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Immigrant-origin college students (those who have immigrated to the US and those who are children of immigrants) are a growing population. Currently, a third of all college-age young people in the US are first- or second-generation immigrants (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Despite their growing numbers, very little attention has been paid to their experiences during this developmental phase. Classic developmental theory suggests that this time of life, referred to as Emerging Adulthood, is characterized as a time of self-focus and ambivalence toward adult status for young people in post-industrialized nations (Arnett, 2006). For many immigrant-origin students, however, their experiences of this time of life can vary significantly from the native-born population (Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco & Dias, 2014). Arriving to diverse college settings (Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2011) immigrant-origin students often struggle to define themselves as they contend with acculturating to mainstream values and norms while simultaneously maintaining a sense of home cultural values such as family interdependence.
(Tseng, 2004). Furthermore, there are significant increases in levels of family obligation values (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) as well as community engagement (Flanagan & Levine, 2010) during this developmental period. How both of these types of social responsibilities (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011) are experienced in the lives of immigrant-origin students has hereto been understudied. This mixed-methods dissertation addresses these gaps in the literature through three iterative studies that utilized both a sequential embedded and multiphase design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Study 1 explores, through mixed-methods, how immigrant-origin community college students (N = 645) identify and achieve criteria of adulthood. Findings suggest multiple responsibilities are key during this phase of life as young adults form their identities. Next, Study 2 quantitatively examines profiles of engagement in family and community responsibilities through cluster analysis with (N = 488) first- and second-generation immigrant community college students. Qualitative case studies contextualizing each cluster profile provide insight into how these social responsibilities are experienced in the lives of students. Lastly, Study 3 examines quantitative trends of engaging in social responsibilities with a national sample of undocumented Latino college students (N = 797). Qualitative portraits from a participatory action research project utilizing verbal (interview) and visual (family-map) narratives of undocumented college students in California provide a deeper understanding of the value of “collective contribution” in undocumented students’ lives. Taken together, these three studies have implications for understanding and supporting immigrant-origin students in the various college contexts they are embedded within.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
Introduction

Immigrant-origin young adults (those who have migrated to the US as well as those who are the children of immigrants) are a growing population. Currently, the number of immigrant-origin young adults (age 18-34 years) has grown to nearly 20 million (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010), with one in four 16-25 year-olds in the US being either first- or second-generation immigrants (Batalova & Fix, 2011). In many ways, immigrant-origin young adults represent our future. As a nation, projections of foreign-born demographics continue to grow (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010).

In addition, immigrant-origin young adults are at the front lines for understanding the ways in which cultural shifts brought about by globalization play out (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Therefore, it is critical to understand their development and engagement in various social institutions.

An Integrative Model of Development for Immigrant-Origin Young Adults

The study of immigrant-origin young adults is scattered across multiple disciplines and literatures including psychology, sociology and education. The findings remain largely disconnected from one another and lack a clear theoretical model of development. Therefore, I attempt to fill this gap by bringing together these disparate threads of literature and present an integrative conceptual model of development for immigrant-origin college students to situate my dissertation studies (see Figure 1).

Immigrant-origin young adults contend with multiple social and cultural influences as they mature: acculturation to the cultural norms, values and expectations of the new host society

---

1 One of the challenges in reviewing literature on this developmental phase is the various age ranges and terminology that scholars use. For the purposes of this paper, emerging adulthood refers to the years of 18-25, which is in line with Arnett’s (2008) definition of emerging adulthood. Psychologists tend to use this age range. Other scholars, primarily sociologists, tend to examine “young adult” populations between the ages of 18-34. I will utilize the term “emerging adults” to refer to my sample, as criteria for inclusion was being within the 18-25 year range.
often through the college context, and *enculturation* to their native cultural norms, values and expectations through family. All of this occurs within a context of *globalization* where economic, cultural, technological and demographic shifts are occurring across the globe (Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Each of these influences impacts immigrant-origin young adults’ development in a variety of domains as they emerge into adulthood.

**Acculturation.** Broadly defined, acculturation refers to the societal influences on the dynamic psychological process of negotiating and developing between two cultures (such as majority and minority, or immigrant and host cultures) (Berry, 1997). As immigrant-origin young adults come of age, they often contend with different domains of acculturation, specifically socialization goals of individualism (Greenfield et al., 2003; Raeff, 1997) and individualistic social schema (Arnett, 2003) in addition to contending with discrimination and xenophobia (APA, 2012) (see Figure 1). These values of independence are reflected in child socialization goals (Greenfield et al., 2003) as well as institutional goals, particularly in US schools (Raeff, 1997).

Current theories of development suggest that emerging into adulthood is marked as a time of self-focus (Arnett, 2006). This is echoed by mainstream emerging adults as they characterize adulthood by individualistic criteria, particularly becoming independent from family and responsible for oneself (Arnett, 2003). The mainstream US criteria for adulthood are individualistic in nature and represent the norms of mostly middle-class White emerging adults from Western post-industrialized societies. Immigrant-origin young adults contend with these individualistic cultural schema as they acculturate to the larger US society (Syed & Mitchell, 2013).

**Enculturation.** At the same time, family is a proximal context in which immigrant-origin young adults are exposed to cultural values. Though not universal, many immigrant-origin
families bring with them collectivistic values of family interdependence from their home countries (Tseng, 2004) (See Figure 1). These cultural values for young adults highlight lifelong financial and emotional support between family members, living close to or with parents, and consulting parents on important decisions (Greenfield et al., 2003; Tseng, 2004). These values are reflected in the socialization goals of parents who wish to pass on the cultural values of their native culture to their children (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009). Research with immigrant populations documents the importance of family interdependence particularly among Asian Pacific and Latino families (Tseng, 2004). These cultural values stand in stark contrast to those implicit within the mainstream US conceptualizations about adulthood and suggest key ways that immigrant-origin young adults may differ from their native-born peers.

A manifestation of such cultural beliefs is a sense of social responsibility. Responsibility for others—often referred to as ‘social responsibility’ is rooted in relationships with others and is defined as a sense of responsibility and duty that extends beyond the self (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). Such social responsibility can often serve as a coping mechanism to discrimination and a sense of “moral exclusion” (Opotow, 1990) experienced by many immigrant and ethnic minority groups (e.g., Sirin & Katsiaficas, 2010). This sense of social responsibility can be for family members, peers, the immediate community, or go beyond to a sense of civic obligation (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). In the literature, these social responsibilities are characterized as family obligations (Fuligni, 2001; 2007) and community engagement (Jensen, 2008). These can take the form of contributing to family expenses at home and abroad, translating for family members and helping them navigate institutions, participating in protests and community organizing efforts among other tasks (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Fuligni & Pederson, 2002; Orellana, 2009; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010; Suárez-Orozco, Hernández & Casanova, 2015). Furthermore, as I argue below, these social responsibilities
reflect a value of “collective contribution” by which young adults and their families engage in mutual giving to one another to benefit the common good (see Study 3).

**Globalization.** Globalization is defined as “what happens when the movement of people, goods, or ideas among countries and regions accelerates” (Coatsworth, 2004, p. 38). Globalization has implications for the development of immigrant-origin young adults in four overarching domains: *economic* dynamics which have increased educational demands, *technological* advances and availability that promote transnational ties, *demographic* changes through increases in mass migration, as well as *cultural* processes in navigating the multiple cultural influences of home and school (Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004) (See Figure 1).

Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard (2004) note that immigration is “a powerful metaphor for many of the processes that globalization seems to generate” (p. 21). Globalization creates an ever more interconnected world where these enculturative and acculturative influences intermix in the daily lives of immigrant-origin young adults. In many ways immigrant-origin young adults sit at the intersection of “old” cultural traditions of their families and their “new” host societies (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). Globalization creates more fluid boundaries regarding “old” and “new.” Immigrant youth are often conceptualized as living “at the hyphen” of these two influences (Fine, 1994). Furthermore, globalization opens up what Maira (2002) describes as a “third place” (p. 87) where new creative dynamics are enacted and performed, unrestricted by theoretical binaries (i.e., here versus there). Instead of falling between acculturative and enculturative influences, Maira (2002) posits that global youth culture allows for “cultural reinvention” where immigrant-origin young adults are able to create who they want to be and how they want to braid together their cultural orientations.

**Flexibility as Developmental Process**
Greenfield’s Theory of Social Change and Human Development (2009) posits that the act of migration brings with it dramatic shifts in context, cultural norms and expectations. This is particularly the case for families that migrate from community-oriented (i.e., “Gemeinschaft”) ecologies with features of rural and economically underdeveloped contexts with socially interdependent values, to society-oriented (i.e, “Gesellschaft”) ecologies with features of large-scale, urban, wealthier contexts, with socially independent and autonomous values.

“Gemeinschaft” contexts tend to honor interdependent or collectivistic ways of being while “Gesellschaft” tend to value independent and autonomous ways of being. As families experience more contact with socio-economic mobility in their new society, their values shift from interdependent (i.e., “Gemeinschaft”) to independent (i.e, “Gesellschaft”). On the other hand, this theory suggests that events such as the Great Recession of 2008, where there was a marked downturn in economic means, result in values and practices that are more in line with community “Gemeinschaft” values and corresponding changes in one’s cultural values (Park, Twenge & Greenfield, 2013).

Immigrant-origin college students living in a large urban environment are developing at the intersection of these shifts. It is not just that youth are carrying with them value systems from the “old world” while developing in the value systems of the “new world,” but they are actively navigating, constructing, and flexibly adapting to their dynamic environments. These intersections subject youth to “cross-cutting currents” by which they must navigate and construct their own cultural values and developmental paths in their dynamic environments (Greenfield, 2009, p. 406).

How immigrant-origin young adults contend with these multiple influences has important implications for their development. Classic developmental theory (Erikson, 1968) suggests that this period of life is marked by a process of synthesizing these multiple social and cultural
influences into a coherent whole for all young people during adolescence and early adulthood. Navigating how to become an adult is particularly salient at this moment. In their comprehensive review of the literature on adolescence, Fuligni and Tsai (2015) found that immigrant-origin adolescents exhibit incredible flexibility in navigating values of independence and interdependence with family relationships and cultural orientation. This flexibility occurs in many of the settings of these immigrant-origin young adults’ lives, including in the everyday migrations between home and school and in developmental coming of age rituals (Maira, 2002). Many of the same developmental processes continue to occur in the lives of young adults (Arnett, 2006; Tsai, Telzer & Fuligni, 2013). Such developmental flexibility is adaptive, and might also apply to immigrant-origin young adults as they navigate these multiple influences on development.

Constraints and Affordances on Development

Immigrant-origin young adults are incredibly diverse. Demographic features both constrain and afford developmental flexibility. In some instances, such flexibility in moving between cultural values is afforded to certain groups. There are also various limitations to such developmental flexibility imposed by demographic constraints (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). Availability of resources is often constrained or afforded on the basis of race/ethnicity and country of origin, generation status, undocumented status, gender and socio-economic status. These demographic features intersect and have important implications for immigrant-origin young adults’ pathways into adulthood.

Race, ethnicity and country of origin.

Many young people from immigrant backgrounds contend with high rates of poverty (US Census, 2007) and differential opportunity structures especially if they are racial/ethnic minorities (Abrego, 2006). In particular, the pipeline to college is slim for emerging adults from
Latino, Southeast Asian and African backgrounds (Gandara & Jolley, 1999) making access to such resources difficult for many.

During this phase of life, immigrant-origin young adults are able to cognitively perceive input from their social surroundings. They become aware of the “Social Mirror” (Suárez-Orozco, 2004) or the reflections of themselves through the eyes of those in their social surroundings. For some this means assimilating to the larger mainstream society if they are able to “pass” as a member. For others who are marginalized as “racial minorities,” they may instead take on an “adversarial” identity negotiation strategy, which can limit developmental flexibility (Suárez-Orozco, 2004). Immigrant-origin populations, especially visible and racial minorities must contend with the current anti-immigrant socio-political climate in the US marked by xenophobia, discrimination and racism. This overarching ethos may manifest in both overt and subtle forms such as through openly targeting immigrant populations with discriminatory laws and practices (Lopez, Morin, & Taylor, 2010), the perpetuation of negative stereotypes, as well as more veiled forms of discrimination such as microaggressions (Sue et al., 2007). Such hyper-visibility in the public eye, coupled with daily experiences punctuated by the “social mirror” (Suárez-Orozco, 2004) of negative media portrayals and stereotypes about immigrants creates a negative environment for development for many racial minorities. In addition, discrimination and institutional racism place multiple barriers to success in these domains (Syed, Azmitia & Cooper, 2011).

Furthermore, cross-cultural research highlights some important ways in which country of origin matters. Arnett (2003) highlights that this developmental phase may only apply under certain cultural conditions, specifically, an increased median age of marriage and parenthood going beyond the late 20s within a society. These demographic trends tend to occur in post-industrialized nations including the US, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and
South Korea, whereas in developing nations such as India, Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia and Brazil, the median age still remains relatively low hovering around 19-21 years of age (Arnett, 2003). Furthermore, anthropological studies have shown that “traditional” cultures (non-Western cultures) elevate and prize collectivistic values such as interdependence, and duties and obligations to others more highly than the individualistic markers as the key transition to adulthood (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder et al., 2006). Therefore, young adults from immigrant backgrounds navigate different levels of discordance with the host society’s cultural expectations and values depending on the country of origin of their families.

A manifestation of such cultural beliefs is a sense of family obligations (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999; Fuligni, 2007), which have been examined extensively with adolescent populations. Family obligations comprise three domains: Attitudes towards providing family assistance, respect for the family and the importance of providing support in the future when become adults. Across the three domains, Latinos and Asian had a stronger sense of family obligations on all three domains than their European American peers (Fuligni et al., 1999). These ethnic differences held true regardless of immigrant generation (Fuligni et al., 1999). Young adults from Filipino and Latino backgrounds reported a stronger sense of family obligation than their Euro-American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). Additionally, as Eastern Asian adolescents became young adults, they changed to more closely resemble their Euro-American peers in their ratings of family obligations, with smaller proportions living with their parents and providing financial assistance to their families than Filipino and Latin American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). Therefore, immigrant-origin young adults often navigate discordant cultural values between home and school that can have important repercussions for development. Such cross-cultural conflict in value systems has been well-documented with young children in primary
schools (Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013), but has only recently been examined with young adult populations.

**Immigrant generation.** Both the first- and the second-generation share in common immigrant parents, reside in the same kinds of neighborhoods, and attend the same schools, however, researchers in the field have pointed to the importance of distinguishing the first- and second-generations in some critical ways (Rumbaut, 2004; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). The first-generation often must learn a new language, going through a difficult transition when they are unable to communicate their thoughts with ease (Rumbaut, 2004). The substantial time it takes to acquire academic English presents significant educational as well as social challenges for immigrant students (Cummins, 1991; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2010). In addition, the first-generation often contends with prolonged family separations during the course of migration, which may involve severe emotional and financial strains (Suárez-Orozco, Todorova, & Louie, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Bang, & Kim, 2011) which can propel them to take on adult roles.

In contrast, the second-generation often has limited facility in their parents’ native language (Portes & Hao, 1998), which presents an altogether different challenge of maintaining communication and navigating relationships at home with parents (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). At the same time, second-generation adolescents in particular may feel more comfortable with the cultural practices of the new land and may be more likely to clash with their parents’ desire to adhere to homeland practices and values (APA, 2012; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995) thereby constricting their flexibility.

**Undocumented status.** Approximately 1.1 million undocumented youth in the United States find themselves in a “suspended illegality” as they emerge into adulthood (Gonzales, 2011). As Menjivar notes, “Immigrants’ legal status shapes who they are, how they relate to
others, their participation in local communities, and their continued relationship with their homelands” (Menjivar, 2006, p. 1000). Undocumented young adults occupy the fault lines of ambiguous and rapidly shifting US immigration policy, and transitional moments of belonging as they emerge into adulthood (Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2015). Liminality because of their legal status defines their existence. Yet at the same time, the flexibility practiced by moving between being an insider and outsider, between the culture they were born in and that where they have grown up, can provide enormous benefits to the development of these youths.

This developmental period is particularly complicated for undocumented immigrants. On one hand, undocumented young adults are often propelled into adulthood, as they often must take on adult responsibilities and roles at an early age, in some cases filling in for parents who have been deported or left behind by raising siblings, contributing financially to the family and navigating legal and medical systems (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). On the other hand, as they begin to come of age, undocumented immigrants bump up against a series of barriers that prohibit them from participating in normative coming of age rituals and prevent them from reaching markers of adulthood. In many states inability to get a driver’s license, apply for financial aid for college, or get a job drastically reduces their future prospects as they transition into adulthood and contributes to a greater sense of social isolation from their peers (Gonzalez, 2011). Instead of emerging into adulthood like many of their peers, they often begin a process of hiding their legal status with feelings of shame and fear, into a period of “(sub)merging adulthood” (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011, p. 453) withdrawing from the larger host society.

**Gender.** Though understudied, there are significant gender differences that might impact how this period of life is experienced (Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). Immigrant girls and adolescents tend to develop deep connections to their ethnic heritage and communities, and they must also contend with the hyper-surveillance of their parents (Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006) and
the larger community (Zaal et al., 2007). As these girls and adolescents develop into women, they become the “keepers of culture” with projections of cultural values grafted onto their bodies (Espin, 1999). In addition, immigrant women face steeper structural challenges than do men—in 2008, immigrant women were twice as likely as immigrant men to be widowed, divorced, or separated; were less likely than immigrant men to have a bachelor’s or advanced degree; and were more likely than immigrant men to live in poverty (Migration Policy Institute, 2009).

Immigrant young men often engage in risk behaviors and delinquency more often than their female peers (Khoury et al., 1999; Ma, 2002). In addition, young men from a variety of ethnic backgrounds are often subject to stereotypes of inferiority and violence which serve as “psychological disparagement” in their host societies. As Suárez-Orozco and Qin (2006) point out, “engaging in delinquent behaviors is often a way to demonstrate status when other outlets or paths for social recognition are lacking” (p. 176). This is particularly the case in societies with racialized hierarchies of power.

Furthermore, family expectations regarding the contribution of young adults to their families oftentimes take on gendered patterns particularly in Latino families. Young women often experience expectations as caretakers (Muñoz & Maldonado, 2011) and young men as financial contributors to the family (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2011). In addition, daughters in undocumented families often fill the gaps left by mothers who are deported and may take on the roles of mothering their siblings that were left behind and taking care of the household chores such as cooking and cleaning (Katsiaficas & Suárez-Orozco, 2013; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). Such family obligations maybe further unequally distributed as women take on more roles inside the home (APA, 2012). Thus, becoming an adult can be difficult terrain to navigate, as the gendered expectations immigrant young adults’ families, cultures and society all significantly influence their development.
**Socio-economic status.** Income inequality has been steadily increasing since 1970 (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). Attaining a higher education degree is related to better employment rates and increasingly is necessary for many entry-level positions (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). Many children of immigrants do not graduate from high school, and if they enroll in college, they are more likely to enroll in a community college than a four-year institution; this is the case for both the first-generation (Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2011) as well as the second-generation (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004). Yet despite most community college students reporting plans to attain a bachelor’s degree, only one in five (20%) attain one after eight years; and almost half (46%) do not receive any credential at all after eight years (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). The length of time it takes to complete a degree within a community college setting precludes many young people to emerge into adult roles. Immigrant-origin community college students often find themselves caught in an economic undertow that constrains the pathways to adulthood.

**Statement of the Problem**

Educational settings are the staging grounds for developmental tasks during this phase of life (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Colleges often serve as the stages upon which these cultural influences play out as immigrant-origin students make sense of these multiple messages in their daily lives. Arriving to these educational contexts, immigrant-origin students often struggle to define themselves as students and forge adult identities (Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco, & Dias, 2014). In addition, immigrant-origin young adults frequently juggle multiple and competing responsibilities such as family obligations (Fuligni, 2007) and involvement in their communities (Jensen, 2008), on top of the demands of work and school. There are significant increases in levels of family obligations (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) and community engagement (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015) during this developmental period. In
addition, immigrant-origin students often cite these competing responsibilities as integral components of their adult identities (Katsiaficas et al., 2014).

Extant literature demonstrates a paradox of familism with regards to how these competing responsibilities relate to academic outcomes. For example, while highly valuing family obligations is related to higher educational aspirations (Fuligni, 2001; 2007), a strong sense of obligation to family can in some cases be negatively related to academic performance and grades (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999; Tseng, 2004). These results suggest that there may be an optimal balance of family and community involvement that helps immigrant-origin students engage in school while not interfering with academic performance.

Considering the growing numbers of immigrant-origin students, and the saliency of social responsibilities during this phase of development, it is imperative to understand these processes more deeply. Therefore, my dissertation takes on these gaps in the literature, utilizing both a mixed-methods sequential embedded and multiphase design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) to explore the adult identities, social responsibilities, and “collective contributions” of immigrant-origin students in diverse college settings.

**Research Questions**

Given the dearth of information on this topic in these settings, this dissertation will inform theory by utilizing both exploratory and explanatory mixed methods designs (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Each successive study builds on the findings of previous studies.

Study 1 examines through mixed methods RQ1: *How do immigrant-origin students characterize the transition to adulthood?* For this study, \( N = 645 \) immigrant-origin community college student responses to survey items (both scaled and open-ended) were examined.

Study 2 explores RQ2: *What are the profiles of competing responsibilities that immigrant-origin students juggle and how do they relate to academic time on campus?* For this
study, I analyzed self-report survey data from \( N = 488 \) immigrant-origin community college students to examine the typologies of competing responsibilities and their relation to academic time on campus. Both Study 1 and Study 2 relied on data from the *Research on Immigrants in Community Colleges* project.

Study 3 explores RQ3: *How do undocumented undergraduates contribute to their families and communities?* Study 3 relied on survey data from \( N = 789 \) Latino undocumented undergraduates from the UndocuScholars National Survey as well as \( N = 4 \) qualitative verbal and visual narratives conducted as part of a PAR project during the UndocuScholars Undergraduate Summer Research Program (see Katsiaficas et al., under review for more details on the study methods).

Together, these studies serve to advance current theories of this developmental phase for immigrant-origin students and inform policy and practices for this population. Understanding the multiple competing responsibilities that immigrant-origin students face is critical for college settings to effectively serve the needs of this growing population. Considering that immigrant-origin students are a sizable population that is continuing to expand, it is critical to the future of our country to understand their developmental challenges especially in these contexts.

**The Iterative Design of this Dissertation**

The design of the three studies that comprise my dissertation represent the work I have undertaken over the past few years. I began as a research associate with the Research on Immigrants in Community College (RICC) project during the Fall of 2010. RICC is a multiphase embedded mixed-methods study (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2011) of three urban community college settings that systematically examined classrooms as well as settings outside of the classroom that have implications for: 1) fostering relational engagement; 2) accessing relevant information/social capital; and 3) fostering academic engagement. I came onto the project with
questions that complemented the study goals. Particularly, I was interested in exploring the
developmental experiences of immigrant-origin students in these community college contexts
and how they emerged into adulthood. These questions became the starting point for my
dissertation as I was able to embed specific items into the larger RICC study protocols.

After spending a year conducting deep ethnographies on one of the campuses, for which I
served as the project site coordinator, I piloted questions as part of structured focus groups across
the three RICC campuses. Twenty-one participants took part in three consecutive weekly focus
groups that explored the experiences and perceptions of immigrant community college students.
These initial findings (Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco & Dias, 2014) informed the development of
the RICC survey protocol and RICC interview protocol. I served as a member of the protocol
development teams, which included a cultural developmental psychologist, an educational
sociologist, an anthropologist, a community college instructor, and bicultural immigrant college
students from a variety of origins. This team served to develop scales that were informed through
grounded emerging findings, building upon the mixed-methods foundations of the study
(Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). As part of the research team, I introduced specific measures and
instruments about adult identities, a subjective sense of adulthood, and assisted in creating
indexes of family responsibilities and community engagement (See Studies 1 and 2 measures
sections below for specific details). Further, in order to gain insights from participants on the
emerging quantitative results, I added complementary items to the semi-structured individual
interviews, which I helped to collect from a subset of participants (n = 58).

By investigating what it means to become an adult in Study 1, I came to understand the
centrality of social responsibilities in these young people’s lives. Thus, in Study 2, I explored
these social responsibilities more deeply with cluster analysis and embedded case studies. Both
of these data drawn from the RICC study have important implications for understanding the
experiences of immigrant-origin students in community colleges.

At the same time, I made my transition from NYU to UCLA in the Fall of 2012 and became a research associate on the UndocuScholars National Study in 2013. I similarly embedded items within the survey protocol in order to further understand questions regarding social responsibilities with a population of undocumented students from various college settings across the nation. This new data collection also provided the opportunity to revise and expand the survey instruments. Specifically, I developed alongside Dr. Carola Suárez-Orozco, an additional measure that captured the ways in which family members contributed to college students, while also expanding the measure of the ways in which students contributed to their families. These data became a natural extension of my initial dissertation questions, and with the approval of my committee members, I added this third study to my dissertation. These initial survey findings were further enriched by my experience with the UndocuScholars Undergraduate Summer Research Program (see Katsiaficas et al., under review for further details). This program fomented both theoretical and methodological developments that led to Study 3. Particularly, the notion of “collective contribution” first emerged during the program and was further explored through the verbal and visual narratives of Latino undocumented undergraduates in Study 3. Together, these three studies represent my immersion in exploring these questions across time and contexts.

**Significance and Implications**

The findings from my dissertation are intended to inform policy makers, higher education professionals and researchers in order to better meet the needs of immigrant-origin college students, which often go unmet in the institutions they are served by. The results from Study 1 and Study 2 will add to a dearth of knowledge about the “New Forgotten Half” (Rosenbaum et al., 2015) of those who attend community colleges. The results from Study 3 will add to the
growing debate regarding the role of undocumented families in our society, and help to provide insight into the ways in which they contribute to the communities they are embedded within. Together, this work heeds the call of researchers (Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Teranishi et al., 2011) to add to our understanding of the development of immigrant-origin young adults, particularly the ways in which they engage in various social institutions and emerge into adulthood. Furthermore, as scholars have pointed out, immigrant-origin youth sit at the front lines for understanding the ways in which cultural shifts brought about by globalization play out (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Taken together, these studies will help to inform researchers and practitioners of what we might expect the developmental implications of globalization to look like across various populations in years to come.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The remainder of the dissertation is organized into five chapters; two empirical articles utilizing the RICC dataset, the third empirical article utilizing the UndocuScholars dataset, followed by a summative discussion. Chapter 2 examines the conceptualizations and markers of adulthood with community college students from the RICC project. Chapter 3 examines the social responsibilities and academic time on campus of a subsample of first- and second-generation community college students with the RICC data. Chapter 4 examines the social responsibilities of undocumented undergraduates. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a cohesive discussion and describes implications for research and practice.
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Figure 1

*Integrative Conceptual Model of Development for Immigrant-Origin Young Adults*
Chapter 2

Study 1

“I know I’m an Adult When… I Can Care for Myself and Others:”

Multiple Responsibilities and Emerging Into Adulthood for Immigrant-Origin Community College Students
Abstract

Nearly a quarter of all emerging adults in the US are either first- or second-generation immigrants (Batalova & Fix, 2011) with cultural values that might contribute to conceptualizations of adulthood that vary in key ways from those of US-born populations. This mixed-method study examines the ways in which immigrant-origin 18-25 year-old community college students perceive adulthood and identify criteria for adulthood. The majority of participants felt that they had already reached adulthood at the time of this study. As immigrant-origin students emerge into adulthood, they cite multiple responsibilities as central to their adult identities. They also manage competing social responsibilities as they navigate community college.

Keywords: Emerging adulthood, community college, immigration, social responsibilities
“I Know I’m an Adult When… I Can Care for Myself and Others”:
Multiple Responsibilities and Emerging into Adulthood for Immigrant-Origin Community College Students

We are in a period of great transition for what it means to become an adult. A marked postponement of the transition into adult roles until the late 20 years of age (Arnett & Taber, 1994), shifting criteria for what it means to become an adult (Horowitz & Bromnick, 2007), and a diversifying demographic composition of 18-25 year-olds in the US signals a shift in the cultural construction of being an adult (Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). What once was a clearly defined path to adult status is now a multitude of complex trajectories, inspiring spirited debates in research, within homes, and across popular culture about what it means to become an adult.

In the US, young adults are increasingly from immigrant backgrounds. Those who have immigrated to the US themselves and children of immigrants are a growing population. Currently, the number of immigrant-origin young adults (age 18-34) has grown to nearly 20 million (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010), with one in four 16-24 year-olds in the US being either first- or second-generation immigrants (Batalova & Fix, 2011). Despite their growing numbers, very little attention has been paid to their experiences of this developmental phase. Immigrant-origin students are most likely to begin their post-secondary career in community college (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004; Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2011). Further, we know little about their engagement in US systems and particularly in settings such as community
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2 One of the challenges in reviewing literature on this developmental phase is the various age ranges and terminology that scholars use. For the purposes of this paper, emerging adulthood refers to the years of 18-25, which is in line with Arnett’s (2008) definition of emerging adulthood. Psychologists tend to use this age range. Other scholars, primarily sociologists, tend to examine “young adult” populations between the ages of 18-34. I will utilize the term “emerging adults” to refer to my sample, as criteria for inclusion was being within the 18-25 year range.
colleges (Teranishi et al., 2011). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the perception of adulthood and the criteria for adulthood with a sample of immigrant-origin community college students.

**Emerging into Adulthood**

There is great debate in the fields of sociology and psychology regarding this phase of life. Sociologists have mainly viewed this period of life as an extended period of the transition to adult roles including getting married, having children, finishing school, moving away from home, and entering the workforce (Settersten & Ray, 2010). Trends in reaching these discrete markers have shifted dramatically over the past 50 years, with the average age of marriage, first childbirth and entering the workforce full-time steadily occurring later in life for young people in post-industrialized nations (Arnett, 2003; Arnett, 2006; Arnett & Taber, 1994). This sociological phenomenon of historical, social, and structural shifts in post-industrialized nations have permitted a postponement of adult roles and perception of adulthood resulting in an extension of the period between adolescence and adulthood, opening up time for a new phase of development to emerge (Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Arnett, 2004, Bynner, 2005, Côté, 2006).

Furthermore, psychologists have noted that the point at which a person has left adolescence and becomes an adult is subject to various definitions by cultures (Arnett & Taber, 1994). The criteria for adulthood that emerging adults cite as central to their identities has also shifted beyond these sociological adult role transitions. Establishing independence is cited as the top criterion for becoming an adult (Arnett, 2003, 2004). Extensive survey and interview data with ethnically diverse emerging adults from various regions in the US demonstrate that emerging adults identify the top criteria for adulthood to include accepting responsibility for oneself, becoming capable of making independent decisions, and becoming financially independent from parents regardless of ethnic background (Arnett, 1998, 2003, 2004). In
addition, cross-cultural work suggests that accepting responsibility for oneself is a key marker of adulthood for emerging adults attending colleges in China (Nelson et al., 2012).

Other research suggests that there is much greater diversity in the ways in which adulthood is characterized (Horowitz & Bromnick, 2007). In their analysis of sentence completion data from 156 16-17 year-olds in the UK, Horowitz and Bromnick, 2007, found “an astonishing amount of variability” in the criteria for adulthood. Their work challenges the notion that there is a "discrete set of subjective markers" of adulthood (p. 209) and instead proposes that adulthood is constructed in the interactions between one and the environments in which one develops. In line with such findings, researchers have urged us to place the voices of participants at the center of this work to understand this developmental phase from the perspectives of diverse youth (Galambos & Leadbeater, 2000).

These delays in the onset of feeling like an adult and shifting markers of adulthood have led developmental psychologists, most notably Jeffery Jensen Arnett (2000), to argue that this transitional period is more than a staging ground for adulthood, and that it should be recognized as a unique and important life-course developmental stage in its own right, referred to as emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000). Emerging adulthood is marked by defining features referred to as the “five pillars” put forth by Arnett (2008). These five pillars include: a time of possibilities, instability, identity explorations, self-focus, with the hallmark pillar, ambivalence toward adult status (Arnett, 2006). Each of these features marks a central developmental process during this time of life.

Emerging adulthood is marked as a time of high hopes about the future (Arnett, 2008; Arnett & Schwab, 2012) and opportunities to make transformational life changes (Arnett, 2004, 2008). For many entering college becomes a way to significantly change one’s life course as youth are exposed to diverse ideas and connected to tangible opportunities that can shift their life.
Instability during emerging adulthood is characterized as occurring in three domains: romantic relationships, work, and place of residence (Arnett, 2004). For many emerging adults, this phase of life represents the time when they will leave the parental home and live either independently, with peers or in a college residential setting (Arnett, 2004). Such residential changes in the US peak during emerging adulthood and decline over the course of adulthood (Arnett, 2008). Instability in these domains gives way to continued identity explorations in these domains during this time of life. In addition, Arnett (2008) asserts that emerging adults are self-focused because “they have little in the way of social obligations, little in the way of duties and commitments to others, which leaves them with a great deal of autonomy in running their own lives” (Arnett, 2008, p. 10). The hallmark of emerging adulthood is feeling neither fully adult nor still an adolescent (Arnett, 2008). Most of the research in this domain has been conducted with responses to a single item: “Do you feel that you have reached adulthood?” The majority of young emerging adults respond with an answer “In some ways yes and in some ways no” (Arnett, 2008; Arnett & Schwab, 2012). Research suggests that the gradual nature of the criteria for adulthood that emerging adults often use to describe adulthood rather than hard markers (e.g., getting married, having children, etc.) creates a sense of being “in-between” during this phase of life (Arnett, 2008).

These pillars, however, are distinctly American in their conceptualization and for many young people these pillars do not attend to the diversity of experiences in their lives. One of the major critiques of this theory is that a period of emerging adulthood largely applies to the White middle class, as nearly all studies regarding emerging adulthood that have taken place in the US thus far have been conducted with predominantly White middle-class samples (Arnett, 2003; Syed & Mitchell, 2013), therefore not reflecting the diversity of experiences of other populations. Further, the majority of research on this developmental period reflects populations
in four-year college settings (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2006) and excludes the experiences of “the new forgotten half”: those who find themselves in community college settings (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). As immigrant-origin students often end up in community colleges, these spaces play a critical role in the developmental trajectories of immigrant-origin students (Teranishi et al., 2011).

Two of the five pillars of Emerging Adulthood theory are particularly problematic when applying to immigrant-origin populations. Most distinctly, ambivalence towards adult status and marking this period as a time of self-focus may not universally apply as the theory suggests. Furthermore, the criteria for adulthood may not solely convey values of independence and autonomy with this population. Yet, no study to date has directly tested these assumptions with immigrant-origin community college students.

**Variations in Experiences of Emerging Adulthood**

Youth in post-industrialized nations are “developing within the context of emerging adulthood, whether or not they themselves take part in it” and must contend with the shifting ideals of what it means to become an adult (Syed & Mitchell, 2013, p.2). How emerging adulthood is experienced varies by demographic differences including ethnic and racial groups, immigration generational status, family socio-economic status, and gender, as well as by the historical moment (e.g., developing during the Great Recession; Park, Twenge & Greenfield, 2013). Placing this theory into developmental context across cultures, we see the emergence of multiple “emerging adulthood(s)” across the globe (Arnett, 2011). There is great variation in how this period of life is navigated with multiple pathways that differ for diverse youth in the US (Syed & Mitchell, 2013) and cross-culturally (Arnett, 2011).

**Ambivalence toward adult status.** Feeling as though one is no longer an adolescent but not yet an adult is increasingly common among 18-25 year-olds. Extant literature suggests that
the majority of 18-25 year-olds in the US do not consider themselves adults (Arnett, 2000, Badger, Nelson & Barry, 2006; Nelson et al., 2012), however, there are significant ethnic differences. Limited research by Arnett (2003) found that White and Asian emerging adults were more likely to endorse a sense of “feeling in between,” the hallmark of emerging adulthood, during the ages of 18-25 years. In contrast, Black and Latino emerging adults were more likely to respond that they had already reached adulthood during this time frame. Thus, the perception of when one becomes and adult and what it means to become an adult may vary significantly by ethnic and racial groups. Notably, however, in this instance racial group membership was confounded with social class, whereas White and Asian emerging adults were more likely to come from higher SES backgrounds than the Black and Latino emerging adults, which might account for these findings (Arnett, 2003). While such research documents important distinctions in trajectories based on demographic differences, it does not address the implications of such variability for the theory of emerging adulthood.

**Criteria for adulthood.** There are major differences between the first- and second-generation immigrant-origin emerging adults in the sociological criteria of adulthood, perhaps a function that the first-generation initiates migration, while the second-generation is born in the US to parents who migrated. The first-generation has a greater propensity than their second-generation peers to reach the five major sociological transitions to adulthood – leaving home, finishing school, entering the work force, getting married, and having children (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Although there is diversity within ethnicities, race, and social class, second-generation immigrants are most likely to be living at home with their parents, to be pursuing a higher education degree, and the least likely to be married or have children (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010) suggesting that they may be more likely to experience a period of emerging adulthood. An important distinction is that second-generation emerging adults, however, are more likely to be
employed and helping to support their family while living at home, which suggests greater value of family interdependence than non-immigrant populations (Tseng, 2004).

Immigrant-origin emerging adults may espouse cultural values that contribute to conceptualizations of adulthood that vary in key ways from those of native populations. Although not universal, many immigrant-origin families bring with them collectivistic values of familism and family interdependence from their home countries, which stand in stark contrast to the more typical mainstream US individualistic schemas (Greenfield, 2009; Nelson et al., 2012; Tseng, 2004). Greenfield’s Theory of Social Change and Human Development (2009) suggests that as families migrate from community-oriented (i.e., “Gemeinschaft”) ecologies marked by rural, poorer, socially interdependent contexts, to society-oriented (i.e, “Gesellschaft”) ecologies marked by large-scale, urban, wealthier, socially independent contexts, shifts in cultural values and development occurs. “Gemeinschaft” contexts tend to honor interdependent or collectivistic ways of being while “Gesellschaft” contexts tend to value independent and autonomous ways of being (Greenfield, 2009). These shifts in context result in corresponding changes to individual’s cultural values.

Low-income, immigrant-origin community college students, living in a large urban environment are developing at the intersection of these shifts. These intersections, subject youths to “cross-cutting currents” by which they must navigate and construct their own cultural values and developmental paths in their dynamic environments (Greenfield, 2009, p. 406). They are living within a large urban center that is marked by Gesellschaft. Yet the economic climate may further shift as a result of events such as the Great Recession of 2008 where there was a marked downturn in economic means, resulting in values and practices that are more in line with community “Gemeinschaft”(Park et al., 2013). Many also may have parents who migrated from “Gemeinschaft” contexts. Research with immigrant populations documents the importance of
family interdependence particularly among Asian Pacific and Latino families (Tseng, 2004). The cultural demands of family interdependence on emerging adults highlight lifelong financial and emotional support between family members, living close to or with parents, and consulting parents on important decisions (Tseng, 2004).

These cultural values are also often referred to as social responsibilities, which are a sense of responsibility and duty that extends beyond the self to family members, peers, community or beyond (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). These types of responsibilities may occur in both the domains of the family and community; a manifestation of which is a sense of family obligations (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999; Fuligni, 2007), which have been examined extensively with adolescent populations. Family obligations comprise three domains: attitudes towards providing family assistance, respect for the family, and the importance of providing support in the future when they become adults (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999). Longitudinal research suggests that as adolescents emerge into adulthood, a central developmental task is learning to balance individual autonomy with family connectedness (Tsai, Telzer & Fuligni, 2013).

Emerging adults from Filipino and Latino backgrounds reported a stronger sense of family obligation than their Euro-American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). On the other hand, as East Asian adolescents became emerging adults, they changed to more closely resemble their Euro-American peers in their ratings of family obligations, with smaller proportions living with their parents and providing financial assistance to their families than Filipino and Latin American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). These findings suggest that this time of life perhaps is not only driven by “self-focus” but that values of family interdependence also come to the forefront (Katsiaficas et al., 2014).
Furthermore, cultural values of connectedness suggest that criteria for adulthood may differ in key ways for immigrant-origin emerging adults from backgrounds that promote such cultural values. Such values often give way to juggling multiple and competing responsibilities such as contributing to family expenses at home and abroad, caring for siblings and extended family members, translating for family members and helping them navigate institutions among other tasks (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002; Orellana, 2009; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). There are significant increases in levels of family obligations (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) and community engagement (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Suárez-Orozco, Hernandez, & Casanova, 2015) during this developmental period. In addition, for immigrant-origin community college students, adulthood was defined not only by these individual responsibilities but also by competing social responsibilities to both their families and communities (Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco & Dias, 2014). These results highlight the centrality of family responsibilities and obligations (Fuligni, 2007) and values of family interdependence (Tseng, 2004) in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students.

Current study

The aim of this study is to explore how immigrant-origin community college students characterize the developmental period as they emerge into adulthood. Given the saliency of competing social responsibilities during this time of life, it is critical to examine the ways in which these responsibilities play a role in the transition to adulthood. This study utilizes a mixed-method convergent parallel design, which collects both quantitative measures and qualitative instruments concurrently, analyzes the datasets separately and then integrates the results to interpret findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This approach allows for alternating between hypothesis generating and hypothesis testing strategies to further develop an understanding of a
heretofore under-studied topic for this population. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

Through descriptive quantitative analyses,

RQ1. Do immigrant-origin community college students feel that they have reached adulthood?

Through qualitative analyses of sentence completions,

RQ2. What criteria do immigrant-origin community college students identify as critical to achieve adulthood?

   RQ2b. How do these criteria differ by gender, generation, or ethnicity?

Finally through descriptive quantitative analyses,

RQ3. How do extant criteria of adulthood (i.e., sociological markers of adulthood) as well as their own criteria (i.e., from RQ2) apply to immigrant-origin community college students?

Methods

Procedure

Participants were recruited as part of a pilot of a larger study, Research on Immigrants in Community College (RICC). RICC is a multiphase embedded mixed-methods study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) of three urban community college settings. This project systematically examined classrooms as well as settings outside of the classroom that have implications for 1) fostering relational engagement; 2) accessing relevant information/social capital; and 3) fostering academic engagement. The data collected included Phase 1: ethnographies, 60 structured classroom observations, and nine semi-structured group interviews; Phase 2: 645 student surveys (matched to student records); Phase 3: 58 semi-structured interviews of students, and 45 instructor and administrator interviews. Phase 1 took place between 9/2010 to 6/2012 and Phases 2 and 3 occurred from 2/2011 through 10/2012. The data for this study were drawn from survey responses from Phase 2.
Three distinct community colleges in a large urban center in the Northeast were selected to participate in the RICC study with the explicit intention of including institutions with varying campus-level characteristics and contexts. All participating community colleges offered two-year public associate’s degree programs and served low-income, ethnically diverse immigrant-origin commuter populations. Located in the poorest congressional district in the nation, Taino was the first two-year, public, open admissions, and bilingual college in the state, created to serve the needs of the local Latino community. During data collection, Taino served predominately Latino (64%) and Black (31%) students, with a very small population of White (2%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (3%) students. More than 90% of the student body reported speaking a language other than English at home. Located in the burgeoning downtown section of a large urban center, Domino began as a trade school in a former industrial neighborhood, and more recently focused heavily on technological education. The racial/ethnic background was highly diverse and the majority of students reported being non-White: 33.2% Latino, 32.5% Black (non-Latino), 19.2% Asian/Pacific Islander 11.2%, White (non-Latino), 0.5% Native American, and 3.4% “other” ethnic groups. Forty percent of the students were born outside of the US representing 134 countries, and 62% reported speaking a language other than English at home. Although a commuter school, Oakmont physically resembled more of a traditional four-year university campus, located in an affluent suburban county roughly 90 minutes away from a major urban city center known for longstanding class-based (i.e. socioeconomic) segregation. Reflecting our country’s rapidly shifting demographics, Oakmont shifted to just under half (49%) its students from White ethnic backgrounds. At the time of data collection, this college had the highest percentage of non-white students in the state system with the largest growth occurring in the low-income Latino (28%) and Black (21%) student population. Foreign-born
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3 All campus names are pseudonyms.
students represented a particularly large segment of this demographic transformation representing 42% of the students who attended the campus during data collection.

**Online survey.** In phase 2 of the project, the research team developed a survey addressing the constructs of interest for the study based on the initial findings from a pilot study with group interview data (see Katsiaficas et al., 2014). Given the population, standardized protocols were often not available. In order to develop a survey that would be relevant across groups, scale development was informed through ethnographic fieldwork, group interviews, and grounded emerging findings, building upon the mixed-methods foundations of this study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The author served as a member of the protocol development team, which included a cultural developmental psychologist, an educational sociologist, an anthropologist, a community college instructor, and bicultural immigrant college students from a variety of origins. Each item of every scale included in the protocols was discussed and wording was revised until there was agreement that the items were meaningful and appropriate. Surveys were piloted with immigrant-origin emerging adult participants and then reviewed in the development team and modified to make as accessible as possible. Specific measures and instruments about adult identities, a subjective sense of adulthood, and indexes of family responsibilities and community responsibilities were specifically tailored for this study and introduced into the protocol by the author (see Measures section below for specific details).

The survey was administered through Qualtrics on-line software (2012). The survey was made available in Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin), and English. Students were qualified to participate if they met the following criteria: a) they were between the ages of 18 and 25; b) they were enrolled full-time in a degree-seeking program in one of the college campuses we were studying. Efforts were made to obtain a demographically balanced sample across genders,
generations, and ethnic groups that were representative of the three participating campuses. Participants received US$25 cash or Amazon gift certificate for completing the survey.

**Participants**

A total of 645 participants (\(M_{\text{age}} = 20\)) took the online survey for the RICC project. Over half (54.6%) of the sample was female; the sample was ethnically diverse with 39.3% Latino/a, 26.9% Black, 12.7% White, 9.1% Asian and 12.1% “other” participants. Thirty-three and a half percent of participants were first-generation (born in their country of origin and having migrated to the US themselves) 43% were second-generation (born in the US to at least one foreign-born parent), and 23.5% were 3+ generation (born in the US to US-born parents). Of those who reported their annual household income, the majority of the participants (72.5%) reported that they made less than $50,000 per year. Over a third of the sample (38.9%) reported an annual household income of less than $20,000 per year. Table 1 presents the demographic breakdown for the survey sample.

**Quantitative Measures**

**Student demographics.** Students were asked to provide self-reports of their gender, ethnicity, immigrant generation status, and household income (a proxy for socio-economic status) as part of the survey. In addition, they were asked to report on four of the five sociological markers of adulthood: leaving home, entering the work force, getting married, and having children (Settersten & Ray, 2011). Since a requirement for inclusion in the study was currently being enrolled in community college, “finishing school” as a marker of adulthood was not examined.

**Subjective sense of adulthood.** The subjective sense of adulthood measure was adapted from two frequently used measures in the field. The first item, “I consider myself to be an adult,”
has been used widely in the field and was adapted from (Arnett, 1997). The scale's original response set ranged from 1 (No); 2 (In some respects yes, In some respects no); 3 (Yes).

The last two items were adapted from the 3-item Sense of Adulthood scale (Luyckx et al., 2006), which were adapted from the identity stage resolution index (Cote, 1997). Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements about becoming an adult, "I feel respected by others as an adult;" "I feel I have fully matured;" The original response set was a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1(not at all true) to 5 (entirely true). For this study, the response set was standardized across these three items to a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in order to facilitate scaling. The scale showed good reliability with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .76$ for the full sample ($N = 629$) with $M = 3.82$, $SD = .80$.

**Family responsibilities.** The family responsibilities measure is an index of the types of family-oriented activities that students often participate, and was created by the author and C. Suárez-Orozco. First, participants responded to the question, “Do you have responsibilities helping out your parents or relatives?” Descriptive results presented in Table 2 show the percentages of participants who responded that they had any family responsibilities by demographic group.

Next, if participants responded that they engaged in family responsibilities, they were prompted to rate the frequency of their participation in four different family responsibility activities in the past month, ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once a month), 2 (2-3 times a month), 3 (once a week) and 4 (2-3 times a week), 5 (daily). These activities included helping family members with translation, taking care of children or the elderly in their family, providing advice or advocacy for people in their family, and other activities (which they wrote in). Descriptive
results of which family responsibility activities they participated in were calculated based on the index of activities.

**Community responsibilities.** The community responsibilities measure is an index of the types of community-oriented activities that students often participate, and was adapted by the author and C. Suárez-Orozco from the Civic Trust Study (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Descriptive results presented in Table 2 show the percentages of participants who responded that they had engaged in any community responsibilities in the past month by demographic group.

Participants were asked the frequency of their participation in seven different activities, ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once a month), 2 (2-3 times a month), 3 (once a week) and 4 (2-3 times a week), 5 (daily). These activities comprised a seven-item index and included, helping people in their community with translation, taking care of children or the elderly in their community, providing advice or advocacy for people in the community, mentoring young people, coaching young people, volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center in the community, engaging a cause that they care about. Descriptive results of which community responsibility activities they participated in were calculated based on the index of activities.

**Work outside of school.** Participants were asked to self-report about work they completed outside of school. Specifically, participants were asked the following questions: “Do you work?” “What kind of work do you do?” “How many hours per week do you work on average?” as part of the larger RICC survey. Descriptive results presented in Table 2 show the percentages of participants who work outside of school by demographic group.

**Qualitative Instruments**

**Sentence completion.** A sentence-completion item was included as part of the larger RICC survey. Participants were asked to "complete the following sentence with the first thing
that comes to mind." The item is taken from Horowitz and Bromnick’s (2007) open-response items used to understand subjective markers of adulthood. Participants completed the sentence, "You know you are an adult when..." All texts were recorded verbatim from participants who directly typed in their responses to the survey. A small minority, (5.7% of participants) were missing data for the sentence completions.

**Analytic Strategy**

Utilizing a convergent mixed-method design allowed for analyzing qualitative and quantitative components of the data separately and to then place these findings in conversation with one another (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

To test RQ1. Regarding whether participants felt they had reached adulthood, a frequency analysis of responses to the item, *I consider myself to be an adult*, was conducted. ANOVA were used to test whether there were significant differences on responses to the three-item subjective sense of adulthood scale based on age.

To test RQ2., regarding what criteria immigrant-origin community college students identified as critical to achieve adulthood, responses to the open-ended item, *You know you’re an adult when...*” were analyzed. These qualitative data were coded utilizing an open-coding process with phrases as the units of analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) by the author and a research assistant. Initially, convergent codes were identified around themes that had previously emerged from on-going analysis of ethnographic observations. In addition, new emergent descriptive themes from the responses were identified (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). These responses were compared and integrated into a single comprehensive list of coding categories (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The coding scheme was then refined by discussing the meanings and relationships of each coding category and established rules for assigning codes to phrases (Mattis et al., 2008). A table of the codes, definitions and percentages of codes applied is presented in
Table 3. Next, the two coders assessed the reliability of the coding scheme using randomly selected narrative samples from 25% of the data. The formula for inter-rater reliability is: inter-rater reliability = agreement/(agreement + disagreement). Both coders reached 85.1% reliability before independently coding the rest of the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Responses were reviewed again and themes were applied to phrases. This was critical as in the first phase a generative list was created, but was not applied to all the data. Each response was coded with any of the codes that were appropriate, meaning that “double-coding” was used where necessary. Thus, the calculations presented below reflect how many of the markers listed included that thematic coding category. Lastly, themes were clustered into theoretical constructs linked to broader psychological theory regarding emerging adulthood (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

To test RQ2B, the qualitative codes assigned to the sentence completion responses were quantified to reveal patterns. Group differences based on demographic factors were examined utilizing chi-square analysis, to determine whether markers of adulthood varied by gender, generation status, ethnic/racial group or age.

Then, to examine RQ3, a descriptive analysis was conducted to examine to what extent extant criteria (i.e., sociological markers) as well as their own criteria (i.e., including participating in various competing responsibilities) applied to participants lives. Finally, the results from these various data were synthesized in the discussion (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

---

Footnote: There were minimal missing data for each of the standardized scales. Data validation techniques were implemented throughout the survey to ensure high responses rates to items (Qualtrics, 2012). However, there were still minimal missing data for the scales analyzed including: The subjective sense of adulthood scale was missing 2.9% of responses; Family responsibilities was missing 6.4% of responses; Community responsibilities were missing 3.6% of responses; work outside of school was missing 2.9% of responses. Cases with incomplete data were deleted for each analysis where data were missing (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
Results

Perceived Adult Status (RQ1.)

In response to the item, *I consider myself to be an adult*, the majority of participants (71.0%) responded that they either “agreed” (44.6%) or “strongly agreed” (26.4%) that they consider themselves to be an adult. Nearly a fifth (19.0%) of emerging adults responded that they “neither agreed nor disagreed,” suggesting the classic ambivalence toward adult status characteristic of this time of life. Nearly a tenth (9.9%) of participants “disagreed” (8.3%) or “strongly disagreed” (1.6%) with the statement, suggesting that they felt that they had not yet reached adult status.

Next, to determine whether participants felt that they had reached adult status, responses to the full three-item scale were examined for differences between groups. T-test and ANOVA results show that a subjective sense of adulthood did not vary by gender, ethnicity, or immigrant generation. A subjective sense of adulthood did vary by age, $F(7,624) = 2.45, p = .017$, however. The mean values for each age group are presented in Table 4 below. The majority of participants were between the ages of 18-20, however, a subjective sense of adulthood peaks at age 23 ($M = 4.09, SD = .71$) and is at its lowest levels at age 19 ($M = 3.66, SD = .84$).

Conceptualizations of Criteria of Adulthood (RQ2.)

Analysis of the sentence completion data reveals that there were three main themes that emerged as criteria for adulthood: Responsibilities (66.3%), Independence (26.3%) and Adult role transitions (10.7%). Additional themes, such as age, facing problems or hardships, and maturity emerged less frequently. Each code, the rules for assigning it, and percentage of participants are outlined in Table 3. Further analysis of each of these three main themes is presented below including demographic differences.
**Responsibilities.** Results from the sentence completion task reveal that the majority of participants (66.3%) listed responsibility or competing responsibilities as the primary marker of adulthood. After cleaning the data for spelling errors and mistakes, the responses were entered verbatim into a word cloud generator (Wordle, 2014). Figure 2 shows the frequency of each of the words used in the responses. The more frequently a word was used in the responses, the larger proportionally it is to other words. A lexical analysis of the most common words used in the sentence completions demonstrated that multiple “responsibilities” ($n = 73$) occurred more frequently than other words including singular “responsible” ($n = 35$) and “responsibility” ($n = 28$).

Beyond the lexical analysis, participants wrote about these multiple responsibilities in many ways, for example, *You know you’re an adult when...*

“…you can work and go to school at the same time.” [134; first-generation Latino, age 22]  

“…you fulfill ALL of your responsibilities and DO NOT take the easy way out.” [309; second-generation, Latina, age 19]  

“…you have responsibilities in life, like work, school, bills.” [98; second-generation Latino, age 22]  

“…have juggled so many things on your plate and not once did you think of quitting anything.” [407; second-generation Mixed/ “Other” Ethnicity woman, age 18]

These results suggest that multiple competing responsibilities are central in the lives of these emerging adults.

Although most of the responses were brief, many provided more information and when possible, additional sub-categories of types of responsibilities were coded. Double coding was applied where appropriate. These subcategories included demonstrating responsible skills (42.1%), financial responsibilities (24.8%), and demonstrating responsibility for self (16.6%) and others (5.9%) (see Table 3). Each of these subcategories is explored further below.
Roughly two-fifths of responses (42.1%) about responsibilities were coded as pertaining to skills. Responses were coded as skills if they listed planning for the future, managing time, paying attention, prioritizing, and making decisions. For example, participants responded to *You know you’re an adult when...*

“…you know what your goals are and do whatever it takes to reach them by you being the one responsible in order for them to happen.” [345; first-generation Latina, age 19]

“…you assume your responsibilities and start planning for the future.” [75; first-generation Latino, age 18]

“…You know what important things need to be done first.” [344; second-generation Latina, age 24].

“…you are able to make sound decisions.” [504; second-generation Latina, age 21]

“…responsibilities come first before hanging out and partying.” [157; second-generation Mixed/ “Other” Ethnicity man, age 25]

Financial responsibility was exhibited by responses that included having bills, having financial responsibilities, paying for financial obligations, and being financially stable. These responses made up 24.8% of the responsibility responses. For example, *You know you’re an adult when...*

“…I pay for school.” [351; first-generation Latina, age 20]

“…you pay rent and utilities.” [213; first-generation Black woman, age 19]

“…You can handle your financial responsibilities.” [second-generation Latino, age 24]

“…you don't live paycheck to paycheck.” [376; third-generation White woman, age 23]

Responsibilities for self were made up of responses that listed responsibilities in taking care of oneself and made up 16.6% of all responsibility responses. For example, *You know you’re an adult when...*

“…you can support yourself.” [285; second-generation Latina, age 20]

“…you are responsible enough to take care of yourself financially, mentally, and physically.” [409; second-generation Mixed/ “Other” Ethnicity woman, age 21]
“…Your able to take full responsibilities for yourself” [27; second-generation Black man, age 18].

“…you can take care of your self.” [248; third-generation Black woman, age 23]

Responsibilities for others included responses that denoted taking care of others and made up 5.9% of the responsibility responses. For example, You know you’re an adult when...

“…I started to think not only for myself, but for others also in every aspect.” [180; first-generation Asian woman, age 21]

“…when I started to have responsibilities at home.” [113; first-generation Latino, age 21]

“…you have responsibilities, and other people are dependent on you.” [381; second-generation White woman, age 20]

“…you can fully take care of yourself and others.” [206; second-generation Black woman, age 19]

“…can care for yourself and others.” [63; third-generation Latino, age 25]

Responsibilities as a criterion for adulthood significantly differed by both gender and ethnicity. Responsibilities as a marker of adulthood significantly varied by gender with 74.1% of female participants and 56.9% of male participants listing this theme. A Chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between gender and responsibility as a marker of adulthood, $X^2(1, n = 606) = 19.04, p < .001$, phi = .18. The effect size is considered small utilizing Cohen’s (1988) criteria of effect size (see Table 5).

In addition, responsibilities as a marker of adulthood also varied by ethnic group. 73.9% of Latino/a participants sampled, 62.8% of all Black participants sampled, 62.7% of all mixed race participants sampled, 62.3% of all White participants sampled, and 54.9% of all Asian participants sampled listed responsibilities as a marker of adulthood. A Chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between ethnicity and responsibility as a marker of adulthood, $X^2 (4, n = 608) = 17.20, p = .002$, Cramer’s
V = .17. The effect size is considered small utilizing Cohen’s (1988) criteria of effect size (see Table 6). No generational or age differences were detected using a Chi-Square analysis.

**Independence.** The second most common criteria for adulthood was independence with 26.3% of participants listing independence as a marker of adulthood. These were responses that described being independent or self-reliant, becoming capable of making independent decisions, and/or becoming financially independent (Arnett, 1997, 1998, 2003). Sample responses included,

*You know you are an adult when...*

“…you can be independent on every aspect of life.” [62; first-generation Mixed/ “Other” Ethnicity man, age 23]

“…you are self sufficient.” [109; second-generation Latina, age 23]

“…you start making your own decisions without the help from anybody.” [3; second-generation Asian man, age 19]

“…you live on your own and have to pay your own bills!” [148; second-generation White woman, age 24]

“…You Can Do Things On Your Own.” [5; third-generation Black man, age 20]

No significant gender, ethnic, generational or age differences were detected with this theme.

**Adult role transitions.** Adult role transitions were the third most common theme with 10.7% of participants listing adult role transitions as a marker of adulthood. These responses included taking on a new role in life, including the five “traditional” sociological markers of adulthood: Getting married; Leaving home; Completing school; Entering the workforce; and Having children (Settersten, 2005). Sample responses included, for example, *You know you are an adult when...*

“…you’re married.” [61; second-generation, White woman, age 18]

“…you move out of ur (sic) family home.” [19; third-generation Black man, age 21]

“…You've established a career.” [34; third-generation White man, age 19]

“…have to raise a child.” [57; second-generation, Latina, age 18]
There were significant gender differences across this theme. Men were more likely to list adult role transitions than women. Of all the men sampled, 14.6% responded that role transitions were a marker of adulthood, nearly proportionally twice as many as women. Of all women sampled, 7.5% responded that role transitions were a marker of adulthood. A Chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between gender and role transitions as a marker of adulthood, $\chi^2(1, n = 606) = 7.83, p = .008$, phi = -.11. The effect size is considered small utilizing Cohen’s (1988) criteria of effect size. See Table 5 for more details.

There were also significant ethnic differences with 30.8% of all Latino/a participants sampled, 24.6% of all Black participants sampled, 23.5% of all Asian participants sampled, 16.9% of all White participants sampled, and 9.2% of all mixed race participants sampled listing responsibilities as a marker of adulthood. A Chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between ethnicity and responsibility as a marker of adulthood, $\chi^2(4, n = 608) = 12.01, p = .017$, Cramer’s $V = .141$. The effect size is considered small utilizing Cohen’s (1988) criteria of effect size. See Table 6 for more details. There were no generational or age differences detected using Chi-Square analysis.

Criteria of Adulthood in the Lives of Immigrant-Origin Students (RQ3.)

The ways in which participants reached four of the five sociological major life role transition criteria for being an adult, including getting married, living alone, being financially independent, and having children, were examined. The fifth criterion, finishing school, was not examined as being currently enrolled in college was a criterion for participation in the study. Notably, results revealed that the majority of participants had not reached any of these criteria. Nearly the entire sample (91.1%) was single, 2.8% were married, 1.7% lived with a partner, and .8% were divorced or separated. Nearly the entire sample (96%) did not live independently, the
majority lived with their families. Specifically, 74.1% reported living with their mother, 41.6%
reported living with their father, and 4.8% lived with their children (a proxy for whether or not
they were parents). In terms of financial independence, roughly half reported that they were
financially independent when it came to college, with 51.7% reporting that their parents did not
contribute financially to their education. In addition, there were no significant correlations
between these markers and a subjective sense of adulthood.

In addition, given the saliency of competing responsibilities in immigrant-origin students’
lives (i.e., work, family and community responsibilities) the ways in which participants were
engaged in responsibilities was examined. Results reveal that participants engaged in many
competing responsibilities in their lives on top of the demands of school. Below are breakdowns
of how participants met each of the criteria for managing responsibilities in the domains of work
outside of school, family, and community.

**Work outside of school.** Descriptive analysis reveals that 46.0% of participants worked
outside of school. Preliminary descriptive results presented in Table 2 show the percentages of
participants who work outside of school by demographic group. Participants wrote in the number
of hours they worked on average each week and provided exact numbers and/or ranges of
numbers of hours per week. After coding these responses, results reveal that the majority of
participants responded that they worked between 20-29 hours/week (25.4%). The remaining
responses show that participants worked on average 10-19 hours/week (20.4%); 30-39
hours/week (17.0%); 1-9 hours/week (8.9%) and more than 40 hours/week (7.3%). Participants
took on a diverse range of jobs including but not limited to babysitting, cashier, fast food or
delivery, home health care aide, medical or nurse’s assistant, retail or sales jobs, waitress/waiter
or work-study. There were significant ethnic differences with regards to whether or not
participants worked outside of school. A Chi-square test for independence indicated a significant
difference between ethnic groups with regards to working outside of school, \( X^2 (4, n = 626) = 22.02, p < .001, \) Cramer’s \( V = .19 \). The effect size is considered small utilizing Cohen’s (1988) criteria of effect size. White participants had the highest percentage (66.2%) of working outside of school, with Asian participants having the lowest percentages of working outside of school (36.4%), (see Table 2).

**Family responsibilities.** The majority of participants (60.9%) reported having responsibilities helping their parents or relatives in the past month. Table 2 shows the percentages of participants who responded that they had family responsibilities by demographic group. For those who reported having responsibilities with their families, on average they participated in slightly more than two family responsibilities during the last month \((M = 2.30, SD = 1.04)\).

The activities in which they participated also varied. Of the nearly two-thirds who listed that they had family responsibilities, these activities ranged from providing advice or advocating for family members (81.0%), helping with child or elder care (72.6%), helping their family members with translation (54.7%), and engaging in some other activity (31.9%). Those who listed an “other” activity were provided a space to write in those activities. Each response was coded for content and these activities included household tasks and financial tasks. Of those who participated in “other” tasks and wrote in what those tasks were, 42.7% listed household tasks such as cooking, cleaning, and other help at home; and 7.0% listed financial help such as paying bills, or giving money to family members.

While there were no significant group differences with regards to whether or not participants engaged in these activities, there were significant ethnic differences in how often they participated. Latino/a participants reported participating in family responsibilities activities more often than White and Black participants \((F(4, 363) = 6.23, p < .001)\).
Community responsibilities. Three quarters (74.6%) of participants reported participating in at least one community responsibility in the past month. Descriptive results presented in Table 2 show the percentages of participants who responded that they had community responsibilities by demographic group. On average, participants reported participating in nearly three community activities in the past month ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 2.51$).

These activities ranged from mentoring young people (46.9%), volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center (45.1%), helping someone in the community with advocacy or advice (42.7%), engaging in a cause that they cared about (40.5%), helping someone in the community with translation (39.9%), helping someone in the community with child or elder care (37.5%), and coaching young people (36.8%). There were no significant group differences by gender, generation status, or ethnicity regarding whether or not or how often participants engaged in community responsibilities.

Discussion

This study provides a descriptive portrait of low-income, ethnically diverse immigrant-origin 18-25 year-olds in community colleges. Most notably, these results show that the majority of participants did not meet traditionally used sociological criteria of adulthood—getting married, having children, leaving the parental home, entering the workforce and finishing school. In addition, the majority of participants do not cite these adult role transitions as their criteria for adulthood. The participants are postponing many of the adult role transitions, until at least their late 20s; the majority continue to live at home with their families, are financially interdependent with their parents, and are unmarried and childless, suggesting that the conditions under which emerging adulthood occurs are present for this sample.

A number of demographic trends can help to place this finding in perspective. There have been significant increases in the age of achieving these markers over the past 50 years (Arnett &
Taber, 1994). Yet, these overall trends become more nuanced as we examine a snapshot of the current national data for immigrant-origin 18-34 year-olds from the 2008 Current Population Survey (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Furthermore, and most importantly perhaps, is that income inequality has been steadily increasing since 1970 (Rosenbaum et al., 2015).

While first-generation 18-34 year-olds tend to reach the sociological markers of adulthood in higher frequencies than the second-generation, this sample showed the lowest levels of reaching adult roles. While more participants in this sample lived at home with parents than national trends, this is not uncharacteristic of young people living in cities with high-cost housing (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). This can be understood as the current sample characteristics reflect the difficult economic realities of attending school full-time while living in a large urban center in the wake of the Great Recession of 2008. Completing school and transitioning to the workforce full-time are markers of adulthood that the participants in this sample had not achieved as they were attending community college full-time. Attaining a higher education degree is related to better employment rates and increasingly is necessary for many entry-level positions (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). Yet despite most community college students reporting plans to attain a bachelor’s degree, only one in five (20%) attain one after eight years; and almost half (46%) do not receive any credential at all after eight years (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). The length of time it takes to complete a degree within a community college setting precludes many young people to emerge into adult roles. Immigrant-origin community college students often find themselves caught in an economic undertow that disrupts the pathways to adulthood. These results further highlight how increasingly elusive reaching these adult milestones can be in the wake of national and global economic hardship and under these circumstances.
Yet, in spite of these preclusions to attaining adult status, results reveal the majority of these participants felt as though they had reached adulthood. After an initial dip in a subjective sense of adulthood after the first major legal milestone of adulthood, turning 18 years-old, when participants are granted privileges of voting and being their own legal guardian, there is a steady increase in a sense of adulthood. From 19-23 years of age this increase peaks at age 23, and then from 23-25 there is a sharp decrease in the subjective sense of adulthood. Perhaps this second dip is related to coming to terms with the constricted opportunities to emerge into adulthood for those who have remained in community college five years after high school; coming face to face with the realities of what Rosenbaum and Rosenbaum (2015) describe, that “many youth who took society’s advice to attend college, sacrificing time and often incurring debts, have nothing to show for their efforts in terms of credentials, employment, or earnings” (2015, p. 6).

These findings stand in stark contrast to the work of Arnett and others who assert that ambivalence toward adult status is characteristic of this time of life. The hallmark of emerging adulthood, feeling “in-between,” may therefore be uniquely a trait for those who have the luxury of exploration, which might not be possible for low-income ethnically diverse immigrant-origin community college students. Instead, these students are not postponing adulthood nor feeling like adults, rather they are managing to find a path to adulthood despite the constrictions of their economic and social realities. Therefore, it is important to understand the ways in which immigrant-origin community college students make sense of their own adult identities and what they consider to be markers of adulthood.

The sense of adulthood that these participants feel is reflected in their own criteria of adulthood and the high level of engagement in competing responsibilities of work, family and community. There are many contributing factors that can impede upon academic persistence. Immigrant-origin students often find themselves in urban institutions, which serve “non-
traditional” students (Kuh, Vesper, & Krehbiel, 1994, p. 2) of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds who attend college part-time, live off campus and commute, work more than 20 hours a week, and often have spent some time out of school before returning to college (Kuh et al., 1994; Horn, Berger, & Carroll, 2005). Immigrant-origin students face challenges that include less than optimal pre-collegiate educations, poverty, being the first generation within the family to attend college, issues of managing a second language on top of the constraints of institutions that might not be equipped to meet their needs (Alexander, Garcia, Gonzalez, Grimes, & O’Brien, 2007; Gándara & Contreras, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytán, & Kim, in press). Managing these multiple impediments in addition to competing social responsibilities sets immigrant-origin students apart from their native-born middle class peers who may have the luxury of immersing themselves exclusively in the college campus experience without these restraints. It is not surprising that students who manage such multiple work, family, and school demands are at higher risk of not persisting in their studies (Bailey, Leinbach & Jenkins, 2006; Valentine et al., 2009). These results further suggest that competing responsibilities are key to understanding this developmental period for this population. In many ways this result corroborates the work of Arnett (2003) and Nelson and colleagues (2012) who found that responsibility and independence are critical to how college students conceptualize adulthood.

These results also differ, however, by pointing to the ways in which this population is “other-focused” and how social responsibilities go beyond the taking responsibility for oneself of the extant literature. Park and colleagues (2013) found that concern for others increased during the recession with nationally representative data of adolescents. While only a small percentage of participants explicitly listed engaging in social responsibilities as their main criterion for adulthood, the majority reported engaging in these responsibilities for their families and
communities. Emerging adulthood therefore is a time where social responsibility comes to the forefront for this population.

There were significant gender differences in the criteria for adulthood. Proportionally more females listed responsibilities as markers of adulthood than their male peers. This is not surprising; as immigrant-origin female adolescents develop into women they become the “keepers of culture” in their families and communities (Espín, 1999), and often take on the burden of household and family responsibilities in immigrant-origin families (Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006; Valenzuela, 1999). Yet, an examination of the behaviors participants reported did not reflect any gender differences in whether or how often they engaged in family or community responsibilities. In addition, although cited less often than responsibilities as a key marker of adulthood, adult role transitions were more often cited by male participants than their female peers on the sentence completion task. This suggests that there are key gender differences in conceptualizations of adulthood, but not necessarily in the ways immigrant-origin emerging adults engage with these social responsibilities.

In addition, there were significant ethnic differences. Latino/as listed responsibilities as a criterion for adulthood more often than other ethnic groups. Latino/as also participated in family responsibilities more often than their peers from other ethnic groups. These findings suggest that there are not only ethnic differences reflected in the criteria for adulthood but also in the behaviors of immigrant-origin emerging adults. This study further corroborates extant literature regarding the role of familism and the high value placed on family obligations for Latino/a youth which is well documented in the literature (Fuligni et al., 1999; Sabogal, Marín, Otero-Sabogal, Marin, & Perez-Stable, 1987). Although the effect sizes were small in these differences, these findings shed light on important gender and ethnic differences in experiences of emerging into adulthood and warrant further analysis.
It was surprising that there were no generational differences with regards to the conceptualizations of adulthood and engagement in competing responsibilities. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that the first- and second-generation immigrant students share immigrant parents who may provide similar home contexts. This does not, however, explain the experiences of the third-generation who were born in the US to native born parents. Perhaps these findings signal the common shared experiences of low-income ethnically diverse students attending community colleges serving large populations of immigrant-origin students and are not unique to immigrant-origin families.

**Limitations & Future Directions**

This study is the first of its kind to examine emerging adulthood descriptively for immigrant-origin populations as well as for students in community colleges, however it is subject to a number of limitations. This study is cross-sectional and given the findings in perception of adult status across ages it would be important to understand how immigrant-origin emerging adults perceive adulthood from a longitudinal perspective.

In addition, the subjective sense of adulthood item, “I consider myself to be an adult” (Arnett, 1997), was not administered the same way that Arnett and others have done in the extant literature. Instead, it was added to additional items, which comprised a highly reliable scale of a subjective sense of adulthood. The scale, however, is descriptive in nature and does not present pathways to adulthood. Future work should follow up with qualitative methods and examine narratives in depth to further build on measuring the perceptions of adult status.

One of the major limitations to the body of work on emerging adulthood is that the majority of the extant literature has been completed in four-year college institutions (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2008). However, immigrant-origin emerging adults find themselves in multiple contexts. If they do go on to college, the first- (Teranishi et al., 2010) and second-generations
(AACC, 2012) most often enter community college settings, which was the impetus for this work. In addition, however, many may enter the world of work directly after high school to help support family, or because of lack of opportunities. Only a minority have the luxury of going on to college, yet the majority of research has taken place in this setting. Therefore it is important for future work to examine diverse contexts, particularly for non-college-going emerging adults.

It is critical for future research to systematically examine the links between emerging adulthood processes and developmental outcomes in a variety of psychological, relational, academic, and work domains. Very little research has considered the developmental implications of navigating this time of life successfully, as the field is relatively young and instead has focused on issues of definitions and conceptualizations of this phase of life. How one navigates emerging adulthood can present both potential strengths and strains on development. Extant literature suggests that competing responsibilities can weigh heavily on academic engagement (Tseng, 2004), yet to date, there have been virtually no studies that examine the links between adult identities, competing responsibilities, and academic outcomes for immigrant-origin students. It is critical to examine the developmental and educational implications of these transitions. This would be an area ripe for future work.

For immigrant-origin emerging adults, the main developmental task of this phase of life is to synthesize the multiple messages about what it means to become an adult in one’s culture into a consistent role (Erikson, 1968; Katsiaficas et al., 2014). Furthermore, navigating emerging adulthood successfully can mean contributing more to others and society. As immigrants emerge into adulthood they are able and highly willing to take on responsibilities for themselves and for others (Katsiaficas et al., 2014). This can take the form of becoming more civically engaged and able to have agency to effect change in their families, communities, and society at large (Jensen, 2008; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Examining the ways in which immigrant-origin emerging
adults engage in these domains is a critical next step for the field. Given the growing numbers of immigrant-origin emerging adults, it is critical for the field to take up questions that explore the features of this developmental period as well as the developmental processes for this population.

There are a number of practical implications for this work. As Rosenbaum & Rosenbaum (2015) note, “young people need dependable pathways to productive adult roles” (p. 16). In particular, community college settings need to take into account the various social responsibilities present in immigrant-origin students’ lives, not only as a competing responsibility on the road to degree attainment, but as a resource to be drawn on. Recognizing that these youths are contributing to their families and communities and that these responsibilities are meaningful in their conceptualizations of adulthood, we must find ways for these youth to contribute to both the institutional and economic structures that they find themselves embedded within.
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### Table 1
**Demographic data for N = 645 Survey Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/ “Other”</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd+ Generation</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Competing Responsibilities by Demographic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Demographics</th>
<th>Family Responsibilities</th>
<th>Community Responsibilities</th>
<th>Work Outside of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/ “Other”</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd+ Generation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Family & community responsibilities reported as at least 1 activity over the past month.

Note. Work outside of school is who reported that they had a job outside of school

Note. There were no group differences in whether they participated in these activities with the exception of work outside school, which significantly differed by ethnicity, $\chi^2 (4, n = 626) = 22.02, p < .001, \text{Cramer's V} = .19.$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Rules for Assigning</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% subcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Includes being responsible or having multiple responsibilities (for example caring for others and oneself)</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Includes planning for the future, managing time, paying attention, prioritizing, and making the &quot;right decision&quot; ( n = 55 )</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Includes having bills, having financial responsibilities, paying for financial obligations, and being financially stable</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Taking care of oneself; (not paying own bills)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Includes taking care of others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Includes being independent or self-reliant; Becoming capable of making independent decisions Becoming financially independent (Arnett, 1997, 1998, 2003)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Life Transitions</td>
<td>Taking on a new role in life; Includes the five &quot;traditional&quot; markers of adulthood: Getting married; Leaving home; Completing school; Entering the workforce; and Having children (Settersten, 2006).</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Includes specific ages or direct time frames (e.g., two years ago)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Includes dealing with, handling and solving problems, difficulties or hardships</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Includes being mature or any mention of maturity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Be Coded</td>
<td>Nonsensical Answer; Did not fit any categories</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Subjective Sense of Adulthood by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Coded Sentence Completion Responses by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Major Life Transitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Statistic</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square probability</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Major Life Transitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/“Other”</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Statistic
- Responsibilities: 11.03
- Independence: 7.78
- Major Life Transitions: 12.01

Chi-square probability
- Responsibilities: 0.026*
- Independence: 0.1
- Major Life Transitions: 0.017*

Cramer's V
- Responsibilities: 0.135
- Independence: 0.113
- Major Life Transitions: 0.141

* p < .05

Note.
Figure 1

Subjective sense of adulthood by age.
Figure 2

*Word cloud of responses to “You know you’re an adult when...”*

*Note.* Larger words denote words that appeared more frequently.
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Study 2

The Role of Social Responsibilities in the Lives of Immigrant-Origin Community College Students
Abstract

Immigrant-origin students are a growing population. Their high enrollment in community colleges, and the saliency of social responsibilities during this phase of development, suggest it is critical to understand the ways in which these social responsibilities are experienced in the lives of these students. Utilizing a mixed-methods design, this study examines the profiles of social responsibilities and their linkages to academic time on campus through cluster analysis. Five clusters were identified: Low Engagers, High Family Engagers, Moderate Family and Community Engagers, High Community and Low Family Engagers, and Highest Family and Community Engagers. Rich qualitative case studies delve deeper into the experiences of participants in each cluster.

Keywords: Social Responsibilities, Immigrant Youth, Community Colleges, Civic Engagement, Family Obligations
The Role of Social Responsibilities in the Lives of Immigrant-Origin Community College Students

Immigrant-origin young adults (those who have immigrated to the US themselves and children of immigrants) are a growing population. Currently, the number of immigrant-origin young adults (age 18-34 years) has grown to nearly 20 million (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010), with one in four (16-25 year-olds) in the US being either first- or second-generation immigrants (Batalova & Fix, 2011). Many children of immigrants do not graduate from high school, and if they enroll in college, they are more likely to enroll in a community college than a four-year institution; this is the case for both the first-generation (Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2011) as well as the second-generation (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004).

Though not universal, many immigrant-origin families bring with them collectivistic values of family interdependence from their home countries (Tseng, 2004) which can manifest as highly valuing social responsibilities such as family obligations (Fuligni, 2007) and community engagement (Jensen, 2008). Immigrant-origin students often cite these social responsibilities as integral components of their adult identities (Katsiaficas, forthcoming; Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco & Dias, 2014), yet we know little regarding how they are engaging in these responsibilities and how they intersect with academic responsibilities.

Extant literature demonstrates paradoxical findings with regards to how these competing responsibilities relate to academic responsibilities. For example, while highly valuing family obligations is related to higher educational aspirations (Fuligni, 2001; 2007), a strong sense of obligation to family can, in some cases, be negatively related to academic performance and grades (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999; Tseng, 2004). These results suggest that there may be an optimal balance of family and community involvement that helps immigrant-origin students engage in school while not interfering with academic performance. Therefore, this study takes on
these gaps in order to understand, through mixed methods, the relationship between social responsibilities and academic responsibilities in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students.

**The Role of Social Responsibilities in Young Adults’ Development**

There are conflicting theories of development during the college-going years, which reflect different understandings of the role of families and communities in young adults lives. Emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000) has been characterized as a time of moving towards autonomy in roles (e.g., getting married and starting a family) and independence in behaviors such as making independent decisions, and taking responsibility for oneself (e.g., becoming financially independent from parents) (Arnett, 2003, 2004). Under this paradigm, typical development in industrialized societies is characterized as a period of “self-focus” where young adults have few responsibilities to others in their lives. Further, development is characterized as re-centering from one’s family to an autonomous unit (Tanner, 2008). As young adults struggle to become autonomous individuals they often feel ambivalent towards adult status, feeling neither like fully independent adults nor like adolescents who are fully dependent on parents. Instead they feel that this time of life is a stage of feeling “in between” adolescence and adulthood (Arnett, 2006).

Theories of Positive Youth Development (Lerner, 2002) conceptualize the healthy development of young adults as the “enactment in adulthood of behaviors that contribute positively to the healthy structure of society and, in doing so, support and further self, family, community and civil society” (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 23). Positive development results in an orientation to *contribution* (Lerner, Dowling & Anderson, 2003), which involves a value of “undertaking a role to contribute to social well-being,” in the form of contributions to family and community. These contributions are critical to positive youth
development (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 15) and often take the form of social responsibilities (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011).

**Social Responsibilities of Immigrant-Origin Young Adults**

Research with immigrant populations documents the importance of family interdependence particularly among Asian Pacific and Latino families. The cultural demands of family interdependence highlight lifelong financial and emotional support between family members, living close to or with parents, and consulting parents on important decisions (Tseng, 2004). Such values often give way to juggling multiple and competing responsibilities such as contributing to family expenses at home and abroad, caring for siblings and extended family members, translating for family members and helping them navigate institutions among other tasks (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002; Orellana, 2009; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010).

These cultural values stand in stark contrast to those of the mainstream US conceptualizations about this time of life suggest key ways that immigrant-origin young adults may differ from their native-born peers. A manifestation of such cultural beliefs is a sense of social responsibility. Responsibility for others, often referred to as ‘social responsibility,’ is rooted in relationships with others and is defined as a sense of responsibility and duty that extends beyond the self (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). This sense of social responsibility can be for family members, peers, the immediate community, or go beyond to a sense of civic obligation (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). These social responsibilities are integral to how immigrant-origin young adults conceptualize this time of life (Katsiaficas et al., 2014). In the developmental literature, these social responsibilities are characterized as family obligations (Fuligni, 2001; 2007) and community engagement (Jensen, 2008).

**Family obligations.** Family obligations comprise three domains: attitudes towards providing family assistance, respect for the family, and the importance of providing support in
the future (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999). Family obligations can take on many forms and includes responsibilities such as caring for siblings, household chores such as cooking and cleaning, translating and language brokering, working to contribute to the family income at home and sending remittances to their country of origin, and tutoring younger siblings among others (Fuligni, 2007; Orellana, 2009; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). These behaviors stem from strong values of family interdependence and prompt immigrant-origin emerging adults to contribute not only to their families but also to their communities at large. These values are particularly salient for Latino and Asian immigrant groups (Tseng, 2004).

As adolescents emerge into adulthood, there are significant increases in each of the domains of family obligations (Fuligni, & Pederson, 2002). In a seminal study of 745 immigrant-origin emerging adults, those from Filipino and Latino backgrounds reported a stronger sense of family obligation than their Euro-American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). Additionally, as East Asian adolescents emerged into adulthood, they changed to more closely resemble their Euro-American peers in their ratings of family obligations, with smaller proportions living with their parents and providing financial assistance to their families than Filipino and Latino peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002). Thus, rather than this period of life being a time of simply accepting responsibility for oneself, this developmental period becomes a time when social responsibility comes to the forefront as one assumes responsibility for oneself and other loved ones.

Seemingly individualistic actions such as being responsible and financially independent may, therefore, take on a different meaning as they are driven by the collectivistic goal of not being a burden on other family members. For example, a young man who is able to take care of himself financially is doing so in the service of relieving his parents of the financial burden of supporting him. In this sense, being financially independent may take on a different meaning where it serves a collectivistic goal rather than an individualistic need (Fuligni, 2007).
Preliminary findings from a study of immigrant-origin young adults (Suárez-Orozco, Hernandez & Casanova, 2015) suggest the centrality of responsibilities to self and others in these young peoples’ lives. Participants described a fundamental need to help others, making decisions to take on helping professions, and often narrating a desire to give back to their communities through their daily activities (Jensen, 2008; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Similarly, these social responsibilities towards families may be extended to include more broadly a sense of responsibility to the community.

**Community engagement.** Often times, family obligations are extended to the community writ large. Community engagement refers to taking an active role in solving social problems and serving one’s community (Search Institute, 2004). Community engagement can encompass many activities including helping people in the community with translation, taking care of children or the elderly, providing advice or advocacy, mentoring young people, coaching young people, volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center, or engaging in a cause that they care about (Orellana, 2009; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Community engagement captures an aspect of civic engagement that is more commonly available to immigrant-origin youth than merely examining participation in elections, the focus of political scientists, which is limited to citizens (Jensen & Flanagan, 2008).

There are limited empirical investigations of community engagement for immigrant youth (Jensen & Flanagan, 2008), however, extant findings suggest that community engagement, and more broadly civic engagement, serve a number of critical functions for positive development. Involvement in the community can often serve as a coping mechanism to discrimination and a sense of “moral exclusion” (Opotow, 1990) experienced by many immigrant groups and other minority groups such as African Americans (Keeter et al., 2005; Sirin & Katsiaficas, 2010). In particular, community engagement can act as an integral part of
identity formation for immigrant youth serving as mechanisms to solidify and express their social identities (Barber, Stone, & Eccles, 2005; Jensen, 2008). Yet, despite the saliency of both family and community responsibilities, we know very little about how these competing responsibilities relate to academic responsibilities for immigrant-origin students in community college settings.

Social Responsibilities and Academic Responsibilities

The interplay between the opportunities provided by attending college and values and attitudes towards family obligations are somewhat paradoxical. Having stronger values of family obligations are associated with higher academic motivation and a stronger desire to attend college (Fuligni, 2001). At the same time, a college degree provides upward economic mobility and opens doors to resources and opportunities that can shift the “cultural traditions that distinguish emerging adults” of these ethnic backgrounds from their Euro-American peers (Fuligni, 2007, p. 97). This may be due to more exposure and pressure to assimilate into contexts that do not promote family obligations. Both first- and second-generation immigrant-origin students contend with this dilemma as they recognize that their family obligations often contributed positively to their academic motivation and high aspirations of degree attainment (Fuligni, 2001). Simultaneously, immigrant-origin students may feel that the college experience stands in contrast to those values and pushes them towards behaviors and goals that are not in the service of family cohesion and interdependence (Fuligni, Rivera & Lininger, 2007).

While strongly valuing family obligations may be related to greater academic motivation, the behavioral demands may impede on academic engagement and persistence (Tseng, 2004). For example, with a sample of over 800 immigrant-origin adolescents, Fuligni, Tseng and Lam (1999) found that students who had the greatest values of family obligation were the most academically motivated, but did not have the highest grades. This paradox regarding family
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responsibilities may be due to the competing demands on their time, with family obligations impeding on students’ abilities to take part in academic tasks on campus.

The academic settings that immigrant-origin students find themselves in also contributes to this paradox. A major challenge facing community colleges is that of academic persistence and completion of a degree. Most students who enter community colleges intend to transfer to four-year institutions (Bailey & Morest, 2006; Schneider & Stevenson, 1999), yet the rates of transfer have steadily declined over the past 30 years (Goldrick-Rab et al., 2007; Grubb, 1991). Although most community college students report plans to attain a bachelor’s degree, only one in five (20%) attain one after eight years; and almost half (46%) do not receive any credential at all after eight years (Rosenbaum et al., 2015).

There are many contributing factors that can impede upon academic persistence. Immigrant-origin students often find themselves in urban institutions, which serve “non-traditional” students (Kuh, Vesper, & Krehbiel, 1994, p. 2) of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds who attend college part-time, live off campus and commute, work more than 20 hours a week, and often have spent some time out of school before returning to college (Kuh et al., 1994; Horn, Berger, & Carroll, 2005). Immigrant-origin students face challenges that include less than optimal pre-collegiate educations, poverty, being the first generation within the family to attend college, issues of managing a second language on top of the constraints of institutions that might not be equipped to meet their needs (Alexander, Garcia, Gonzalez, Grimes, & O’Brien, 2007; Gándara & Contreras, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytán, & Kim, in press). Managing these multiple impediments in addition to competing social responsibilities sets immigrant-origin students apart from their native-born middle class peers who may have the luxury of immersing themselves exclusively in the college campus experience without these restraints. It is not surprising that students who manage these multiple work, family, and school
demands are at higher risk of not persisting in their studies (Bailey, Leinbach & Jenkins, 2006; Valentine et al., 2009).

**Current Study**

Considering the growing numbers of immigrant-origin students, their high enrollment in community colleges, and the saliency of social responsibilities during this phase of development, it is imperative to understand the ways in which these social responsibilities are experienced in the lives of these students. Extant literature suggests that there will be different levels of engagement in one’s family and community, with some students being highly involved and others being more selectively involved. Furthermore, research suggests that these social responsibilities might compete with academic responsibilities and negatively impact time spent on academic tasks.

Therefore, in this study, I take on these gaps in the literature, utilizing a mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) to understand the profiles of responsibilities and their linkages to academic time on campus. These research questions provide a quantitative description of social responsibilities across individuals, and are followed by rich qualitative case studies that go deeper into the experiences of a subset of participants. Each methodological technique provides a new level of insight (Bryman, 1996).

This study was guided by three overarching research questions:

Utilizing descriptive quantitative analyses,

- RQ1. How do immigrant-origin community college students engage in family and community social responsibilities?
  - RQ1A. What activities do they participate in?
  - RQ1B. How often do they participate?
• RQ1C. Are there demographic group differences in the frequency of participation?

Utilizing cluster analysis and multinomial logistic regression,

• RQ2A. What are the typologies of engaging in social responsibilities?
• RQ2B. What demographic features predict types of engagement in social responsibilities?
• RQ2C. How do these types of engagement in social responsibilities relate to academic time on campus?

Utilizing qualitative case studies,

• RQ3. What are the experiences of social responsibilities in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students?

Methods

Procedure

Participants were recruited on campus in three different community college settings to participate in the RICC study. Students were qualified to participate if they met the following criteria: a) they were between the ages of 18 and 25; b) they were enrolled in a degree-seeking program in one of the college campuses we were studying; and c) they were from immigrant-origin backgrounds (either themselves immigrants or children of immigrants).

Participants

The sub-sample of first-generation and second-generation participants from the RICC project was taken for this study (n = 489). The sample was 54.2% female and 45.8% male. Ethnically, 43.6% identified as Latino/a, 26.0% Black, 11.9% Other or Multiple Ethnicities, 11.1% Asian, and 7.4% White. The mean age was 20.2 years (SD = 1.9 years) and the majority of participants (75.8%) were 21 years of age or younger. For those who were first generation
(43.9%; \( n = 214 \)), more than half (58.2%) arrived in the US at age 12 or earlier, with the mean age of arrival at 11.1 years (SD = 5.9 years).

**Measures**

**Participant demographics and household information.** Participants were asked to provide self-reports of their gender, ethnicity, age, as well as country of birth and parents’ country of birth (to determine immigrant generation status). In addition, participants were asked to self-report about work they completed outside of school as part of the larger RICC survey. Household items captured whether participants spoke a language other than English at home with their parents, and who they lived with. In addition participants estimated their total household income. Utilizing the 2001 census income to needs ratio, participants were considered “low-income” based on the whether they fell below the national poverty line for the number of people listed in their household. Percentages are presented in Table 1.

**Family responsibilities.** Participants rated the frequency of their participation in four different family responsibility activities, ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once a month), 2 (2-3 times a month), 3 (once a week) and 4 (2-3 times a week), 5 (daily). These activities included helping family members with translation, taking care of children or the elderly in their family, providing advice or advocacy for people in their family, and other activities (which they wrote in). For the purpose of the cluster analysis, three of the most common responses were selected and entered into the equation: helped family with translation, took care of children or elderly family members, provided advice or advocacy for family in the past month.

**Community responsibilities.** The community engagement index of the types of community-oriented activities that students often participate in is adapted from the Civic Trust Study (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Participants were asked the frequency of their participation in seven different activities, ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once a month), 2 (2-3 times a month), 3
(once a week) and 4 (2-3 times a week), 5 (daily). These activities included helping people in their community with translation, taking cared of children or the elderly in their community, providing advice or advocacy for people in the community, mentoring young people, coaching young people, volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center in the community, engaging in a cause that they care about. For the purpose of the cluster analysis, the top three ways that they engaged were selected to counterbalance the family responsibilities measure. These items included: mentored young people in the community, volunteered in a place of worship or community organization, and engaged in a cause they cared about.

**Academic time on campus.** Academic time spent on campus out of class was measured by a self-report measure that asked students to report how many hours outside of class they spent studying and taking care of college business on campus. A sum of the total time spent during the past week doing the listed activities was calculated.

**Analytic Plan**

The mixed-method study was carried out utilizing an explanatory sequential embedded design where quantitative data and a subsample of qualitative data were both collected followed by analysis (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). Quantitative data were analyzed to address RQs 1 and 2 utilizing descriptive analysis and an agglomerative hierarchical cluster technique. The frequency of participation in various social responsibilities was clustered into distinct profiles. Next, these profiles of social responsibilities were deepened through the analysis of multiple qualitative case studies to further explain these findings to address RQ3. This mixed-methods approach allows the trends that emerge quantitatively to be further contextualized in the lived experiences of immigrant-origin community college students through qualitative analysis.

**Quantitative analysis.** To address RQ1A. and RQ1B., descriptive quantitative analyses were conducted to assess what activities participants engaged in and with what frequency. In
addition, t-test and ANOVA techniques were utilized to assess whether there were demographic group differences in participation in these social responsibilities to explore RQ1C.

To address RQ2A, cluster analysis methods were employed to explore the typologies (i.e., cluster membership) of competing responsibilities for immigrant-origin community college students. A cluster analysis was run on $n = 473$ cases who had complete data, each responding to items on demographics, family and community responsibilities. A hierarchical agglomerative cluster analysis technique was used with Ward’s method with the program SPSS.

Cluster analysis is a helpful tool for data discovery, as it produces an ordering of cases, which may be informative for data display. Cluster analysis methods identify groups of participants who share similar characteristics and are distinct from individuals in other groups (Norusis, 2010). An agglomerative hierarchical clustering technique with SPSS (Norusis, 2010) was utilized in this study in order to determine group membership based on family and community responsibilities. Hierarchical cluster analysis is the most commonly used type of clustering methodology and is considered “the major statistical method for finding relatively homogenous clusters of cases based on measured characteristics” (Norusis, 2010, p. 555). This particular method takes an ANOVA approach to cluster analysis, which is considered a “bottom-up” approach that begins with each data point in its own cluster and then groups similar cases into larger clusters (Norusis, 2010)\(^5\).

---

\(^5\) The process of hierarchical cluster analysis is the following: each case begins as a separate cluster and then clusters are joined until there is ultimately only one cluster. The process of joining clusters involves: evaluating the distances between initially distinct clusters, identifying pairs of clusters with the shortest distance between them (i.e., the clusters that are most similar) and fusing them. The distances between the new clusters are then recalculated and the process of merging similar clusters is repeated until there is only one cluster. There are a variety of ways to calculate the distance between clusters. I selected Ward’s Method, which is a measure of calculating the distance between clusters, and utilizes an ANOVA approach to evaluate the distances between clusters. Ward’s method assesses cluster membership of cases by “calculating the total sum of squared deviations from the mean of a cluster. The
**Interpretation.** One of the main issues with cluster analysis techniques is around decisions of how many clusters are included in the optimum solution. This can be largely seen as a subjective process and must be informed by either hypotheses or theoretical underpinnings. One of the dangers of this method is that as more and more distinct clusters are merged, it means that more dissimilar cases are merged into one. Therefore, deciding on the optimum number of clusters is an essential part of this process. While there are no hard and fast rules, there are some guiding tools one can utilize to help inform this decision: looking at the dendogram, and examining the agglomerative schedule. In addition, clusters should include no less than 4 cases to be meaningful (Norusis, 2010).

The agglomerative schedule is produced by SPSS using Ward’s method, and it provides “a solution for every possible number of clusters” from 1 to 473 (which is the N). For ease of interpretation, the output of the agglomerative schedule is reversed and truncated, so that we are reading from the “bottom up” or in reverse from a single cluster solution to an eight-cluster solution (See Table 2). This format makes it “easier to see the changes in the coefficients as the number of clusters increase” (Norusis, 2010, p. 560). The change column, which is the delta in coefficients from the previous step to the current step, “enables us to determine the optimum number of clusters” (Norusis, 2010, p. 560).

**Estimating validity and reliability.** Quantitative estimates of the validity and reliability of a cluster solution are not yet developed (Norusis, 2010), however, the validity can be assessed on a qualitative basis by evaluations of the meaningful nature of the cluster theoretically and how reliably cluster membership is able to distinguish between certain characteristics. With the five-
cluster solution, cluster membership was able to meaningfully distinguish between levels of engagement in family and community responsibilities.

Therefore, it is critical to understand the legitimate uses for cluster analysis and the limitations of this method. Cluster analysis is most useful as a classification tool of cases to help illuminate how groups may differ on specific study variables. It is not a causal mechanism to determine differences based solely on clustered characteristics, as there may be additional individual differences that are unaccounted for in the data collected. Thus, the cluster profiles presented below utilize a mixed method approach to help illuminate the ways in which social responsibilities relate to academic time on campus differently for each of these groups. Quantitative results suggested the cluster solution, but the meaning making of the five clusters involved a set of mixed method analyses, including group differences on a number of variables, as well as qualitative narratives regarding how students viewed the social responsibilities in their lives and how they related to their academic life.

Following the cluster analysis, multinomial logistic regression was performed using SPSS NOMREG to assess the impact of a number of demographic predictors on the likelihood that respondents would fall into their specific cluster classification (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) to address RQ2B. Lastly, group differences between cluster membership regarding academic time spent on campus were conducted using ANOVA techniques to explore RQ2C.

**Qualitative analysis.** To address RQ3., follow-up case studies were analyzed to help explain the results of the quantitative clusters. Qualitative case studies provide meaningful insight into the lived experiences of participants (Merriam, 2009) and can contextualize the quantitative findings of cluster analysis (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2010). The cases help to deepen our understanding of how immigrant-origin students experience the social responsibilities in their lives.
Every effort was made to select a representative member for the case study based on ethnicity, gender, and generation, however, the results of the multinomial logistic regression suggest that there were few demographic differences between clusters. There were further restrictions due to the number of cases in each cluster and the quality of the data. Interviews with missing questions were discarded. Cases with rich descriptions were selected. In each cluster, multiple cases were read and a single case selected based on the ways in which they were representative of the other cases, not by how unique the person’s story was. In many case studies, explaining the variance by selecting outliers is sometimes preferable. In this instance, selection criteria were based on how normative the person was to the cluster as a whole.

Full interview transcripts were read after case descriptions were created based on a query of quantitative variables from the individual’s survey. In what ways were participants reporting their level of involvement in their communities and families? What was their personal history (i.e., high school background, migration history, family background)? Interviews were coded for narrations of family responsibilities and the role that family played in their lives. Additionally, narrations of the ways in which they were involved in their communities were coded.

**Results**

**RQ1. Engaging in Social Responsibilities**

Descriptive analyses revealed that with regards to RQ1., the majority of participants (86.9%; \( n = 411 \)) were involved in a variety of social responsibilities on a regular basis. 86.9% reported being engaged in either family or community responsibilities at least once in the past month.

**Family responsibilities.** Over half of participants (57.1%, \( n = 270 \)) reported having responsibilities helping their parents or relatives. There were a variety of ways in which they engaged in activities such as the kind and frequency of participation.
On average, participants took part in just over two activities ($M = 2.4$, $SD = 1.1$). Of those who reported having family responsibilities, 64.9% helped their family members with translation, 70.1% helped with child or elder care, 80.5% provided advice or advocated for family members, and 30.0% engaged in some other activity. Those who listed an “other” activity were provided a space to write in those activities. Each of these responses ($n = 40$) was coded and two additional criteria emerged: household tasks and financial tasks. Of those who participated in “other” tasks and wrote in those tasks, 37.5% listed household tasks such as cooking, cleaning, and running errands; and 17.5% listed financial help such as paying bills, or giving money to family members. With regards to how often participants took part in these activities, on average participants engaged in a family responsibility activity 2-3 times per month ($M = 2.0$, $SD = 1.3$).

A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant ethnic differences in frequency of participation in family responsibilities ($F(4, 270) = 6.34$, $p < .001$). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for participants was statistically significantly higher for Latino participants ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.33$) than for Black participants ($M = 1.49$, $SD = 1.05$). There were no significant differences between the other ethnic groups. Calculation of eta squared, a measure of effect size, revealed that these ethnic differences had a medium effect (eta squared = .08) according to Cohen (1988). There were no significant gender or generational differences.

**Community responsibilities.** Two-thirds of participants (74.6%) reported participating in at least one community responsibility in the past month. On average, participants reported participating in three community activities ($M = 2.9$, $SD = 2.5$). Nearly half of participants (45.1%) reported mentoring young people in their community. A similar proportion (44.7%) reported volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center, and helping someone in
the community with translation (44.0%). Further, many reported helping someone in the community with advocacy or advice (41.9%), engaging in a cause that they cared about (39.7%), and helping someone in the community with child or elder care (36.9%). In addition, nearly a third reported coaching young people (35.1%). On average, participants as a whole took part in community responsibilities on a once a month basis ($M = 1.0, SD = 1.1$). There were no significant demographic group differences in the frequency of participation in community responsibilities.

RQ2. Typologies of Social Responsibilities

In order to address RQ2., a hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted. This analysis produced five discrete clusters or groups of participants who shared similar profiles of social responsibilities. Looking at Table 2, the change score reduces significantly from step 1 to step 2 and continues to reduce before tapering off after step 5. Therefore, the cut point of five clusters seems to be logical. In addition, an examination of the dendrogram suggests that five clusters are the optimal solution (see Figure 1).

The five clusters included “Low Engagers,” “Family Only Engagers,” “Moderate Family and Community Engagers,” “Low Family and High Community Engagers,” and “Highest Family and Community Engagers” (see Figure 2 for graphical representation of clusters). An analysis of variance showed that frequency of engagement in family and community responsibilities significantly differed between clusters, $F_{\text{family}}(4, 471) = 348.7, p < .001$; $F_{\text{comm}}(4, 471) = 182.8, p < .001$.

The results in Table 3 show these differences. With regards to family responsibilities, post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the average level of engagement in family responsibilities was significantly lower for the Low Engagers ($M = 0.2, SD = 0.4$) and Low Family High Community Engagers ($M = 0.4, SD = .6$)
than for all other groups. In addition, the Family Only Engagers ($M = 3.0, SD = 1.2$) and Highest Family and Community Engagers ($M = 3.3, SD = 1.5$) had significantly higher levels of family engagement than all other groups but not from one another.

With regards to community responsibilities, post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD post hoc criterion for significance indicated that clusters all were significantly different from one another on the average frequency of engagement in community responsibilities. Table 4 shows these differences. The Low Engagers ($M = 0.3, SD = 0.4$) and the Family Only Engagers reported the lowest rates of engagement in community activities ($M = 0.3, SD = 0.4$). The Highest Family and Community Engagers ($M = 2.4, SD = 0.9$) and the Low Family High Community Engagers ($M = 2.3, SD = 0.5$) had significantly higher rates of participation compared to all other groups, but not one another.

**RQ2B. Demographic predictors of clusters.** A multinomial logistic regression was performed to assess demographic predictors of cluster membership (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Demographic predictors were ethnicity, gender, generation status, English as a first language at home, and residing with mother or father. There was good model fit (discrimination among groups) on the basis of these predictors ($X^2(364, N = 488) = 337.3, p = .84$), however, overall classification was unimpressive. Although these demographic predictors significantly predicted cluster membership, the model did not adequately predict which cluster each participant belonged to based on these variables alone. Specifically, on the basis of the demographic predictors, correction classification rates were 82.8% for Low Engagers, 9.7% for Family Only Engagers, 28.2% for Moderate Family and Community Engagers, 10.0% for Low Family and High Community Engagers, and only 1.6% for Highest Family and Community Engagers. Cases were over-classified into the largest group (Low Engagers). In other words, these demographic
predictors most successfully predicted membership in the Low Engagers cluster, however, this was also the largest cluster and therefore had the highest probability of correct classification.

Table 6 shows the contribution of the individual predictors for the model. Results suggest that English as a first language, living with one’s mother, and Black ethnicity were significant predictors of cluster membership and each enhanced prediction of cluster membership, \( p < .044 \). Table 7 shows the odds ratios for each of the predictors in comparing the Low Engagers with each of the other clusters. The odds of living with one’s mother are three times as great for the Family Only Engagers compared to the Low Engagers and two times as great for the Low Family High Community Engagers and Highest Family and Community Engagers than for the Low Engagers. The odds of being of Black ethnicity are two times as great for the Low Family High Community Engagers compared to the Low Engagers. Furthermore, the odds of English being the only language spoken at home was two times as likely for the Moderate Engagers compared to the Low Engagers. These results suggest that there were very few demographic differences between clusters and that these clusters represent patterns that cut across these demographic groups.

With regards to RQ2C., cluster membership distinguished between levels of academic time on campus (see Table 8). An analysis of variance showed that the number of hours spent on campus in academic activities significantly differed between clusters, \( F(4,401) = 3.42, p = .009 \). Post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the Highest Family and Community Engagers (\( M = 8.2 \) hours, \( SD = 11.9 \) hours) had significantly higher amounts of academic time on campus than the Low Engagers (\( M = 4.2 \) hours, \( SD = 5.4 \) hours). Table 5 presents the means for each of the clusters.

**RQ3. Qualitative Profiles of Clusters**
Features of the clusters and an illustrative qualitative case study are presented below for each cluster. These mixed-method descriptions help to illuminate how family and community responsibilities play out in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students.

Low engagers: The “classic” emerging adults. Low Engagers made up 36.9% of the sample ($n = 174$). These participants reported low or no engagement in family and community responsibilities, which stood in stark contrast to the four other clusters where participation was significantly higher.

*Aliyah “You always got to put yourself first.”* Aliyah is a 19-year-old African-American young woman whose mother migrated from Belize. Her mother is a nurse and Aliyah lives at home with her and her three siblings. Her family’s annual household income is $95,000 and Aliyah works at a large world-renowned music center as a cashier and as a bartender 25-30 hours per week in addition to attending school full time. She has chosen accounting as her major not because she finds in enjoyable, but because “it’s safe right now until I figure out what I’m going to do.”

She struggles with bouts of boredom and self-described “laziness” with regards to school. She describes to her interviewer that she has a “tardiness problem” which prompted her to attend school close to home. Her cumulative GPA is 1.42, roughly a D+. She’s thought about leaving school a few times, but has not. When asked why, she responds, “Because I’m not a quitter I guess I would say. Either way… being in school is only going to benefit me. So it doesn’t make any sense to quit.” She teeters on the edge of staying in school, often bored and excited by the prospect of leaving, yet knowing that there is a better life for her if she stays.

Her female family members, her sister, cousin and mother, are her support system. She relies on her cousin, a junior at a local public 4-year college, to help her with her calculus homework, and her sister for general advice. Her mother, by far, provides the most support.
When asked who supported her to stay in school, she responds, “My mother, I guess cause she’s like if you drop… nah. [Laughing] She really like stresses the importance of like getting an education. She won’t say it like every day like did you go to school or…she’ll be like you know it’s only going to help you. It’s like you know enjoy it and better yourself…stuff like that, so she’s like my motivation of going to school.”

Overall, Aliyah has little in the way of responsibilities beyond herself. Her responses on the survey suggest that she occasionally takes care of children or the elderly in her family (once per month) and her community (2-3 times per month). She makes no mention of this in her interview, but often remarks that her mother takes care of a lot. When asked about the roles and responsibilities she has outside of school, she states: “Besides going to school – working. That’s about it. Like I live with my mother, so she takes care of everything for me.” She describes that she feels in-between adolescence and adulthood because although she is working and making her own decisions at school, she still relies on her mom for her basic needs. With one foot in and one foot out of adulthood, she describes the classic Arnett ambivalence towards adult status at this age.

I: Do you think you’re an adult?

S: I’m getting there. I guess because like I make my own decisions you know, I work, I go to school, I pick classes, I go out, I make sure that I’m responsible for myself. I don’t do anything too crazy, but then I live with my mother so she pays my bills, she feeds me, things like that.

Her family is important to her as they play an integral role in supporting her. When talking about her plans to transfer to a 4-year institution, she remarks that having family close by to turn to is key in the decision.

I: What factors will influence your decision about selecting a transfer destination?
S: Like family-wise, like who’s having family around the campus, so like in Florida my grandparents live down there, but they don’t live like in Miami, the Miami part, they live in Fort Lauderdale but it’s still like I can always just go over there. Or in North Carolina, all my aunts and cousins live down there, so it’s like a …it’s like a home away from home kind-of.

Yet, her relationship with her family is unlike many of the other students we interviewed. It is more one-sided as they serve to support her in her endeavors. We asked about how she prioritizes between competing responsibilities.

I: And when you have to prioritize between school, family, work, friends, and things that you want, how do you make choices?

S: I just do what I see is best for me ‘cause you always got to put yourself first.

Aliyah’s case characterizes the experiences of “emerging adults” as Arnett describes them: self-focused, with few responsibilities towards others, exploring what they want to do for the rest of their lives. The Low Engagers most closely resembled the “emerging adults” of Arnett’s developmental theory, having few responsibilities other than to themselves, yet still relying heavily on their parents’ support. In this way, particularly for Aliyah, this produced a sense of ambiguity about adult status that further resembled “emerging adults.”

**Family only engagers: the family supporters.** In contrast, the Family Supporters looked drastically different. Family Only Engagers made up 13.1% of participants (n = 62). Participants took part in several family responsibility activities, most actively in helping their family with translation (100.0%), providing advice or advocacy for people in their family (87.1%), and taking care of children or the elderly in their family (75.8%). Participants took part in very few community responsibilities. Participants engaged in a cause they cared about (24.2%),
volunteered in a place of worship, school or community center (22.6%), and mentored young people in their community (12.9%).

**Susie, nurse at home and at school.** Susie is a 21-year-old woman who arrived in the US at age 10 from China. She lives with both her parents and an older sister with an average family income of less than $20,000 per year. Her father, a baker, completed eighth grade while her mother, who works making dumplings, finished high school. They speak Cantonese at home, which is situated away from campus so that Susie has to commute an average of 10 hours per week.

Susie began her college career at a private Catholic 4-year college, but after an academically challenging first semester, she decided to transfer. “I left [that college] because I wasn’t focusing at school, I guess it is because it is a big school and it is the first year of college and I didn’t take it seriously, so then I transferred out because I failed one course.” During the transfer process, a clerical error at the college left her with few options, and she found herself enrolling at Taino, however, this college was far from her first choice. “When I took a walk around Taino, I said, I am not going to that school…one is, this is a community college. Secondly, it is because it is a Black college, it is in a Black neighborhood, and I am one of a person [sic]…In the beginning I just felt like I am alone because I felt like I am the only Chinese in a whole big crowd of Black.”

Time is of the essence for Susie, as she struggles to enter the world of work to help support her parents. She quickly found the nursing program as a solution. She notes that her program was not her first choice, but it works because “I need to get out fast for my parents because my dad’s health is not very good… so I need to work sooner to have him retire.”

Financial constraints coupled with the needs of caring for her ailing father have reconfigured Susie’s dream of becoming a doctor to becoming a nurse.
I: How long have you wanted to be a Nurse Practitioner?

S: Ever since I gave up the doctor dream. At first when I majored in biology I wanted to be a doctor. But for one, I know that my dad is not going to last that long—not going to wait for me that long to be a doctor, and I don’t have the funds, and I don’t have the time, so I am just OK, since I am so interested in the medical field then I will go for nurse.

For Susie, family comes first. When asked about choosing between the responsibilities at home, school, work, and friends she says, “I think family comes first. Yeah, family first, then school second.” She takes on a major role in both her extended and immediate family. Her survey responses indicate that she helps her family on a regular basis. She takes care of family members two to three times per week, helps with translation once per week, and advocates on their behalf roughly two to three times per month. She elaborates on these responsibilities in her interview.

“I don't know why, but anything happens in my family, my dad, for translation, letter translation, go to the doctors, translation, or my grandma enters the hospital, I need to translate, or she's got a nurse home visit, I need to be there to translate, so my major role in the family, in the big family, would be translator.” A translator to her extended family, she also takes on the added role of nurse at home.

But for my own family, at home, I will be maybe like the carer [sic] for my dad because he needs insulin injection. I am the one who gives him the insulin injections when I am home…And sometimes I have to check on him at midnight because that is the time when his sugar level goes down like really low and we have to watch out for that…He says when I do it, it doesn't hurt that much.

She goes on to describe the delicate balance of priorities she manages,
It is just that he [my dad] needs me to be home at night because that is when he is sleeping and he needs somebody to check on him and stuff like that, so my work has to balance with my school. My school schedule has to be able to let me finish sooner so I can take care of my dad, kind of like that. So the reason I am taking nursing program is because of my dad, and I am taking evening program.

These family responsibilities take a major toll on Susie’s studies. When asked what gets in the way of completing assignments she describes caring for her family members’ medical issues. Yeah, since everybody don't speak English and I am like that, I have to take them to the ER…like three times, four times, I was in the ER…and there was one time, it was the night of the test, the next day would be the big test…I had to study for it, so I was studying inside the hospital for the nursing test.

With long nights caring for her father and other family members, coupled with the hour-long commute to and from campus, there is little time left for Susie to be successful. Her survey responses indicate that she agrees with the statement, “These family responsibilities sometimes make it difficult for me to concentrate on my college studies.” Yet at the same time, she strongly agrees with the statement, “These family responsibilities motivate me to continue with my college studies.” Serving as both her motivation and a distraction to her studies, Susie’s family responsibilities are central in her life.

This is particularly true in the intensive environment of the nursing program. Not only is the workload heavy, she feels that the climate is not optimal for learning, particularly when faculty members spout disparaging and discouraging comments at students in classes. When asked about her faculty members she remarks, “They make it hard. They make you feel like you are so little. They are not going to praise you or anything, they make us feel so little in class.” She recounts a specific instance of a comment a professor made that stuck with her, “When you
get out there, I don't want you to ruin my name because I am your professor. You kill a patient, don't come back and say, this is my professor.’ You know, things like that. It is just like these kind of comments.”

Susie, with the deck stacked against her, struggles to keep her head above water. During her time in classes she feels she must shield herself from the barrage of assaults on her educational integrity. She then spends close to an hour commuting home, late at night to stand watch over her father and his ailing health. All the while she is pushing herself forward in a career that is almost second-tier to her, in order to accommodate her family’s needs. With little help from academic peers, she steers the course alone, relying on the process of ‘losing her accent’ as a well of strength to draw from. Much like the other young people in this cluster, Susie’s story exemplifies the intersection of family obligations and the constraints of school.

**Moderate family and community engagers: the social contributors.** Moderate Family and Community Engagers comprised 15.3% of participants \( (n = 72) \). Participants took part in several family responsibility activities, including high levels of taking care of children or the elderly in their family (87.5%) and providing advice or advocacy for people in their family (84.7%). In addition, they also exhibited helping with translation (75.0%). Participants took part in several community related activities, most often including mentoring young people in the community (43.1%), volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center (44.4%), and engaging in a cause they cared about (40.3%).

**Christian, finding his way through family and community contribution.** Christian is a 25-year-old Latino young man who migrated from Panama to the US at the age of 15. Five people live in his house with him including his father, an accountant, his step-mother and siblings with a combined annual household income of $45,000 per year. Upon arriving to the US, Christian had a difficult time adjusting to his new life. He describes his time in the US before
attending Taino: “I arrived here and I was in the street and things like that, drinking, nothing else… in the streets doing nothing. With my friends drinking and talking until late at night. Then go to bed and wake up the next day to do the same thing. I didn’t know what I wanted to study, or anything.” He credits his father with helping him to go back to school: “Then my father told me to get into an English program at Taino, in this school.” He describes wanting to follow in his father’s footsteps and take over the family business as an accountant in the future.

Yet despite these desires for attending school, Christian didn’t find much reprieve from his negative peer group. He describes his transition to school as a rocky start.

I had some friends, they were in gang stuff, problems. I began to drink with them outside of the building. They were always coming with another group that had problems with them, that they were looking at them bad or that they were throwing something at them or something. And always, every single week there was a fight. And since I was with these friends I was getting involved in that, looking for problems for myself. Until there was one time…that the police detained me. I spend three months in jail, I mean, three weeks. And my dad had to take out money to get me out.

After his father got him out of jail, learning more about job opportunities on campus and reflecting on the realities of life in the US without a degree, Christian decided to take school seriously. He notes,

I wanted to make progress. I wanted a change in my life after I got out of jail. Like this made me think a lot about what, about everything that my dad had told me. I didn’t want to stay in the same thing. And also like, how this situation now, to find a good job, you should have something like a diploma or something like that, you have to do it. If I didn’t do it I was going to spend my whole life
working for seven dollars or people abusing me or asking me to work more and not paying me what they would really have to pay. Without a diploma, you are no one in this country.

These realities loom large for him in his narrative. Christian describes a change in him as he began to work full-time off campus in construction and part-time on campus to save up for the life he wants. School is challenging with these multiple responsibilities and he relies on his dad and campus resources to help him when he finds the work to be challenging.

He is also moderately involved in his family and community. His survey responses note that during the last month he helped his family with advice (two to three times per week), took care of family members (two to three times per month), and helped with translation (on a monthly basis), “other” activities which he wrote in as helping with homework (everyday). He describes helping his brother with advice and how that helps him to feel more like an adult. He notes, “When I’m talking to him, like I am older than him, and I feel like an adult, giving advice.”

His survey responses also show moderate engagement in his community. He notes that he engaged in a cause he cared about (once a week), volunteered and mentored young people (two to three times a month), and all other activities were on a monthly basis during the past month. In his interview, he describes a project that he has taken on with his friends,

…where I live, among my friends and I, we have, there was a vacant lot…like a park. But it hasn’t done anything there, like the government or a politician. They haven’t done anything like a park. So we fixed it ourselves. And we did a barbecue of Fridays, Saturday, and sometimes Sunday…We also have weights there to do exercises, and everything. And we bought it ourselves. And things to
play basketball, we bought everything among ourselves, and we keep it safe...

And child go and play there, and they do a barbecue, and then give them food.

When the interviewer asks what the goals of this project are, he states, “I haven’t thought about that, truly. We do it like that to do it, to help other people there…we feel good helping other people.”

Low family and high community engagers: the advocates. Low Family and High Community Engagers was the second largest cluster in the sample (21.2%; n = 100). Participants took part in several community related activities most often including volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center (87.0%), mentoring young people in the community (80.0%), and engaging in a cause they cared about (65.0%).

Participants also took part in several family responsibility activities, although to a lesser extent. These activities included high levels of taking care of children or the elderly in their family (23.0%) and providing advice or advocacy for people in their family (20.0%). In addition, they also exhibited helping with translation (20.0%).

Malik, sharing his perspective with the community. Malik arrived in the US roughly two years prior to our interview, displaced from his home in Haiti after the earthquake of 2010 to come live with his uncle’s family in New York. At 22, he had already had two years of college under his belt before leaving and now attends a local community college near to his uncle’s home.

He has relatively few issues with the language, because he studied English in Haiti and often practiced with a family friend who had returned from studying in the US. Having attended private school for his entire educational career, he recognizes the privilege he has had through education, “I went to private school all my life, so I was kind of one of the privileged few.” He understands that privilege and wants to give back to his community/youth in his country. This
drive shapes his career trajectory, as he wants to become a youth minister, and is a central theme in his narrative.

Coming to the US, he is immediately struck by the resources provided to him as a student, which many others might take for granted.

Here it is fair and all the rooms are comfortable and you can get help when you need it.

Over there it is not that easy. It is not that easy. In my school, it could be, but most colleges back in Haiti, especially the public ones, it's very, very, very hard to get in, and very, very, very hard if you need help, to get it, because there would be one professor teaching many classes so he doesn't really have time to have one-on-one time with any student. So here professors are more accessible, you have many professors for one class and it is easy, it is flexible, and you can choose your classes.

He credits his parents with having an educationally focused home with no TV, which inspired him to rely on books. His father, an engineer, and his mother, a doctor, stayed behind in Haiti. His parents often send him money, which he saves to pay for college. They also serve as a major source of emotional support to him as he makes his way in the US. He knows they are just a phone call away. His uncle, a math teacher, has lived in the US for over 20 years. He is Malik’s guide in the US, helping him make decisions about where to go to college and with his math homework.

He helps his family in many ways, “Well, sometimes I am cooking, mowing the lawn, taking out garbage, stuff like that.” These responsibilities play a minimal role in his daily life, however. He lists providing advice or advocating for people in his family once a month and cooking 2-3 times per week. He notes that “if it was up to my family, I could sit in my room all day long working, they wouldn’t care.” He makes it clear that school is his priority and that family comes second. When asked about how he prioritizes between school, family, and work,
he notes, “School comes first. School needs to be...I mean, school, there's no doubt. There's no doubt. Unless it is really, really, really necessary, I won't miss school. Like a really big emergency, then I won’t miss going to school. School, school.”

He is actively involved in a community youth group through his church, noting in his survey that he provides advice and advocacy to community members on a weekly basis, and mentorship to young people 2-3 times per week. In his interview he narrates his involvement: “I am really involved in my church. Wednesday nights and Thursday nights I help out at the youth group, and on Sunday morning I play on the worship team, I play the keyboard.”

He offers the young people in his youth group his perspective on hunger and poverty, which was shaped from growing up in Haiti, especially after the earthquake. When asked about his motivation in these activities, he states, “I think I have a lot to give. I think that the students there can benefit from my experience, from my knowledge, and, well, quite honestly I like it and for some reason the kids are comfortable around me. I really like it. I really do love that.” Having found a way to engage meaningfully with young people, he hopes to continue to do so in the future.

**Highest family and community engagers: the social champions.** Frequent Family and Community Engagers made up 13.6% of the sample ($n = 64$). Participants took part in several family responsibility activities. All participants (100.0%) in this cluster reported providing advice or advocacy for people in their family, as well as helping with translation (98.4%). In addition, they also exhibited high levels of taking care of children or the elderly in their family (78.1%).

Participants took part in several community related activities, most often including mentoring young people in the community (85.9%), engaging in a cause they cared about (67.2%), and volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center (65.6%).
**Elena, contributing at home and in community.** Elena is the middle child of immigrants who came to the US from Ecuador. She is interested in fashion design, something that she has been interested in since she was 10 years old. Elena lives at home with her mother who is unemployed, her father, who works as a driver, and her two brothers. Her parents graduated from high school in Ecuador, but struggle financially in the US. Their annual household income is $15,000 per year. The economic realities of Elena’s life are tough for her.

Elena feels school is a lot easier than she expected. “I thought it was going to be more harder, but I realize its just [like] high school.” But she also describes herself as never really liking school, “I have always been in school and everything, but I never really liked school…” In some instances, Elena says she has thought about dropping out of school. When asked about what made her think about doing so she says,

> Sometimes when it gets stressful, like during midterms and finals, it is so much work, and it's like, I have so many more years, it is so annoying, you don't know if it is going to pay off at the end, because I've heard stories where people go to the best schools and everything and then after they are stuck, in debt, and they can't get a job. I don't know, sometimes I am like, damn, is it worth it?

Fears about her future, particularly in the midst of the Great Recession are common amongst our participants, as their narratives are punctuated by the economic realities that they are emerging into.

We learn that her parents and the financial sacrifices they have made are what prevent her from dropping out. The interviewer asks her why she has chosen not to quit, and she describes that her parents are at the center of this.

> For my parents. I don't think I would be able to tell them, “I don't want to go to school anymore”… Because my parents have taught me in Catholic school and they paid a lot of
money, they are paying for college. I can't look at them and be like, “I quit,” and all the money that they have put to my education for nothing, so I really wouldn't be able to do that.

We learn that her family is at the center of what keeps her going, which is echoed in her survey responses. When asked about whether her family obligations make it difficult to do her studies she responds indifferently, while she agrees that they help to motivate her to succeed.

Elena takes on a lot of responsibilities at home. Her responses to our survey indicate that she is involved in a number of activities quite frequently. She is mainly involved in advocacy for her family on a weekly basis. She reports helping her family with translation and caring for her relatives two to three times per month. She elaborates on the ways in which these responsibilities fall more heavily on her, as the only daughter in the family.

Just like, I am the only girl in the house, so, like, my mom, but in Ecuador it is supposed to be that the girl does everything around the house, so I always have to be after my brothers, and I have to be cooking, and my cousin, the one, my uncle that owns the house, he works a lot, and almost all the time his kids are by themselves at the house, and I am really close to them and they live right downstairs from my grandfather, so I try to go visit them a lot, and I cook for them, and they are literally like my little brothers too.

She compares her family responsibilities with those of her brothers:

Yeah, because oh my gosh, they [my brothers] don't clean nothing! Like once I clean something they are just messing it up again, and it is like they are little. It is so annoying because they are not. In Ecuador, they always say that the girl is supposed to do all of that, doing the laundry, like they don't do no laundry, I am always the one doing that.
Family is tied together with work and school for her. This is particularly salient when she is asked how she makes decisions and prioritizes between school, family, work, friends, and things she wants. She responds, “School, work, and family kind of go together for me. And then it is like friends.” These multiple domains of family, school, and work are completely interrelated for her. Elena describes the need to work and how it is related to her family:

Because I try to be there for my family. That is a big thing for me, my family. I think when I got my first job and everything, I realized that in the beginning, my parents, they would pay for me for everything, but they wouldn't say anything. But then when I got my job, I actually realized how much they needed more people to help them out, because I pay for my own things, and I pay for my brother's things, like I am always there helping them out when they need a little bit of extra cash because now that I am, sometimes I don't want to have a job right now. It's like I can't, now I know I have to have one, because to help my parents out.

Somehow, she manages these multiple competing responsibilities and is also involved with the community. Her responses to our survey indicate that she is involved in a number of activities in her community. Mainly she is involved in advocacy in her community on a weekly basis. She also mentors young people each week. She helps people in her community with translation and cares for people in her community 2-3 times per month. In addition, she volunteers in a place of worship and is involved in a cause she cares about once a month.

She describes her involvement with one organization,

They try to help students like...they try to tell them about what is going on in the world, like about the government and metro cards, financial aid and things like that, they try to help students with that. And I remember I had to volunteer handing out fliers and signing up people…
For Elena, contributing to her family and community are integral parts of her college experience.

**Discussion**

Overall, the findings suggest that immigrant-origin community college students in this sample were overwhelmingly engaged in their families and communities. Immigrant-origin community college students engaged in a variety of activities in their families and communities from helping family members with translation and providing advice and advocacy, to mentoring young people in their communities and engaging in causes they cared about. These findings stand in contrast to developmental theory, which suggest that emerging adults (young adults in this same age category) have little in the way of social responsibilities (Arnett, 2006). On the whole, these findings suggest that this time of life is an awakening of other-focused responsibilities as the majority of participants were engaged in at least one social responsibility activity in the past month.

The cluster analysis was able to provide a more nuanced perspective on how these social responsibilities were experienced in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students. Quantitative trends suggest that there were five major clusters, the Low Engagers (i.e., the “Classic” Emerging Adults), the Family Only Engagers (i.e., the Family Supporters), the Moderate Family and Community Engagers (i.e., the Social Contributors), the Low Family and High Community Engagers (i.e., the Advocates), and lastly the Highest Family and Community Engagers (i.e., the Social Champions).

The Low Engagers embodied the tenets of Emerging Adulthood as these participants had few, if any, responsibilities outside of themselves. As Aliyah noted, she often prioritized herself when juggling between family, school, friends, and self. For students in this cluster, life during this developmental period may more closely resemble that of their native peers as described by Arnett’s theory of Emerging Adulthood (2006).
In contrast, however, the four other clusters represented a sense of social responsibilities that played out in various ways. Theories of Positive Youth Development (Lerner, 2002) conceptualize the healthy development of young adults as the “enactment in adulthood of behaviors that contribute positively to the health structure of society and, in doing so, support and further self, family, community and civil society” (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 23). Positive development results in an orientation to contribution (Lerner, Dowling & Anderson, 2003), which these students are exhibiting in varying degrees. For the Family Supporters, family obligations were at the forefront of their lives. As we could see with Susie, these obligations in such high frequency and value have the potential to impede on her academic resilience. Christian of the Social Contributors found that contributing to his family and community was a path away from the detrimental effects of hanging out with the wrong crowd. Malik’s story demonstrated how the Advocates could find a calling to a cause important to them and advocate on behalf of their communities. Lastly, Elena’s story demonstrated the ways in which managing the multiple responsibilities of home and school can be done alongside the many other responsibilities of school and is in many ways being a Social Champion.

These various levels of engagement in family and community suggest that there might be differential outcomes with regards to academic responsibilities. The “Classic” Emerging Adults, free from the social responsibilities of their families and communities, reported significantly fewer hours spent on campus engaging in academic tasks. On the other hand, the Social Champions exhibited the highest levels of social responsibilities and the highest level of reported academic time spent on campus. While life often resembled a juggling act, their commitment to both family and community provided a resource for them to draw on as they flexibly navigate the multiple cultural expectations of home and school (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). While research suggests that students who manage multiple work, family, and school demands are at higher risk
of not persisting in their studies (Bailey, Leinbach & Jenkins, 2006; Valentine et al., 2009), the findings from this study suggest that they might be mutually beneficial activities. Although beyond the scope of this study, future work should explore the ways in which social responsibilities are linked to academic engagement and persistence in these settings.

The mixed-method approach of the study had many strengths. Primarily, the quantitative patterns were contextualized by the qualitative case studies and allowed for a richer understanding of the ways in which social responsibilities were experienced in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students. Further, these case studies provided new insights into the process of contribution. Particularly, understanding the ways in which the family and community contributes to students’ success was not captured in the quantitative data, but emerged in the qualitative case studies. For example, Christian credits his father with helping him to understand the importance of attending school and supporting him to be able to complete school. His father’s support ranged from bailing him out of jail, to counseling him about his future, to providing help with his homework. These are critical pieces of the way in which social responsibilities are enacted. Future research should examine the bi-directional nature of family and community contributions.

**Limitations**

This study was subject to several limitations. This work is the first step in describing these processes for this under-examined population. These developmental processes would be better understood through utilizing longitudinal data to examine the ways in which social responsibilities contributed to academic persistence over time. Further, while there are no causal links that can be drawn due to the cross-sectional nature of the data, the mixed methods approach was able to shed light on some of the processes of contributing to one’s family and community.
Future work should utilize larger samples in diverse settings (i.e., outside of major metropolitan settings).

**Conclusion**

We are in an age of globalization where cultural shifts are occurring for adolescents and young adults across the globe. Immigrant-origin youth “already experience the social and cultural shifts thought to typify globalization, and an analysis of their experiences could shed light on what to expect as existing national barriers become more permeable” (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015, p. 411). For these immigrant-origin community college students, navigating the values of contributing to one’s family and community in the context of individualistic schemas of adulthood at school do not seem to be incongruent. The high levels of engagement alongside high levels of academic time on campus suggest that they may be mutually beneficial to academic success. Understanding the multiple social responsibilities that immigrant-origin students face and how they relate to academic responsibilities on campus is critical for community colleges to effectively serve the needs of this growing population. Considering that immigrant-origin students are a sizable population that is continuing to expand, it is critical to the future of our country to understand their developmental challenges especially in these contexts.
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## Table 1

**Participant Demographics and Household Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taino</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domino</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakmont</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Agglomeration Schedule for Hierarchical Cluster Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Clusters</th>
<th>Agglomeration last step</th>
<th>Coefficients this step</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7857.9</td>
<td>5480.8</td>
<td>2377.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5480.8</td>
<td>4775.0</td>
<td>705.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4775.0</td>
<td>4108.4</td>
<td>666.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4108.4</td>
<td>3729.9</td>
<td>378.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3729.9</td>
<td>3416.3</td>
<td>313.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3416.3</td>
<td>3121.8</td>
<td>294.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3121.8</td>
<td>2708.2</td>
<td>413.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Mean of Frequency of Family Engagement by Cluster*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Engagers</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Only Engagers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family High Community Engagers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Mean of Frequency of Community Engagement by Cluster*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Engagers</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Only Engagers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family High Community Engagers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Mean Academic Hours Spent on Campus Outside of Class by Cluster*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Engagers</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Only Engagers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family High Community Engagers</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Family and Community Engagers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

_Logic Regression Analysis of Cluster Membership as a Function of Demographic Variables_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ to Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Only Language at Home</td>
<td>38.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reside with Mother</td>
<td>12.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reside with Father</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .045
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Family Only</th>
<th>Moderate Engagers</th>
<th>Low Family High Community</th>
<th>High Family &amp; Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reside with Mother</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.297*</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.069*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reside with Father</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.494*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Low Engagers Compared to Each Cluster*

*p < .045
Figure 1

Dendogram of Clusters
Figure 2

*Cluster Solution*
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- Cluster 1: Low engagers
- Cluster 2: Family only engagers
- Cluster 3: Moderate family and community engagers
- Cluster 4: Low family and high community engagers
- Cluster 5: Highest family and community engagers
Chapter 4

Study 3

“We’ll Get Through This Together”:

Collective Contribution of Family and Community in the Lives of Latino Undocumented Undergraduates

Note. The qualitative portion of this study was the result of the UndocuScholars Participatory Action Research Collective. I would like to note that there will be several co-authors on this article as it is submitted for publication, to recognize their contributions and adhere to the tenets of PAR work. Co-Authors: Edwin Hernandez, Cynthia Alcantar, Oscar Rodriquez Texis, Erick Samayoa, Maria Nava Guiterrez, Zymphia Williams.
Abstract

Undocumented undergraduates are a growing population in the US. Despite being shut out from many resources such as access to federal financial aid and social services, many are thriving by contributing to their families and communities. Through mixed methods, this paper examines the social responsibilities of a sample of $N = 797$ Latino undocumented undergraduates student survey respondents along with four portraits of visual and verbal narratives. Results highlight the value of “collective contribution” in undocumented immigrant families. Further, results reveal the varied ways that undocumented undergraduate engage in their families and communities, exhibiting the characteristics of ideal citizens despite being denied a pathway to citizenship.

Keywords: Undocumented Immigrants, Social Responsibilities, Positive Youth Development, Family Responsibilities, Civic Engagement
“We’ll Get Through This Together”:

Collective Contribution of Family and Community in the Lives of Latino Undocumented Undergraduates

US immigration policy has produced a growing number of “undocumented” immigrants living in the US over the past few decades. Undocumented immigrants refers to individuals who were born outside of the U.S., have not been permitted admission under the most current and specific set of rules for longer-term residence and who are not U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents (Abrego 2008; Passel & Cohn, 2010). Nearly a fifth of the approximately 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the US, are children and young adults (Batalova & McHugh, 2010; Passel & Cohn 2010). Current estimates reflect that 47% of 16 to 26 year-old immigrant youth have an undocumented status compared to 31% of the total immigrant population in the US, suggesting that legal status disproportionality affects the lives of students as they come of age (Batalova & Fix, 2011). Most undocumented youth were born abroad and arriving in the U.S. at an early age (many before the age of 12) and are largely described as the 1.5 generation (Gonzales, 2008). Undocumented immigrants are diverse in ethnicity, country of origin, and immigration histories (Suárez-Orozco et al., in press; Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2015) ranging from various places around the globe, including Canada, Asia, Europe, Africa, and other parts of Latin America, however migrants from Mexico and Central America are disproportionately affected by exclusionary migration laws and make up the majority of undocumented immigrants in the US.

Undocumented immigrants’ legal status creates a sense of what scholars have termed “liminality” (Menjivar, 2006; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011)—belonging neither to the society they left behind or the society they have entered into. With the current political and public policy landscape, undocumented immigrants and their families are caught in a sense of “interminable
liminality” by which there are no clear paths to citizenship and no means to fully assimilate into the American society (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011 p. 444). Such liminality constrains their access to resources, possibilities for belonging, and trajectories into adulthood (Menjivar, 2006).

Theories of development suggest that the years of 18-25, referred to as “Emerging Adulthood,” are marked by few responsibilities and self-focus (Arnett, 2000). This developmental period is particularly complicated for undocumented immigrants. On one hand, undocumented young adults are propelled into adulthood, as they often must take on adult responsibilities and roles at an early age, in some cases filling in for parents who have been deported or left behind by raising siblings, contributing financially to the family and navigating legal and medical systems (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). On the other hand, as they begin to come of age, undocumented immigrants bump up against a series of barriers that prohibit them from participating in normative coming of age rituals and prevent them from reaching markers of adulthood. Unable to get a driver’s license, apply for financial aid for college, or get a job drastically reduces their future prospects as they transition into adulthood and contributes to a greater sense of social isolation from their peers (Gonzalez, 2011). Instead of emerging into adulthood like many of their peers, they often begin a process of hiding their legal status with feelings of shame and fear, into a period of “(sub)merging adulthood” (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011, p. 453).

Undocumented students face a series of obstacles in their daily lives such as a lack of access to resources (Chávez, 1998; Yoshikawa, 2011), and discriminatory laws, policies and interpersonal interactions (Gonzales, 2011; Nienhusser, 2014). These experiences can negatively impact their physical and mental health (Katsiaficas & Suárez-Orozco, 2013; Sullivan & Rehm, 2005), social belonging (González, Suárez-Orozco, & Dedios-Sangotti, 2013), academic engagement (Perez, 2009; Perez, 2010; Perez, Cortés, Ramos & Coronado, 2010a; Muñoz &
Maldonado, 2011) and family processes (Abrego, 2008; Oliveras, 2006). Most difficult to contend with are the negative media and societal portrayals of undocumented immigrants as draining national and local resources. These damaging portrayals negate the tangible ways in which undocumented members of communities contribute to the social fabric of society.

**Undocumented College Students**

Liminality is further made salient as undocumented students exit high school and enter college. As undocumented young adults transition from adolescence to adulthood they are moving from federally protected status during K-12 to unprotected status during college. While the 1982 *Plyler v. Doe* U.S. Supreme Court decision affords undocumented immigrants access to a K-12 education, there is no similar federal edict that informs how undocumented immigrants are to be treated in postsecondary education settings (Gonzalez, 2009; Teranishi et al., 2015).

The college pipeline problem is further complicated for undocumented youth. Approximately 65,000 undocumented students graduate from high school each year (Abrego, 2008; Golden Door Scholars, 2012; Passel, Capps, and Fix, 2004). Of these, roughly 13,000 enroll in colleges or universities throughout the U.S. (Golden Door Scholars, 2012; Perez et al., 2009). That is, approximately one out of every five undocumented students will make it to college. Further, Latino foreign-born adolescents have the lowest rates of high school completion, college enrollment and completion when compared to Asian, White and Black peers (Fuligni & Hardway, 2004). Thus, it is critical to understand the ways in which Latino youth at the intersection of undocumented status are developing within school settings to better address their needs.

What is often overlooked are the ways in which undocumented young adults are thriving under these circumstances and are contributing to the society that gives conflicting messages about how to belong. Few studies to date have taken a strengths based perspective to
understanding the lives of undocumented young adults or examined their normative developmental experiences. Therefore, this study aims to take on these gaps in the literature by examining the positive development of social responsibilities of undocumented college students.

**Contributions of Immigrant Youth**

Contribution involves a value of “undertaking a role to contribute to social well-being,” in the form of contributions to family and community which are critical to positive youth development (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 15). Furthermore, young adults who exhibit these behaviors are considered to be thriving, which is conceptualized as the “enactment in adulthood of behaviors that contribute positively to the health structure of society and, in doing so, support and further self, family, community and civil society” (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 23). Research with immigrant populations documents the importance of family interdependence particularly among Latino families. The cultural demands of family interdependence on emerging adults highlight lifelong financial and emotional support between family members, living close to or with parents, and consulting parents on important decisions (Tseng, 2004). A manifestation of such cultural beliefs is a sense of social responsibility. Responsibility for others—often referred to as ‘social responsibility’ is rooted in relationships with others and is defined as a sense of responsibility and duty that extends beyond the self (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). This sense of social responsibility can be for family members, peers, the immediate community, or go beyond to a sense of civic obligation (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011).

**Family and community social responsibilities.** Young people often describe contributing to their families and communities in important ways while also receiving support and contributions from members of their families and communities. In these ways social responsibilities represent bidirectional contributions of family and community members. As
youths in immigrant families transition to college, there are significant increases in levels of family responsibilities (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) and civic engagement (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Suárez-Orozco, Hernandez & Casanova, 2015) during this developmental period. Yet other studies with undocumented students suggest that civic participation decreases as they enter college (Perez et al., 2010b). This may be due to the additional demands of college and financial responsibilities. Furthermore, these social responsibilities are central to the ways in which immigrant-origin community college students define adulthood (Katsiaficas, forthcoming; Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco & Dias, 2014). Therefore, examining the role of contribution during the college-going years is of the utmost importance for immigrant youths and for those with undocumented status in particular.

Immigrant sons and daughters contribute to their families in many ways by contributing to family expenses at home and abroad, caring for siblings and extended family members, translating for family members and helping them navigate institutions among other tasks (Fuligni, 2007; Fuligni & Pederson, 2002; Katsiaficas, forthcoming; Orellana, 2009; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Extensive research suggests that immigrant children are more likely to financially support their families as young adults than are native-born children (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002). Furthermore, immigrant-origin young adults from Latino backgrounds report a stronger sense of values of family obligations than do their European American peers (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002).

Oftentimes, expectations regarding the contribution of young adults to family can take on gendered patterns particularly in Latino families, with young women experiencing expectations as caretakers (Muñoz & Maldonado, 2011) and young men as financial contributors to the family (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2011). In addition, daughters in undocumented families often fill the gaps left by mothers who are deported and may take on the roles of mothering their siblings that were left
behind and taking care of the household chores such as cooking and cleaning (Katsiaficas & Suárez-Orozco, 2013; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). Such family obligations maybe further unequally distributed as women take on more roles inside the homes (APA, 2012). The expectations of young women’s families, cultures and society all significantly influence their understanding and engagement in contribution.

In addition, undocumented parents support their children in various ways. Many undocumented students rely on the emotional and financial support of their families (Finch, Kolodny, and Vega, 2000; Finch and Vega, 2003; Perez et al., 2010a). Often undocumented parents demonstrate a strong desire for their children to succeed academically which can support them as they navigate college institutions (Perez et al., 2010a). Older cousins and siblings who are also undocumented play a critical role in serving as guides for undocumented youths trying to navigate the way to and through college (Abrego, 2014). Thus, in many ways contribution for undocumented students is a family value of “collective contribution” between students and parents (Katsiaficas et al., under review).

Contribution also occurs beyond the family context and can take the form of civic engagement. Civic engagement for immigrant youth often takes the form of giving back to the community through translating for community members as well as tutoring and mentoring youth in the community (Alcantar, 2014; Enriquez, 2014; Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Mody, 2008; Pascarella, Ethington, & Smart, 1988; Perez, et al, 2010b; Seif, 2011; Stepick, Stepick, & Labissiere, 2008). Although unable to participate in voting, undocumented college students are often highly engaged in their communities (Uhlaner, Cain, & Kiewiet, 1989) by participating in rallies and participating in community organizing (Flanagan & Levine, 2010). This kind of civic work can turn into a virtuous circle whereby by helping others, undocumented young adults find purpose and a role that serves to augment their own well-being (Kirshner & Ginwright, 2012;
Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Katsiaficas, 2014). This may also differ significantly by gender. Female students report greater levels of civic engagement compared to their male counterparts (Perez et al., 2010b).

**Current Study**

Despite understanding the centrality of engaging with families and communities across these domains, the majority of previous research has explored the experiences with small, localized samples through qualitative approaches. No studies have examined the extent to which undocumented undergraduates are involved in these activities on a national scale. Thus, this study documents the extent to which Latino undocumented undergraduates are engaged in family and community contributions with data from a national study. Furthermore, four qualitative portraits help to illuminate the many ways in which these contributions manifest in the lives of Latino undocumented undergraduates.

Through the analysis of quantitative results from $N = 797$ survey responses as well as $N = 4$ interviews and “family maps” of Latino undocumented undergraduates, two research questions were explored:

Utilizing quantitative methods,

RQ1. What are broad patterns of social responsibilities (i.e., family and community responsibilities) in undocumented undergraduates’ lives?

Utilizing qualitative methods,

RQ2. How do undocumented undergraduates students contribute to their families and communities in their daily lives?

**Methods**

This study utilized a convergent mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) where parallel quantitative and qualitative databases were collected and analyzed separately.
Next, results from each methodological strand were compared and contrasted during the interpretation phase. Finally, the ways in which the two sets of results represent a more complete picture of the data are described.

In addition, many of the design elements were influenced by a transformative mixed-method guiding framework (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The Transformative-Emancipatory Paradigm (Mertens, 2003) encompasses a participatory action research perspective (Fine & Torre, 2006; Tolman & Brydon-Miller, 2001). This paradigm is guided by three main tenets:

1. Creating an “interactive link” between researchers and participants
2. Involving the community in “methodological and programmatic decisions”
3. Recognizing and placing the diversity of viewpoints in cultural, social, political and historical context (Mertens, 2003).

The transformative design helped to shape the ways in which community members were involved in all phases of the project from designing the instruments to analyzing the data.

Utilizing both these mixed-method design paradigms helped to investigate how family and community responsibilities occur broadly for Latino undocumented college students, as well as exploring deeply how they are experienced in their daily lives.

**Study Context**

The project began as the UndocuScholars National Survey, an online quantitative survey with a sample of diverse undocumented undergraduates from across the nation (see Suárez-Orozco et al., in press, and Teranishi et al., 2015 for full details). Community Advisory board members helped to shape the questions that were asked on the survey. During the data collection of the UndocuScholars National Survey, a qualitative study was designed as part of a participatory action research project embedded within the UndocuScholars Summer Research Program (see Katsiaficas et al., under review for full details). Preliminary quantitative findings
from the UndocuScholars National Survey helped to inform the design of the qualitative follow-up along with the perspectives and priorities of the PAR Research Collective Members who were working together to understand undocumented undergraduates experiences at a public university in California. Table 1 summarizes the project activities and the type of data yielded.

The analysis mimics this structure as the quantitative data is used to frame the qualitative findings regarding undocumented undergraduates’ contributions to their families and communities. Below, the quantitative method are described followed by the qualitative methods employed.

**Quantitative Method**

**Procedure.** Participants for the online survey were recruited through a variety of social and community outreach efforts including social and digital media and community organizations. All potential participants were directed to the study website where they were provided with information about the study and were able to consent to take part. The website was linked to the survey on Qualtrics, an online hosting site which in turn provided a checklist of inclusion criteria including: being born outside the U.S. and self-identifying as undocumented (or DACAmented);

---

6 At the same time we were doing this work, it was an important political moment regarding the status of immigrant youths and their family members. In June of 2012, President Obama issued the executive order Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) which provided an opportunity for undocumented young adults to apply for lawful presence in the U.S. and a work permit for two years. Although DACA has no direct benefits related to college, it has expanded opportunities for students who are now able to lawfully work, get drivers licenses (in many states), open bank accounts and seek opportunities that are related to their educational and career aspirations such as paid internships, and opportunities to study abroad through Advance Parole (Gonzales & Bautista-Chavez, 2014; Teranishi et al., 2015). In 2014, President Obama’s executive order expanded the DACA program by lengthening the time from two to three years and extended benefits on DACA 2012 to undocumented parents of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents, this is referred to as the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) program. Although DACA and DAPA serve as recognition by the federal government of mixed-status families, and the importance of keeping families together, DAPA excludes undocumented parents of undocumented children. Additionally, DACA and DAPA only provide temporary relief, not a permanent solution, nor do they provide a path to citizenship.
being enrolled in college as an undergraduate (either currently or in the past semester to account for stop-outs); and being between the ages of 18-30. Those who did not meet the criteria were unable to complete the survey. Through Qualtrics, \( n = 784 \) valid surveys were collected. UndocuScholars Advisory Committee members also distributed paper surveys at campus and community events to bridge gaps in participation rates in targeted states, campuses, and ethnic groups; \( n = 125 \) valid surveys were completed in this way. Participants were assured confidentiality; once it was determined that the survey response (either on-line or paper) was legitimate, the participant was sent a link to a $20 gift card and their identifying information was destroyed. This study focused solely on the Latino subsample \( (n = 797) \).

**Participants.** Participants included 797 self-identified Latino undocumented undergraduate college students (ages 18-30, \( M = 21.5 \) years, \( SD = 2.7 \); 54.5% female) (See Table 2 for demographic detail). Participants emigrated from 22 different counties of origin (See Table 3 for full details). The average age of arrival to the US was 6.4 years of age (\( SD = 4.3 \)). Over half (51.9%) had arrived between the ages of five and 12 years old, and over a third (37.8%) had arrived before they were five. On average, participants had lived in the US 15.1 years (\( SD = 4.7 \)). The majority of participants were the first in their families to attend college (61.3%) and were residing in families whose annual income was less than $40,000 per year (79.1%). Two thirds of participants (66.0%) had received Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. Similar proportions resided in mixed-status families where at least one person was documented (61.7%). Nearly half

---

\(^7\) A key aim of the data collection strategy was to protect the identities of survey respondents. However, the anonymity that was afforded respondents had an unfortunate corollary, namely a large number of mischievous responses (Robinson-Cimpian, 2014) to the online version of the survey. Of the over 3,500 responses received in total, more than 70% were identified as being mischievous, either having been generated by computer programs or “made up” by individuals, presumably with the aim of profiting from the $20 Amazon gift voucher. This data collection issue was recognized early in the data collection process and a systematic procedure was developed to systematically assess the genuineness of each response (see Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco, 2015 for detail).
of participants attended 4-year public colleges (45.0%) or community colleges (43.9%), while fewer than one in ten attended a 4-year private college (8.2%). Nearly two-thirds of participants were attending colleges in California, while others attended colleges in a variety of states. This sample significantly overlapped with available benchmarks (Immigration Policy Center, 2012; Batalova, Hooker, & Capps, 2014) both in terms of country of origin of undocumented immigrants and state of residence for DACA-eligible youth (see Suárez-Orozco et al., in press and Teranishi et al., 2015 for further details).

**Measures.** Three advisory boards were consulted in the development, piloting and adaptation of the quantitative measures. The UndocuScholars Student Advisory Board consisted of 11 student leaders, the Community Advisory Board consisted of members from 13 national organizations working closely on behalf of undocumented youth throughout the country, and the Research Advisory Board was comprised of well-regarded organization leaders, practitioners, as well as faculty advisors with complementary expertise. Revisions to measures were made based on piloting and in accordance with Advisory Board recommendations (e.g., regarding respectfulness and parsimony) to ensure survey items were appropriately tailored to undocumented students.

**Family responsibilities.** A version of the Family Responsibilities Index from the RICC project was adapted for this study (see Katsiaficas, forthcoming, for original). Whereas previous measures had examined the ways in which participants provided support to their families, the measure was expanded to include an additional index of the types of support participants received from their family as well.

The Family Assistance Checklist tapped into the types of assistance undergraduates received from their family members in the past month. Participants indicated whether they had received help in the following domains: paying expenses, paying tuition, errands or practical
tasks, tutoring or homework help, advice and solving problems as well as a space of additional domains for which they wrote in their responses.

The Family Engagement Checklist tapped into the types of assistance undergraduates provided their family members in the past month. Participants indicated if they had provided help to their family members in the following domains: paying bills or expenses, errands or practical tasks, tutoring or homework help, translating, advice and solving problems, as well as a space for additional domains where they wrote in their responses.

**Community responsibilities.** A version of the Civic Engagement Index from the RICC project was adapted for this study to account for the variety of ways that immigrant-origin college students may exhibit civic participation beyond traditional indicators such as voting and political participation (see Katsiaficas, forthcoming, for original). Participants were asked the frequency of their participation in eight different activities, ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once a month) 2 (2-3 times a month), 3 (once a week), 4 (2-3 times a week), and 5 (daily). These activities included helping people in their community with translation, taking care of children or the elderly in their community, providing advice or advocacy for people in the community, mentoring young people, coaching young people, volunteering in a place of worship, school or community center in the community, and engaging a cause that they care about. Two additional items were added to the original measure to include items about community organizing and attending a protest or demonstration given the history of political activism in the undocumented student and DREAMer movement.

**Qualitative Method**

**Procedure.** The qualitative interview was designed and carried out as part of the UndocuScholars Summer Research Program as a parallel dataset to the national quantitative survey (Cressell & Plano Clark, 2011). The UndocuScholars Summer Research Program was
established to provide research training and an opportunity for undocumented students to make change on their campus through a participatory action research project. The research team was composed of undocumented and ally graduate and undergraduate students. Four undergraduate students were selected to participate from a pool of applicants recruited through campus clubs and student services. Together with three graduate student researchers, the PAR collective was formed. The PAR Collective designed and carried out a qualitative study during which these visual and verbal narratives were collected (See Katsiaficas et al., under review for further details).

Participants were recruited for the qualitative study on campus through a combination of convenience and snowball sampling at a large public university in California. Many members of the team had preexisting trusting relationships with the undocumented student community on campus. Some were key gatekeepers due to their involvement and engagement with undocumented student organizations on campus. Students were mostly recruited through outreach to on-campus student organizations and the undocumented student support services office via email listservs and social media. Recruitment messages were posted on the Facebook group pages of the undocumented student organization on campus. Participants were also recruited via personal referrals from team members. Every effort was made to recruit a sample that reflected the diversity of the student population on campus. Participants were diverse in terms of country of origin and also represented a diverse pool of undocumented students on campus.

---

8 California is one of few states in the U.S. where undocumented undergraduate students benefit from state and institutional policies which support undocumented students. Since 2001, many undocumented college students have qualified for in-state tuition rates through Assembly Bill 540 (AB540) after meeting certain requirements. In 2011, Assembly Bills 130 and 131 called the California Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act (CA DREAM Act), granted undocumented undergraduate students access to state grant aid. Prior research on undocumented students has mostly been conducted before the passage of CA DREAM Act.
campus with regards to transfer history, DACA status, family migration history and living situation.

Interviews were audio-recorded and lasted roughly 1.5 hours. Interviews were conducted in a secure, quiet, and confidential setting where students would be comfortable on campus. Each interview was transcribed verbatim and all participants were assigned a pseudonym to protect their identities. No personal identifiers (e.g., names of self or others) were collected and any other potentially identifying information was further removed from the transcripts in order to ensure the safety of participants. Each participant was provided a $20 Amazon gift card incentive after completion of interview. All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board prior to data collection. As a result of our anonymity procedures we were unable to link quantitative data to qualitative data for this study.

Participants. Four Latino/a participants were selected from the qualitative study who had complete and generative verbal and visual narratives. Table 4 presents the demographic information for the four participants.

Verbal and visual narratives. Verbal and visual narratives were collected during the interviews. These pluralistic narratives (Katsiaficas et al., 2011) served as a tool to further explore contribution to family and community for this population. The semi-structured interviews (verbal narratives) were conducted using the same protocol across participants. As part of the interviews, participants were asked to complete a family identity map (visual narrative) in which they were asked to “draw what they consider to be their family.” The family identity map task was designed specifically for this project, drawing from the long history of visual mapping techniques (Futch & Fine, 2014) in psychological studies (Sirin, Katsiaficas & Volpe, 2010).
Mapping techniques allow participants to express a visual narrative of self and relationships that may be “preverbal, affect-laden, metaphoric and/or relational” (Katsiaficas et al., 2011, p.123). While in previous research endeavors participants were merely asked to complete the maps without any explanation or interpretation of the elements (Katsiaficas et al., 2011), in this study the maps were further integrated into the interviews, with interviewers asking participants for specific interpretations to delve deeper into the narratives of family and community. Finally, participants completed a short demographic survey in which they identified country of origin, gender, and time of arrival to the US.

**Analytic Strategy**

A convergent mixed-method analytic strategy was utilized for this study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed independently utilizing strategies “best suited” for the research questions (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 215). The databases were compared regarding dimensions of family and community contributions. These comparisons of the ways in which the findings converged and diverged fostered insights into what might have been missed utilizing a single method (Marks & Abo-Zena, 2013).

**Quantitative analysis.** Descriptive quantitative analyses were conducted using SPSS to examine the research questions. In addition, Chi-Squares tests were conducted to determine if there were gender differences in the percentages of participants who took part in each of the family and community activities.

**Qualitative analysis.** Each qualitative case was analyzed to identify how undocumented undergraduates drew upon and served as resources to their families and communities. Each case file included a narrative interview transcript, a short demographic survey, and the family map, annotated by the interviewers during the interview to be able to tell who were the figures in each of the maps. A pluralistic analysis was employed to provide insight across the visual and verbal
narratives of each case (Katsiaficas et al., 2011). The Research Collective played a central role in this process. Analyses were conducted as conversations between the Research Collective members as a dialogic analysis. As Katsiaficas and colleagues (2011) describe this process involved “creating conversations among ourselves, as the research team, using our own diversity (in theoretical and methodological training, cultural backgrounds, and lived experiences) as a resource” (p. 125). As Smythe and McKenzie (2010) note, “dialogical engagement among diverse perspectives can often be a source of new insights and understandings” (p. 230). The diversity (both in methodological training and lived experience) within the Research Collective became a source of new insights and understandings of the family and community resources of undocumented undergraduates. The Research Collective took into practice what Fine and Torre (2004) note with regards to working in such groups where “varied perspectives could be aired, challenged, and thoughtfully discussed, without the imposition of ‘making nice’ or reaching unanimous agreement. When tensions emerged among the team, rather than ignoring or silencing them through consensus, we sought meaning in the friction” (Fine & Torre, 2004, p. 20). This approach allowed Research Collective members to create what Maria Elena Torre (2005) calls a “contact zone” for interpretation.

Analysis began with each member of the Research Collective reading the piece of the interview narrative that pertained to the map and examining the drawing simultaneously. Next, discussions were held collectively with each interviewer presenting a brief summary of the case for the analysis to the group. So as not to privilege any one narrative over another within a case, the order of which we analyzed the maps and interview narratives varied from case to case. During the analytic meetings the Research Collective members combed through the narratives and examined the maps of multiple participants placing the visual and verbal narratives in conversation with one another.
Moving between the verbal and visual narratives, a lot of time was spent contextualizing the drawings with insights from the verbal narratives and vice versa to help capture the multidimensionality of participants’ experiences (Frost, 2009). Interpretive questions guided the conversations including: What metaphors do participants use? What contradictions are present in these narratives? As Katsiaficas and colleagues (2011) recognize, “analytic dialogue between forms of evidence and between members of a research team, enables a thick analysis of complex lives held accountable to theory and a dense archive of materials produced by each respondent” (p. 126). By placing both the visual and verbal narratives in dialogue with one another as part of the shared analytic conversations, Research Collective members were able to develop thick descriptions of contribution in the lives of undocumented undergraduates.

These four cases that were particularly rich in data and presented a diversity of experiences with regards to family and community resources were then selected. Working in pairs, each team read and re-read the narratives until an overarching understanding of the narratives with regards to the role of family and community came through (Josselson, 2011). Narrations of important relationships in one’s life were used as guideposts utilizing the following questions: Who do the participants consider family? What role (if any) does community/friends play in who they consider to be family? Then narrations of family/community involvement were examined. Guiding questions included: What role does family play in college students’ lives? How do they support students? How is family a resource? What role do UndocuScholars play in contributing to their families and communities? How are they a resource to their family/community? Each pair presented to the group the main themes for further validation.

At the subsequent analytic meetings the Research Collective members discussed issues that arose during the analytic process. During this session, many topics were addressed including how to narrate the process of moving between the map and narrative, how to connect themes at
the beginning and end of the narrative, making decisions around relevance and deciding what constitutes “evidence,” as well as sharing our own reflexivity and examining the role of bias in interpretation. These analytic conversations engaged the reflexivity of Research Collective members, most significantly the ways in which the understandings of their families might inform the analysis. The personal backgrounds or Research Collective members came together to bring a variety of experiences to the interpretive community. The family immigration histories were diverse with some members having migrated to the US as young adults, others as small children, and some born in the US to parents or grandparents who migrated. Many of the Research Collective members were the first in their families to attend or graduate from college, something in common with many of the participants. Some of the Research Collective members lived with family members while others lived on their own with roommates or with partners. The significant overlap with participants made the Research Collective members particularly well suited to conduct this analysis.

Finally, quantitative and qualitative results were compared by the first author. Patterns in the quantitative data were reviewed and qualitative portraits were revisited to further illuminate these patterns.

**Results**

With regards to RQ1., descriptive quantitative results suggest that undocumented undergraduates provide and receive a significant amount of support from their families. Nearly all participants (94.8%) received assistance from their parents. Participants reported that they received support in a variety of domains (See Table 5 for full description). Family members helped participants to pay for expenses (62.1%), solving problems or giving advice (42.1%), pay for tuition (33.1%), and helped with errands or practical tasks (31.9%). Very few participants (6.5%) reported that they received tutoring or help with their homework from family members.
These types of supports received varied significantly by gender. Men received more help from their families in paying tuition (39.0% of men compared to 28.1% of women; \( \chi^2 (1, 789) = 10.42, p = .001, \text{Eta} = .12 \)). Nearly half of women (49.5%) reported receiving more help solving problems and getting advice from their families compared to only roughly a third (33.1%) of their male counterparts (\( \chi^2 (1,789) = 21.56, p < .001, \text{Eta} = .17 \); See Table 5).

Participants also provided a significant amount of support to their families. Nearly all (97.2%) of participants took part in at least one activity to support their families in the past month. The majority of participants took part in translating for their families (70.2%). Two thirds (64.0%) helped their families with errands and household chores such as child and elder care. Over half reported giving advice to family members (57.8%). Two fifths (45.4%) reported tutoring or helping family members with homework. Similar proportions (42.8%) reported helping their families pay for bills and other expenses. These types of supports undocumented undergraduates provided significantly varied by gender across nearly all domains, with women providing significantly more support to their families than their male peers. Significantly higher proportions of women provided support translating (75.6% compared to 63.8% of men; \( \chi^2 (1, 789) = 13.01, p < .001, \text{Eta} = .13 \)), helping family with errands (69.1% compared to 57.9% of men; \( \chi^2 (1, 789) = 10.52, p = .001, \text{Eta} = .12 \)), giving advice (63.7% compared to 50.7% of men; \( \chi^2 (1, 789) = 13.61, p < .001, \text{Eta} = .13 \)), and tutoring family members (51.2% compared to 38.4% of men; \( \chi^2 (1, 789) = 12.78, p < .001, \text{Eta} = .13 \)) (See Table 6 for full details).

Community responsibilities also played a large role in students’ lives. The majority of participants (92.1%) took part in at least one activity to contribute to the community in the past month. Over three-quarters of participants reported being engaged in a cause they cared about in the past month (77.7%). Similar proportions helped community members with translation (76.5%). Many also reported mentoring young people in their communities (70.4%). Nearly two-
thirds (63.6%) engaged in advocacy for their communities, with similar proportions participating in community organizing (60.1%) and volunteering in a community center or place of worship (59.7%). Slightly fewer than half (46.1%) reported participating in a demonstration or protest in the past month. Roughly two-fifths (42.1%) reported taking care of an elderly member of child in their community in the past month. Similar levels of engagement in these activities occurred for both men and women, while men reported significantly higher levels of engagement in advocacy for their community than women (68.1% of men compared to 60.1% of women; $\chi^2 (1, 789) = 4.6 P = .03, ETA = .077$) (See Table 7).

Next, the ways in which these family and community responsibilities were experienced in the daily lives of participants were explored through four portraits.

**Monica, Getting Through it Together**

[Insert Figure 1 Here]

“My parents were really, like, I think at the beginning they were more excited for me to attend [this highly selective four-year college] than I was. Because I was more worried financial wise. But they were like, ‘We’ll get through this together.’”

At the age of 22, Monica is in her fourth year majoring in anthropology. She moved from Ecuador to the U.S. at the age of six with both of her parents and older siblings, after having lived in Australia for three years. She is the fourth of five children in a mixed-status family, and currently lives with all her family members in a small apartment in a gateway immigrant community. She drew her family in descending order, her father and mother, her older brother carrying her newborn niece and her sister-in-law, then her second brother and his wife, her older sister, a family friend, herself and her boyfriend, her younger sister and her boyfriend (see Figure 1). In her narrative she revealed that all the family members lived in the same house except her father who moved back to Ecuador. In the family map and throughout the interview narrative it
became evident that family was very important in Monica’s life; they serve as both a source of support and motivation for her to continue her education despite the barriers she faces, just as she serves as a source of support for them.

Her description of how she selected a college illuminates the ways in which they show mutual support and value “collective contribution.” Monica describes how her family is at the forefront of her thoughts when making decisions about college. She notes, “I didn't really see college as something I had to get done. It was more like once I graduate high school, I’d try to find a job to help my family…”

All the family’s decisions revolve around what’s best for the family as a group. Monica talks about the ways in which her family’s well-being was central to her decisions about where to go to college. She describes that despite being accepted to four-year colleges she was willing to sacrifice that opportunity to attend a community college as they are often a less expensive option. She notes, “I’m not gonna be the one that puts the family in jeopardy just so I can be the only one out of the five kids to go to college.” She feared the financial strain attending college would put on her family since her dad had just suffered an injury at work and was let go from his job. She says:

Coming from a low-income family that you know, there’s five kids and I’m like the second youngest and my older siblings also wanted to go to college so it was more like if I was gonna go to this schools, I was gonna pay for it on my own ‘cause I didn’t see it fair to ask my parents to be the only one to pay for.

In the end, she decided to attend a four-year college after her brother insisted she apply and her parents telling her they would make it work:

My parents and my brothers were motivating, like they would tell me that I had to go…
My parents were really, like, I think at the beginning they were more excited for me to attend [this highly selective four-year college] than I was. Because I was more worried financial wise. But they were like ‘We’ll get through this together.’

Looking further into her narrative, we learn that Monica’s father role modeled this sense of responsibility to the family two years ago when he moved back to Ecuador to take care of his elderly mother. In doing so, he sacrificed potentially never seeing his wife, children, and grandchild again, as his undocumented status would make it nearly impossible to return to the US. Yet, despite returning to Ecuador, he was still very much connected to his family. When we look again at the family map, we see Monica has drawn her parents holding hands across the US to Ecuador, representing a transnational family unity that transcends well beyond national borders.

For Monica, her motivation to do well in school came from the sense of responsibility to her family. “All my high school and my middle school I just felt like ‘I just have to stick to school, this is my only way out. This is my only way of making sure my family gets better things in life.’” She demonstrates a heightened sense of responsibility to her family in the interview when she shares her decision to move back home to help family after her father returned to Ecuador. She says,

My first two years when my dad was here, um I mean, I would try to help out at home with food or something ‘cause I already worked. So I’d help with food or little things. But two years ago my dad left the US and… I felt the pressure to help more at home… So I went back home and I just help with rent, cable, food, … It’s a lot of um financial responsibilities at home.

For Monica, her responsibilities are matched by her family’s commitment to helping her succeed.
Throughout the narrative she talks about her father and older brother as a key source of why and how she got to the college she currently attends. She said, “A lot of the teachers who also knew my older brother…he went to a community college [because of his undocumented status] so they were like, ‘He did that so that he could help your family, so you need to make sure you take advantage of that and go to a university.’” Beyond the financial support and advice provided between these family members and captured in the quantitative data, Monica’s story reveals the way she honors her family’s sacrifices by continuing in her education.

In this sense, by attending a four-year college, Monica is honoring her brother’s sacrifice to help the family, and in return also helping her family by going to college. She poignantly states,

Every time you go into a class and you write your first name and your family name, you’re representing us [family]. So take school seriously. I think that was what prepared me for school. It was like I was representing the family, like all my siblings and me were representing our family and their work every time we put our name down, every time our name was called. So I think that’s what prepared me to do the best…

Monica’s experience has not only shed light on the significant contribution that her family plays in providing financial, emotional, and motivational support, but it has illustrated that family support pattern does not follow a unidirectional lane. More precisely, family support is a reciprocal process, in which both parts simultaneously make decisions based on a value of “collective contribution” that operates beyond physical and transnational borders.

Valeria, The Quiet Contributor
Valeria arrived to the U.S. from Mexico at the age of one. Now 23, at the time of the interview, she is the first in her family to attend college in the US. While Valeria describes a future that is full of potential as she pursues a degree in engineering, her trajectory thus far has come with many sacrifices and tribulations. She is contending with many issues in her life, and articulates the ways in which being “poor, undocumented, and Mexican” intersect to produce barriers to success in her life:

Had I been a billionaire, being undocumented wouldn't be a problem or an issue… because I am so poor and being poor sucks when you want to come to school, etcetera’. Being poor and undocumented sucks…

We learn that financial struggles coupled with her lack of access to financial aid have made it difficult for Valeria to attend college consistently, having had to stop out for multiple semesters to save up to re-enroll over the past seven years. In addition, being the first in her family to attend college has its own hurdles to get through. She says, “…in my community we lack a lot of preparation for when we come here, you know. I know that first hand. I struggled, like in the sciences, I struggled a lot and it wasn’t because I’m dumb, its just like I come from a family where there isn’t engineers, there isn’t doctors.”

These experiences manifest as a struggle to feeling like she belongs on campus. She notes, “I don’t know if this an undocumented issue or this is because I am Mexican, I just don’t feel like I fit in it.” Quietly recounting to her interviewer the ways in which she is different, the ways in which she stands out, Valeria reveals how this impacts her college experience. Valeria describes herself as an “introvert,” partly as an outcome of her place in the larger campus ecosystem. She feels alone on campus. She goes on to describe the ways in which she feels in the classroom, “Every time I just sit in a class, I just feel like I am observing other people interact, like I don’t feel that I’m the one interacting.” Nevertheless, feeling alone is not something that
silences Valeria. While she doesn’t feel comfortable talking about her undocumented status in “big” and public ways such as at a campus protests, something that we would have missed by only examining the quantitative data. Instead, Valeria prefers to disclose her status discretely, sharing a counternarrative (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014) in the hopes of changing people’s minds one at a time.

During the interview, she narrates a past experience she had with her friend, a Chinese young woman. Valeria vividly recalls her friend’s response after she disclosed her status: “You know what? You made me change my view with undocumented people. I used to be like, ‘oh, why do I have to pay taxes for them to go to school?’ I feel like now I am changing my mindset.”

Valeria works on an individual basis to educate and inform her peers about her undocumented status. She believes that adding a face and story to the issue makes an impression that she could not otherwise create by participating in a protest. She recounts, “I feel that has a bigger impact, than me just holding something because they are not going to know who I am, you know, but if I tell them personally and they get to know me, maybe they would be like ‘maybe legislation is wrong’.” Although Valeria does not see her herself as very political, she contributes to the movement through a different form of political activism that’s just as crucial; storytelling, sharing her narrative, her story, her life as an undocumented student and thus providing a face to the struggle (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014).

Moreover, when we look at her map (see Figure 2), we see what perhaps may be a similar depiction of Valeria in her family life to that of her at school. The portrait depicts her family members, boyfriend, and cats, yet she is nowhere in the picture. Instead, she drew it from the vantage point of someone looking in from the outside.

[Insert Figure 2 here]
We learn through her narrative that this may be a product of her status in the family. Valeria is the oldest of seven children and the only daughter with undocumented status. As we learn more about her family, we learn that her family serves as a resource of both inspiration and support to help her persevere through the obstacles presented by her various statuses. When she is asked to describe her family as she has drawn them in the map, she speaks of each family member and the ways in which they support her.

Her parents serve as an incredible well of emotional and financial support, which she often draws on to persevere through the barriers in her life. Her father is a source of inspiration and role model in the character traits he exhibits: “He is very hard working and perseverant. He doesn’t give up regardless of how darkest things look.” In addition, her mother provides her with a sense of positive outlook. Valeria recounts her mom’s genuine advice as she would share how upset her major would make her: “You know if this is making you sad, don’t do it. Be happy’… I know my mom, whatever major I chose, she would be happy for me.” Moreover, after her scholarship money was exhausted, her parents helped her to pay for college: “Then my parents started helping me like my dad paid for at least two years of my tuition and after that I had to take quarters off to make some money.”

Furthermore, her siblings also offer her support by serving as a coping mechanism. For example, her brother, Aldo, provides a type of compassion and understanding that her other siblings cannot offer: “we’ve gone through similar issues and [he’s] the only [other] undocumented one.” Additionally, Valeria describes how essential her sister, Rosa, has been: “there’s been times when I’m sad and she would be there for me to feel better.” Similarly, she describes the close relationships she has with her brother Jesus: “we also talk about feelings and stuff…when I would drop out of school and I would be sad, he would hug me and make me feel better.” We can see how her siblings, although younger than her, serve as a coping mechanism in
her day to day struggles as well as their crucial role as a source of motivation when she says, “When I feel like I just feel like giving up, I just look up to them.” All in all, her siblings enable and push her to keep moving forward.

As we take a step back to see the portrait of her family as a whole, it almost seems as though her parents, siblings, and boyfriend form a strong wall of support. Perhaps, a family wall of safety and protection that has provided countless support in many forms over the years. Yet we can also see how she supports her family in the very same manner that she quietly contributes to the undocumented immigrant youth movement through her own form of activism.

One way in which she provides support is acting as a financial resource by assisting her family with money to pay for rent: “sometimes the money I would raise for tuition I would give it to them for rent and they would give it back later…I would try to help them because I was like my family needs a place to live, you know that was more important.” Working so hard to be able to pay for college, she also balances this need with that of the well-being of her family. This piece of her narrative demonstrates the strong family bond and the collective support that fills in where there might be gaps to form a reciprocity of resources.

Furthermore, we see how her status becomes a resource, now having a social security through DACA, she is able to place herself as the primary person in charge of utility bills. She recounts: “Recently I have to get like the services which its gas because my parents recently moved and then I offer to pay for it so I have to be the one on the bill and then they ask you for social and then I don’t have to be like oh I don’t have one, you know.” So while she may not contribute in the same degree, she offers a new way in which she can contribute to the family unit.

Despite the struggles, Valeria finds a way to contribute back to her family, similar to the way in which she resembles this silent activist within the immigrant movement. Valeria’s family
have been vital during her undergraduate journey. This collaborative and reciprocal support that she shares with them is what has kept her from dropping out of college altogether. Her family is the reason why she continues to persevere no matter how long it has taken her.

**Julio, Working for the Public Interest**

“*[College] made me open my mind and realize that getting here was not just me. It was a bunch of people that helped me along the way so it’s practically my duty to give back.*”

Julio is a 19-year-old young man who arrived to the US at the age of six from Mexico with his parents and older brother. He aspires to get a PhD in epidemiology through his education. Julio is a gifted student whose success is mitigated by his undocumented status. At the opening of the interview, we learn how he ended up at his current college.

Well my first choice was *[one of the top private schools in California]* and um, I received a full scholarship but then since my DACA social ID hadn’t gone through yet they had to like revoke the scholarship so um, and then two months later it finally came in but by then it was too late. So uh, then I started looking into the *[public colleges]*…*[my current college]* was the one that was giving me the most financial aid so I chose [it].

Although not his first choice, the public four-year institution he arrived at has proven to be a place where he can thrive, one where he feels he belongs and is able to be open about who he is.

Um so I, like I knew people were open to diversity and things like that and um, in my high school it was kind of shameful to say that you were undocumented but here I feel like nobody cares or like I feel like some people are even interested and they’re like what does that mean? Tell me more. So it’s more of a positive thing.

He goes on in the interview to further discuss this with his interviewer, “Um, I feel like on campus- I don’t even think about the undocumented part. It’s just like oh, you’re undocumented? Cool. You have long hair? Cool. Like it’s just another thing.”
Much like the quantitative data reflected, male participants received more support from their parents in paying tuition. He notes, “In the middle of the school year I got behind my dorm payment so I was thinking this is gonna be the breaking point and maybe I’m gonna have to take a break but my parents got loans and that was able to help me um, continue college.”

Reflecting on the ways in which he is supported to be able to get to where he is in college, we learn that Julio has a number of people who support him. This is reflected in his depiction of his family in map (see Figure 3). His family seems to play a central role in his life, but after examining the map more closely we learn that his friends also play a significant role. They are depicted as the large group of faces stacked behind him.

[Insert Figure 3 Here]

The first one is my father and my mom, and then my brother and me. That’s four of us with our family. And then this guy he’s my partner and behind me is all the friends I have met throughout this school year so I feel like all of them are practically my family. We have shared so much.

He notes throughout his interview that his friends provide him with emotional support to cope with both the stresses of being a college student, but also the difficulties that come along with his status, such as concerns about family member deportation. Throughout his narrative, Julio conveys the burden of this liminal status, as he notes he has sought help from various people with regards to questions such as “will this affect me in the future if I get my degree revoked if I no longer have DACA?”

Yet in turn, we learn that his parents have played a central role in his life, particularly in shaping his ideas about giving back in terms of social responsibilities. He notes, “Because they [my parents] are so giving it made me realize that I have to do something that would not only
benefit me but other people.” Julio reflects how the notion of “collective contribution” has developed within him over time, particularly with regards to success. He notes,

Well throughout late middle school I thought success was money. And the richer you are the more successful you are. Then in high school I realized that maybe it meant having family and friends along the way. Then in college I realized success is like when you are able to provide for your family and for other people and give back to your community. So in college I’ve learned that there’s a whole humanity part to success- not financial.

He embodies this giving back most saliently through his contributions to his family.

“…every now and then I have to help my parents you know pay for groceries. So right now I’m taking a summer job to help that and you know to pay a small portion of what they have given me all my life.” Beyond this reciprocal financial support, he also helps his younger cousins:

Right now that I’m home for the summer I’m tutoring my cousins even though some of them are in elementary. I am telling them this is what a college application looks like so start getting familiar with it…I gotta to make sure my family and my extended family is ready for college.

Although Julio has an older brother who attended college, he is the one in his family who provides information about how to prepare for college. “…because he didn’t know there was the AB540 and he could do this and that and get scholarships here and there. So I’m actually like the first one to bring all these resources to my family and my extended family and things like that.”

His values of contribution extend to picking a career that would be for the benefit of common good, while also balancing his own personal fulfillment.

Mmm, well in the beginning they [my parents] wanted me to be a doctor but when I told them I wanted to go into research um at first it created a conflict. They were like “No, you should become a doctor. You’ll help more people that way.” But then I made them
realize if I’m the guy making the, you know, the medicine, then maybe I’m gonna help even more people than just a surgery. So we’ve had discussions about that but we came to good terms.

Yet in the end, Julio helps us to understand that in the face of his liminal legal status, his contribution to his family and community will have a lasting impact beyond the limitations imposed by immigration policy.

Well right now the DACA Law. Well I’m not sure if it’s- it’s not a law, but if they were to revoke the DACA benefits then, like – or completely get rid of the DREAM Act, even though it hasn’t even passed, but if they were to get rid of it I can see that I would have to rethink my career.

Esperanza, The Connector

“College became something that I knew was going to be better for my future, for my family, and for my community.”

Esperanza is a 22 year-old transfer student who grew up with her parents as a single child in Northern California. Through her narrative and family map, Esperanza weaves a story of resilience, maturity, and connection. She was a high achieving student, attending a progressive school that had a reputation for sending students directly into four-year institutions. However, due to financial barriers she decided to attend community college first, which she described as, “the best decision of my life.”

In her family map (see Figure 4), she is featured prominently and through her interview narrative we learn that she is surrounded by the various family and community members that have contributed to her persistence in college. The community college setting was a formative place where Esperanza felt supported and was able to braid together the threads of family,
community, and self. As she described in her interview narrative when reflecting on her time at the community college, “college became something that like I knew was going to be better for my future, for my family, and for my community.” Despite having transferred to a four-year institution hundreds of miles away, these elements are still present in her family map.

She begins to unpack her family map to her interviewer by describing her immediate family, “My family… they saw me stressed out so they were ready to make sacrifices and that’s why like, you know, even though I’m far away from them I know I’m doing it for me and for them cause I know they’re making a lot of sacrifices like financially and emotionally.”

Furthermore, moving down the map she sheds light on her family in Mexico, who sit beneath her below an arrow. She describes,

My family in Mexico City. Cause I’m from Mexico City because, you know, they’re also like my blood relatives and even though I don’t see them, I haven’t seen them in sixteen years like, the reason why I’m here and the reason why I’m getting an education it’s also because of them and for them.

Esperanza acknowledges the importance of becoming the first in her family to graduate from college in the U.S. and how meaningful it will be to her extended family in Mexico.

Esperanza documents in her family map and narrative the importance of “community” within the community college setting. She goes on to narrate the impact of the various communities she is a part of, one a club for undocumented students, and the other the community outside the walls of her community college, labeled as “the Undocumented Community in Northern California” (exact location obscured to protect participant’s identity), despite being far away and not knowing each individual, she considers them an integral part of her family. A large section of the family map is dedicated to members of the “AB540 student club” (pseudonym) at her community college standing under a prominent banner with their club name (the image has
been blurred to protect identities). The family map has ten individuals pictured under the “AB540 student club” banner, which represents the larger community of allies, counselors, and advisors that have supported them along the way in their educational journey at the community college and beyond. She illustrates the validation and empowerment she received through the multiple communities she belongs to. In the discussion of her family map she talks about the inspiration she received from her community to pursue a higher education and the benefits of getting an education.

The “AB540 student club” became a central part of her family within the community college she attended for over four years. She became very close with other group members and she still remains connected to them, despite having transferred to a four-year college across the state. She describes her peers in the club as though they are still with her, “We’ve become so close that I know everything about them and they know everything about me and we’ve been through so much together we’ve all been on this journey.” She discussed the student rallies and educational workshops, which were geared toward undocumented student success and facilitated by members of the faculty at her community college. In her narrative she states, “the people who supported our group and the people who kinda make it happen because, you know, we’re students and if it was just us there wouldn’t be like the group that we are.” Her experience at the community college provided her with an understanding of the importance of building community and giving back.

The potential for community involvement weighed heavily in Esperanza’s decision to which institution she would transfer. Yet after transferring to the highly-selective four-year institution she selected, she still yearned for more community involvement. Esperanza’s commitment to community involvement reflects the high levels of engagement observed in the national sample of survey respondents.
She became involved with the undocumented student club (*pseudonym*) on campus, but felt that she was not able to work as closely with the community as she was used to. She described, “Even with [undocumented student club], we don’t work as much with the community and I think that has to do with the fact that, you know, those communities don’t have access to an institution like this.” Her strong desire to connect with the undocumented community off campus was frustrated by the exclusivity the college campus created. We can see the loud absence of community further echoed in the tensions between her visual and verbal narratives. Despite the undocumented student organization being heavily featured in her verbal narrative, it bears no presence on her family map; in fact she does not identify a community within her four-year institution in her drawing at all.

Esperanza yearns to make connections with her community in order to better serve them and bumps up against the limitations of her current environment. She describes that she not only feels the desire to contribute, but that it is fundamental to her own ability to affect change. She shares,

I need them to know me too cause they’re like, you know, [inaudible] communities, the ones that I wanna work with don’t have access to this kinds of institutions. So they’re gonna be like “oh, this person who graduated from a [this college] all of a sudden wants to come help us, what does she know?” So I think one of the key things is that’s why I also wanna work a lot with communities. Cause I wanna stay grounded.

Esperanza understands the importance of staying close and connected to the community she aspires to work closely with and gaining the respect and trust of these communities are important in her work.
Esperanza’s unique experience with her particular community college began a transformative journey, which has led to her passion for social activism and civic engagement. Despite being far away from home and attending a highly selective public four-year college, she still maintains close ties with both her community college and her Northern California community. Through her narrative and identity map she represents a student that is driven by multiple communities, one who is not only dedicated to her academic achievements, but who is also incredibly committed to the well being of others.

Discussion

The mixed method analysis provides a rich understanding of the ways in which undocumented undergraduates are thriving by contributing to their families and their communities despite the obstacles they face. The quantitative analysis of Latino undocumented undergraduates across the nation reveals the high levels of engagement of this population in social responsibilities. The majority of the undocumented students who were surveyed reported a variety of ways in which they contributed to their families and communities by translating, providing advice, mentoring young people, and engaging in causes they cared about. This finding corroborates work by Suárez-Orozco and colleagues (2015).

The quantitative data revealed gendered patterns of frequency of participation in a variety of family and community activities. Women reported providing more support to their families than their male peers across a variety of domains. This finding is in line with others who found that as immigrant-origin female adolescents develop into women they often take on the burden of household and family responsibilities in immigrant-origin families (Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006; Valenzuela, 1999). Further, young women often take on the role of caretaker in their families, particularly when affected by undocumented status (Muñoz & Maldonado, 2011). As Espín (1999) notes immigrant young women become the “keepers of culture” in their families and
communities (Espin, 1999). As their families migrate from contexts often marked by “Gemeinschaft” to “Gesellschaft” values, maintaining the values of social relationships and interdependence often falls on young women (Greenfield, 2009). However, the qualitative portraits remind us that despite these patterns, across the board Latino undocumented undergraduates are highly engaged in their families and communities and are doing so in a variety of ways.

The qualitative portraits reveal a great deal about the multidimensional nature of contribution of and to family and community. Each of the portraits of undocumented undergraduates demonstrated the ways in which they contributed to their families in tangible ways, through financial contributions of paying rent or utilities, or by gaining status through DACA to provide them with a social security number to put utilities in their name. Each described their own needs alongside those of their family members, never forgetting those who came before them, the sacrifices they made or the weight of their own decisions in their family members lives.

Furthermore, the qualitative portraits illuminated what we “may have missed” (Marks & Abo-Zena, 2013) had we not collected the verbal and visual narratives in our parallel qualitative dataset. There were a variety of ways in which to contribute to families and communities beyond what was captured by the quantitative measure. For example, Esperanza felt a strong need to give back to her community and to share her knowledge with as many others as she could, often participating in rallies and demonstrations to support undocumented students’ rights. In contrast, however, Valeria contributed in quieter ways, changing the minds of her classmates one private conversation at a time. By sharing what scholars refer to as “counternarratives,” the telling of stories/ narratives of “those people whose experiences are not often told--those on the margins of society” (Diaz-Strong et al., p. 223; Solis, 2004), Valeria is helping to resist and shift the
preconceived notions of undocumented immigrants among her classmates. This particular type of contribution was not captured by the measure and would have been difficult to access through a survey methodology. Further, Julio contributed by wanting to help others beyond his community through working for the public good. Monica was intricately involved with her family, getting through each of life’s major hurdles together with the help of her family. The nuances of these lived experiences of “collective contribution” were amplified only by these visual and verbal narrative techniques.

Beyond what we captured quantitatively, the qualitative portraits also revealed an additional important theme of contribution: the act of being in college was seen as a major contribution to the family and to the community. For Monica, her brother only attended community college and she feared that if she chose the path of attending university it would put too much of a financial burden on her family. After speaking with her family members extensively, she resolved to attend as a way to honor her brother’s sacrifice and as a way to represent her family. Julio did so in a different way. He wanted to make sure that his immediate and extended family was prepared for college and shared the knowledge pathways that he had gained from attending school with his relatives. Esperanza noted how being the first in her family to graduate from college in the US was meaningful for her extended family left behind in Mexico.

In each of these ways, these four students demonstrate an important theme that would have been missed had we not explored these questions qualitatively: Contribution takes the form of attending college and further feeds what they can give back. Thus, attending school and going further than one’s parents with regards to educational attainment expands the notions of contribution. This finding extends the work of Fuligni (2001; 2007) that demonstrates highly valuing family obligations is related to higher educational aspirations with diverse immigrant-
origin adolescents. For undocumented undergraduates, attending college was a way to honor the sacrifices that one’s family had made and was an important form of contribution, one that might be overlooked by typical theories of positive youth development (Katsiaficas et al., under review).

In sum, despite not having a direct pathway to citizenship, these youths are demonstrating the fundamental acts of citizenry through their contributions to their communities. The vast majority of the 797 participants who took our survey reported contributing to their communities in a variety of ways including translating for community members, advocating on their behalf, and mentoring young people. This is particularly striking in the face of current developmental theories, which suggest that college aged “emerging adults” enter into a period that is characterized as self-focused (Arnett, 2000). These students are anything but, as emerging into adulthood seems to instill an awakening of the ways in which they can further contribute to their families and communities.

The role of parents and family members in undocumented students’ lives is also highlighted in this data. In addition, these innovative measures both with the quantitative scales and verbal and visual narratives helped to capture the bidirectional nature of family contributions. Undocumented parents serve not only as their children’s caretakers, but their financial support, the self-sacrificers who go without so their children can have, and their inspiration to persist through college. Often serving as their motivations for attending and persisting throughout college, echoing through nearly each narrative, ‘its because of them and it is for them.’

The value of “collective contribution” was both learned from and modeled by students’ family members. For instance, both undocumented students recognize the sacrifices their families have made, in which they understand the significance of fulfilling their educational
goals. Their family and community have granted them with academic, emotional and financial support that has contributed to their academic success thus far. In return, they are driven by the investment they have received that symbolizes the assets of their independence and the need to thrive to attain their educational goals to become future investors in their family and community.

Taken together, these findings highlight the centrality of families in undocumented students’ lives. Strikingly, the ways in which undocumented students define family varies from their nuclear family members to community writ large, from proximal relatives living in the same home to those who they hold hands with across international borders, and from those who contribute to their lives and those whom they contribute to. We can see the ways in which undocumented parents of undocumented college students play a critical role in their children’s lives. Yet, despite the integral role that undocumented parents play in their children’s lives, they have been left out of recent executive actions that temporarily protect them from deportation. Without such protections in place undocumented undergraduates, most of whom have parents who share their status, struggle with the fears of the ever-present threat of deportations and prolonged family separations.

Limitations & Future Directions

This study is an attempt to lay the groundwork for understanding the positive developmental processes for undocumented young adults. This study was subject to several limitations. While we employed novel strategies to recruit participants for our national survey, it is likely that the students who participated in the survey are amongst those who are most active and open about their status. Those who are most disengaged, distrusting, and “in the shadows” are less likely to have participated in this study. It should also be noted that a large proportion of students in our sample were attending college in the most “UndocuFriendly” states, in particular the majority of the sample resided in six states that had a state-level DREAM Act during the
period of data collection (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Further, the majority of respondents attended colleges in California, which is a progressive state for undocumented students considering they offer access to in-state tuition and state grants for undocumented students (Abrego, 2008; Nienhusser, 2015). Although the sample also included students from states with a “hostile” or “oblivious” attitude towards undocumented students and undocumented immigrants more generally, it is likely that students facing the most difficult environments are underrepresented in this data (See Teranishi et al., 2015 for more details on these state-level policy implications). Further, as a result of our precautions to ensure participant anonymity we were unable to connect the quantitative and qualitative data points, which would have allowed for deeper and more richly contextualized portraits as well as further explanation of our quantitative analyses. Although the anonymous participation will not allow for longitudinal investigations as understanding these processes over time, this would be a critical next step to understanding the processes behind these developmental phenomena. Further, future work should understand the linkages between participating in these domains and developmental and academic outcomes.

Conclusion

In sum, Latino undocumented college students, engaged in their families and communities, continue to enter American higher education institutions. The ways in which they engage in their families and communities has important implications for the people they will become (Lerner, Dowling & Anderson, 2003; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Perhaps more importantly, however, their engagement in these ways has important implications for what type of society we will become (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015). Latino undocumented undergraduates are exhibiting a social connectedness to those outside of schools, what Danielle Allen (2014) has called a critical piece to educating citizens for our democracy. Yet they are caught in a liminal legal status with
no direct pathway to citizenship. As a society we must ask fundamental questions about how we can build upon these social resources to make our democracy stronger and our communities stronger, recognizing immigrants as a resource to strengthen the social fabric of our society.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>Product/Data Yielded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National UndocuScholars Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive Quantitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of National Study Findings</td>
<td>Research Questions for PAR project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Program</td>
<td>Deepened Theoretical Understanding of Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Design Meetings</td>
<td>Design of Visual and Verbal Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Katsiaficas et al., under review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus Interviews</td>
<td>$N = 18$ verbal and visual narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic Analysis meetings</td>
<td>Portraits of $n = 4$ participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Dissemination Products</td>
<td>Policy Report &amp; Short Film, It's Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

**Participant Demographics (N = 797)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 5 years of age</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 12</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 12 years of age</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation college students</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income: &lt; $40,000</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed status household</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen siblings</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother does not reside in the US</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father does not reside in the US</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Has DACA</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends CC</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends 4 year public</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends 4 year private</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends school in CA</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>63.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a All percentages are given as a percentage of responses for that item  
b At least one family member is documented
Table 3

*Countries of Origin of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Republic of the...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>789</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Percentages of participants *receiving* support from family in various domains by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 359)</td>
<td>(n = 430)</td>
<td>(N = 789)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying my expenses</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>$\chi^2(1, 789) = 21.56, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>$\chi^2(1, 789) = 10.42, p = .001$</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying for tuition</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errands</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Percentages of participants providing support to family in various domains by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Male (n = 359)</th>
<th>Female (n = 430)</th>
<th>Total (N = 789)</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1, 789) = 13.01, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errands &amp; chores</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1, 789) = 10.52, p = .001$</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1, 789) = 13.61, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1, 789) = 12.78, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying expenses</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Percentages of participants who took part in civic engagement activities by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause Cared About</th>
<th>Male (n = 359)</th>
<th>Female (n = 430)</th>
<th>Total (N = 789)</th>
<th>Sig difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>*χ²(1, 789)= 4.6 P = .03, ETA = .077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest or Demo</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/Elder Care</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Figure 1

Monica’s Family Map

Note. From left to right: Dad (Ecuador), Mom, Brother, Niece, Sister-in-Law, Brother, Sister-in-Law, Family friend, Sister, Self, Partner, Sister’s boyfriend, Sister.
Figure 2

Valeria’s Family Map

*Note.* From left to right: Boyfriend [with yellow circle around him], Dad, Mom, Sister, Brother, Brother, Brother, Brother. Below: Pet Cats.
Figure 3

Julio’s Family Map

Note. From left to right: Dad, Mom, Older Brother, Self, Partner, Friends (behind)
Figure 4

Esperanza’s Family Map

*Note. Image is blurred to protect participant identity

*Note. From left to right: Self, Mom, Dad, Pets; Clockwise: “AB540 Student Club” [pseudonym; blurred], “Undocumented Community in Northern California” [location obscured; blurred], Extended family in Mexico.*
Chapter 5

General Discussion
General Discussion

We are in an age of globalization where cultural shifts are occurring for adolescents and young adults across the globe. Immigrant-origin youth “already experience the social and cultural shifts thought to typify globalization, and an analysis of their experiences could shed light on what to expect as existing national barriers become more permeable” (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015, p. 411). Immigrant youth can provide insight into what these global cultural shifts might look like in the future as they contend with the multiple influences and expectations from family, community, academic institutions and society. From the above mixed-method explorations, there are several key findings that shed light on how they are navigating this time of life with these multiple influences.

The results from Study 1 show that immigrant-origin community college students are postponing many of the adult role transitions, until at least their late 20s; the majority continue to live at home with their families, are financially interdependent with their parents, and are unmarried and childless. Not having met the typical criteria for adulthood suggests that the conditions under which emerging adulthood—a developmental period between adolescence and adulthood—occurs are present (Arnett, 2006). The hallmark of emerging adulthood is feeling “in-between,” with an ambivalence toward adult status, however, these immigrant-origin community college students in contrast, reported feeling that they have reached adulthood.

The community college students in this sample were contending with the difficult economic realities of attending school full-time while living in a large urban center in the wake of the Great Recession of 2008. Against an economic backdrop of shrinking job prospects, attaining a higher education degree becomes increasingly is necessary for many entry-level positions (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). Yet despite most community college students reporting plans to attain a bachelor’s degree, only one in five (20%) attain one after eight years; and almost half
(46%) do not receive any credential at all after eight years (Rosenbaum et al., 2015). The length of time it takes to complete a degree within a community college setting precludes many young people to emerge into adult roles. Immigrant-origin community college students often find themselves caught in an economic undertow that disrupts the pathways to adulthood. These results further highlight how increasingly elusive reaching these adult milestones can be in the wake of national and global economic hardship.

Therefore, it is important to understand the ways in which immigrant-origin community college students conceptualize adulthood. The pilot to my dissertation, which utilized in-depth focus groups of immigrant-origin community college students on the same campuses suggested that social responsibilities were at the forefront of their definitions of adulthood (Katsiaficas et al., 2014). In addition, participants in Study 1 most frequently listed responsibilities as the top criteria for adulthood.

Thus, in Study 2, I explored typologies of social responsibilities through mixed methods. Overall, the findings suggest that immigrant-origin community college students in this sample were overwhelmingly engaged in their families and communities. Immigrant-origin community college students engaged in a variety of activities in their families and communities from helping family members with translation and providing advice and advocacy, to mentoring young people in their communities and engaging in causes they care about. These findings corroborate the work of other researchers with adolescents (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015), young adults in four-year college settings (Fuligni & Pederson, 2002) and Latino 18-25 year olds in the Northeast US (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015), which stand in contrast to mainstream developmental theory that suggests emerging adults have little in the way of social responsibilities (Arnett, 2006). On the whole, this finding suggests that this time of life for immigrant-origin young adults is an
awakening of other-focused responsibilities as the majority of participants engaged in at least one social responsibility activity in the past month.

Further, the cluster analysis was able to provide a nuanced perspective on how these social responsibilities were experienced in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students. Quantitative trends suggest five profiles of social responsibilities: Low Engagers (i.e., the “Classic” Emerging Adults), Family Only Engagers (i.e., the Family Supporters), Moderate Family and Community Engagers (i.e., the Social Contributors), Low Family and High Community Engagers (i.e., the Advocates), and lastly Highest Family and Community Engagers (i.e., the Social Champions). Low Engagers embodied the tenets of Emerging Adulthood as these participants had few if any responsibilities outside of themselves. In contrast, however, the four other clusters demonstrated various patterns of social responsibilities and ways in which family and community played a central role in their lives. Contrary to extant work (e.g., Fuligni, 2007), few demographic differences were observed between the clusters. These findings suggest that demographic differences do not meaningfully predict cluster membership, or in other words that these clusters cut across demographic groups. Theories of Positive Youth Development (Lerner, 2002) conceptualize the healthy development of young adults as the “enactment in adulthood of behaviors that contribute positively to the healthy structure of society and, in doing so, support and further self, family, community and civil society” (Lerner, Brentano, Dowling & Anderson, 2002, p. 23). Positive development results in an orientation to contribution (Lerner, Dowling & Anderson, 2003), which these students are exhibiting in varying degrees.

These various levels of engagement in family and community suggest that there might be differential outcomes with regards to academic responsibilities. The “Classic” Emerging Adults, free from the social responsibilities of their families and communities reported significantly fewer hours spent on campus engaging in academic tasks. On the other hand, the Social
Champions exhibited the highest levels of social responsibilities and the reported the highest levels of academic time spent on campus. While life often resembled a juggling act, their commitment to both family and community provided a resource for them to draw on. While research suggests that students who manage multiple work, family, and school demands are at higher risk of not persisting in their studies (Bailey, Leinbach & Jenkins, 2006; Valentine et al., 2009), the findings from this study suggest that they might be mutually beneficial activities.

These quantitative patterns were contextualized with the qualitative case studies, which allowed for a richer understanding of the ways in which social responsibilities were experienced in the lives of immigrant-origin community college students. These case studies provided new insights into the process of contribution to family and community. Particularly, understanding the ways in which the family and community contributes to students’ success was not captured in the quantitative data, but emerged in the qualitative case studies. These are critical pieces of the way in which social responsibilities are enacted, and it became clear that future studies needed to capture the bidirectional nature of contribution. Therefore, for Study 3 I utilized data from the UndocuScholars National Survey to further understand this. As a research associate on the project, I had embedded within the survey two measures of contribution: one to capture the ways in which students provided support and another to capture the ways in which family members supported students. Furthermore, through the design of the PAR project with the UndocuScholars Undergraduate Summer Research Program, the theme of “collective contribution” came to the forefront.

The quantitative analysis of Latino undocumented undergraduates across the nation in Study 3 revealed even higher rates of engagement in social responsibilities than with the immigrant-origin community college samples. The majority of the Latino undocumented students who were surveyed reported a variety of ways in which they contributed to their
families and communities, most often including translating, providing advice, mentoring young people, and engaging in causes they cared about.

Beyond what was captured quantitatively, an important theme emerged through the qualitative portraits: The value of “collective contribution” is fostered by the bi-directional nature of support from parents and students. Undocumented parents served not only as their children’s caretakers, but their financial support, the self-sacrificers who go without so their children can have, and their inspiration to persist through college. Often serving as their motivations for attending and persisting throughout college, echoing through nearly each narrative, was ‘its because of them and it is for them.’ In sum, the mixed method analysis in Study 3 provides a rich understanding of the ways in which undocumented Latino undergraduates are thriving by contributing to their families and their communities despite the obstacles they face. This value of collective contribution was both learned from and modeled by students’ family members. For instance, both undocumented students recognize the sacrifices their families have made, in which they understand the significance of fulfilling their educational goals. Their family and community have granted them with academic, emotional and financial support that has contributed to their academic success thus far. In return, they are driven by the investment they have received that symbolizes the assets of their independence and the need to thrive to attain their educational goals to become future investors in their family and community.

Implications

Taken together, there are several important implications of these findings. While these studies have laid the groundwork for understanding descriptively the nature of social responsibilities in the lives of immigrant-origin college students, future work should examine these processes longitudinally. One of the strengths of this work, however, was the mixed methods design and analytic techniques (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Without mixing both
quantitative and qualitative methods, there would have been several missed opportunities to explore these questions deeply. As Marks and Abo-Zena (2013) describe, mixing methods allows us to understand what we “may have missed” solely employing a single quantitative or qualitative method. Throughout the above studies I note places where methodological pluralism allowed for theoretical turning points. Thus future work should continue to utilize mixed-methods paradigms to understand these complex phenomena.

In addition, this work was grounded with community members serving as advisory board members. In the RICC project, after completing deep ethnography of the community college sites, student advisory boards were run as focus groups that served as pilots for the instrument protocols. These focus groups served as a way for students on campus to provide insight into their perspectives and experiences on campus and helped to shape the subsequent quantitative and qualitative data collection (see Katsiaficas et al., 2014 for findings from focus group pilot). In addition, with the UndocuScholars project, community advisory boards were utilized to assist with the development and piloting of survey measures (see Suárez-Orozco et al., in press for full details). Furthermore, the qualitative component of Study 3 was shaped in the context of a participatory action research project. Together, these diverse methods helped to ground this work in the communities within which the studies were taking place and helped to nourish and make room for theoretical insights to grow.

There are a number of practical implications for this work. As Rosenbaum and colleagues (2015) note, “young people need dependable pathways to productive adult roles” (p. 16). In particular, community college settings need to take into account these various social responsibilities present in immigrant-origin students’ lives. Given the saliency of family and community responsibilities in the lives of immigrant-origin students, colleges, in particular community colleges, need to take into account these competing responsibilities. Where
applicable, financial and instrumental resources need to be made available to help ease the
potential burden on students as they navigate the road to degree attainment (Fuligni & Hardway,
2004). In addition, immigrant-origin young adults’ commitment to family and community can be
viewed as a resource to be drawn upon. Recognizing that these youths are contributing to their
families and communities and that these responsibilities are meaningful in their
conceptualizations of adulthood, we must find ways for these youth to contribute to both the
institutional and economic structures that they find themselves embedded within.

Conclusion

In a rapidly pluralizing and diversified world, what does it take to be a productive
member of society? It takes the skills of being able to contribute to a diverse society and build
interconnections among the sometimes disparate members. Such “bridging sensibilities” (Allen,
2014) are a critical skill to navigate such contexts. Immigrant students are doing just that. As we
hold onto the promise of globalization in shaping our collective future, immigrant-origin students
are enacting the potential of such promises in their families and communities. They bridge
together their multifaceted worlds from home and school, piecing together the various social and
cultural expectations (Greenfield et al., 2003). In doing so they demonstrate a flexibility that is
not only adaptive developmentally in their own lives (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015) but is adaptive to the
communities in which they are embedded. As they advocate, mentor, translate and navigate
institutions on behalf of their family and community members, they are bridging them into the
host society. In doing so they are allowing for education to flow beyond the wall of social
institutions, into their families and communities.
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