Nepalese American than their non-citizen/immigrant counterparts. As predicted, with each additional year of stay in United States, the likelihood of identifying self as Nepalese American versus Nepalese increases by 14 percent. Contrary to my hypothesis, chat/discussion is significant and positive. For each additional level on chat/discussion, the likelihood of identifying with Nepalese American versus Nepalese is predicted to increase by 27.4 percent. However, as predicted, the preference to identify as Nepalese American versus Nepalese is predicted to decrease, by 14.5 percent, for each level increase in reading Nepali newspapers. Here, transnational variables, such as chat/discussion, suggest attachment to the host country and another variable, like reading Nepali newspapers, suggests attachment to the home country. Having two contradictory findings under transnational variables, that is chat/discuss and reading Nepali newspapers, signifies that one of the predictors may not be a good indicator to predict "self-identification."

Column 2 indicates that demographic variables, assimilation variables, and transnational variables are insignificant, suggesting that these predictors do not contribute to identifying self as Asian versus Nepalese.

Note that only legal status is significant and positive in Column 3. As hypothesized, Nepalese who are U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely than are non-citizens/immigrants to identity as Asian American versus Nepalese. No significant

141

differences were found for other variables, indicating these predictors do not influence self-identification as Asian American versus Nepalese.

Column 4 shows respondents' likelihood of self-identification as American/other versus Nepalese. As anticipated, for each level increase in the length of stay in the United States, the likelihood of identifying as American/other versus Nepalese increases by about 16 percent. None of the predictors significantly contributes to self-identification.

Table 8.2: Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Nepalese Self - Identification, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]			
	Nepalese American Vs. Nepalese	Asian Vs. Nepalese	Asian American Vs. Nepalese	American/Other Vs. Nepalese
Age of entry	.043* (.022) [1.044]	.006 (.046) [1.006]	-.004 (.052) [.996]	.013 (.125) [1.014]
Sex (Male =1)	.744** (.300) [2.105]	.689 (.548) [.502]	-.046 (.630) [.955]	.430 (1.055) [1.538]
Legal status (Cit/immi= 1)	1.296*** (.344) [3.654]	.948 (.602) [2.580]	1.749* (.825) [5.747]	-.619 (1.189) [.538]
Length of stay	.131*** (.025) [1.140]	.041 (.051) [1.042]	.065 (.048) [1.068]	.148* (.074) [1.159]

Table 8.2 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]			
	Nepalese American Vs. Nepalese	Asian Vs. Nepalese	Asian American Vs. Nepalese	American/Other Vs. Nepalese
Education	-.169 (.131) [.844]	.013 (.269) [1.013]	.654 (.404) [1.922]	-.713 (.509) [.490]
Yrs. Edu. in U.S.	.008 (.048) [1.008]	-.072 (.112) [.931]	.070 (.086) [1.072]	.095 (.193) [1.100]
Travel to Nepal	.034 (.100) [1.034]	.050 (.196) [1.051]	.297 (.245) [1.346]	-.428 (.381) [.652]
Sending money	-.037 (.083) [.963]	-.081 (.157) [.923]	.062 (.178) [.940]	.098 (.329) [1.103]
Chat/discussion	.242** (.096) [1.274]	-.113 (.223) [.893]	.124 (.234) [1.132]	.073 (.531) [1.076]
Read Nepali newspapers	-.157* (.083) [.855]	.077 (.150) [1.080]	-.017 (.177) [.983]	-.751 (.411) [.422]
Constant	-3.662***	-3.747*	-10.183***	-.231

-2Log Likelihood	723.570
Model Chi-Square	153.239***
Pseudo R^2	.308
Degree of Freedom	40
N	538

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

143

Feeling Closer to Nepalese

Feeling close to their own ethnic group is associated with how close a person feels toward their own group, meaning identifying or associating with their own group. Table 8.3 reports the multinomial logistic regression estimates to predict feeling closer to Nepalese (reference category = "not close at all"). The dependent variable "feeling closer to Nepalese" has three categories ("not close at all," "close," and "very close"). The first column reveals the probability of feeling "close" with Nepalese versus "not close at all." The second column shows the probability of feeling "very close" with Nepalese versus "not close at all." The model χ^2 is significant at the .001 level ($\chi^2 = 61.598$). The estimated pseudo R^2 exhibits that all explanatory variables included in this model explain about 14 percent of the variation in "feeling closer to Nepalese."

Education in the United States appears to significantly affect feeling "close" versus "not close at all," as predicted (Column 1 of Table 8.3). As hypothesized, education in the United States decreases the likelihood of feeling "close" with Nepalese versus "not close at all." Transnational variables, such as sending money, chat/discuss, and reading Nepali newspapers are statistically significant and contribute to feeling "close" with own ethnic group versus "not close at all." As anticipated, for each level increase in remittance sent home, feeling "close" with Nepalese versus "not close at all" is predicted to increase by about 83 percent. It seems that the level of reading Nepali newspapers is positive and has a significant effect on feeling "close" with their own ethnic group versus "not close at all." Contrary to my hypothesis, for each level increase

in chat/discussion, feeling "close" with Nepalese versus "not close at all" decreases by about 33 percent ($.671 - 1 = -.329$). Note that within transnational variables, sending remittances home and reading Nepali newspapers increases the likelihood of feeling closer to own ethnic group. On the contrary, taking part in Nepali chat/discussion lessens the likelihood of feeling closer to own ethnic group. It appears that the predictor, chat/discussion may not be a good predictor of "feeling closer to Nepalese." Surprisingly, age of entry, gender, legal status, length of stay, and highest level of education turned out to be insignificant and do not influence "feeling closer to Nepalese."

The second column consists of the logistic coefficients and log odds for feeling "very close" versus "not close at all" with Nepalese. Yet, again, transnational variables, such as travel to Nepal, sending money, and reading Nepali newspapers are positive and significantly affect closeness to own ethnic group, as expected. The likelihood of feeling "very close" with the Nepalese versus "not close at all" is predicted to increase by nearly 53 percent, 42 percent, and 76.4 percent for each level of increase in travel to Nepal, sending remittance home, and reading Nepali newspapers, respectively. Other predictors; however, do not contribute to predicting the likelihood of feeling "very close" versus "not close at all" with the Nepalese.

Table 8.3: Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Feeling Closer to Nepalese Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]	
	Close Vs. Not Close at All	Very Close Vs. Not Close at All
Age of entry	-.041 (.047) [.960]	-.034 (.045) [.967]
Sex (Male =1)	-.058 (.518) [.944]	-.524 (.513) [.592]
Legal status (Cit/immi= 1)	.158 (.542) [.854]	.068 (.535) [1.071]
Length of stay	.021 (.045) [1.021]	-.002 (.045) [.998]
Education	-.316 (.294) [.729]	-.269 (.291) [.764]
Years of Education in U.S.	-.174* (.085) [.840]	-.154 (.082) [.858]
Travel to Nepal	.280 (.164) [1.323]	.424** (.162) [1.528]

Continued on next page

Table 8.3 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]	
	Close Vs. Not Close at All	Very Close Vs. Not Close at All
Sending money	.392* (.174) [1.48]	.351* (.172) [1.420]
Chat/discussion	-.399* (.203) [.671]	-.366 (.199) [.693]
Read Nepali newspapers	.351* (.157) [1.420]	.567*** (.156) [1.764]
Constant	4.031**	3.505*
-2Log Likelihood	797.814	
Model Chi-Square	61.598***	
Pseudo R^2	.136	
Degree of Freedom	20	
N	538	

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

SUMMARY

This chapter explains the identificational adaptation of the Nepalese to American

society. The descriptive statistics reveal that self-identification as Nepalese and closeness

to own ethnic group were very strong. It appears that the Nepalese are retaining their

ethnic identity and closeness to their own ethnic group more as opposed to identifying

with the dominant identity and closeness to dominant groups (Table 8.1).

I employed a multinomial logistic regression for both the dependent variables: "self-identification" and "feeling closer to Nepalese." Contrary to my hypotheses, the older the age of entry, self-identification leans toward Nepalese American versus Nepalese (Column 1 of Table 8.2). Nonetheless, hyphenated American does not mean a total assimilation, but a partial assimilation to American society. Among Nepalese men, identifying self as Nepalese American appears to be more resilient than women, which supports the hypothesis (Column 1 of Table 8.2). As expected, legal status contributes towards the likelihood of identifying self as Nepalese American (Column 1 of Table 8.2) and Asian American, a panethnic identity, rather than Nepalese (Column 3 of Table 8.2). Similarly, length of stay significantly contributes to identifying self as Nepalese American (Column 1 of Table 8.2) and American/other (Column 4 of Table 8.2) rather than Nepalese, indicating that the Nepalese prefer to identify with the dominant identity as they stay longer in the United States. As predicted, years of education in the United States are associated with losing closeness with the Nepalese (Column 1 of Table 8.3), signifying an American education contributes towards identificational adaptation, particularly, by not being close to own ethnic group.

Transnational predictors significantly contribute in predicting identificational adaptation. For example, travel to Nepal (Column 2 of Table 8.2), sending money (Columns 2 and 3 of Table 8.2), and reading Nepali newspapers (Column 1 of Table 8.2; Columns 1 and 2 of Table 8.2) have a significant and positive effect on the "self-identification" and feeling 'close' or "very close" to coethnics. These findings suggest

148

that the greater the degree of transnational connections the higher the retention of ethnic identity, that is, Nepalese and closeness to own ethnic group become even resilient. On the contrary, inconsistent with the hypothesis, chat/discuss appears significant for self-identification ("Nepalese American" versus "Nepalese") and feeling closer to the Nepalese ("close" versus "not close at all"), suggesting their willingness to assimilate to American society by identifying as Nepalese American, -- a hyphenated identity -- and a waning closeness to the Nepalese is prominent. Since the findings of chat/discussion in both Tables 8.2 and 8.3 show consistent results, but are contradictory to other transnational variables, I speculate that chat/discussion may not be a good predictor of identification adaptation or I may need to revise the question.

The next chapter will discuss the results of receptional adaptation.

CHAPTER IX

RECEPTIONAL ADAPTATION

This chapter presents the results of receptional adaptation. I used eight items to measure receptional adaptation (see Appendix B, questions 19-26). All of the first seven items are categorical variables (3-point scale) and the last item is a nominal variable. I employed an ordinal regression for the first seven items and a multinomial logistic regression for the last item. For mistaken identity, I dropped the "black" category as it had only 5 responses.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 9.1 shows the means, medians, and standard deviations of the dependent variable used in the analysis. Among the respondents, half of them thought that they had been treated "well" (median = 2), and had experienced ethnic discrimination "sometimes," (median = 1). Unexpectedly, half of the respondents "never" felt exclusion from their co-workers; "never" experienced discrimination in buying/renting houses or apartments, and had "never" experienced unwelcomed feeling in public places (median = 0). The Nepalese face some sort of prejudice in the United States; half of the respondents admitted that they were viewed as less competent, "sometimes," by people from other races (median = 1) and judgment based on their appearance (median = 1). Overwhelmingly, the majority of them have been mistaken as Hispanic (mode = 1).

Table 9.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Analysis, Receptional Adaptation, 2010

Variable	Mean	Median	N
Dependent Variable			
Receptional Adaptation			
Reception by the host country (3-point scale)	2.22	2.00	725
Experience of racial/ethnic dis. (3-point scale)	.63	1.00	720
Social exclusion by co-workers (3-point scale)	.27	0.00	717
Experience in housing dis. (3-point scale)	.16	0.00	719
Judgment based on appearances (3-point scale)	.81	1.00	716
Perception of less competent (3-point scale)	.61	1.00	714
Unwelcome feeling in public places (3-point scale)	.50	0.00	717
Mistaken Identity	2.1	1.00[a]	716

[a]Mode

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Reception by the Host Country

Reception by the host country measures whether the respondents feel discriminated against by the host country. Table 9.2 presents the estimates in predicting reception by the host. A higher category indicates more positive thinking toward the treatment they received in the United States (1 = "not well, 2 = "well," and 3 = "very well"). The model χ^2s of Model 2 and Model 3 are significant at the .001 level.

151

In Model 1, both age of entry and gender are insignificant and do not contribute in predicting reception by the host. Next (Model 2), as predicated, legal status and length of stay are positive and significant, all else being equal. U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely, by 275 percent, than are non-citizens/immigrants to think positively regarding reception by the host $(3.75 - 1 = 2.75)$. As expected, length of stay contributes to experiencing a positive attitude toward the host country, all else being equal (Model 2). The other predictors do not significantly impact the experience in reception by the host country.

Yet again, the effect of legal status is significant, as anticipated (Model 3). It is possible to find U.S. citizens or immigrants with a positive attitude toward the host country; perhaps because they receive many governmental benefits and facilities as compared to their non-citizen/immigrant counterparts. The demographic variables, assimilation variables, except legal status, and transnational variables are not supported in Model 3.

Following the pseudo R^2 across the models reveals that the demographic variables account 0 (zero) percent of the variation in reception by the host, 2.1 percent from assimilation variables, and 1 percent from transnational variables.

Table 9.2. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Reception by the Host Country, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	-2.181*** (.287)	-.262 (.551)	.277 (.616)
Threshold 2	1.050*** (.269)	3.388*** (.571)	3.927*** (.645)
Age of entry	.006 (.010) [1.01]	-.010 (.015) [.990]	-.004 (.017) [1.00]
Sex (Male =1)	.114 (.160) [1.12]	.296 (.172) [1.34]	.135 (.204) [1.14]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		1.323*** (.203) [3.75]	1.419*** (.226) [4.13]
Length of stay		.046*** (.017) [1.05]	.045 (.019) [1.05]
Education		.230 (.090) [1.26]	.232 (.101) [1.26]
Years of education in U. S.		.029 (.033) [1.03]	-.010 (.037) [.990]

Continued on next page

153

Table 9.2 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Travel to Nepal			.105 (.070) [1.11]
Sending money			-.062 (.060) [.943]
Chat/discussion			-.085 (072) [.990]
Reading Nepali newspaper			.051 (.058) [1.05]
-2Log Likelihood	350.217	1003.132	853.345
Model Chi-Square	.998	95.455***	93.073***
Pseudo R^2	.022	.168	.192
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	677	641	540

*$P \leq .05$ ** $P \leq .01$ *** $P \leq .001$

Experience of Racial/Ethnic Discrimination

Experiencing racial/ethnic discrimination measures prejudice that the Nepalese may have faced in the United States. Table 9.3 shows the estimated coefficients for the models. It is an ordinal variable with a higher category, indicating a higher degree of response toward experiencing ethnic discrimination (0 = "never," 1 = "sometimes," 2 =

"often/all the time"). The model χ^2s of the three models are all significant at the .001 level, indicating that these are good models

In Model 1, age is negative and significant, contrary to the hypothesis. Each year increase in the age of entry is associated with a 4 percent decrease in the likelihood of ethnic discrimination (.961-1 = -.039). Gender does not affect ethnic discrimination.

In Model 2, consistent with my hypothesis, U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to experience racial/ethnic discrimination than non-citizens/immigrants (Model 3). None of the predictors make any significant difference in the dependent variable, offering no support for the hypotheses.

In Model 3, as predicted, legal status is negative and significant, holding other variables constant. Contrary to the hypothesis, among the transnational variables, only travel to Nepal is significant and negative, all else being equal. For each additional increase in level of travel to Nepal is associated with a 13 percent decrease in experiencing ethnic discrimination (Model 3), indicating that travel to homeland reduces the Nepalese from experiencing ethnic discrimination. Perhaps their frequent visits to Nepal may allow them to compare the discrimination that they face in Nepal, which is more severe than in the United States. In addition, opportunities that the Nepalese get in the United States are so immense that they may overrule racial/ethnic discrimination when compared to the home country. There are no significant differences in age of entry, gender, length of stay, years of education, years of education, sending money,

155

chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers, thus they do not impact the

discrimination they experienced.

Demographic variables (Model 1) explain 2.4 percent of the variation in

experiencing ethnic discrimination. Adding the assimilation variable increases the

predictive power of the model by nearly 6 percent. Including transnational variables

further increases the predictive power of the model by 2.2 percent.

Table 9.3. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Experience of Racial/Ethnic
Discrimination, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

Model #	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	1	2	3
Threshold 1	1.134*** (.269)	-1.719*** (.535)	-2.225* (.600)
Threshold 2	1.983** (.294)	1.518** (.543)	1.063 (.601)
Age of entry	-.038*** (.011) [.961]	.015 (.014) [1.01]	-.028 (.017) [.971]
Sex (Male =1)	.129 (.157) [1.14]	-.047 (.166) [952]	.081 (.197) [1.08]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-1.021*** (.187) [.361]	-1.015*** (.207) [.357]

Continued on next page

Table 9.3 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Length of stay		.016 (.016) [1.02]	.025 (.019) [1.02]
Education		-.102 (.086) [.900]	-.100 (.097) [.901]
Years of education in U. S.		.021 (.032) [1.02]	.001 (.036) [1.00]
Travel to Nepal			-.136* (.067) [.870]
Sending money			.080 (.058) [1.10]
Chat/discussion			-.096 (070) [.909]
Reading Nepali newspaper			.034 (.056) [1.03]
-2Log Likelihood	343.046	1033.523	891.218
Model Chi-Square	13.408***	43.003***	46.842***
Pseudo R^2	.024	.079	.101
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	672	636	537

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

157

Social Exclusion by Co-workers

Social exclusion by co-coworkers is discrimination that the respondents encounter in the workplace. Table 9.4 predicts the likelihood of exclusion by co-workers. The explanatory power of each model is reflected by model χ^2 statistics. However, none of model χ^2 is significant, suggesting that these are not good models. Conversely, considering the significance of the predictor, Models 2 and 3 are better than Model 1, since one of the predictors in each model is significant compared to none in Model 1.

Model 1 consists of demographic variables and it is insignificant, thus rejecting my hypothesis. As predicted, in both Models 2 and 3, only legal status is significant at the .01 level, all else being equal. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to be socially excluded by their co-workers than non-citizens/immigrants, suggesting that immigrants may be socially accepted by their co-workers easier than non-immigrants. All of the predictors, except legal status, are insignificant in both Model 2 and Model 3. Thus, they fail to predict social exclusion by co-workers.

The pseudo R^2 indicates that all explanatory variables in Model 1 do not explain any variation in the likelihood of exclusion by co-workers. The assimilation variables add 1.2 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Transnational variables contribute 1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Table 9.4. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Social Exclusion by Co-workers, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	1.071***	.147	.314
	(.309)	(.599)	(.671)
Threshold 2	3.822***	2.928***	3.038***
	(.400)	(.651)	(.722)
Age of entry	.000	.013	.004
	(.012)	(.016)	(.019)
	[1.00]	[1.01]	[1.00]
Sex (Male =1)	-.032	-.057	-.026
	(.183)	(.192)	(.227)
	[.970]	[.943]	[.971]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.567**	-.531*
		(.216)	(.236)
		[.555]	[.588]
Length of stay		.016	.023
		(.019)	(.022)
		[1.02]	[1.02]
Education		-.161	-.134
		(.097)	(.109)
		[.833]	[.877]
Years of education in U. S.		-.019	-.015
		(.038)	(.043)
		[.980]	[.980]

Continued on next page

Table 9.4 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Travel to Nepal			-.065 (.075) [.910]
Sending money			.127 (.066) [1.13]
Chat/discussion			.076 (.077) [1.08]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.010 (065) [.990]
-2Log Likelihood	275.644	771.426	676.893
Model Chi-Square	.035	9.646	12.044
Pseudo R^2	.000	.021	.031
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	672	638	537

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Experience in Housing Discrimination

It is important to measure whether the Nepalese face housing discrimination. Table 9.5 presents the results of the ordinal regression predicting experience in housing discrimination. The model χ^2 s of all three models 1, 2, and 3 are significant at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively, suggesting all three are good models.

Inconsistent with the hypothesis across all three models, men are more likely to experience housing discrimination than women. I expected men are more assimilated to

160

the host society, and therefore, less likely than women to face discrimination; however, my findings indicate otherwise. One possibility could be that since Nepalese men are involved more so than Nepalese women in housing matters considering it as a bigger financial decision. Hence, Nepalese men are more likely to face housing discrimination than women. Legal status is a consistently significant predictor for predicting housing discrimination in Model 2 and Model 3, all else being equal. U.S citizens or immigrants are less likely to face housing discrimination than non-citizens/immigrants, as expected (Models 2 and 3). In Model 3, unexpectedly, each additional year of education in the United States increases the likelihood of housing discrimination, holding other variables constant. It suggests that regardless of education in the United States, Nepalese face housing discrimination, which is similar to other racial or ethnic groups, non-whites are always inassimilable. Age of entry, length of stay, highest level of education, and transnational variables do not impact predicting housing discrimination (Model 3), thus rejecting my hypotheses.

A pseudo R^2 of .017 indicates that this model accounts for about 2 percent of the variation in experiencing housing discrimination. Assimilation variables contribute about 3 percent and transnational variables add 2.2 percent of the variation in experiencing housing discrimination.

Table 9.5. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Experience in Housing Discrimination, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	1.850*** (.385)	1.581* (.749)	2.318** (.839)
Threshold 2	4.212*** (.479)	3.943*** (.806)	4.693*** (.898)
Age of entry	.012 (.015) [1.01]	.012 (.020) [1.01]	.018 (.024) [1.02]
Sex (Male =1)	.614** (.238) [1.85]	.554* (.255) [1.74]	.631* (.293) [1.88]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.640** (.271) [.526]	-.594* (.291) [.552]
Length of stay		-.019 (.027) [.980]	-.046 (.032) [1.05]
Education		-.106 (.122) [.901]	-.053 (.138) [.952]
Years of education in U. S.		.066 (.047) [1.07]	.108* (.053) [1.11]

Continued on next page

162

Table 9.5 (continued)

Model #	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	1	2	3
Travel to Nepal			.172 (.097) [1.19]
Sending money			.063 (.083) [1.07]
Chat/Discussion			.012 (096) [1.01]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.073 (.081) [.926]
-2Log Likelihood	203.113	549.224	485.439
Model Chi-Square	7.114*	17.479**	22.589**
Pseudo R^2	.017	.045	.067
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	672	636	536

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Judgment by Appearance

Judgment by appearance is an indicator to analyze whether the respondents face prejudice based on their appearance. The model χ^2 s of all three models 1, 2, and 3 are significant at the .001 level, revealing all three are good models (Table 9.6). In Model 1, only age of entry is negative and significant, contrary to my hypothesis. Gender does not affect the dependent variable. In Model 2, legal status is negative and significant, all else

163

being equal. As expected, immigrants are significantly less likely, by 54 percent, than non-immigrants to be judgment based on appearance (.459 -1 = .541).

Inconsistent with the hypothesis, age of entry is significant and negative as shown in Model 3, holding other variables constant. Each additional year in age of entry reduces the likelihood of judgment by appearance by 3 percent (Model 3). As anticipated, legal status is significantly associated with predicting prejudice based on appearance. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely face judgment by their appearance than non-citizens/immigrants. Inconsistent with the hypothesis is that for each level of increase in the level of travel to Nepal, judgment by appearance decreases by 14 percent (.855-1 = .145). This may be possible because of the prevalence of prejudice and discrimination in the home country may enable them to compare with the prejudice in the United States, thus the Nepalese consider that there is less prejudice in the host country. Contrary to the hypotheses, there are no influences of other predictors on judging the Nepalese by their appearance (Model 3).

A pseudo R^2 of .030 accounts for 3 percent of the variation in demographic variables. Adding assimilation variables increases the pseudo R^2 to .069 from .030 in Model 2, suggesting that about 4 percent of the variation in demographic variables is due to assimilation variables. Adding transnational variables increases the predictive power of the model by another 3 percent.

Table 9.6. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Judgment by Appearances, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	-1.771*** (.274)	-2.161*** (.527)	-2.948*** (.598)
Threshold 2	.904*** (.269)	.621 (.519)	-.062 (.581)
Age of entry	-.044*** (.011) [.961]	-.020 (.014) [.980]	-.033* (.016) [1.03]
Sex (Male =1)	.099 (.155) [1.10]	-.012 (.163) [.990]	.053 (.194) [1.05]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.780*** (.184) [.459]	-.816*** (.204) [.442]
Length of stay		-.001 (.016) [1.00]	.004 (.018) [1.00]
Education		-.097 (.085) [.910]	-.069 (.095) [.934]
Years of education in U. S.		.051 (.031) [1.05]	.017 (.036) [1.02]

Table 9.6 (continued)

Model #	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	1	2	3
Travel to Nepal			-.155* (.066) [.855]
Sending money			.033 (.057) [1.03]
Chat/discussion			-.105 (.068) [.901]
Reading Nepali newspaper			-.019 (.055) [.980]
-2Log Likelihood	372.905	1148.315	976.464
Model Chi-Square	17.345***	38.420***	46.743***
Pseudo R^2	.030	.069	.098
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	668	633	534

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Perception of Less Competence

This is another indicator to predict prejudice. Table 9.7 indicates that model χ^2 is significant only in Model 2, demonstrating this model is a good model. In Model 1, none of the demographic variables are significant and do not contribute in experiencing the perception of being less competent by other races than the respondents deserve to be treated. As predicted, legal status appears to be significant and negative in Model 2, a

166

consistent pattern in Model 3. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to experience the perception of less competence by other races than non-citizens/immigrants (Models 2 and 3). None of the remaining variables has a significant effect on experiencing the perception of less competence by other races (Model 3).

A pseudo R^2 reveals that there is no variation in experiencing the perception of being less competent by other races than the respondents deserved to be treated (Model 1). The assimilation variables add 2.3 percent of the variation in the dependent variable on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 =.000). Likewise, transnational variables contributes less than 1 percent on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 =.023) in the dependent variable.

Table 9.7. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Perception of Less Competence, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	-.186 (.258)	-.899 (.518)	-1.204* (.579)
Threshold 2	2.647** (.291)	1.990*** (.530)	1.804** (.591)
Age of entry	.000 (.010) [1.00]	.007 (.014) [1.01]	-.001 (.016) [.820]
Sex (Male =1)	.021 (.154) [1.02]	-.065 (.162) [.934]	-.200 (.192) [1.22]

Continued on next page

Table 9.7 (continued)

| | B (SE) [Odds Ratio] | | |
Model #	1	2	3
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.470** (.181) [.625]	-.507** (.200) [.588]
Length of stay		.005 (.016) [1.01]	.019 (.018) [1.02]
Education		-.073 (.084) [.926]	-.068 (.094) [.909]
Years of education in U. S.		-.038 (.032) [.961]	-.058 (.036) [.943]
Travel to Nepal			-.061 (.066) [.910]
Sending money			.049 (.056) [1.05]
Chat/discussion			.009 (.068) [1.01]
Reading Nepali newspaper			.011 (055) [1.01]
-2Log Likelihood	360.007	1092.859	933.001
Model Chi-Square	.019	12.133*	13.355
Pseudo R^2	.000	.023	.030
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	669	634	533

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Unwelcome Feeling in Public Places

Experiencing unwelcome feeling in public places is the indictor to predict prejudice face by the respondents. The model χ^2s of the three models is significant, signifying these models are good. In Model 1, contrary to the hypothesis, age of entry is negative and significant (Table 9.8). Each year of increase in age of entry significantly reduces the likelihood of unwelcomed feeling in public places by 4 percent (.961 -1 = .039). As I mentioned earlier, the Nepalese may not see the prejudice in the United Sates as compared with the prejudice they face in Nepal, especially if someone belongs to the lower castes. Gender is insignificant and does not influence experiencing unwelcome feeling in public places.

As predicted, only legal status appears negative and significant in Model 2, holding other variables constant. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to experience unwelcome feeling in public places than non-citizens/immigrants by 48 percent (.518 – 1 = .482). The remaining variables are insignificant and do not contribute to experiencing unwelcome feeling in public places. In Model 3, consistent with the hypothesis, age of entry is negative and significant. Again, as anticipated, legal status is negative and significant, holding other variables constant (Model 3). Immigrants are less likely to experience unwelcome feeling in public places than non-immigrants, suggesting their legal status may reduce the prejudice they face more so than non-immigrants.

A pseudo R^2 shows about 2 percent of the variation in Model 1 is due to the demographic variable. The assimilation variables add about 3 percent of the variation in

169

the dependent variable on top of Model 1 (Pseudo R^2 =.017). Likewise, transnational

variables contribute about 2 percent on top of Model 2 (Pseudo R^2 =.045) in the

dependent variable.

Table 9.8. Ordinal Regression Estimates Predicting Unwelcome Feeling in Public Places, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Threshold 1	-.703** (.270)	-1.145* (.532)	-1.375* (.596)
Threshold 2	2.457*** (.321)	2.015*** (.555)	1.916** (.620)
Age of entry	-.036*** (.011) [.961]	-.026 (.015) [.971]	-.036* (.017) [.961]
Sex (Male =1)	.107 (.159) [1.11]	-.047 (.166) [.952]	-.132 (.197) [.877]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)		-.656*** (.185) [.518]	-.628** (.204) [.813]
Length of stay		-.009 (.016) [1.00]	.002 (.019) [1.00]
Education		-.038 (.087) [.961]	.003 (.098) [1.00]

Continued table on next page

Table 9.8 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
Model #	1	2	3
Years of education in U. S.		.002 (.032) [1.00]	-.019 (.037) [.980]
Travel to Nepal			-.115 (.058) [.893]
Sending money			.077 (.058) [1.12]
Chat/discussion			-.063 (.070) [.910]
Reading Nepali newspaper			.042 (.056) [1.04]
-2Log Likelihood	314.522	1001.546	858.404
Model Chi-Square	12.061**	25.032***	27.587**
Pseudo R^2	.017	.045	.062
Degree of Freedom	2	6	10
N	669	634	533

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

Mistaken Identity

Mistaken identity is an indicator to measure prejudice toward Nepalese. A multinomial regression model to predict the likelihood of mistaken identity is shown in Table 9.9. The dependent variable has four categories and "never" is the reference category. Column 1 demonstrates the likelihood that respondents are mistaken as Hispanic versus "never." Column 2 predicts the probability of mistaken identity as other Asian versus "never". Finally, Column 3 reveals the likelihood of mistaken identity as "other" versus "never."

Combined, model χ^2 is significant at the .001 level ($\chi^2 = 75.516$). The percentage value of pseudo R^2 shows that all explanatory variables included in this model explain about 15 percent of the variation in the likelihood of predicting mistaken identity. In Column 1, only legal status and length of stay are significant at the .01 level. Consistent with my hypothesis, U.S citizens or immigrants are less likely to be mistaken as Hispanic versus "never" than non-citizens/immigrants. Contrary to my hypothesis, for each level increase in the length of stay in the United States, the likelihood of mistaken as Hispanic versus "never" increases by 16 percent, suggesting that regardless of length of stay, immigrants, especially non-whites, are inassimilable, including Nepalese.

Column 2 shows respondents' likelihood to be mistaken as: other Asian versus "never." However, gender is significant which is inconsistent with the hypothesis. I anticipated that Nepalese men are more likely to assimilate to the host society and less likely to be mistaken as another race/ethnic group than women, but my findings indicate

otherwise. Men are 67 percent more likely to be mistaken as other Asian versus "never" than women. It is possible that Nepalese men may come in contact with other racial/ethnic groups more so than women, thus they face a higher degree of mistaken identity than women. Length of stay does not improve mistaken identity; they are mistaken as other Asian versus "Never" (Column 2) and "other" versus "never" (Column 2).

Table 9.9. Multinomial Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting Mistaken Identity, Nepali Adults, United States, 2010

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	Hispanic Vs. Never	Other Asian Vs. Never	Other Vs. Never
Age of entry	-.033 (.027) [.968]	.010 (.031) [1.010]	-.023 (.035) [.977]
Sex (Male =1)	-.208 (.382) [.812]	1.123** (.444) [.325]	-.140 (.473) [.869]
Legal status (U.S. Cit/immigrant= 1)	-1.067** (.372) [.344]	-.617 (.443) [.540]	-.866 (.473) [.421]
Length of stay	.146** (.050) [1.158]	.158** (.054) [1.171]	.203*** (.055) [1.225]
Education	-.161 (.183) [.851]	-.216 (.208) [.805]	-.084 (.230) [.920]

Continued on next page

173

Table 9.9 (continued)

	B (SE) [Odds Ratio]		
	Hispanic Vs. Never	Other Asian Vs. Never	Other Vs. Never
Years of education in U. S.	.032 (.082) [1.033]	.049 (.090) [1.051]	-.027 (.095) [.973]
Travel to Nepal	-.048 (.123) [.953]	.058 (.147) [1.059]	-.079 (.155) [.924]
Sending money	-.035 (.107) [.966}	-.029 (.124) [.972]	-.015 (.133) [.985]
Chat/discussion	-.190 (.111) [.827]	.148 (.133) [1.160]	-.098 (.145) [.907]
Reading Nepali newspaper	-.084 (.117) [.920]	-.168 (.133) [.845]	-.067 (.142) [.936]
Constant	4.061***	1.654	1.065
-2Log Likelihood		1027.570	
Model Chi-Square		75.516***	
Pseudo R²		.151	
Degree of Freedom		30	
N		532	

*P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001

SUMMARY

I attempted to analyze receptional adaptation that focused on discrimination and prejudice. Under discrimination, I found that half of the respondents admitted that they had been treated well in the host country (Table 9.1), had been discriminated "sometimes," had 'never" been socially excluded by co-workers, and "never" experienced discrimination when buying houses. Half of the respondents admitted that "sometimes' they had faced prejudices, such as judgment based on appearance and viewing them as less competent by other races. Half of the respondents expressed that they had "never" experienced unwelcome feeling in public places. It appears that being mistaken as Hispanic is very common among Nepalese.

Unexpectedly, the older the age of entry, the Nepalese experienced less discrimination based on their race/ethnicity (Model 1 of Table 9.3), faced judgment less on their appearance (Models 1 and 3 of Table 9.6), and had experienced less unwelcome feeling in public places. This is possible because the current socio-political situation in Nepal is in peril. Nepalese people are in search of a better life and opportunities, which they are getting in the United States. Conversely, it is possible that the Nepalese perceive the United States as a less discriminating country with better opportunities when compared with their own country.

I hypothesized that men are more likely to have receptional adaptation; however, in the case of housing, Nepalese men are more likely to face discrimination than women (Models 1, 2, and 3 of Table 9.5). It is possible, considering Nepali culture, that men are

175

more likely to be involved when a large monetary transaction is involved. Also, Nepalese men are more likely than women to be mistaken as "other Asian" versus "never" (Column 2 of Table 9.9). Again, the possible reason could be men come into contact with other races more so than women.

It is worth noting that legal status contributes to mitigating discrimination and prejudice in all items that I measured. This supports my hypothesis that U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to experience receptional adaptation in the United Sates than non-citizens/immigrants. U.S. citizens or immigrants considered that the host country has treated them more positively than non-citizens/immigrants (Model 2 and 3 of Table 9.2). Likewise, they are less likely to experience discrimination based on race/ethnicity (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.3), less likely to be socially excluded by co-workers (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.4), less likely to face housing discrimination (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.5), less likely to face judgment based on appearance (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.6), less likely to experience perception of less competence by other races (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.7), less likely to experience unwelcomed feeling in public places (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.8). Interestingly, United States citizens or immigrants are less likely to mistaken as Hispanic versus "never" than non-citizens/immigrants (Column 1 of Table 9.9).

Longer U.S. residency is positively associated with having a positive attitude toward the host country (Model 2 of Table 5.2), suggesting the United States government's positive treatment to the Nepalese significantly contribute in assimilation

176

to the host country. Unfortunately, despite the length of stay, the Nepalese are mistaken as either Hispanics or others rather versus never (Columns 1 and 3 of Table 9.9), suggesting that regardless of how long someone stays in the U.S they cannot assimilate to the United States as they are always considered as a "perpetual foreigner." Similarly, contrary to the hypothesis, years of education is negatively associated with housing discrimination (Model 3 of Table 9.5). Unlike the hypothesis, the level of discrimination experienced by the respondents is predicted to decrease for each additional level of travel to the homeland (Model 3 of Table 9.3). Perhaps their frequent visits to Nepal allow them to compare Nepal and the United States in terms of the castes discrimination and the lack of opportunities that they face in Nepal.

The next concluding chapter discusses a more detailed summary of the findings of cultural, structural, marital, receptional adaptation, and identification experiences of Nepalese in the United States, their implications, and future research.

CHAPTER X

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study is guided by the following specific research questions: 1. "How do

Nepalese in the United States adapt culturally, structurally, maritally, identificationally,

and receptionally to American life?" 2. "What factors influence the cultural, structural,

marital, identificational, and receptional adaptation of Nepalese in the United States?"

3. "Which factors play a more important role in the adaptation of Nepalese in the

United States?" This chapter summarizes the major findings, discusses the theoretical

and practical implications of the findings, highlights the contributions and limitations of

the study, and points to directions for future research.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The summary in this section is organized in terms of the three research questions

of this study: status of Nepalese adaptation; determinants of Nepalese adaptation; and

relative importance of Nepalese adaptation determinants.

Status of Nepalese Adaptation

Cultural adaptation. Among the respondents, the majority of Nepalese celebrated

both Hindu (95 percent) and American holidays (92 percent). Half of them attended

Hindu religious services and Nepali functions several times a year, and cooked Nepali

food more than once a week. Nepali is the dominant language spoken at home and with

178

children. According to the respondents, their proficiency of spoken English is "very good."

Structural adaptation. It appears that, among the respondents, only 8 percent were hesitant to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. As I assumed, most of them had a friendship (best or close friends) with fellow Nepalese, and slightly over two thirds of the respondents socialized with Nepalese, followed by whites, and other Asians. The respondents also revealed that they socialized with blacks and Hispanics (19 percent). Contrary to my expectations, it appears that Nepalese are more likely to interact with whites in the workplace. For example, three fourths of the Nepalese interacted with whites at their workplace, followed by slightly less than half with other Asians. Interestingly, they not only interacted with blacks and Hispanics, slightly less than one third at their workplace, but they also lived in black and Hispanic neighborhoods. Massey (1985) states that foreign born people tend to live in neighborhoods that are predominately comprised of residents from the same country of origin. I assumed that the Nepalese live in predominantly Nepalese neighborhoods; however, the findings showed that three fourths of the respondents lived in predominantly whites neighborhoods and one fourth lived in other Asian neighborhoods. Asians are more likely to live in white rather than Hispanic or black neighborhoods (Yang 2011). Inconsistent with my hypothesis, less than one sixth of the respondents lived in Nepalese neighborhoods. More than half of the respondents were members in Nepalese organizations. Interestingly, less

than one sixth of the respondents were members of American organizations and Asian organizations in the United States.

Marital adaptation. In reference to the" inassimilable" condition of certain racial groups, some scholars have considered interracial marriage as one of the fundamental approaches to assimilate minority groups into U.S. society. Inter-group marriage reduces social distance (Lee and Yamanaka 1990; Lee and Fernandez 1998), and simultaneously reinforces the assimilation of racial minority groups into U.S. society (Lee and Yamanaka 1990). Interracial marriage blurs the boundaries of minority groups and the dominant groups as it is the final stage of acculturation and assimilation (Gordon 1964). Among the respondents, the majority have Nepalese spouses. Again, their preference of marriage would be Nepali, if given a choice. More than half of the respondents agreed that they would allow their children to marry non-Nepalese. Not surprisingly, the respondents prefer to marry people from their own ethnic group even if they were given a choice. Unexpectedly, almost half of them would allow their children to marry non-Nepalese.

Identification adaptation. The descriptive statistics reveal that slightly less than three fourths of the respondents identified as Nepalese and little over one sixth of the respondents identified as Nepalese American. As I expected, slightly less than two thirds of the respondents felt very close and one third felt close to fellow Nepalese. It is obvious that the Nepalese not only identify as Nepalese, but also feel closeness to their own ethnic group. It suggests that they are maintaining their identity more so than associating with the host society

Receptional adaptation. Receptional adaptation occurs when there is an absence of prejudice and discrimination. I assumed that the Nepalese might face less discrimination and prejudice than other racial groups. Among the respondents, half reported that they had been treated well in the host country and had been discriminated against only "sometimes." An interesting aspect of the issue of race is that half of the respondents had "never" felt social exclusion by co-workers, "never" experienced discrimination when buying houses, and "never" experienced unwelcomed feeling in public places. However, half of the respondents expressed that they had faced judgment by appearance and had been viewed as less competent by other races, "sometimes." Overwhelmingly, the Nepalese are mistaken as Hispanics. In the United States, distinction is based on palpable characteristics, such as skin color and/or a thick accent..

I used the same independent variables for each of my dependent variables. Independent variables revealed that the respondents came to the United States at the age of 24.3 years, on average. Among the respondents, 59 percent were male and 41 percent were female. More than half were United States citizens or immigrants. The Nepalese lived in the United States, on average, for approximately nine years. The highest level of education attained by the Nepalese revealed that half of the respondents had a bachelor's degree and they averaged 4 years of education in the United States. Among transnational variables, every two years, half of the respondents had visited the homeland and had sent remittances. Half of the respondents, never chatted/discussed online. Additionally, half read Nepali newspapers at once a week.

Receptional adaptation. Receptional adaptation occurs when there is an absence of prejudice and discrimination. I assumed that the Nepalese might face less discrimination and prejudice than other racial groups. Among the respondents, half reported that they had been treated well in the host country and had been discriminated against only "sometimes." An interesting aspect of the issue of race is that half of the respondents had "never" felt social exclusion by co-workers, "never" experienced discrimination when buying houses, and "never" experienced unwelcomed feeling in public places. However, half of the respondents expressed that they had faced judgment by appearance and had been viewed as less competent by other races, "sometimes." Overwhelmingly, the Nepalese are mistaken as Hispanics. In the United States, distinction is based on palpable characteristics, such as skin color and/or a thick accent..

I used the same independent variables for each of my dependent variables. Independent variables revealed that the respondents came to the United States at the age of 24.3 years, on average. Among the respondents, 59 percent were male and 41 percent were female. More than half were United States citizens or immigrants. The Nepalese lived in the United States, on average, for approximately nine years. The highest level of education attained by the Nepalese revealed that half of the respondents had a bachelor's degree and they averaged 4 years of education in the United States. Among transnational variables, every two years, half of the respondents had visited the homeland and had sent remittances. Half of the respondents, never chatted/discussed online. Additionally, half read Nepali newspapers at once a week.

Determinants of Nepalese Adaptation

Cultural adaptation. As hypothesized, age of entry is significant as it pertains to celebrating Hindu festivals, attending Hindu religious services, and attending Nepali functions. Inconsistent with my hypothesis, age of entry does not impact celebrating American holidays, cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home and with children, and English speaking ability.

As anticipated, Nepalese women preserve Nepali culture by attending Hindu religious services and cooking Nepali food more so than men. Gender is insignificant in predicting attending Hindu festivals, Nepali functions, celebrating American holidays, spoken language at home and with children, and English speaking ability.

Consistent with my hypothesis, legal status has a significant effect on celebrating American holidays (Model 3 of Table 9.3). Interestingly, U.S. citizens or immigrants attend Nepali functions more often than non-citizens/immigrants. This finding indicates that U.S. citizens or immigrants are making an effort to participate in American culture, while at the same time remaining active participants in ethnic functions, consistent with the theory of cultural pluralism. Incongruent with my hypotheses, legal status does not contribute to attending Hindu festivals, Hindu religious services, cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home and with children, and English speaking ability.

I hypothesized that the length of stay enables the Nepalese to culturally assimilate to the American culture. The length of stay is associated with the preference of

speaking the English language over Nepali, as expected. As their residency in the U.S. increases, Nepalese are less likely to speak "Nepali" or "both Nepali & English" at home (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 9.7) and with children, as compared to "English" (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 9.8). The finding consistently shows that as the length of residence extends, the frequency of using English also increases (Kim and Hurh 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Inconsistent with my hypotheses, length of stay does not have an influence on attending Hindu festivals, celebrating American holidays, attending Hindu religious services, cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home and with children (other over English), and English speaking ability.

As expected, the level of education is negatively associated with attending Hindu religious services (Table 9.4) and Nepali functions (Table 9.5). This finding suggests that as the level of education increases, the Nepalese are less likely to attend Hindu religious services and Nepali functions. Similarly, the level of education improves English speaking ability to "well" or "very well" (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 9.9), as hypothesized. Education does not significantly impact celebrating Hindu religious services, celebrating American holidays, cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home, spoken language with children, and English speaking ability ("English only" versus "not well"), thereby providing no supporting evidence to my hypotheses.

In addition, education in the United States significantly strengthens proficiency in English ("well", "very well", or "English only"). Other predictors do not impact English speaking ability.

183

Transnational connections help the retention of ethnic culture and delay the process of assimilation to the host culture. The level of travel to Nepal and reading Nepali newspapers are associated with attending Hindu religious services (Table 9.4). Similarly, the level of reading Nepali newspapers is positively associated with attending Nepali functions (Table 9.5) and cooking Nepali food (Table 9.6). These findings suggest that the Nepalese conceivably retain their culture by attending Hindu religious services and Nepali functions, and cooking Nepali food as their level of transnational connections increases. Furthermore, the findings indicate that reading Nepali newspapers not only encourages speaking "Nepali" or "both Nepali & English" at home (Table 9.7) and "Nepali" with children (Table 9.8), but also weakens English speaking ability ("English only" vs. "not well"), indicating the retention of their ethnic language. None of the transnational variables predict attending Hindu religious services and celebrating American holidays. Reading Nepali newspapers does not impact spoken language at home ("other" versus "English") and English speaking ability ("well" versus "not well" and "very well" versus "not well"). Likewise, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not predict attending Hindu religious services. Note that variables, such as travel to Nepal and sending money, do not impact attending Nepali functions. Similarly, travel to Nepal, sending money, and chat/discussion fail to influence cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home ("Nepali" versus "English" and "Both Nepali & English" versus "English"), and spoken language with children ("Nepali" versus "English"), as anticipated.

184

Structural adaptation. As I hypothesized, the older the age of entry, the less likely the Nepalese are to socialize with whites (Model 2 of Table 6.4). Men are more likely to live in predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods than women (Model 5 Model 6.6). Inconsistent with the hypothesis, men are more likely to obtain a membership in Nepalese organizations than women (Model 2 of Table 6.7).

Demographic variables do not impact interaction with other racial/ethnic groups, friendship, socialization, except for whites, interaction in the workplace, living in predominantly other neighborhoods except Hispanic, membership in Nepali organizations, except gender, membership in Asian organizations, and American organizations.

As anticipated, citizens/immigrants live in predominantly other Asian neighborhoods more than non-citizens or immigrants, suggesting immigrants may assimilate to American society by choosing to live in communities where they feel closer, in this case, with other Asians. Both foreign- and US-born Asians have a significantly higher degree of residential assimilation than Hispanics and blacks (Yang 2011). However, again, living in other Asian neighborhoods does not mean they are structurally assimilated to the host country. Legal status does not contribute to the hesitancy to interact with other/racial groups, friendship, socializing, working, neighborhood choice except other Asian, and memberships in all three organizations.

Interestingly, length of stay is associated with friendship (Column 1 of Table 6.3) and socialization (Model 2 of Table 6.4) with whites. My findings are consistent with a

study conducted by Kim and Hurh (1993). According to them, "While the great majority of the respondents have Korean friends regardless of the length of residence, the proportion of those who have American friends substantially increases, as the length of residence in the United States increases" (Kim and Hurh 1993:703). The length of stay increases the likelihood that the Nepalese live in predominantly "white" neighborhoods (Model 2 of Table 6.6). This result coincides with Iceland and Scopilliti's (2008: 91) findings that "immigrants who have been in the United States for longer periods are generally less segregated than new arrivals...[and the] difference can be attributed to the characteristics of these immigrants." Conversely, the length of stay decreases the probability of living in predominantly Nepalese (Model 1 of Table 6.6) and Hispanic neighborhoods. It appears that the length of stay enables the Nepalese to assimilate to American society by having friendship (close or best friends) with whites, socializing with whites, and living in white neighborhoods. However, the length of stay is positively associated with membership in Nepalese organizations in the United States. Length of stay does not impact the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups, and friendship and socialization with other racial/ethnic groups, except for with whites. It also is insignificant in predicting interaction in residential neighborhoods with blacks and other and attaining membership in Asian and American organizations.

The level of education decreases the likelihood of mostly working with Hispanic (Model 3 Table 6.5) and living in predominantly Nepalese neighborhoods (Model 1 of Table 6.6), suggesting that the Nepalese seemingly prefer to work and live with other

186

racial groups rather than Hispanic and Nepalese, respectively. It is possible that with a higher level of education, the Nepalese may gain entrance into white neighborhoods; an example of spatial assimilation or residential integration. "[S]patial assimilation occurs as Hispanics of high socio-economic status enter predominantly Anglo areas" (Massey and Mullah 1984:868). The higher the level of educational attainment, the more likely the Nepalese are to live in white neighborhoods. The level of education is insignificant in predicting the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups (Model 3), friendship and socialization, except for whites. The level of education does not impact interaction in the workplace with blacks, other Asians, and others. Additionally, the level of education does not influence interaction in neighborhoods with whites, blacks, Hispanics, other Asians and other or membership in any organizations.

Similarly, as predicted, education in the United States is positively associated with working mostly with whites (Model 1 of Table 6.5) and taking membership in American organizations (Model 2 of Table 6.9). Conversely, education in the United States decreases the likelihood of socializing with fellow Nepalese (Model 1 of Table 6.4), suggesting that education in the United States may enable the Nepalese to join the social cliques of the dominant group, which is white. Years of education also increases the likelihood of living in other Asian neighborhoods (Model 3 of Table 6.6) and increases the likelihood of socializing with other Asians (Model 3 of Table 6.4). It appears that the Nepalese are more likely to structurally assimilate to the host society by working mainly with whites and being a member of an American organization, and are

less likely to socialize or live with fellow Nepalese. Education in the United States does not predict the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups, friendship, interaction in residential neighborhoods, membership in Nepalese organizations, and membership in Asian organizations. In addition, education does not affect socialization ("white," "black," "Hispanic," and "other") and interaction in workplace ("black," "Hispanic," "other Asian," and "other").

Contrary to my hypothesis, travel to Nepal lessens the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. Consistently, the Nepalese are less likely to have friendships with blacks or Hispanics with an increase in level of travel to the home country. To my surprise and contrary to my hypothesis, each additional level of travel to Nepal increases the likelihood of working mostly with whites (Model 1 of Table 6.5) and living in predominantly white neighborhoods (Model 2 of Table 6.6). Conversely, as the level of travel homeland increases, the Nepalese are less likely to live in black neighborhoods. Nevertheless, living in a black neighborhood does not mean assimilation to American society or vice versa. According to Iceland and Scopilliti (2008), "Levels of segregation from non-Hispanic whites are much higher for black immigrants than Asian and Hispanic immigrants" (p. 91). As anticipated, for each level of increase in reading Nepali newspapers, the likelihood of having friendships with blacks/Hispanics or other Asians decreases (Columns 2 and 3 of Table 6.3). Reading Nepali newspapers also increases the likelihood of socializing with fellow Nepalese (Model 1 Table 6.4), suggesting reading Nepali newspapers may encourage a connection to the homeland. It is interesting to note

188

how reading and travel to homeland enable the Nepalese to interact with whites in their workplace and live in white neighborhoods. None of the transnational variables has an impact on membership in all three organizations (Nepali, American, and Asian). Travel to Nepal is not significant in predicting friendships ("white" versus "Nepalese" and "other Asian" versus "Nepalese"), socialization, interaction in the workplace ("blacks," "Hispanics," "other Asians," and "other"), and interaction in residential neighborhoods ("Nepalese," "Hispanic," "other Asian," and "other"). Likewise, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers does not have a significant effect on the hesitancy to interact with other racial/ethnic groups, interaction in the workplace, and interaction in residential neighborhoods. Sending money does not impact friendship and socialization. Chat/discussion does not affect predicting friendship ("white" versus "Nepalese," "other Asians" versus "Nepalese"). However, consistent with the hypothesis, chat/discussion is positively associated with having friendships with blacks/Hispanics (Column 2 of Table 6.3). Nonetheless, since blacks/Hispanics are also minority groups, the Nepalese cannot assimilate to the white host society by having friendships with blacks/Hispanics. Alba and Nee (1997) rightly point out, "Individuals may be structurally assimilated, but prejudice and discrimination can still be widespread," (p. 830).

Marital adaptation. As anticipated, as the age of entry increases, the Nepalese are less likely to have a non-Nepalese spouse (Models 1 and 2 of Table 7.2) and they are less willing to marry blacks/Hispanics (Column 2 of Table 7.3), if they were given a choice. Furthermore, the age of entry contributes to being "unsure" to almost "no" in terms of

189

allowing their children to marry non-Nepalese (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 7.4). Yang states that Asian "Parents often expect their children to choose a spouse from their own ethnic group and in some cases follow the tradition of arrange[d] marriage" (p. 204). The age of entry does not contribute to predicting a non-Nepalese spouse (Model 3 of Table 7.2) or hypothetical choice of marriage ("white" vs. "Nepalese," "other Asian" vs. "Nepalese," and "other" vs. "Nepalese").

Contrary to the practice of other Asian groups that women are much more likely to intermarry than men (Lee and Yamanaka 1990; Liang and Ito 1999; Song 2009), Nepalese men are more likely to marry blacks/Hispanics than women (Column 2 of Table 7.3), if given a choice. According to some studies, Asian Indian men are more likely to out marry than their female counterparts. This finding indicates that there is some degree of marital assimilation which may exist amongst Nepalese men, as I predicted. As one study indicates, native-born Asian American women are more likely to have husbands from different ethnic groups or tend to perform out-marriages (Lee and Yamanaka 1990). Nonetheless, in the case of the Nepalese, men are willing to out-marry more so than women. Lee and Yamanaka (1990) state that, "intermarriage is a positive development" and an important index of assimilation (Pp. 301-302). Gender does not contribute to predicting a non-Nepalese spouse (Models 1 and 2 of Table 7.2), choice of marriage ("whites" vs. "Nepalese," "other Asians" vs. "Nepalese," and "other" vs. "Nepalese"), and allowing children to marry non-Nepalese ("unsure" vs. "no" and "yes" vs. "no").

190

Interestingly, legal status does not contribute to interracial marriage. Immigrants are less likely to marry blacks/Hispanics even if they had to hypothetically marry. Legal status is insignificant in predicting a non-Nepalese spouse, a hypothetical choice of marriage ("white" vs. "Nepalese," "other Asian" vs. "Nepalese," and "other" vs. "Nepalese"), and granting permission for their children to out marry, inconsistent with my hypotheses.

As hypothesized, length of stay increases the likelihood of marrying non-Nepalese versus fellow Nepalese. Length of stay does not have an impact on choice of marriage and permission for children to marry non-Nepalese.

Highest level of education is associated with allowing children to marry non-Nepalese. On the other hand, it does not have an impact on having a non-Nepalese spouse and hypothetical marriage.

Education enables immigrants to assimilate to the host society in many ways. In this case, education in the United States is positively associated with a hypothetical choice of marriage ("other" versus "Nepalese"). People with a higher education are more likely to intermarry than those without education (Liang and Ito1999; Spickard 1989). Education has a positive relationship with interracial dating with whites (Ellison and Powers 1994; Powers and Ellison 1995). Remarkably, among the respondents, education contributes to granting permission for children to marry non-Nepalese (Column 2 of Table 7.4). Education in the United States is insignificant in predicating a non-Nepalese

spouse, hypothetical marriage ("white" vs. "Nepalese," "black" vs. Nepalese, and "other Asian" vs. "Nepalese"), and allowing children to marry non-Nepalese.

Reading Nepali newspapers is negatively associated with marital assimilation; it lessens the possibility of marrying a non-Nepalese spouse, as well as the choice of marrying whites and "other" over Nepalese (Table 7.3). Similarly, chat/discussion further hinders allowing children to marry non-Nepalese from "unsure" or "yes" to "no" (Column 1 of Table 7.4 and Column 2 of Table 7.4). Among the transnational variables, travel to Nepal and sending money do not impact predicting a non-Nepalese spouse, hypothetical marriage, and granting permission to their children to marry non-Nepalese. Chat/discussion is insignificant in predicting a non-Nepalese spouse and hypothetical marriage.

It is obvious that the Nepalese still primarily consider marrying fellow Nepalese, but have become a little more malleable regarding interracial marriage as it pertains to their children. The rate of interracial marriage increases as it moves on to the next generation (Spickard 1989). For example, out-marriage in European marriages has risen from 20 percent in the first generation to 50 percent by the third generation (Spickard 1989).

Identification adaptation. Contrary to my hypotheses, the older the age of entry, the more likely self-identification leans toward Nepalese American as opposed to maintaining a Nepalese identity (Column 1 of Table 8.2). Nonetheless, hyphenated American does not mean a total assimilation, but a partial assimilation to American

192

society. Self-identification is a matter of personal choice, not the choice of the host country. The age of entry does not predict self-identification in the case of identifying as Asians, Asian American, American/other versus Nepalese and feeling closer to fellow Nepalese ("close" vs. "not close at all" and "very close" vs. "not close at all").

Similarly, among Nepalese men, identifying oneself as "Nepalese American" appears to be more resilient than women, as hypothesized. This supports the hypothesis that men are more likely to assimilate to the host country (Column 1 of Table 8.2). Women are more likely than men to retain their ethnic identity (Ullah 1985). Legal status does not impact self-identification ("Asians" versus "Nepalese" and "American/other" versus "Nepalese") and feeling closer to Nepalese ("close" vs. "not close at all" and "very close" vs. "not close at all"), offering no support to my hypotheses.

As expected, legal status contributes to the likelihood of identifying oneself as Nepalese American (Column 1 of Table 8.2) and Asian American, a panethnic identity, rather than Nepalese (Column 3 of Table 8.2). In addition, length of stay significantly contributes to identifying oneself as Nepalese American (Column 1 of Table 8.2) and American/other (Column 4 of Table 8.2) rather than "Nepalese," indicating that the Nepalese prefer to identify with the dominant group as they stay longer in the United States. Length of stay is insignificant when predicting self-identification ("Asian" vs. 'Nepalese" and "American/other" versus "Nepalese" and feeling close to one's own ethnic group ("close" vs. "not close at all" and "very close" vs. "not close at all").

As predicted, education in the United States is associated with losing closeness with fellow Nepalese (Column 1 of Table 8.3), signifying that an American education contributes to identificational adaptation, principally, by not being as close to their own ethnic group. The highest level of education does not affect self-identification and closeness to one's own ethnic group. Similarly, education in the United States does not contribute to predicting self-identification and closeness to one's own ethnic group ("very close' vs. "not close at all").

The transnational predictors significantly contribute to identificational adaptation. For example, consistent with my hypothesis, travel to homeland increases the closeness to fellow Nepalese, and sending remittance also increases the feeling of closeness to one's own ethnic groups, Inconsistent with the hypothesis, chat/discussion appears to be a significant predictor of self-identification ("Nepalese American" versus "Nepalese") and feeling closer to fellow Nepalese ("close" versus "not close at all"), suggesting their willingness to assimilate to American society by identifying as Nepalese American, -- a hyphenated identity -- and a waning closeness to other Nepalese is prevalent. Since the findings of chat/discussion (in both Tables 8.2 and 8.3) show consistent results, but are contradictory to other transnational variables, I speculate that chat/discussion may not be a good predictor of identification adaptation or I may need to revise the question. On the other hand, reading Nepali newspapers decreases the likelihood of identifying the self as Nepalese American and closeness to one's own ethnic group, suggesting that reading Nepali newspapers helps to retain self-identification as Nepalese and closeness to one's

194

own ethnic group. Travel to Nepal does not impact any of the columns in self-identification and closeness to other Nepalese except "very close" versus "not close at all." Sending money is not significant in predicting self-identification (all the columns). Reading Nepali newspapers is not significant in predicting self-identification (Columns (Column 2, 3, and 4 of Table 8.2).

The Nepalese are more likely to identify as Nepalese American when they enter at an older age, they are male, have legal status, and stay longer. Relying on Yang's (2000) integrated approach, I argue that the Nepalese may want to create a new identity as Nepalese American based on social conditions and/or based on cost and benefit analysis in order to maximize their gains and minimize their losses. In other words, they become "selective" when it comes to identificational adaptation. The findings indicate that identificational adaptation of the Nepalese run counter to the classical assimilation theory and coincide with cultural pluralism and selective assimilation. Moreover, for whites, ethnicity is a personal choice (Waters 1990), but for Asians, "ethnicity is not an option but an everyday reality" regardless of even the third or later generations or the place of birth: foreign-born or US-born (Yang 2011:214).

Receptional adaptation. Unexpectedly, as the age of entry increases, the Nepalese had experienced less discrimination based on their race/ethnicity (Model 1 of Table 9.3), had faced judgment by their appearance (Models 1 and 3 of Table 9.6), and had experienced less unwelcome feeling in public places. This is possible because, like other immigrants, one of the reasons for the Nepalese migrating to the United States is for

195

a better future. Hence, the Nepalese place more value on the opportunities they receive and refuse to acknowledge the discrimination or prejudice they face in the United States. Inconsistent with the hypotheses, the age of entry does not influence reception by host, ethnic discrimination (Models 2 and 3), social exclusion by co-workers, housing discrimination, judgment by appearance (Model 2 of Table 9.6), perception of less competence, unwelcome feeling in public places (Model 2 of Table 8.8), and mistaken identity.

I hypothesized that men are more likely to have receptional adaptation than women. Contrary to my hypotheses, Nepalese men are more likely to face housing discrimination than women (Models 1, 2, and 3 of Table 9.5). Furthermore, Nepalese men are more likely than women to be mistaken as other Asians over "never" (Column 2 of Table 9.9). In both cases, Nepalese men interact/encounter more other racial/ethnic groups than women; consequently, they are more likely to face discrimination and/or prejudice. Gender does not affect predicting reception by the host, ethnic discrimination, social exclusion by co-workers, judgment by appearance, perception of less competence, unwelcome feeling in public places, and mistaken identity (Columns 1 and 2).

It is worth noting that with legal status, the Nepalese internalize less discrimination and prejudice. This supports my hypothesis that U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to experience receptional adaptation in the United States than non-citizens/immigrants. For example, immigrants considered that the host country has treated them "well" or "very well" (Tables 2 and 3 of Table 9.2) and experienced less

ethnic discrimination (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.3). Similarly, they are less likely to be socially excluded by co-workers (Models 2 and 3 of Table 8.4), face housing discrimination (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.5), judgment by appearance (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.6), perception of less competence by other races (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.7), and experience of unwelcome feeling in public places (Models 2 and 3 of Table 9.8). In addition, immigrants are less likely to be mistaken as Hispanics over "never" than non-immigrants (Column 1 of Table 8.9). Nonetheless, mistaken-identity is mainly based on individuals' skin color, and is not going to blur immigrant status. Inconsistent with my hypothesis, mistaken identity is insignificant in predicting "other Asian" versus "never" and "other" versus "never."

As hypothesized, there is a positive relationship between the length of residency and having a positive attitude toward the host country (Model 2 of Table 8.2). Nevertheless, the U.S. government's favorable attitude towards immigrants is not sufficient for integration into the host society. There could be other reasons; for example, there may be an unwillingness to accept the Nepalese by whites. The Nepalese are mistaken as either Hispanic or other as opposed to "never" (Columns 1 and 3 of Table 9.9), indicating that length of stay does not contribute to assimilation into American society as the Nepalese would always be considered as a "perpetual foreigner." In this case, the color of one's skin is more prominent than the length of stay. Length of stay is insignificant in predicting reception by the host (Model 3 of Table 8.2), ethnic

197

discrimination, social exclusion by co-workers, discrimination on housing, judgment by appearance, perception of less competence, and unwelcome feeling in public places.

Remarkably, differing from my hypothesis, education is not significant and does not contribute to predicting any of my dependent variables that measure prejudice and discrimination. Note that even though education is insignificant, the direction of each of the predictors shows a decrease in the level of prejudice and discrimination. Likewise, education also does not contribute to predicting the dependent variables except for housing discrimination. Inconsistent with my hypothesis, education increases perception of housing discrimination (Model 3 of Table 9.5). Note that education does not contribute to predicting any indicators of receptional adaptation. Formal education is considered a panacea for many social consequences, including racial discrimination (Emersion and Sikkink 1998). Education has become a panacea in transforming society into a non-segregated and non-discriminated one. Park (1921) and Warner and Srole (1945) also mention that education not only provides minorities upward mobility, but also a favorable environment to assimilate into the dominant culture. Perhaps, education increases the Nepalese's awareness of prejudice and discrimination against minorities in America and offsets its impact. However, more research is needed in this area.

At odds with my hypothesis, the level of discrimination experienced by the respondents is predicted to decrease for each level of increase in travel to Nepal (Model 3 of Table 9.3), suggesting that the Nepalese may not feel discrimination in the host country as a result of perceiving the home country as more discriminatory than the host

198

country. None of the transnational variables has a significant effect on reception by the host, exclusion by coworkers, housing discrimination, perception of less competence, unwelcome feeling in public places, and mistaken identity. Likewise, sending money, chat/discussion, and reading Nepali newspapers do not impact predicting ethnic discrimination and judgment based on appearances.

Relative Importance of Predictors of Nepalese Adaptation

In order to find out which factors play a more important role or have the strongest effect, I looked at the β's in OLS regression models and odds ratios in logistic regression, ordinal regression, and multinomial logistic regression.

Cultural adaptation. The age of entry has the strongest effect on celebrating Hindu festivals (Model 1 of Table 6.2), attending Hindu religious services (Model 3 of Table 6.4), and attending Nepali functions (Model 3 of Table 6.5). As established in other studies, immigrant age of entry contributes toward the retention of their ethnic culture, and in the case of Nepalese, by celebrating Hindu festivals, attending religious services, and Nepali functions. Gender has the strongest effect on attending religious services and cooking Nepali food. It appears that the age of entry and gender facilitates the retention of Nepali culture. Legal status has the strongest effect on celebrating American holidays and attending Nepali functions. Length of stay has the strongest effect on spoken language at home and spoken language with children ("Nepali" versus "English" and "Both Nepali and English" versus "English").

The highest level of education has the strongest effect on predicting attending Hindu religious services and attending Nepali functions. Interestingly, chat/discussion also has the same effect as the highest level of education in predicting attending Nepali functions; however, as the level of chat/discussion increases, the Nepalese are more likely to attend Nepali functions. Reading Nepali newspapers has the strongest positive effect on cooking Nepali food, spoken language at home and with children ("Nepali" vs. "English"), and spoken language at home ("Both Nepali & English" and "English"), as predicted. In addition, reading Nepali newspapers decreases English speaking ability ("English" versus "not well"), as predicted.

Structural adaptation. Age of entry has the strongest effect on interacting with other Asians in the workplace, as anticipated. Gender has the strongest influence on predicting interaction in residential neighborhoods and obtaining membership in Nepalese organizations. Males are more likely to live in Hispanic neighborhoods than women. However, inconsistent with my hypothesis, they are more likely to obtain membership in Nepalese organizations than women.

The highest level of education has the strongest effect on predicting socialization and interaction in the workplace with whites, as hypothesized. Highest level of education also has the strongest effect on having less interaction with Hispanics in the workplace, inconsistent with the hypothesis. Additionally, as years of education of in the United States increases, socialization with fellow Nepalese decreases, but friendship with other Asians increases. Education in the United States also has the strongest impact on

200

interacting with whites in the workplace and obtaining membership in an American organization. Legal status has the strongest effect on interaction in residential neighborhoods and obtaining membership in Nepalese organizations. U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to live in other Asians neighborhoods than non-citizen/immigrant counterparts. Inconsistent with the hypothesis, the Nepalese are obtaining membership in Nepalese organizations despite their length of stay in the United States. Length of stay has the strongest effect on having friendships and socialization with whites. Similarly, length of stay lessens the probability of living in Nepalese, Hispanic, or other Asian neighborhoods, but increases living in white neighborhoods.

Travel to homeland has the strongest effect in predicting interaction with other racial/ethnic groups and friendship ("black/Hispanic" versus "Nepalese" and "other" versus "Nepalese"). Inconsistent with the hypothesis, as the level of travel to homeland increases, the Nepalese are less likely to be hesitant to interact with other racial/ethnic groups. On the contrary, as hypothesized, they are less likely to have friendships with blacks/Hispanics and others. Reading Nepali newspapers has the strongest positive effect on socialization with other Nepalese. Likewise travel to Nepal has the strongest effect on living in "white" neighborhoods, inconsistent with my hypothesis. On the contrary, travel to homeland decreases living in black neighborhoods, as predicted.

Marital assimilation. Age of entry has the strongest negative effect on hypothetically marrying blacks/Hispanics over Nepalese. The Nepalese who enter at an older age are less likely to marry blacks/Hispanics over Nepalese, as predicted. Likewise,

age has the strongest impact on allowing children to marry non-Nepalese. As anticipated, when parents arrive at an older age, they are less likely to give permission for their children to marry non-Nepalese ("unsure" and "yes" to "no"). Gender has the strongest effect on predicting a non-Nepalese spouse and a hypothetical choice of marriage, as predicted. Nepalese men are more likely to have a non-Nepalese spouse and more likely to marry blacks/Hispanics versus Nepalese, as predicted.

Length of stay has the strongest effect on predicting a non-Nepalese spouse. The highest level of education has the strongest effect on allowing children to marry non-Nepalese. As anticipated, as the level of education increases, the Nepalese are more likely to allow their children to marry non-Nepalese from "unsure" and "no" to "yes." Education in the United States has the strongest positive effect on marrying others versus Nepalese, as predicted.

Reading Nepali newspapers has the strongest effect on predicting a non-Nepalese spouse, and a hypothetical choice of marriage, as predicted. As the level of reading Nepali newspapers increases, the Nepalese are less likely to have a non-Nepalese spouse and hypothetically less likely to marry whites and other Asians.

Identificational adaptation. Legal status has the strongest effect on identify as Nepalese American versus Nepalese and Asian American versus Nepalese. Likewise, chat/discussion has the strongest influence on identify as Nepalese American versus Nepalese. Sending remittances and reading Nepali newspapers have the strongest positive effect on feeling close to Nepalese.

202

Receptional adaptation. Age of entry has the strongest influence on predicting unwelcome feeling in public places. Legal status is the main factor in predicting reception by the host. U.S. citizens or immigrants are more likely to think reception by the host is positive than non-citizens/immigrants, as anticipated. Again, legal status has the strongest effect on predicting ethnic discrimination, social exclusion by co-workers, housing discrimination, judgment by appearances, perception of less competence, and experienced unwelcomed feeling in public places. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to experience ethnic discrimination, exclusion from co-workers, discrimination in housing, judgment based on appearances, perception of less competence, and experience unwelcome feeling in public places than non-citizens/immigrants.

Surprisingly, legal status has the strongest effect on mistaken identity. U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to be mistaken as Hispanics versus never than non-citizens/immigrants, as anticipated. Length of stay has the strongest effect on predicting mistaken identity. Contrary to the hypothesis, regardless of the length of stay, the Nepalese are mistaken as Hispanics, other Asians, and others. Education in the United States has the strongest effect on housing discrimination. Differing with my hypothesis, despite the education in the United States, the Nepalese still face housing discrimination. The prejudice and discrimination by the host country impedes the assimilation process (Charles 2003). Travel to Nepal has the strongest effect on experiencing less discrimination based on race/ethnicity and judgment based on appearances.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

Cultural pluralism is the reality for the Nepalese. Yang (2000) suggests, "Partial assimilation into the dominant culture is an undeniable...[and] partial retention of ethnic cultures can be found at all times for almost all groups" (p. 89). This dissertation succinctly discussed the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. The empirical analyses provide many similar, yet different experiences of adaptation pertaining to other Asian or South Asian people. The Nepalese' partial assimilation and partial retention can be seen when they celebrate Hindu religious festivals, attend Nepali functions, or cook Nepali food, and at the same time, celebrate American holidays. Gordon (1964) underlines that cultural pluralism was a reality before it became a theory. Another important indication of cultural pluralism is language acquisition. Length of stay and level of education are the determinants for proficiency in English, as well as the preference of using the English language. However, transnational variables, such as reading Nepali newspapers, hinder English language attainment.

Although it seems that the Nepalese are gaining entrance in the white domain in many ways, for example, interacting more with them in the workplace and having friendship, it is nevertheless, only a partial assimilation. As age of entry increases, the Nepalese are less likely to socialize with whites, as expected. Men are more likely to live in Hispanic neighborhoods and obtain membership in Nepalese organizations. The length of stay is associated with friendship, socializing, and living with whites, including obtaining membership in Nepalese organization(s). It is possible that Nepalese gain an

entrance into the white neighborhood as Charles (2003) expresses that although recent immigrants initially have low socio-economic status and limited English proficiency, they will make gradual progress and get into neighborhoods comparable to those of whites (p. 201). As we know, education plays a significant role in gaining entrance into the dominant culture; for example, the highest level of education decreases the frequency of working with Hispanics, and living in Nepalese neighborhoods. In addition, educational attainment increases the likelihood of living in white neighborhoods (Massey and Denton 1987). Furthermore, education in the United States enables the Nepalese to assimilate into the dominant society. For example, it enables the Nepalese to interact with whites at work and to attain membership in American organization(s). Consistent with Dustmann's (1996) findings, social integration is strongly affected by the years of residence and education. However, age of entry negatively affects integration (Dustman 1996). It is obvious that with education, the connection with fellow Nepalese may weaken.

Again, martial assimilation confirms cultural pluralism. The Nepalese still prefer to marry other Nepalese (hypothetically). Qian (1997) states, "The more recent the immigrants, the less likely that they will intermarry" (p. 581). However, when considering gender, men are more likely to prefer interracial marriages than women. Another significant predictor for marital assimilation is length of stay, which facilitates marrying non-Nepalese; however, the probability of marrying non-Nepalese decreases by reading Nepali newspapers. Qian (1997) underlines, "who marries whom across racial

groups is likely to be affected by their socioeconomic structure, e.g. compositions in educational attainment" (p. 579). Children get permission to marry non-Nepalese when their parents' level of education increases.

The findings on receptional adaptation buttress again the notion of cultural pluralism. Surprisingly, an older age of entry makes the Nepalese feel less discriminated against based on race/ethnicity. Nonetheless, men face housing discrimination more so than women and also being mistaken as other Asians. In addition, housing discrimination is persistent, regardless of years of education in the United States. Empirical evidence confirms that there is a persistent level of discrimination in the housing market. To my surprise, U.S. citizens or immigrants are less likely to be mistaken as Hispanics; however, length of stay does not blur their skin color, ergo being mistaken as Hispanics or "other." Interestingly, U.S. immigrants or citizens face less discrimination and prejudice than non-immigrants.

The findings of identificational adaptation are in agreement with cultural pluralism. Regardless of age of entry, the Nepalese by choice identify themselves as Nepalese American as opposed to other ethnic identities. Similarly, legal status and length of stay influence Nepalese men to select Nepalese American identity over ethnic identity. Immigrants are also more likely to identify themselves as Asian American; and as American/other when they stay longer in the United States. The reason for selecting their identity as Nepalese American (own choice) is that the Nepalese perhaps try to fit into the host country. However, the Nepalese remain "forever foreigners" in the United

206

States, despite their many unsuccessful attempts. The implication is that "No matter how much you are like us, you will remain apart" (Steinberg 2007:112).

Transnational connections have significantly altered the adaptation of the Nepalese. It also has a significant effect on cultural adaptation in terms of language attainment. Sanders (2002) explains that transnationalism not only involves frequent visits to the home country, but also frequent communication with the home society. In the case of the Nepalese, they connect with their home country not only by traveling to home country or sending remittance, but also by taking part in chat/discussion and reading Nepali newspapers. The findings indicate that Nepalese transnational connections, such as reading Nepali newspapers, not only facilitate the maintenance of their ethnic language, but also limit their socialization and marriages to their own ethnic group, thus slowing down assimilation to the host society. As anticipated, reading Nepali newspapers increases socialization with fellow Nepalese and decreases having friendships with blacks/Hispanics or other Asians. Travel to home country decreases having friendships with blacks/Hispanics and others or living in black neighborhoods. Interestingly, travel to Nepal, increases the likelihood of working mostly with whites and living in white neighborhoods, but preferring less to live in black neighborhoods. Notably, the Nepalese are less likely to feel prejudice or discrimination in the United States when they travel to home country. It appears that transnational variables are hindering the assimilation process to the host country, while at the same time, facilitating interaction more with whites in the workplace and in neighborhood. Several studies have

indicated that transnational connections to the homeland among the first generation remain strong; however, it weakens with the next and successive generations (Kasinitz et al. 2008; Levitt 2001; Sutton 2004). The extent of the transnational connections of the Nepalese is reinforcing the retention of their ethnic culture and hindering the process of language attainment. For example, Portes (2000) underlines that transnational activities will slow down the process of assimilation; perhaps this may be the same case with the Nepalese in the United States.

The findings would be very helpful in assisting the Nepalese to better adjust to American life. It can be used to improve policy and to provide better services. Given the fact that the Nepalese in the United States are from different backgrounds, many lack the resources to adapt to American society. In order to facilitate the adaptation process of Nepalese, English language acquisition is of course very crucial, but cultural retention is also important. It is also important to educate other racial/ethnic groups about the Nepalese in the United States in order to mitigate prejudice and discrimination in their everyday lives. The housing, educational, and occupational sectors should be reviewed and provide favorable support to the Nepalese in the United States.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

A major contribution of this dissertation is that this is the first large-scale survey study of Nepalese in the United States. It offers wealth of information on the adaptation of Nepalese that cannot be found elsewhere. In particular, it systematically analyzes the status and determinants of Nepalese cultural, structural, marital, identificational, and

208

receptional adaptation. In addition, this dissertation proposes a multidimensional theoretical framework to depict the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese in the United States. It tests this theoretical framework and deriving hypotheses using data from Nepalese who are brand new immigrants in America. The results provide support for cultural pluralism theory and challenge classical assimilation theory. It also analyzes the role of transnational activities on adaptation. The findings show that transnational activities are contributing to the dynamics of Nepalese adaptation experience in the United States. The results may help the understanding of the adaptation experiences of other new immigrant groups.

Despite the many improvements over the existing scholarship, this dissertation is not without limitations. First, because of the non-random nature of the sample, the findings may not be generalizable to the larger population of the Nepalese living in the United States, but only to those who took part in this study. Second, although this study attempts to include people with various backgrounds, people with limited knowledge of English and illiteracy on computers have been left out. Since my study required some level of education, it may not capture the adaptation experiences of people with lower levels of education. Third, since many respondents belong to Nepalese organizations in the United States, the results may reflect the experience of the Nepalese in the organizations more than that of Nepalese outside the organizations. Fourth, although this study uncovers various important determinants of the adaption experiences of the Nepalese, not all predictors have been included in my analysis. Finally, even though I collected data

through a few open-ended questions on the questionnaire, I have not had time to analyze the qualitative data in my dissertation because of time constraints. I will save it for my future research.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Although this dissertation provides a wealth of information on the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese, important endeavors for future work will offer a fuller analysis of the adaptation experiences of the Nepalese, not limited to five dimensions. Future research should focus on the socio-economic, civic, and political adaptation of the Nepalese. In addition, it is necessary to have more robust data that offers conclusive generalizable findings; therefore, the use of a random sampling method with a larger representative sample size will be an asset. Given the importance of diversity within the Nepalese people, future studies should be conducted in both English and Nepali and should not be limited to only online surveys. If the sample size is large enough, separate analyses of immigrants and non-immigrants can offer nuanced insights into their experiences.

Last, but not least, this study is restricted to first generation immigrants. In the future, it will be important to conduct research on second generation Nepalese. Adding a qualitative analysis, either independently or in conjunction with a quantitative study would help more fully capture the in-depth experiences of the Nepalese in the United States.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream.* Cambridge,

    MA: Harvard University Press.

Basch, Linda G., Nina G. Schiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 2003. *Nations Unbound :*

    Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-

    States. London: Routledge.

Bennett, Lynn. 1983. *Dangerous wives and sacred sisters: social and symbolic roles of*

    high-caste women in Nepal. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bohara, Alok K., Neil J. Mitchell and Mani Nepal. 2006. "Opportunity, Democracy, and

    the Exchange of Political Violence: A Subnational Analysis of Conflict in Nepal."

    The Journal of Conflict Resolution 50(1): 108-128

Central Bureau of Statics (CBS). 2001. *Report on the Nepal Labor Force Survey*

    1998/1999. Central Bureau of Statistics, Kathmandu Nepal.

-----. 2003. "Population Projections for Nepal 2001-2021." Central Bureau of Statistics,

    Kathmandu Nepal.

-----.2008. "Nepal in Figure 2008." Central Bureau of Statistics, Kathmandu Nepal.

Charles, Zubrinsky C. 2003. "Dynamics of Racial Residential Segreagation." *Annual*

    Review of Sociology 29:167-207.

"Civic Report 53 | Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States." Retrieved

    November 20, 2009 (http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_53.htm).

Dasgupta, Shamita. D. (2000). "Charting the Course: An overview of Domestic Violence in the South Asian Community in the United States." *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 9:173-185.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. 2009. "DHS | Profiles on Legal Permanent Residents." Retrieved November 20, 2009 (http://www.dhs.gov/files/statistics/data/dslpr.shtm).

Dhungel, Ramesh. K. 1999. "Nepalese Immigrants in the United States of American." *Contribution to Nepalese Studies* 26 (1):119-134.

Dustmann, Christian. 1996. "The Social Assimilation of Immigrants." *Journal of Population and Economics"* 9(1). 37:54.

Ellison, Christopher G. and Daniel A. Powers. 1994. "The Contact Hypothesis and Racial Attitudes among Black Americans" *Social Science Quarterly* 75:385-400.

Gans, Herbert J. 1997. "Toward a Reconciliation of "Assimilation" and "Pluralism": The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention." *International Migration Review* 31(4):875-892.

Garland, Sarah. 2008. "Report: Immigrants Assimilating More Rapidly in N.Y. - May 13, 2008 - The New York Sun.", Retrieved 11/9/2009, 2009

George, Douglas and George Yancey. 2004. Taking stock of America's attitudes on cultural diversity: An analysis of public deliberation on multiculturalism, assimilation, and intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 35(1):1-20.

212

Gibson, Margaret A. 1988. *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

------. 1998. "Promoting Academic Success among Immigrant Students: Is Acculturation the Issue?" *Educational Policy* 12 (6):615-633.

Glazer, Nathan. 1993. "Is Assimilation Dead?" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:122-136.

Gordon, Milton. 1961. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality." Daedalus 90 (2):263-285.

-----. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1974. *Ethnicity in the United States: A preliminary Reconnaissance.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gubhaju, Bina. 1999. "The Fluidity of Ethnicity: The Case of Nepali and Newar Identity in the United States." *Contribution to Nepalese Studies.*26 (1):119-134.

Gupta Das, Monisha. 2006. *Unruly Immigrants: Rights, Activism, and Transnational South Asian Politics in the United States.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Gurung, Harka. 1997. "Linguistic Demographic of Nepal." *Contribution to Nepalese Studies* 24 (2):147-185.

-----. 2003. *Social Demography of Nepal:Census 2001.* Nepal: Himal Books.

Hachettu, Krisha. 2004. "The Nepali and the Maoist Insurgency, 1996-2001." Pp. 58-78 in *Himalayan People's War: Nepal's Maoist Rebellion*, edited by Hutt, Michael *Bloomington*: Indiana University Press.

Hada, Dibya. 1995. "Problem of the Nepalese Community in America." Pp. 141-144 in *Nepalese American Perspective*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Association of Nepalese in North America.

International Institute of Education. 2009. "Record Numbers of International Students in U.S. Higher Education." Retrieved November 20, 2009 (http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=150649).

------ 2010. " Open Doors Data: International Students Leading Countries of Places." Retrieved June 20, 2011 (http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Leading-Places-of-Origin.aspx).

Iceland, John and Melissa Scopilliti. 2008. "Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000." *Demography* 45(1):pp. 79-94.

Joshi, Madav. 2010. "Between clientelistic dependency and liberal market economy: Rural support for the Maoist insurgency in Nepal" Pp. 92-109 in *The Maoist Insurgency in Nepal: Revolution in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Lawoti, Mahendra and Anup K. Pahari. London, New York: Routledge.

Joshi, Madhav and T. D. Mason. 2007. "Land Tenure, Democracy, and Insurgency in Nepal: Peasant Support for Insurgency Versus Democracy." *Asian Survey* 47(3):pp. 393-414.

----- . 2011. "Peasants, Patrons, and Parties: The Tension between Clientelism and Democracy in Nepal." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(1):151-175.

Kasinitz, Philip, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters , and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age.* New York; Cambridge, Mass: Russell Sage Foundation; Harvard University Press.

Khadka, Narayan. 2000. "U.S. Aid to Nepal in the Cold War Period: Lessons for the Future." *Pacific Affairs* 73(1):77-95.

Kibria, Nazli. 2006. "South Asian Americans" Pp. 206- 227 in Min, Pyong G., *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Koirala, Shabnam. 2004. "Exploring Solutions at the Intersection of Education, Immigration and Transnationalism: Efforts of the Diaspora in Nepali Social Change." University of California, Berkeley, United States -- California (http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=795930961&Fmt=7&clientId=48335&RQT=309&VName=PQD).

Lawoti, Mahendra. 2005. *Towards a Democratic Nepal : Inclusive Political Institutions for a Multicultural Society.* New Delhi ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications

Lawoti, Mahendra and Anup K. Pahari. 2010. *The Maoist Insurgency in Nepal: Revolution in the Twenty-First Century.* London ; New York: Routledge.

Lee, Sharon M. and Keiko Yamanaka. 1990. "Patterns of Asian American Intermarriage and Marital Assimilation. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 31(2): 287-305.

Lee , Sharon M. and Marilyn Fernandez. 1998. "Trends in Asian American Racial/Ethnic Intermarriage: A Comparison of 1980 and 1990 Census Data." *Sociological Perspectives* 41(2):pp. 323-342.

Leonard, Karen I. 1997. *The new Americans: The South Asian Americans.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Levitt, Peggy and Mary C. Waters. 2002. *The Changing Face of Home : The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Liang, Zai and Naomi Ito. 1999. "Intermarriage of Asian Americans in the New York City Region: Contemporary Patterns and Future Prospects." *International Migration Review* 33(4):pp. 876-900

Massey, Douglas. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research* 69:315- 350

Massey, Douglas and Denton Nancy. 1987. "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks. Hispanics, and Asians: 1970-1980." *American Sociological Review* 52(6):802-825.

Mihaly, Eugene B. and Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1965. *Foreign Aid and Politics in Nepal, a Case Study.* London: New York, Oxford University Press.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41(1): 152-168.

Onesto, Li. 2005. *Dispatches from the People's War in Nepal.* London: Pluto Press.

Park, Robert E. and Herbert A. Miller. 1921. "Old world traits transplanted." New York: The Harper Publications.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1924. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Portes, Alejandro, Luis E. Guarnizo and Patricia Landolt. 1999. "The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 22(2):217-237.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1999. "Conclusion: Towards a New World--the Origins and Effects of Transnational Activities." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 22(2):463.

-----. 2009. "Migration and Development: Reconciling Opposite Views." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 32(1):5-22

Powers, Daniel A. and Christopher G. Ellison. 1995. "Interracial Contact and Black Racial Attitudes: The Contact Hypothesis and Selectivity Bias." *Social Forces* 74(1):205-226.

Pradhan, Pratik. (2002, August 18). In the land of opportunities, Nepali Emigrés Shy away from Risks. *The Kathmandu Post.* Retrieved February 25, 2006 (http://www.kantipuronline.com/archive/kpost/2002-8-20/kp_frontpg.htm#).

Purkayastha, Bandhana. 2005. *Negotiating ethnicity second-generation South Asian Americans traverse a transnational world.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, c2005.

Qian, Zhenchao. 1999. "Who Intermarries? Education, Nativity, Region, and Interracial Marriage, 1980 and 1990." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 30:579-597.

Ranjeet, Bidya and Bandhana Purkayastha. 2007. "Minority within a minority: Reflecting on marital violence in the Nepali American community."Pp.38-52 in S. D. Dasgupta (Ed.), *Body evidence: Intimate violence against South Asian women in America.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

"Report: Immigrants Assimilating More Rapidly in N.Y. - may 13, 2008 - the New York Sun." Retrieved November 11, 2009. (http://www.nysun.com/new-york/report-immigrants-assimilating-more-rapidly-in-ny/76273/).

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1997. "Assimilation and its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality." *International Migration Review* 31(4):923-960.

Sanders, Jimy M. 2002. "Ethnic Boundaries and Identity in Plural Societies." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:327-357.

Shrestha, Mohan N. 1995. "Nepalese in America: A Historical Perspective." Pp. 115-124 in *Nepalese American Perspectives.* Cincinnati, Ohio: Association of Nepalese in America.

Simon, Sarah E. 1901. "Social Assimilation." *American Journal of Sociology* 6:790-822.

Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. Race Relations: A Critique. Stanford, CA: An Imprint of
Stanford University Press.

Song, Miri. 2009. "Is Intermarriage a Good Indicator of Integration?" *Journal of Ethnic
& Migration Studies* 35(2):331-348.

Spickard, Paul R. 1989. *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-
Century America* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. Pp. 3-20, 343-
372.

Sutton, Constance R. 2004. "Celebrating Ourselves: The Family Reunion Rituals of
African-Caribbean Transnational Families." *Global Networks* 4(3):243-257.

Tamot, R. 2008. "Marginal Professionals, Predatory Nepalese Elites, and Emigration to
the "Dreamland"." Michigan State University, United States -- Michigan
(http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1607939251&Fmt=7&clientId=48335&R
QT=309&VName=PQD).

Thapa, Soni. 2007. "Assimilation in America: Is it a Melting Pot, Cultural Pluralism or
Salad Bowl?" *Eklo Tara* 2(5):46-47.

Thapa-Oli, Soni, Hari B. Dulal and Yoko Baba. 2009. "A preliminary study of intimate
partner violence among Nepali women in the United States." *Violence Against
Women* 15(2):206-223.

Thapa, Deepak and Bandita Sijapati. 2004. *A Kingdom Under Siege : Nepal's Maoist
Insurgency, 1996 to 2003*. Updated ed. Kathmandu; New York : Zed Books: The
Printhouse; Distributed in the USA exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan.

Thieme, Susan, Raju Bhattrai, Ganesh Gurung, Michael Kollmair, Siddhi Manandhar and

    Ulrike Müller-Böker. 2005. "Addressing the Needs of Nepalese Migrant Workers

    in Nepal and in Delhi, India." *Mountain Research and Development* 25(2):pp.

    109-114.

United States Department of Homeland Security. 1954-2008. "Profiles on Legal

    Permanent Residents" Retrieved November 20, 2009

    (http://www.dhs.gov/files/statistics/data/dslpr.shtm).

United States Census Bureau. 2000. "The Asian Population: 2000" Retrieved November

    22, 2009 (http://www.census.gov//prod/2002pubs/c2kbr01-16.pdf).

Unmuth, Katherine L. 2009. "Studies take them far from Nepal - But these students are

    finding a growing kinship at community colleges throughout North Texas."

    Dallas Morning News, November 2, *The (TX)* FIRST ed., 1B. Retrieve November

    22, 2009 from NewsBank on-line database (America's Newspapers).

Upadhyay, Pratima. 1991. "The social assimilation of Nepalese immigrants in the United

    States and the role of their English language training in this process." Ph.D.

    dissertation, The University of Connecticut, United States – Connecticut.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole. 1945. *"The social systems of American Ethnic*

    Groups." New York: Yale university press.

Waters, Mary. C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America.* Berkeley:

    University of California Press.

Yancey, George (2003) *Who Is White? Latinos, Asians, and the New Black/Nonblack Divide* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Yancey, George. 2006. "Racial Justice in a Black/Nonblack Society." Pp.49-62 in *Mixed Messages: Multiracial Identities in the "Color-Blind" Era,* edited by D.L. Brunsma. Boudler, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Yang, Philip Q. 1995. *Post-1965 Immigration to the United States: Structural Determinants.* Westport, Conn: Praeger.

------.2000. Ethnic Studies: Issues and Approaches. NY: Sunny Press.

------. 2006. "Transnationalism as a New Mode of Immigrant Labor Market Incorporation: Preliminary Evidence from Chinese Transnational Migrant." *Journal of Chinese Overseas* 2(2):173-192.

------ . 2011. *Asian Immigration to the United States.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Yetman, Norman R. 1999. *Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Appendix A

LIST OF NEPALESE ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

List of Nepalese Organizations in the United States:

1. Adhikaar, New York
2. America Nepal Society, DC
3. Association of Nepalese in Minnesota
4. Association of Nepali Terrain in America
5. Florida-Nepal Association
6. Friends of Nepal – New Jersey
7. Friends of Nepal-Los Angeles
8. Greater Boston Nepali Community
9. Nepa Pasa Pucha Amerikaye
10. Nepal Center of North Carolina
11. Nepalese Association of Houston
12. Nepalese Society in Texas
13. Nepalese Women Global Network
14. Nepalese Youth Association of Austin
15. Nepali American Organization of Ohio
16. Rocky Mountain Friends of Nepal (RMFN
17. The America-Nepal Friendship Society
18. The Association of Nepalis in America

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE

A completed questionnaire demonstrates your informed consent to act as a participant in this study. Please DO NOT include your name in this survey. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. For each question, please check an appropriate box, except for those indicated otherwise.

Nepalese adaptation experience in the United States

1. Do you celebrate Hindu festivals, such as Dahsin and Tihar (Dewali)?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. How often do you attend Hindu/Buddhist religious services or go to a Hindu temple?
   ☐ Never ☐ Once a year ☐ Several times a year
   ☐ Once a month ☐ 2-3 times a month
   ☐ Nearly every week ☐ More than once a week

3. How often do you attend functions organized by local Nepali organizations?
   ☐ Never ☐ Once a year ☐ Several times a year
   ☐ Once a month ☐ 2-3 times a month
   ☐ Nearly every week ☐ More than once a week

4. How often do you cook Nepali food at home?
   ☐ Never ☐ Once a year ☐ Several times a year
   ☐ Once a month ☐ 2-3 times a month
   ☐ Nearly every week ☐ More than once a week

5. In general, what language do you mostly speak at home?
   ☐ English ☐ Nepali ☐ Both Nepali and English
   ☐ Other (Please specify)...............

6. What language do you mostly speak with your child at home?
   ☐ English ☐ Nepali
   ☐ Both Nepali and English ☐ Other (Please specify).............

7. Do you celebrate American holidays/festivals?
   ☐ Do not celebrate at all
   ☐ Celebrate (check all holidays/festivals that apply)

☐ Thanksgiving   ☐ Christmas   ☐ July 4th
☐ Halloween   ☐ New Year   ☐ All of the above

8. Do you feel hesitant to interact with people of other racial/ethnic groups?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

9. Thinking of your best friend, or friend you feel closest to, is this friend.
    ☐ Nepalese   ☐ White   ☐ Black   ☐
Hispanic
    ☐ Other Asian   ☐ Other (Please specify).........

10. In general, whom do you mainly socialize with (apart from your family)?
    ☐ Nepalese   ☐ White   ☐ Black
    ☐ Hispanic   ☐ Other Asian   ☐ Other (Please
specify)........

11. Whom do you work with the most?
    ☐ White   ☐ Black   ☐ Hispanic
    ☐ Asian   ☐ Other (Please specify)........

12. The people living in your neighborhood are mostly
    ☐ Nepali   ☐ White   ☐ Black
    ☐ Hispanic   ☐Other Asian   ☐ Other (Please specify)...............

13. Are you a member of Nepalese one or more ethnic organizations in the United States?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

14. Are you a member of any other Asian organization in the United States?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

15. Are you a member of any American organization in the United States?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

16. Is your spouse Nepali?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No (Please specify his/her race/ethnicity).............

17. Who would you marry, if you had a choice?
    ☐Nepali   ☐ White   ☐Black
    ☐ Hispanic   ☐Other Asian   ☐Other (Specify).........

18. Do you allow your children to marry a non-Nepalese?
    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

19. How well do you think the U.S. government has treated you?
    ☐ Not well   ☐ Well   ☐ Very well

20. Have you been discriminated against because of your ethnicity in the United States?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

21. Have you ever been excluded socially from your co-workers?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

22. Have you ever been discriminated against when buying or renting a house in an area you preferred?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

23. Have you ever noticed that you were being judged based on your appearance?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

24. Have you ever been mistaken as
    ☐ Hispanic   ☐ Black   ☐ Asian
    ☐ Other (Specify)………….. ☐ Never

25. Because of your ethnicity or nationality, how often do people of other races treat you as less competent than you deserve to be treated?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

26. Because of your ethnicity or nationality, how often do you feel out of place or unwelcome in public places?
    ☐ Never   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Often   ☐ All the time

27. How do you identify yourself, that is, what do you call yourself?
    ☐ Nepalese   ☐ Nepalese American   ☐Asian
    ☐ Asian American ☐ American   ☐ Other (Please specify).......

28. How close do you feel to your ethnic group (Nepalese)?
    ☐ Not close at all   ☐ Close   ☐ Very close

29. How often do you travel to your home country?

☐ Never   ☐ Once a year   ☐ Every other year
☐ Other (Please specify).....................

30. How often do you read Nepali newspapers?
       ☐ Every day   ☐ Once a week
       ☐ Once a month   ☐ Several times a month   ☐ Several times a
year
       ☐ Never

31. How often do you take part in Nepali chat or discussion boards online?
       ☐ Every day   ☐ Once a week   ☐ Once a
month
       ☐ Several times a month   ☐ Never

32. How often do you send money to your family or relatives in Nepal?

       ☐ Never   ☐ Once a year   ☐ Every other year
       ☐ Once several years ☐ Other (Please specify)....................

33. Have you ever donated money to Nepalese organizations in Nepal?
       ☐Yes   ☐No
34. Have you voted in Nepal while living in the United States?
       ☐Yes   ☐No

35. Have you ever taken part in political activities in Nepal?
       ☐Yes   ☐No

Demographic Information

36. What is your age ____?

37. Are you _____?
       ☐ Male   ☐ Female

38. What is your caste in Nepal?
       ☐ Brahman   ☐ Chettri   ☐Newar   ☐Gurung   ☐Magar
       ☐Other caste (Please specify).........

39. What is your religion *before* coming to the U.S.?
       ☐ Hindu   ☐ Buddhist   ☐Christian   ☐ Other
   (Specify)...................

40. What is your current religion?
       ☐ Hindu   ☐ Buddhist   ☐Christian   ☐ Other
(Specify)...................

41. What is your current marital status?
       ☐ Currently married   ☐ Widowed   ☐ Divorced
       ☐ Separated   ☐ Never married

42. When did you get married? (Please specify in year)..........

43. Do you have children?
       ☐ Yes (if yes, how many)............   ☐ No

44. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
       ☐ No schooling   ☐ Elementary school   ☐Middle school
       ☐ High school   ☐ Associate degree/Junior college   ☐ Bachelor's
degree   ☐ Master's/professional degree   ☐ PhD

45. How many years of schooling have you completed in the U.S? ....years

46. What was your 2009 total income, before any taxes or deductions?
       ☐ $0 to 9,999   ☐ $10,000 to 19,999   ☐ $20,000 to 29,999
       ☐ $30,000 to 39,999 ☐ $40,000 to 49,999   ☐$50,000 to 59,999
       ☐ $60,000 to 69,999 ☐ $70,000 to 79,999   ☐ $80,000 to 89,999
       ☐ $90,000 to 99,999 ☐$100,000 or over

47. What is your occupation (that is, your job title)? Please specify......................

48. How well do you speak English?
       ☐ Speak English only   ☐ Very well   ☐ Well
       ☐ Not well

49. Where were you born?
       ☐ United States   ☐ Nepal   ☐ Elsewhere (Please
specify).......

50. If born outside of the U.S., how did you come to the United States?
       ☐ As family-sponsored immigrant   ☐ As employment-preference
immigrants
       ☐ As H-1B worker   ☐ As a student

☐ As a refugee

☐ As a visitor

☐ Under diversity immigrant program

☐ Other (Please specify) ....

51. What is your legal status?
   ☐ U.S. citizen   ☐ Permanent Resident   ☐ Student (F1)
   ☐ H-1B worker   ☐ Other (Please specify)...................

52. How old were you when you came to the United States? ....years

53. In which year did you come to the U.S.? (Please specify).......

54. How long have you lived in the United States? ....years

55. Where do you currently live in the United States?(Please specify)
   City...........and State.........

56. Are you a member of the following organization(s)? (Select all that apply)
   ☐ None   ☐ The Association of Nepalis in America

   ☐ Nepalese Society in Texas   ☐ Nepalese Women Global Network

   ☐ Greater Boston Nepalese Community   ☐ Nepali American Organization of Ohio

   ☐ Nepalese Association of Houston   ☐ Nepalese Youth Association of Austin

   ☐ Friends of Nepal-Los Angeles   ☐ Association of Nepali Terrain in America

   ☐ America Nepal Society, DC   ☐ Florida-Nepal Association

   ☐ Nepal Pasa Pucha Amerikaye   ☐ Friends of Nepal – New Jersey

   ☐ Association of Nepalese in Minnesota   ☐ Nepal Center of North Carolina

   ☐ The America-Nepal Friendship Society   ☐ Other (Specify).......................

57. Would like to know the results of this study?
   ☐ Yes (please contact me via email:sonithapa@twu.edu)
   ☐ No

58. Would you like to share any experience of discrimination that you have faced in the U.S.?

....

....

....

59. In your opinion, is there anything you think that the U.S. government should do to help Nepalese immigrants?

....
....
....

60. Is there anything you would like to add about your adaptation experiences in the U.S.?

....
....
....

*If you would like to know the results of this study, please contact me by email at sonithapa@twu.edu

*If you would like to receive counseling regarding any issues that may arise from participating in this study, you may contact:

National Mental Health Association
800-969-NMHA (6642)

National Domestic Violence Hotline
1-800-799-SAFE (1-800-799-7233)

Covenant House Hotline

800-999-9999

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline
800-273-TALK (8255)

Thank you for your participation in this survey!

Appendix C

IRB LETTER OF APPROVAL

June 11, 2010

Ms. Soni Thapa Olli

Dear Ms. Olli:

Re: *Adaptation of Nepalese in the United States*

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.

Another review by the IRB is required if your project changes in any way, and the IRB must be notified immediately regarding any adverse events. If you have any questions, feel free to call the TWU Institutional Review Board.

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.