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Multiculturalism
Cultural Differences

"Culture is more often a source of conflict than of synergy. Cultural differences are a nuisance at best and often a disaster."

– Prof. Geert Hofstede, Emeritus Professor, Maastricht University.
Multiculturalism

• *Kosmopolites* – world citizens (Stoics)
  – Local community of birth
  – Larger community of commonality (source of moral and social obligations)
  – Critical examination of habits and customs

• Morally & Ethically important (Fowers & Davidov, 2006)
Multiculturalism

• Ideology relating to acceptance of diversity & cultural differences
• Psychological state of openness
• Relationship oriented, assuming context of cultural heterogeneity
Measurements

• Objectively as an index
  – Presence of a diverse context in which no one group represents a 50% majority (Graham, 2006)

• Subjectively as perception of school context
  – “students’ perceptions of whether cultural diversity is valued, utilized, and encouraged both at the organizational (school) level and in the classroom” (Tan, 1999)
Possible Benefits

• Increase comfort with others (Kurlaender & Yun, 2002)
• Feelings of safety, less victimization for ethnic minority youth (Graham, 2006; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2006)
• Neighborhood diversity & psychological outcomes (Georgiades, Boyle, & Duku, 2007)
• Teachers value integration and cooperation among students from all background → African American students attain higher levels of achievement (Epstein, 1985)
• Development of personality assets (e.g., empathy, flexibility, adaptability)
• Bicultural competency & positive mental health (Garcia Coll et al., 1996; Yasui & Dishion, 2007)
School Ethnic Diversity & Delinquency Trajectory
Delinquency Trajectory by Race/Ethnicity

• Life Course Perspective
  – Age-crime curve (Hirschi & Gottfredon, 1983)
  – Increases during preadolescence, peaks mid to late, decreases thereafter
  – Primarily shown among White and African American youth

• However, studies with Asian & Latino youth limited
  – Do they show the same age-crime curve?
    Rowe et al.'s (1994) review argued for similarities in trajectories
Moderators of Delinquency Trajectory

• Bronfenbrenner’s ecological system theory
  – Context moderates development

• Schools
  – School as “contexts of socialization” (Trickett, 1978)
  – School Demographics
    • Ethnic diversity of students & teachers
    • School size
  – School climate
    • Safety, Violence
    • Discrimination
Diversity of School Context: Advantages

- Social Contact Theory (Allport, 1953)
- Greater school diversity → fewer experiences of discrimination & victimization for minority students due to balance of power (Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2006)
- Schools supportive of cultural pluralism and diversity → students report higher academic self-efficacy (Green et al., 1988)
- Asians less likely to engage in substance use when schools or neighborhoods have high Asian or Latino majority (Kim & McCarthy, 2006)
Diversity of School Context: Disadvantages

- **Conflict theory**
  - Social identity theory -- > need to distinguish resulting in in-group, out-group biases (Tajfel, 1978)
  - Social threat, need for dominance
  - Greater self-protection & self-preservation tendencies

- **Constrict theory: isolation & anomie** (Putnam, 2007)

- Higher delinquency & victimization in more mixed school environment, (Ross, 1995; Vervoot et al., 2009), and potentially more so for white youth (Hanish & Guerra, 2000)
Aims

• Examine delinquency trajectory by ethnicity
• Examine influence of school covariates on delinquency trajectory:
  – Student ethnic diversity
  – Teacher ethnic diversity
  – Discrimination, violence
  – Positive school attitude
  – Negative school attitude
• Control variables
  – Family SES, generation status
Method

• Sample
  – In-home core sample of National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) (N = 18,753)
    • Ages (13 -25 years old)
    • Gender
    • Race/ethnicity: white, Asian, African American, Hispanic
  – National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY97) (N = 9,000)
    • Wave 1-8 (1997-2004)
    • Ages (13-25 years old)
    • Gender
    • Race/ethnicity: white, Asian, African American, Hispanic

• Analysis: Latent growth curve modeling
Measures

- Add Health & NLSY97
  - Self-reported age, biological sex, racial/ethnic identity
  - Generation (1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd}) – nativity of youth & mother
- Add Health only
  - Delinquent activity (Huizinga & Elliott, 1986)
    - 15 items, 7 aggressive offenses, 8 non-aggressive offenses
    - Examples: take part in serious physical fights, injured someone, threatened someone with weapon, pulled knife or gun
Measures

- NLYS97 Only
  - Delinquent activity
    - 10 items
    - Carried a hand gun, belonged to a gang, purposely damaged or destroyed property, stolen something, committed other property crimes, attacked with idea of seriously hurting, drug use
Student & Teacher Ethnic Diversity

Add Health Only

• **School Diversity Index** (Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2006; Simpson, 1949)
  \[ SDI = 1 - (f^2 + g^2 + h^2 + i^2 + j^2) \]
  Higher SDI, higher student ethnic diversity

• **Teacher Diversity Index**
  \[ TDI = 1 - (f^2 + g^2 + h^2 + i^2 + j^2) \]
  Higher TDI, higher teacher ethnic diversity
Other School Contextual Variables

Add Health

• Positive school experience (5 items)
  – Feels close to people at school, has good qualities, feel safe at school, happy to be at this school, feels part of school

• Negative school experience (2 items)
  – Trouble getting along with teacher, trouble with other students

• Prejudiced
  – Students at school are prejudiced
School Context

NLSY97

• Positive school experience (5 items)
  – Teachers good; teacher interests students; students graded fairly; discipline is fair; feel safe at school

• Negative school experience (2 items)
  – Students disrupt learning; cheating on tests/homework

• School violence (2 items)
  – # times threatened to be hurt at school; # times fight occur at school
RESULTS
Developmental Trajectory of Delinquency by Race, Add Health

![Graph showing developmental trajectory of delinquency by race. The graph illustrates the number of incidents decreases with age for Hispanic, African American, Asian, and White individuals.]
Developmental Trajectory of Delinquency by Race, NLYS97

[Graph showing incidents of juvenile delinquency by race from age 13 to 25. The graph includes lines for White/African American/Hispanic and Asian groups, with a downward trend indicating a decrease in incidents with age.]
**Effect of Covariates by Ethnic Group on Intercept and Slope Estimates For Delinquency Trajectories, Add Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.84*</td>
<td>-1.58*</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
<td>-1.72*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Covariates: School and Participant Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Diversity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Diversity</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td>-0.65*</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
<td>-0.56*</td>
<td>1.30*</td>
<td>-2.60*</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
<td>-2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive School Experiences</td>
<td>-0.62*</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-1.16*</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative School Experiences</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
## Effect of Covariates by Ethnic Group on Intercept and Slope Estimates for Delinquency Trajectories, NLYS97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope1</td>
<td>Slope2</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive School1</td>
<td>-1.294*</td>
<td>0.184*</td>
<td>0.061*</td>
<td>-0.706*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative School2</td>
<td>0.250*</td>
<td>-0.034*</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Violence3</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>-0.011*</td>
<td>-0.005*</td>
<td>0.069*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Discussion

• Convergence to low levels in young adulthood for all race/ethnicity regardless of initial rates in early adolescence

• School context as moderators
  – Students prejudiced increases delinquency
  – Positive school experiences decreases, negative school experiences increases
  – Teacher diversity – no effect
  – Student diversity – increases for all groups
Ethnic Diversity of Friends/Dating Partner & Delinquency Trajectory
Theoretical Considerations

• Differential Association Theory (Sutherland, 1939)
  – Delinquency is a learned behavior via social interactions with others, esp intimate personal groups

• Homophily Principle
  – Contact between similar people occurs at a higher rate than among dissimilar people
  – Selection trumps influence (McPherson et al., 2001)

• Bonding Social Capital

• Bridging Social Capital
Aims

• Examine influence of friend/partner’s race/ethnicity on delinquency trajectory:

• Control variables
  – Family SES, generation status
Measures

• **Friends ratio (Add Health)**
  - Proportion of co-ethnic friends from the 5 nominated closest same sex friends divided by the proportion of co-ethnic individuals in the attended school.

• **Friend/Partners (NLSY97)**
  - Best Friend’s race/ethnicity
  - Dating Partner’s race/ethnicity
  - First sexual partner’s race/ethnicity
  - Recent sexual partner’s race/ethnicity
Effect of Covariate Relating to Peers Ethnicity for Delinquency Trajectories, Add Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Co-Ethnic Friends/ Percent Same Ethnicity as Target in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.34*</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>1.41*</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Ratio</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td><strong>0.05</strong>*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vs. High SES</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td>-0.79*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med vs. High SES</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Born</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of Covariates Relating to Peers Ethnicity for Delinquency Trajectories, NLSY97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friend</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Partner</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sexual Partner</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Sexual Partner</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covariates: Ethnicity Match between Target and...
Multiculturalism & Subjective Happiness
Method

Sample (N = 338)

- Participants from an after-school youth program, and from school at large
- Males (53%)
- Age (M=12.5, range 11-15 yrs old)
- Generation Status (20% 1st, 50% second)
- Ethnicity: 47% Asian (predominately Chinese or Vietnamese); 37% Hispanic; 14% African American
Method

• Measures
  – Demographics
  – Subjective Happiness
    • 4-item scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999)
  – School multiculturalism
    • 4-item scale from Inventory of School Climate-Student Version (Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003)
    • How often teachers show they value racial harmony; students from different cultures are chosen to participate in school activities; youth get to do something to learn about different races and cultures; youth work with students from different races and culture in school activity
Method

• Measures
  – Social support (from California Healthy Kids Survey, WestEd, 2003)
    • Adult in youth’s life
  – Ethnic identity
    • 12-item of the Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992)
  – Ethnocultural Empathy (Wang et al., 2003)
Analysis

• Structural Equation Models
  – Mplus 3.1 (Muthen & Muthen, 2003)
  – Latent variables created by forming 3 item – parcels

• Mediator models: no, partial, full
Model C: Full Mediation

• Full mediation model supported:
  \( \chi^2 = 177.52, \text{ df}=127, p=.00, \chi^2:df = 1.40, \text{ RMSEA}=.045, \text{ TLI}=.972, \text{ CFI}=.977 \)
  Ethno empathy largest variance: 25%
Discussion

- Ethnically diverse context, sense of belonging, safety (e.g., Georgiades et al., 2007) & well-being
- School an important ecology of HD
  - School multiculturalism
  - Assesses the perceived structural components
- Ethno empathy, social support mediators
- Person-environment fit
Multiculturalism & Delinquency
Method

• **Measures**
  
  – **School multiculturalism**
    
    • 4-item scale from Inventory of School Climate-Student Version (Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003)
  
  – **Civic engagement** (Keyes, 1998)
    
    • Feelings of acceptance by community
    • Community participation/contribution
  
  
  – **Ethnic Identity** (MEIM; Phinney, 1992)
  
  – **Ethnocultural empathy** (Wang et al., 2003)
  
  – **Delinquency** (Elliott et al., 1995)
    
    • 5 serious interpersonal violence
Model C: Full Mediation

- Full mediation model supported:
  - SRMR = .040, RMSEA = .055 (.00, .10), TLI = .911, and CFI = .976.
Discussions

• Multiculturalism goes beyond presence of other groups; also includes norm settings, knowledge, resource building, cooperative interactions.

• Factors that facilitate growth and flourishing will also prevent a “ghettoization” of research on minority youth as only problem-oriented (Constantine & Sue, 2006).
Multiculturalism from Youth’s Perspective: Photovoice Project
Background

• Participatory-action research methodology

• Women in rural China (Wang, 1994)

• Rooted in Feminist Theory: inclusive construction of knowledge

• Photo novella & learning in dialogue: Pablo Freire
Photovoice and Youth

- Giving a voice to the youth
- Opportunity for self-reflection

Some Studies

- Issue of diversity in the classroom (Chio & Fandt, 2007)
- Youth empowerment in the community (Royce, Parra-Medina & Messias, 2006)
- Adolescent mothers (Stevens, 2005)
- Social image of youth (Messias et al., 2008)
- Flint Photovoice (Wang et al, 2004)
Method

• Recruitment
  – Fort Collins, Co: Flyer at after school programs.
  – Oakland, Ca: Through the East Bay Asian Youth Center.

• Sample
  – **Age**
    - **Ft. Collins/Loveland**: 14-15 yrs old
    - **Oakland**: 14-18 yrs old
    - **South Bronx**: 15-18 yrs old
  – **Gender**
    - **Ft. Collins/Loveland**: 4 male, 4 female
    - **Oakland**: 4 male, 4 female
    - **South Bronx**: 1 male, 4 female
  – **Ethnicity**
    - **Ft. Collins/Loveland**: 6 white; 1 Asian; 1 Undisclosed
    - **Oakland**: 4 Southeast Asian; 3 Hispanic (Mexican); 2 Black/African American
    - **South Bronx**: 2 Hispanic (Puerto Rican); 3 Black (West Africa)
Procedure

• Modified Photovoice Manual (Royce, 2003)

• Distribution of camera phones

• One on one interview

• Focus group
Empty Desk
Playground
Together
Ice Cream and Chinese Tea
Shadows
San Antonio District
Graffiti
Competition
Food is Universal
Preliminary Findings

• Commonalities
  – Unity
  – An ideal
  – Sub-cultures

• Differences
  – Fort Collins/Loveland youth: Symbolic images (the desk; leaves; tomatoes; school bus; playground etc).
  – Oakland youth: More concrete imagery (people, murals/graffiti, signs).
  – South Bronx: Emphasis on culture, conflicts/misunderstandings between cultures
Thematic Coding

- Unity
- Acceptance/Tolerance
- Celebrate differences
- Segregation
- Sameness despite differences
- Ignorance to topic
- Lack of institutional support and education of topic (or support)
- Uniformed distinction of other’s cultural practice
- Talk of misunderstanding leading to violence
- Innocence
- Need for belonging
- Realizing difference (non celebratory)

- Emotions coded in red:
  - Hopelessness
  - Shame/Pride
  - Sense of equality
  - Enthusiasm
Thank You!

Questions, Ideas, Thoughts?