Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies

ISSN: 1556-2948 (Print) 1556-2956 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wimm20

Punishing the Children of Immigrants: Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, Student Misbehavior, and School Discipline

Anthony A. Peguero, Zahra Shekarkhar, Ann Marie Popp & Dixie J. Koo

To cite this article: Anthony A. Peguero, Zahra Shekarkhar, Ann Marie Popp & Dixie J. Koo (2015) Punishing the Children of Immigrants: Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, Student Misbehavior, and School Discipline, Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 13:2, 200-220, DOI: 10.1080/15562948.2014.951136

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2014.951136

Published online: 17 Jun 2015.

Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 13:200–220, 2015

ISSN: 1556-2948 print / 1556-2956 online
DOI: 10.1080/15562948.2014.951136

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Punishing the Children of Immigrants: Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, Student Misbehavior, and School Discipline

ANTHONY A. PEGUERO
Center for Peace Studies and Violence Prevention, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia, USA
ZAHRA SHEKARKHAR
Department of Criminal Justice, Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA
ANN MARIE POPP
Department of Sociology, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
DIXIE J. KOO
Department of Criminal Justice, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, California, USA

Using segmented assimilation theory, this study examines whether the children of immigrants' experiences with being disciplined at school are disproportionate. This study draws from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 and utilizes multilevel techniques to analyze the relationships between race, ethnicity, generational status, misbehavior, and school discipline. Findings reveal that Black/African American second- and third-plus generation as well as Latina/o American third-plus generation youth have increased odds of being disciplined despite having similar levels of misbehavior as their White American peers. The implications of the racial and ethnic, as well as generational, disparities in school discipline practices are discussed.

KEYWORDS School discipline, race and ethnicity, assimilation

Consistently, racial and ethnic minority students are overrepresented in the population of students who are disciplined in U.S. schools (Kupchik, 2010;

Address correspondence to Anthony A. Peguero, Department of Sociology, Center for Peace Studies and Violence Prevention, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061. E-mail: anthony.peguero@vt.edu

Skiba et al., 2011); however, the patterns of school discipline vary across racial and ethnic groups. Some research has found that Latina/o American students are the racial and ethnic group most likely to be disciplined (Morris, 2005; Rios, 2011). On the other hand, some have found that Black/African American students are the group most likely to be disciplined (Kupchik, 2010; Rios, 2011; Skiba et al., 2011). Asian American students, it appears, are least likely to be disciplined (Morris, 2005; Skiba et al., 2011). These disparate school discipline patterns across racial and ethnic groups beg the question—what factors contribute to the variability in school discipline practices for racial and ethnic minority students?

Generational status matters when examining the educational and school experiences of racial and ethnic minority students (Feliciano, 2001; Kao, Vaquera, & Goyette, 2013; Peguero, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). In other words, there are evident distinctions between first, second, and third-plus generation students' experiences within school, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities. For instance, some researchers find that while first-generation youths have strong relationships with teachers, that relationship steadily deteriorates across generations and lessens students' chances for success in school (Kao et al., 2013; Peguero & Bondy, 2011; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Some also argue that third-plus-generation youths are more likely to be exposed to school violence and have perceptions of school disorder than were their first- and second-generation counterparts (Peguero, 2009, 2011). It is imperative to scrutinize the possible pathways to educational failure, such as school discipline, that contribute to disparate educational outcomes for a rapidly growing population of students in immigrant families.

Segmented assimilation theorists suggest that the risk of educational failure increases as the children of immigrants undergo the assimilation process (Kao et al., 2013; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008; Zhao, 1997). Segmented assimilation theory offers important insight into the distinct generational patterns of school discipline for the children of immigrants within the U.S. educational system. This analysis draws on data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS), a nationally representative sample of public school students. This study also incorporates Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) and Hierarchical Generalized Linear Modeling (HGLM) techniques to investigate the relationships between misbehavior and the likelihood of being disciplined for the children of immigrants. The results, as well as their implications about the children of immigrants' susceptibility to school discipline are discussed.

THE "COLOR" OF DISCIPLINE

"Zero tolerance" and other school discipline policies are common responses to the social and educational problem of violence within U.S. schools. Zero

tolerance policies were originally intended to enforce drug laws but have since been extended to include other problem behaviors, such as violence, and reflect a criminal-justice-style approach to enforcing school rules. Zero tolerance policies were implemented across the United States as a result of the Gun Free Schools Act of 1994, which initially mandated a 1-year expulsion for students who brought a firearm or any instrument that can be used as a weapon to school (Skiba et al., 2011). Zero tolerance policies assign explicit, predetermined punishments to specific violations of school rules, regardless of the situation or context of the behavior. In many cases, punishment for a violation under the policy, such as suspension or expulsion from school, is severe (Skiba et al., 2011). Ideally, zero tolerance policies deter students from misbehavior because the punishment for such a violation is swift, harsh, and certain. Although this "school safety" policy is intended to protect students, many argue that the zero tolerance policy is ineffective, problematic, and discriminatory, particularly for racial and ethnic minority students (Kupchik, 2010; Rios, 2011; Skiba et al., 2011). The racial and ethnic disparity in school punishment that results from the zero tolerance policy is worrisome because school discipline usually places students on a path toward academic disengagement and failure (Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2011). Kupchik (2010) argues that school discipline facilitates the criminalization of poor students in order to establish and maintain a criminal class to legitimate systems of inequality in modern capitalist states. If school discipline is potentially socializing youth toward criminality and economic and educational failure, this type of socialization appears to target racial and ethnic minority students.

Researchers have historically and consistently found racial and ethnic disparities within many of the U.S. school processes. Racial and ethnic minority students perceive that they are unfavorably viewed in terms of their educational capabilities or potential (Kozol, 1991; Olsen, 2008). Racial and ethnic minority students report experiencing low teacher expectations, having less access to educational resources, being placed on lower educational tracks, and being steered toward low-paying employment (Kozol, 1991; Olsen, 2008). This pattern of racial and ethnic educational disparity is also reflected in school discipline. Even after controlling for student misbehavior, racial and ethnic minority students are disproportionately disciplined in schools (Kupchik, 2010; Morris, 2005; Skiba et al., 2011).

In one of the first studies of school disciplinary practices, the Children's Defense Fund (1975) report revealed that the suspension rates for Black/African American youth are two to three times higher than for their White American counterparts. Since then, research has found substantial evidence indicating Black/African American youth are being disproportionately punished at school (Kupchik, 2010; Rios, 2011; Skiba et al., 2011). However, only a limited number of studies have examined the patterns of school discipline and punishment for Latina/o American and Asian American youth

in the U.S. educational system. In a study that focuses on school discipline in the multicultural setting of Miami, Florida, public schools, Arcia (2007) found that Latina/o American youth are more likely to be suspended than White American youth but Black/African American youth are the most likely to be disciplined by the school. In another study, Morris (2005) found that Latina/o American students are more likely to receive a form of school discipline and punishment in comparison to both Black/African American and White American youth in Texas.

GENERATIONAL STATUS AND STUDENT EXPERIENCES

Straight-line assimilation theorists propose that immigrants and the children of immigrants are engaged in a process that involves assimilating to the dominant host culture and that advancing through the assimilation process facilitates upward mobility for immigrants and their children (Alba & Nee, 2003; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, Waters, & Holdaway, 2009). Under this paradigm, the assimilation process consists of immigrants learning the dominant host group's values, beliefs, and behaviors in social institutions, such as schools, which then translates into upward mobility. Segmented assimilation theorists, however, contend that this conceptual approach does not appropriately depict the current experiences of immigrants or their children in the United States. Segmented assimilation theory contends that the process of immigrant assimilation results in various social, economic, and educational outcomes and not the upward mobility promised by the straight-line assimilation theorists (Kao et al., 2013; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Segmented assimilation theorists propose that the assimilation process is "segmented," with divergent trajectories for immigrants and the children of immigrants. There are pathways of progress and upward mobility as well as "downward" paths toward economic failure and marginalization. With a segmented-assimilation–conceptual framework, the process of assimilating and incorporating the dominant groups' values, beliefs, and behaviors in schools could result in educational progress for the children of immigrants or it could result in continuing marginalization and failure (Kao et al., 2013; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

It is the concept of "downward" assimilation that raises significant policy, research, and social concerns about the economic, social, and educational experiences of the children of immigrants. Because of the deterioration of public schools, the rise in drug use and violence, and the adversarial discourse about immigration that the children of immigrants endure in U.S. schools, it is believed that the educational progress and success of the fastest growing segment of the U.S. population is being derailed (Kozol, 1991; Olsen, 2008; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Valenzuela, 1999). Segmented assimilation theorists suggest that as the children of immigrants assimilate

or become "Americanized," they are at greater risk of educational and economic failure and marginalization (Perreira, Harris, & Lee, 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Valenzuela, 1999; Zhou, 1997). In comparison to first-generation youth, third-plus-generation youth are more likely to drop out, be violently victimized at school, and have lower grades and test scores (Peguero, 2008, 2009; Perreira et al., 2006; Portes & Rumbaut 2001). Segmented assimilation theorists suggest that race and ethnicity are key factors to why some of the children of immigrants are facing educational barriers and hurdles that restrict progress and success within U.S. schools.

The race and ethnicity, or "color," of the majority of contemporary immigrants sets them apart from the traditional and historical trends in American immigration of primarily White European immigrants. For the current wave of immigrants, many of them have never experienced prejudice associated with a particular skin color or racial type in their country of origin (Alba & Nee, 2003; Kasinitz et al., 2009; Portes & Rumbaut 2001). Immigrants and their children, especially those whose physical characteristics are similar to the physical characteristics of U.S. native-born Black/African Americans, have confronted the historical legacy and present-day reality of racial and ethnic discrimination in U.S. schools (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). The role of race and ethnicity may be significant for the children of immigrants, particularly considering the long history of disproportionately disciplining Black/African American students.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Ideally, "zero tolerance" and other similar school-discipline policies restrict the discretion of school administrators and faculty in order to ensure unbiased application of school disciplinary measures to student misbehavior; however, it appears that there continue to be racial and ethnic disparities in school discipline despite these policies (Kupchik, 2010; Rios, 2011; Skiba et al., 2011). There is evidence suggesting the treatment and schooling of the children of immigrants varies by generation, race, and ethnicity (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Thus, there are three central questions that emerge from this discussion. First, because of the strong correlation between student misbehavior and school discipline, what is the pattern of student misbehavior by generational status for racial and ethnic minority youth? Second, are the patterns of school discipline segmented by generational status for racial and ethnic minority youth? If so, does the pattern of school discipline reflect one of downward assimilation for the children of immigrants? In summary, this research examines whether generational status is associated with student misbehavior and school discipline for the children of immigrants.

METHOD

Data Source

This analysis relies on data from the base year of the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS) because questions about school discipline only appears in this wave. ELS is a longitudinal survey administered by the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) for the National Center for Education Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004) of the U.S. Department of Education. ELS is "designed to monitor the transition of a national sample of young people as they progress from tenth grade through high school and on to postsecondary education and/or the world of work" (p. 7). These data include information about the experiences and backgrounds of students, parents, and teachers and physical and administrative descriptions of the schools the students attended. This research uses a subsample of the ELS data consisting of 9,870 students (with a modal age of 15) in 580 public schools.

Student Misbehavior

Students were asked if they have been involved in two forms of school misbehavior during the first half of the 2001–2002 academic year. Student misbehavior is a constructed scale that counts the number of misbehaving acts the student self-reported: (a) cutting or skipping classes (0 = never; 1 = 1–2 times; 2 = 3–6 times; 3 = 7–9 times; and, 4 = 10 or more times) and (b) getting into a physical fight at school (0 = never; 1 = once or twice; 2 = more than twice). Approximately 3,400 students engaged in at least one form of misbehavior while at school. The range for student misbehavior is from 0 to 6, with higher values representing higher levels of school misbehavior.

School Discipline

Students were asked if they had received one of three forms of school discipline during the 2001–2002 academic year: (a) in-school suspension (0 = never; 1 = 1–2 times; 2 = 3–6 times; 3 = 7–9 times; and, 4 = 10 or more times), (b) suspension or probation (0 = never; 1 = 1–2 times; 2 = 3–6 times; 3 = 7–9 times; and, 4 = 10 or more times), or (c) transferred to another school for disciplinary reasons (0 = never; 1 = 1–2 times; 2 = 3–6 times; 3 = 7–9 times; and, 4 = 10 or more times). Because the results were skewed with a mean of 3 on a 15-point scale, a dichotomous school discipline variable was created, where 1 indicates having received some form of school discipline and 0 indicates not having received a form of school discipline during the year. Approximately 2,080 students had received at least one form of school discipline in the sample.

Race, Ethnicity, and Generational Status

In the ELS survey design, Black/African American, Latina/o American, and Asian American students were oversampled to obtain sufficient representation for statistical analyses of these groups. The sample weights used in these analyses were calculated by NCES (2004) to compensate for the survey design and nonresponse bias. All of the analyses in this study incorporated sample weights. The sample weights are necessary in order to ensure that the results reflect a nationally representative sample of Black/African American, Latina/o American, Asian American, and White American tenth grade students (see NCES, 2004, for further detail).

Generational status is measured as a set of dummy variables indicating whether the student is a first, second, or third-plus generation. This numerical classification of generational status is commonly used in immigration research (Kao et al., 2013; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Immigration and birthplace information was collected on the parents' survey. First-generation students are children who are born outside the United States; second-generation students are born in the United States and have at least one parent born outside the United States; and, third-plus-generation students are U.S.-born with two U.S.-born parents.

Student and School Characteristics

Previous studies have established that a number of student and school characteristics are associated with the likelihood of school discipline. Student-level characteristics including gender, educational achievement, school involvement, family socioeconomic status (SES), and parental involvement, as well as school-level factors including size, diversity, poverty, region, and locale, have been linked to student's likelihood of being disciplined by the school and/or the school experiences of the children of immigrants (Peguero, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008; Skiba et al., 2011); therefore, this research controls for these student-level and school-level characteristics.

Gender is coded male or female based on the student's self report of their biological sex. Male students serve as the reference group. Educational achievement is measured using the standardized measure developed by RTI and NCES. ELS included a reading-and-math composite score based on standardized tests developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The composite score is the average of the math and reading standardized scores, restandardized to a national mean of 50.0 and standard deviation of 10 (see NCES, 2004, for further detail). School involvement measures if the student participates in any of the following four categories of extracurricular activities: (1) academic (e.g., honor society, band, yearbook, etc.), (2) school club, (3) intramural sports, and (4) interscholastic sports. The

preconstructed measure of family socioeconomic status (SES) is a standardized (z-score) variable based on five equally weighted, standardized components: father's/guardian's education, mother's/guardian's education, family income, father's/guardian's occupational prestige, and mother's/guardian's occupational prestige (see NCES, 2004, for further detail). The parental-involvement measure is constructed using eight questions that represented parents' involvement in their children's school experience. Students were asked to indicate the extent to which their parents or guardians engaged in a variety of school activities ranging from (a) checking homework (0 = never thru 3 = often), (b) helping with homework (0 = never thru 3 = often), (c) discussing school courses (0 = never thru 2 = often), (d) discussing school activities (0 = never thru 2 = often), (e) discussing things studied in class (0 = never thru 2 = often), (f) discussing grades (0 = never thru 2 = often), (g) discussing transferring (0 = never thru 2 = often), and (h) discussing college attendance (0 = never thru 2 = often).

School size is measured as the total student enrollment of the school. School diversity measures the percentage of students who belong to racial and ethnic minorities enrolled at the school. School poverty measures the proportion of students within each school who were receiving free or reduced-price lunches. School region measures whether schools are located in the West, Midwest, Northeast, or South. School locale represents whether the school is located in an urban, rural, or suburban (reference category) locale.

Analytical Strategy

Since ELS is designed as a cluster sample in which schools are sampled with unequal probability and then students are sampled, or "nested," within these selected schools, the subsample of the ELS violates the assumption of independent observations. The nested structure of the ELS data set (i.e., students within schools) makes multilevel modeling an appropriate analytic tool (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2008). Because student misbehavior is a scale variable, Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM) is utilized to analyze the relationships between race, ethnicity, generational status, and student misbehavior. Because school discipline is a dichotomous variable, Hierarchical Generalized Linear Model (HGLM) is utilized to analyze the multilevel relationships between race, ethnicity, generational status, and school discipline. All Level 1 (student) and Level 2 (school) predictors have been centered on their group means. This allows us to examine the probability of student misbehavior and school discipline within each school. This statistical approach facilitates a rigorous set of controls, based on prior research and theory, and isolates the "net effect" of individual predictors on student misbehavior and school discipline.

TABLE 1 Descriptive Statistics for Variables

Variable	Range	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Dependent Variable				
Misbehavior	0–6	.63	1.12	9,870
School discipline	0–1	.21	.41	2,080
Race and Ethnicity				
Black/African American	0–1	.15	.36	1,490
Latina/o American	0–1	.16	.37	1,630
Asian American	0–1	.11	.32	1,130
White American	0–1	.57	.50	5,620
Generational Status				
First generation	0–1	.12	.32	1,170
Second generation	0–1	.16	.36	1,540
Third-plus generation	0–1	.73	.45	7,160
Student Characteristics				
Female	0–1	.51	.50	5,040
Achievement	21.50–79.94	49.96	9.94	9,870
School involvement	0–4	1.48	1.15	9,870
Family SES	−2.11–1.98	−.07	.73	9,870
Parental involvement	0–18	8.10	4.98	9,870
School-Level Variables				
Size	52–4, 631	1,411	839.90	580
Diversity	0–100	36.89	31.53	580
Poverty	0–100	24.93	18.63	580
Midwest region	0–1	.24	.43	140
South region	0–1	.39	.49	230
Northeast region	0–1	.16	.37	90
West region	0–1	.21	.41	120
Urban locale	0–1	.28	.45	160
Rural locale	0–1	.22	.42	130
Suburban locale	0–1	.50	.50	290

The analyses proceed in several steps. Table 1 presents descriptive information for the variables in this study. Because race and ethnicity are important aspects of this study, the individual student-level mean differences between racial and ethnic groups are displayed in Table 2. Table 3 displays the multilevel results of the relationships and interactions between race and ethnicity, generational status, and student misbehavior and school discipline while controlling for other pertinent student and school characteristics. Table 3 displays the HGLM results of the relationships and interactions between race and ethnicity, generational status, and school discipline while controlling for other pertinent student and school characteristics.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Group differences between Black/African American, Latina/o American, Asian American, and White American subsamples are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 2 Individual Student-Level Descriptives by Race and Ethnicity

	Black/African American	Latina/o American	Asian American	White American
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Dependent Variable				
Student misbehavior	.73 (1.14)*	.92 (1.33)*	.59 (1.07)	.53 (1.04)
School discipline	.36 (.48)*	.25 (.43)*	.10 (.30)*	.18 (.38)
Generational Status				
First generation	.05 (.22)	.28 (.45)*	.46 (.50)*	.02 (.14)
Second generation	.07 (25)	.41 (.49)*	.48 (.50)*	.05 (.21)
Third-plus generation	.88 (.32)*	.31 (.47)*	.06 (.24)*	.93 (.25)
Student Characteristics				
Female	.51 (.50)	.52 (.50)	.51 (.50)	.51 (.50)
Achievement	44.38 (8.21)*	44.73 (9.33)*	51.97(10.26)	52.69 (9.32)
School involvement	1.46 (1.14)*	1.21 (1.13)*	1.43 (1.19)*	1.57 (1.13)
Family SES	−.27 (.64)*	−.48 (.66)*	−.05 (.86)*	.11 (.67)
Parental involvement	7.58 (5.47)*	7.02 (5.16)*	7.48 (4.78)*	8.68 (4.74)
N	1,490	1,630	1,130	5,620

*$p \leq .05$.

Note. Significance tests are based on chi-square tests (for dummy variables) and Welch's *t*-tests (for continuous variables) and verified with nonparametric Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests; Statistically significant in Bonferroni tests compared to White Americans.

Latina/o American students have the highest mean of misbehavior, followed by Black/African American, Asian American, and White American students, respectively. Clearly, the percentage of students who received a form of school discipline differed by racial and ethnic groups. Black/African American students report the highest mean of school discipline, followed by Latina/o American, White American, and Asian American students, respectively. There are also pertinent generational-status differences between racial and ethnic groups. Thirty-one percent of Latina/o American students are third-plus generation, compared to 6% of Asian American, 88% of Black/African American, and 93% of White American students. Additionally, SES for Latina/o American and for Black/African American families are below the average family SES for the entire nationally representative sample. Finally, for Latina/o American and Black/African American students, mean educational achievement scores are significantly below the average score of 50 for the entire nationally representative sample. On the other hand, for Asian American and White American students, mean educational achievement scores are above the average score for the entire nationally representative sample.

Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, and Student Misbehavior

Table 3 presents the HLM analysis of student misbehavior. As presented in Model 1 of Table 3, while controlling for other variables, race and ethnicity is

TABLE 3 Multilevel Modeling Effects and Standard Errors for Student Misbehavior and School Discipline

	Misbehavior				Discipline			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	β	*SE*	*β*	*SE*	*β(SE)*	*OR*	*β(SE)*	*OR*
Within School								
Race, Ethnicity, and Generational Status								
Black/African American	−.135**	.050	—	—	.614(.11)***	1.855	—	—
First generation	—	—	−.311*	.191	—	—	.255(.357)	1.293
Second generation	—	—	−.292**	.121	—	—	.779(.252)**	2.164
Third-plus generation	—	—	−.132**	.052	—	—	.592(.110)***	1.807
Latina/o American	−.023	.056	—	—	.062(.13)	1.066	—	—
First generation	—	—	−.158*	.097	—	—	−.380(.185)*	.689
Second generation	—	—	−.056	.068	—	—	−.096(.175)	.916
Third-plus generation	—	—	.045	.074	—	—	.427(.179)**	1.525
Asian American	−.231***	.055	—	—	−.254(.14)*	.783	—	—
First generation	—	—	−.256***	.069	—	—	−.318(.180)*	.735
Second generation	—	—	−.219**	.073	—	—	−.222(.191)	.816
Third-plus generation	—	—	−.456***	.135	—	—	−.505(.313)	.606
White American								
First generation	—	—	−.271**	.097	—	—	−.905(.355)	.817
Second generation	—	—	−.067	.072	—	—	.073(.187)	1.038
Student Characteristics								
Misbehavior	—	—	—	—	.693(.03)***	1.983	.691(.032)***	1.983
Female	−.112***	.027	−.111***	.027	−.654(.06)***	.525	−.650(.060)***	.523
Achievement	−.019***	.002	−.020***	.002	−.055(.01)***	.955	−.053(.011)***	.954
School involvement	−.002	.012	−.004	.012	−.092(.03)***	.916	−.094(.038)***	.918
Family SES	−.028	.023	−.030	.023	−.120(.05)*	.897	−.145(.051)**	.872
Parental involvement	−.019***	.003	−.019***	.003	−.015(.01)*	.980	−.013(.010)*	.981

Between Schools								
Size	.001*	.001	.001*	.001	−.016(.01)***	.975	−.015(.012)***	.970
Diversity	.001	.001	.001	.001	.013(.01)	1.018	.016(.017)	1.015
Poverty	.005***	.001	.005***	.001	.015(.01)***	1.019	.017(.010)***	1.034
Midwest region	−.171**	.064	−.171**	.064	.160(.13)	1.174	.179(.135)	1.186
South region	−.276***	.057	−.277***	.057	.343(.12)**	1.415	.350(.121)**	1.417
Northeast region	−.111*	.064	−.110*	.064	−.081(.13)	.936	−.086(.141)	.928
Urban locale	.160**	.052	.160**	.052	.160(.12)*	1.175	.165(.123)*	1.172
Rural locale	−.056	.042	−.055	.042	.109(.09)*	1.106	.106(.090)*	1.105
Random Effects	Variance	X^2	Variance	X^2	Variance	X^2	Variance	X^2
	.084***	1254.624	.084***	1258.844	.413***	1128.713	.421***	1129.896

*$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$. — means variable not included in analysis of that analytical model.

Note. Models 1 and 3: The omitted categories are White Americans, males, west region, and suburban schools. Models 2 and 4: The omitted categories are White American third-plus generation, males, west region, and suburban schools.

linked to student misbehavior. Black/African American and Asian American students are less likely to misbehave while at school. The results also indicate that there is no significant difference between Latina/o American and White American students in the likelihood that they will misbehave while at school. As for student characteristics, being female, increased educational achievement, and parental involvement are associated with decreased engagement in student misbehavior while at school. As for school characteristics, students who attend larger, poorer, and urban schools are associated with increased misbehavior while at school. On the other hand, students who attend Midwestern, Southern, and Northeastern schools are associated with decreased misbehavior while at school. These aforementioned student and school control characteristics remain significantly associated with misbehavior in Model 2.

In Model 2 of Table 3, generational-status categories by race and ethnicity are added to the analysis. While controlling for other student and school factors, Black/African American first-, second-, and third-plus-generation students are less likely to misbehave while at school than White American third-plus-generation students. Latina/o American first-generation students are less likely to misbehave at school than White American third-plus-generation students; however, Latina/o American second- and third-plus-generation students have similar likelihoods of misbehavior at school as White American third-plus-generation students. Asian American first-, second-, and third-plus-generation students are less likely to misbehave while at school than White American third-plus-generation students. White American first-generation students are less likely to misbehave at school than White American third-plus-generation students; however, White American second-generation students have similar likelihoods of misbehavior at school as White American third-plus-generation students.

Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, and School Discipline

Table 3 presents the HGLM analysis of school discipline. As presented in Model 3 of Table 3, while controlling for other variables, race and ethnicity is linked to school discipline. Black/African American students are more likely while Asian American students are less likely to be disciplined at school than White American students. The results also indicate that there is no significant difference between Latina/o American and White American students in the likelihood that they will be disciplined while at school. As for student characteristics, engaging in misbehavior increases the likelihood of being disciplined at school. On the other hand, being female, increased educational achievement, increased school involvement, increased family SES, and parental involvement are associated with decreased likelihoods of a student being disciplined. As for school characteristics, students who attend

larger schools are associated with decreased likelihoods of being disciplined. However, students who attend poorer, Southern, urban, and rural schools are more likely to be disciplined. These aforementioned student and school control characteristics remain significantly associated with misbehavior in Model 4.

In Model 4 of Table 3, generational status categories by race and ethnicity are added to the analysis. Latina/o American first-generation students are less likely to be disciplined at school than White American third-plus-generation students. There is no statistical difference in school discipline for Latina/o American second-generation students and White American third-plus-generation students. Latina/o American third-plus-generation students, however, are more likely to receive a form of school discipline than their White American third-plus-generation counterparts. Black/African American second- and third-plus-generation students are more likely than their White American third-plus-generation student counterparts to be disciplined at school. There is no statistical difference in school discipline for Black/African American first-generation students and White American third-plus-generation students. Asian American first-generation students are less likely to be punished at school than White American third-plus-generation students. There is no statistical difference of school discipline between Asian American second- and third-plus-generation immigrant students and their White American third-plus-generation counterparts.

DISCUSSION

There are important results related to race, ethnicity, generational status, student misbehavior, and school discipline that need to be highlighted and emphasized. First and foremost, once other student and school characteristics are controlled for in the model, the children of immigrants are not misbehaving more at school than their White American counterparts. Second, the patterns of school discipline are segmented by race, ethnicity, and generational status. Additionally, it appears that generational status is not a factor in determining the likelihood of school discipline of White American students. In other words, there are segmented patterns of school discipline by generational status, which varies by race and ethnicity.

Punishing the Children of Immigrants and the Significance of Race and Ethnicity

This study demonstrates that generational status matters for the school discipline of racial and ethnic minority students and the children of immigrants; however, these relationships are quite complex. Segmented assimilation,

specifically downward assimilation, is particularly useful to guide our understanding of this study's findings. This study's results highlight the importance of understanding the "Americanization" of a rapidly growing immigrant population in U.S. schools. Unfortunately, findings also indicate that the historic and persistent racial and ethnic inequalities evident within U.S. schools are presenting educational barriers and hurdles for the children of immigrants.

The United States has approximately 43 million foreign-born people, representing approximately 13% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). As a result, 20% of all students in U.S. schools have at least one immigrant parent. Unlike earlier immigration waves were most immigrants where from Europe, approximately 85% of recent immigrants are from Latin America, Asia, or the Caribbean (U.S. Census, 2010). Due to the change in the racial and ethnic composition of this wave of immigration, the persistent disparities linked to race and ethnicity appear to be contributing to the educational barriers that the children of immigrants face in U.S. schools (Olsen 2008; Peguero, 2009, 2011; Peguero & Bondy, 2011; Rong & Preissle, 2008). School is not only where the children of immigrants learn about U.S. values, beliefs, and behaviors but also about their social and cultural role in U.S. society (Olsen 2008; Peguero, 2009; Peguero & Bondy, 2011; Rong & Preissle, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to believe that the children of immigrants are assimilating or learning lessons of racial and ethnic inequality. Recently, Kupchik (2010) stressed that racial and ethnic minority youth in U.S. schools may be learning the "wrong" lesson when it comes to school discipline practices by suggesting that "this lesson encourages passivity and uncritical acceptance of authority, which bodes poorly for the future of democratic participation" (p. 7).

Research suggests that Black immigrant youth in the U.S. are confronted with racial and ethnic segregation and discrimination within their schools and communities (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Although Black immigrant youth attempt to distance themselves from U.S. native-born Black/African Americans and the associated marginalization, their immigrant status and ethnic identity does not protect these youth from the discriminatory practices that occur within schools (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Although Black/African American second- and third-plus-generation students are more likely to be disciplined than their White American counterparts, Black/African American first-generation students are also potentially vulnerable to discriminatory school discipline practices. For Latina/o American and Asian American first-generation students, their first-generational status is an insulating factor against school discipline; but not so for Black/African American first-generation students.

These findings also suggest that the children of Latina/o American immigrants become more likely to be disciplined at school as they move through the assimilation process or become "Americanized." Because Latina/o

American youth represent one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population (U.S. Census, 2010), this pattern of increasing likelihood of school discipline only further marginalizes an already vulnerable segment of the youth population. Latina/o Americans have the lowest rates of college enrollment, the highest rates of college attrition, relatively lower achievement, educational attainment and aspirations (Kao et al., 2013; Perreria et al., 2006; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001); finally, Latino American youth are three times more likely to drop out than White Americans (Perreria et al., 2006). Furthermore, these aforementioned studies suggest that these detrimental experiences and outcomes become more evident in the children of Latina/o immigrants' lives as they "Americanize."

While Asian American first-generation students are less likely to be disciplined at school, that insulating relationship is no longer evident for Asian American second- and third-plus-generation students. Asian American second- and third-plus-generation students have similar likelihoods of school discipline as their White American counterparts. The perception of Asian Americans as the "model immigrant" is a stereotype often assigned to Asian American youth; however, that perception has been both beneficial and detrimental to the Asian American students (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kao et al., 2013). Asian Americans are stereotypically portrayed as academic and economic overachievers, but Asian Americans often live in poverty, underserved by human services, underpaid, and often subjected to discrimination and harassment (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Lee, 2009; Segal, 2002). The feeling of alienation is also common for Asian American youth (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kao et al., 2013; Lee, 2009). School administrators, staff, and teachers often assume that Asian American students do not need help or assistance, which results in Asian American youth not being cared for by the school system (Lee, 2009). Although Asian American first- and second-generation students surpass the educational achievements of White American students, Asian American third-plus-generation students' dropout rate is much higher and mirrors that of White Americans (Feliciano, 2001). Feliciano's (2001) results are supported by this study's finding that Asian American second- and third-plus-generation students' likelihood of school discipline is similar to White American students.

Unfortunately, the pattern of downward assimilation in relation to school discipline found in this study is consistent with other disparities in school and educational outcomes. As the children of immigrants move through the assimilation process, their success and/or failure varies by generational status, which is replicated in this study's results. Some researchers find that the children of immigrants' educational optimism and aspirations decline from second- to third-plus-generation (Kao et al., 2013). Others reveal that the likelihood of dropping out increases as the children of immigrants move toward third-plus-generational status (Perreira et al., 2006). Peguero (2009) suggests that third-plus-generation students experience more violent

victimization at school than their first -generation counterparts. For the children of Latina/o American immigrants, as they advance through the assimilation process, they become more likely to be disciplined at school. Although the assimilation trajectory of school discipline is not as clear for Asian American students, it is certainly segmented, with the possibility of downward assimilation. Asian American first-generation children are less likely to be disciplined, but that protective factor is no longer evident as the children of Asian American immigrants move through the assimilation process. It is evident that Black/African American second- and third-plus-generation students have increased likelihoods of being disciplined; however, Black/African American first-generation students have similar patterns of school discipline as White American third-plus-generation students. Of course, school discipline policies are believed to be a necessary mechanism of school social control, particularly for deviant, delinquent, and misbehaving youth. This is only true if discipline policies are applied fairly, but research consistently indicates that this is not the case: racial and ethnic minority students are disproportionately subjected to school discipline (Kupchik, 2010; Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2011). Our research replicates this finding by demonstrating that the children of immigrants are not more likely to engage in misbehavior than other students, and yet, the children of immigrants are more likely to be subjected to school discipline, even after controlling for their misbehavior.

Limitations

There are limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, students' misbehavior in this analysis was limited to cutting and fighting. Indeed, there are a number of measures that constitute misbehavior that may lead to discipline such as drug and alcohol use, verbal abuse, offender bullying, and intimidation. Unfortunately, these aforementioned forms of student misbehavior were not collected in the ELS data. Second, since these results rely on self-reported misbehavior data, students could have exaggerated or underestimated their misbehavior at school. Third, information about who decided to discipline the student, as well as the reporter's demographic information, is not available. The race, ethnicity, or gender of the faculty member, administrator, or security personnel could play an important role in relation to the disparate punishment of the children of immigrants. Fourth, details about if and how zero tolerance policies were implemented within the school were not captured in the ELS data. Given that zero tolerance policies are unlikely to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in school punishments, the question of how zero tolerance policies are affecting the children of immigrants in terms of student misbehavior, school discipline, and educational progress deserves further scrutiny.

Future Research

Future research can certainly build on this study's findings. First, examining the longitudinal effects of school discipline for the children of immigrants is essential. Even though previous research suggests that there are detrimental effects associated with being subjected to school discipline, especially for racial and ethnic minorities, the specific consequences for the children of immigrants remain uncertain. Because racial and ethnic minority youth may be placed on a path toward educational failure and adult incarceration (Noguera, 2003; Rios, 2011), as well as a possible link between "Americanization" and increased likelihood of educational failure and adult incarceration for the children of immigrants, it is important to explore the impact of disproportionate school discipline on the children of immigrants' life course. Second, researchers have suggested that both school discipline and assimilation are gendered social processes (Skiba et al., 2011; Morris, 2005; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rong & Preissle, 2008). Although the focus of this study centers on the specific link between race, ethnicity, and generational status, exploring the role of gender in the disparities evident within the assimilation and school discipline processes is warranted and needed. Third, based on this study's findings, future research should utilize Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a theoretical tool to investigate the relationship between race, ethnicity, immigration, and school discipline. Solórzano and Yosso (2001) defined CRT as "an attempt to understand the oppressive aspects of society in order to generate societal and individual transformation and [it is] important for educators to understand that CRT is different from any other theoretical framework because it centers race" (pp. 471–472). As presented in this study's literature review and findings, it is evident that disparate punishment of racial and ethnic minority youth exists. Finally, researching the roles of the community and family characteristics in relation to the school discipline of the children of immigrants should be addressed in future work. In order to better understand the impact of immigration-related factors on youth's school experiences, the social, political, and economic context of immigration as well as family factors need to be considered (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Policy Implications

These findings have important implications for schools. Children of immigrants often experience disparate punishment by school faculty, staff, and administrators, despite this study's findings that the children of immigrants are less likely to engage in misbehavior while at school. Although the United States is currently in a heated debate over immigration policy and there is an increasing rhetoric that vilifies immigrants and their children (Chavez, 2008), it is imperative for school administrators and faculty to ensure the safety of

students and treat students fairly and impartially. Moreover, Chaudry and colleagues (2010) find that the political policy and law enforcement's practice of increasing immigration raids within the United States are resulting in serious detrimental outcomes for the children of immigrants. Chaudry and colleagues (2010) investigated the consequences of parental arrest, detention, and deportation on 190 children in 85 families in six locations across the country and found that separations from parents and economic hardships experienced by the children of immigrants contributed to adverse behavioral changes (Chaudry et al., 2010). School administrators and faculty should be mindful of the inequalities that the children of immigrants face within and outside of school, particularly in relation to school discipline practices in response to student behaviors while at school. Although data about the citizenship status of respondent youth or their parents were not collected in the ELS data, examining citizenship status in relation to disproportionate school discipline is warranted.

Conclusion

Disproportionate school discipline can place students on a course toward educational and economic failure (Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2011). Even though disproportionate school discipline is found to be incredibly damaging to students, zero tolerance policies have yielded dramatic increases in school discipline, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities (Skiba et al., 2011). Wacquant (2001) argues that "the penal state threatens the vitality of democratic engagement among youth and that we should invest in building mutual trust, democratic participation, and community building as a form of correcting the problem of youth violence in schools" (p. 86). Because many of the children of immigrants are already marginalized in schools, this study's finding only complicates the social problem of school discipline and highlights the need to further scrutinize the "Americanization" of immigrant children in U.S. schools. Because the social, economic, and political debate about U.S. immigration policy is controversial and heated, understanding and addressing the adverse treatment and schooling of the children of immigrants is essential. Understanding the pathways for educational success and failure for the children of immigrants is imperative because they are part of the United States' future.

REFERENCES

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Arcia, E. (2007). A comparison of elementary/K-8 and middle schools' suspension rates. *Urban Education*, *42*, 456–469.

Chaudry, A., Capps, R., Pedroza, J. M., Castañeda, R. M., Santos, R., & Scott, M. M. (2010). *Facing our future children in the aftermath of immigration enforcement*. Washington, DC: the Urban Institute.

Chavez, L. R. (2008). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Children's Defense Fund. (1975). *School suspensions: Are they helping children?* Cambridge, MA: Washington Research Project.

Chou, R., & Feagin, J. R. (2008). *The myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Feliciano, C. (2001). The benefits of biculturalism: Exposure to immigrant culture and dropping out of school among Asian and Latino youths. *Social Science Quarterly*, *82*, 865–879.

Kao, G., Vaquera, E., & Goyette, K. (2013). *Education and immigration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kasinitz, P., Mollenkopf, J. H., Waters, M. C., & Holdaway, J. (2009). *Inheriting the city: The children of immigrants come of age*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Crown.

Kupchik, A. (2010). *Homeroom security: School discipline in an age of fear*. New York: NYU Press.

Lee, S. J. (2009). *Unraveling the model-minority stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Morris, E. W. (2005). "Tuck in that shirt!": Race, class, gender, and discipline in an urban school. *Sociological Perspectives*, *48*, 25–48.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Educational longitudinal study: 2002 base year data file user's manual*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory Into Practice*, *42*, 341–350.

Olsen, B. (2008). How reasons for entry into the profession illuminate teacher identity development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *35*, 23–40.

Peguero, A. A. (2008). Bullying victimization and extracurricular activity. *Journal of School Violence*, *7*, 71–85.

Peguero, A. A. (2009). Victimizing the children of immigrants: Latino and Asian American student victimization. *Youth and Society*, *41*, *2*, 186–208.

Peguero, A. A. (2011). Immigration, schools, and violence: Assimilation and student misbehavior. *Sociological Spectrum*, *31*, 695–717.

Peguero, A. A., & Bondy, J. M. (2011). Immigration and students' relationship with teachers. *Education and Urban Society*, *43*, 165–183.

Perreira, K. M., Harris, K. M., & Lee, D. (2006). Making it in America: High school completion by immigrant and native youth. *Demography*, *43*, 511–536.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., & Congdon, R. T. (2008). *Hierarchical linear and nonlinear modeling, version 6.06*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.

Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: The criminalization of inner city boys*. New York: NYU Press.

Rong, X., & Preissle, J. (2008). *Educating immigrant students in the 21st century: What we need to know to meet the challenges*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Segal, U. (2002). *A framework for immigration: Asians in the United States*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C. G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, *40*, 85–107.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical Race and LatCrit Theory and method: Counterstorytelling Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*, 471–495.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Current population survey*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau, Population Division, Ethnic and Hispanic Statistics Branch.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wacquant, L. (2001). The advent of the penal state is not destiny. *Social Justice*, *28*, 3, 81–87.

Zhou, M. (1997). Growing up American: The challenge confronting immigrant children and children of immigrants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 63–95.