Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Res. 2015 July ; 52: 132–146. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.01.012.

English, Spanish and Ethno-Racial Receptivity in a New Destination: A Case Study of Dominican Immigrants in Reading, PA

R.S. Oropesa^a

R.S. Oropesa: oropesa@psu.edu

^aDepartment of Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16803, Office: (814) 865-1577, Fax: (814) 863-7216

Abstract

Scant information is available on experiences with language among immigrant populations in new destinations. This study provides a multi-dimensional portrait of the linguistic incorporation of Dominican immigrants in the “majority-minority” city of Reading, Pennsylvania. The results show that daily life for most largely occurs in a Spanish-language milieu, but English proficiency and use in social networks is primarily a function of exposure to the United States. This is consistent with the standard narrative of assimilation models. At the same time, negative experiences with the use of both English and Spanish suggest that the linguistic context of reception is inhospitable for a substantial share of this population. Negative experiences with English are particularly likely to be mentioned by those with dark skin and greater cumulative exposure. Lastly, language plays an important role in experiences with ethno-racial enmity more broadly. Nonetheless, the persistent effect of skin tone indicates that such experiences are not reducible to language per se.

The large volume of immigration to the United States over the past half century has been accompanied by concerns about its economic and socio-cultural consequences. Prominent among the latter are those that involve English acquisition. English acquisition is problematized in discussions of immigration because it affects access to opportunities by lowering a barrier to interpersonal communication that impedes integration into the mainstream. In so doing, it is touted as a safeguard against ethnic balkanization, at least to the extent that a common language binds people as a basis for nationhood. Hence, language is integral to conceptions of immigrant incorporation in the national interest. This is why English is a “flash point” for public conflict (Waters, 2011).

These concerns have been amplified by the dispersal of Latin American immigrants away from traditional gateway cities to new destinations; a tectonic shift with few demographic parallels (Tienda and Fuentes, 2014). This has fundamentally altered the population composition of some areas that were shielded from migrant streams in the past. Indeed, the

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

dispersal of immigrants has contributed to a decline in the share of cities that are predominantly native-born white and an increase in the share of “majority-minority” and “no-majority” cities (Lee, Iceland and Sharp, 2012). As a result, issues related to community formation, incorporation and tolerance in new destinations have risen to the fore (Flippen and Parrado, 2012; O’Neil and Tienda, 2010; Oropesa, 2012).

Shifts in settlement have implications for how the lives of immigrants unfold through the accumulation of experiences that reflect place-specific opportunities to use languages along with reactions to their use. Certainly, negative reactions to the use of language reveal flash points for hostile receptions in new destinations. This is especially the case for those from the Dominican Republic (as discussed below), an immigrant group that has become less spatially concentrated. The number of island-born Dominicans has increased from 166,000 to over 800,000 since 1980, but the share living in New York has fallen from 75% to 45% with their dispersal across the Northeast to cities such as Reading, Pennsylvania. Reading is particularly noteworthy for having the second highest growth rate for Dominican immigrants and emerging as a majority-minority city of 80,000 that is 53% Latino, 33% white and 11% African American.¹

Diversity-related challenges are palpable in this southeastern Pennsylvania city. A former mayor remarked that the area is “going through some real assimilation problems. It is a threat to a whole lot of people” (Montgomery, 2008). Apparently, language is part of the problem. Letters to the newspaper editor remind readers that past “immigrants made it their business to learn English,” “teachers weren’t speaking in Ukrainian, Italian or German,” and “to advance and succeed...one must learn English.” Others state that “in vast sections, the city appears more like a barrio than a bastion of Latin American culture and entrepreneurship.” Thus, Reading offers a case study of how language and ethnicity intersect for a specific segment of a Hispanic majority city that is struggling with change. This immigrant group and this type of city are hidden from view in much recent scholarship on assimilation in new destinations.

Using a 2004 survey, three objectives are pursued in this study to illuminate the experiences of Dominican immigrants in Reading, PA. The first objective is to provide a multi-dimensional portrait of linguistic incorporation by expanding a standard narrative that is grounded in English proficiency. The expanded narrative encompasses boundary-defining experiences that reflect local receptivity to the use of both English and Spanish. The second objective is to demonstrate how experiences with language are structured by factors that are emphasized in models of assimilation. The third objective is to investigate how language serves as a channel for experiences that reflect ethno-racial hostility.

These objectives are important in light of the claim that demographic research on new destinations is “largely divorced from broader theoretical debates on immigration and assimilation” (Waters and Jiménez, 2005, p. 117). Although nearly a decade old, this assertion still serves as a trenchant reminder about priorities for moving forward. Indeed,

¹All figures herein are from the Census and American Community Surveys (ACS; Ruggles et al. 2010). This ranking is based on cities with 2,500+ Dominicans. Nearby cities with high growth rates are Allentown-Bethlehem (ranked 1st, 25 miles away) and Philadelphia (7th, 60 miles away).

Daniel Lichter's (2013) Presidential Address to the Population Association of America called for explicit attention to issues related to ethno-racial inclusion, as well as racial boundaries that are rooted in structural inequalities and ideological processes associated with racialization. This research responds to his call to action with empirical evidence on the prevalence of exclusionary boundary-defining experiences and explanations of how such experiences are structured by the process of incorporation in a new destination. In so doing, the value of going beyond English acquisition to “rethink” the role of language in assimilation is demonstrated (Akresh, Massey and Frank, 2014). This entails attention to the full gamut of experiences with languages in places where immigrants live to uncover not only how languages are used, but also how immigrants are treated when they use them. Thus, the following case study offers extensive evidence-based insights into the experiences of a national-origin group that is a distinct segment of the new Latino majority in a new type of destination in the Northeast.²

Why Dominican Immigrants?

Dominicans are a group with intersecting ethno-racial characteristics that elevate the risk of antagonism in new destinations. Specifically, these descendants of African, Spanish and indigenous peoples may elicit negative reactions among those who devalue blackness (Itzigsohn, 2009; Liberato and Feagin, 2007). Negative reactions could also stem from language. Spanish distances Dominicans from African Americans and dialect distances Spanish speakers from one another (Toribio, 2000). Some feel that their dialect is denigrated, even by co-ethnics who valorize Standard Spanish (Toribio, 2000, 2006; Zentella, 2002).³ These characteristics suggest why Dominicans are the most likely of any group to claim internal discrimination among Latinos is a major problem (Lavariega, Monforti and Sanchez, 2010). In short, color and language may cause friction in the assimilation process.

Background

Assimilation is conceptually intertwined with ethnicity. Alba and Nee's (2003, p. 11) widely embraced view is that the former involves incorporation into the societal mainstream accompanied by the “decline of an ethnic distinction and its corollary cultural and social differences.”⁴ Although disagreement exists on the long-term prospects of some groups, contemporary scholarship on assimilation offers a standard narrative about the importance of

²Besides lacking comprehensive empirical studies of language, the literature on new destinations tends to focus on Latinos (generally) or Mexicans in Southern and North Central states (e.g. Massey, 2008; Zuñiga and Hernández-León, 2005; Itzigsohn 2009 is a notable exception). Also, much of the literature on new destinations tends to focus on socio-economic or demographic outcomes that can be measured in government-sponsored surveys. Such surveys provide a narrow view of language.

³Distinctions exist in lexicality (word choice), phonetics (allophones), morphology (word structure) and syntax (word order). Some features of Dominican Spanish are characteristic of Caribbean Spanish. In turn, both have features that are stigmatized by those from elsewhere (Lamboy 2004). Some language practices that vary across regions and social strata within the Dominican Republic are derided as well.

⁴Terminological flexibility is necessary on three fronts. First, some prefer “incorporation” over “assimilation” to acknowledge separation from the mainstream through racialization (Bean and Stevens, 2003: 95; Itzigsohn, 2009). This is tinged with irony because theories of assimilation describe “modes of incorporation” and were assailed in the past for relying on incorporation as a metaphor (Brubaker, 2004). Second, “ethno-racial” is used here to acknowledge that classic distinctions between “ethnicity” and “race” are contested by some scholars. A racial group is considered a type of ethnic group. Physical characteristics such as skin tone that are used in racial classification have power as markers of common ancestry (Hirschman, 2004; Wimmer, 2008). Third, “Hispanic” and “Latino” are used interchangeably.

English mastery for bridging the communication gulf that separates the foreign born as outsiders from the mainstream (Alba and Nee, 2003; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Portes and Rumbaut, 1996, 2001). This gulf is particularly evident among Dominicans. According to the ACS, just 34% of those from the Dominican Republic are very proficient in English, compared to 50% of the total foreign-born population.

The standard narrative links proficiency primarily to three factors (Rumbaut, 2006). The two most important factors are the timing and the accumulation of exposure to American society (Akresh, 2007; Bean and Stevens, 2003). Timing matters because age-graded developmental capacity coupled with immersion in settings such as schools is conducive to fluency (Birdsong, 2005). Cumulative exposure matters because skills accrue with opportunities to speak a second language over time (Stevens 1999, 2006). *Therefore, English proficiency and use should be negatively associated with age at arrival and positively associated with time in the United States.*

Education is the third factor that promotes language acquisition and use (Akresh, 2007; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Espenshade and Fu, 1997; van Tubergen and Kalmijn, 2009). Schooling operates through several channels, including formal instruction and informal interaction in venues that entail contact with native speakers. Another channel is the incentive for those with various credentials to increase access to labor-market opportunities. Education may also affect language aptitude by boosting cognitive capacity or confidence in communication.

The evidence for these hypotheses from national-level studies is compelling. However, these analyses do not demonstrate whether the language environments of emerging majority-minority cities are conducive to English acquisition. Chiswick (2011, p. 144) argues that the “English-language acquisition of Spanish-speaking immigrants is slowed by the pervasive presence of Spanish...In such areas, one can work and shop in a Spanish-language enclave without suffering serious adverse consequences” (see Borjas, 1999; Chiswick and Miller, 2007; Hwang and Xi, 2008). This implies *low levels of English proficiency and use in Reading*. In turn, it draws attention to the possible effect of exposure to this majority-minority city itself if population composition matters. *Ceteris paribus, a weaker association is expected for exposure to Reading than for the United States.*

The Context of Reception

At risk of overstatement, the narrative from this research portrays language more as a problem of human capital formation than part of a broader experiential problem. This is surprising because the foundation for the latter is well-established in contemporary perspectives on assimilation. Segmented assimilation theory, for example, emphasizes how experiences are shaped by the contexts of reception for national-origin groups. Contexts of reception are revealed by the stance of society and the stance of the state toward their presence, as well as characteristics of co-ethnic communities (Portes and Rumbaut, 1996, 2001). The stance of society toward Dominicans is evident in their treatment from the mainstream through racialization, a process involving the imposition of racial meanings on distinctions to separate groups hierarchically. Racialization is evident in accounts of pressure to place Dominicans on the “black” side of the color line. Personal stories of those

who claim that “from the minute I arrived at the airport, I was treated like a black...” resonate with scholarly studies (Winn, 1992, p. 277). Such studies conclude that “Dominicans face the intense stigmatization, stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination to which all people of African origin are subjected” (Duany, 1998, p. 148). Migrants “enter a society in which race is a central feature of daily life and where they suffer discrimination due to their skin color and ethnicity” (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral, 2000, p. 232).⁵

Racialization is implicated in the incorporation of Latin American immigrants into the United States as Latinos --- a designation for separateness apart from the black-white color line. Feagin and Cobas (2014, p. 29) describe Latinos' universal experiences with the enmity of “a great many whites because they are considered to be dangerous, threatening, ‘foreign’ or ‘un-American.’ The dominant racial framing is *pervasive* across society.” Such framing encompasses language as a basis of oppression in an English-speaking society where “Latinos of *all* class backgrounds and education levels face this questioning or denigrating of Spanish or Spanish accents” (Feagin and Cobas, 2014, p. 61; emphasis mine). Accordingly, *negative experiences with language should be universal and social differences in negative experiences should be undetectable given the ubiquity of racialization.*

This strong statement contrasts with what might be expected if within-group experiences are heterogeneous. An obvious source of heterogeneity is phenotype. Bonilla-Silva (2002) argues that skin tone is a key determinant of placement in the U.S. racial order. Latinos with darker complexions are treated as part of a “collective black” segment of the population while their lighter counterparts gain entrée to the white mainstream. Indeed, numerous studies indicate that light-skin immigrants fare better than their dark-skin counterparts on educational and labor market outcomes (Hersch, 2008, 2011). Roth (2010, p. 1302) concludes from reports of employment-related experiences of Dominican migrants in New York that “color adds an extra layer of barriers to confront.” In the words of one respondent, “if you're a dark Hispanic, you're doubly stereotyped.” This is consistent with Oropesa and Jensen's (2010) conclusion that a substantial share (42%) of Dominicans reports unfair treatment by institutions and unfair treatment is more likely to be reported by those with darker skin. *Because darker skin exacerbates the risk of marginalization, it should also exacerbate the risk of negative experiences with language due to the role of Spanish for signaling ethnicity.*

Grounds for hypothesizing linkages between experiences with language and explanatory variables in models of proficiency exist as well. Leverage for doing so is provided by the classic insight that negative events can be understood individualistically as idiosyncratic personal troubles or as manifestations of public problems (Mills, 2000). Portes and Rumbaut (1996, p. 186) suggest that interpretive frameworks shift from the former to the latter as knowledge accumulates with exposure to infuse interpretations with realism. Immigrant optimism fades with the emergence of a “realistic appraisal of the social environment...the more educated and more informed immigrants become, the more they come to understand

⁵The stance of the state refers to preferences for admission or targeted programs to facilitate the settlement of national-origin groups. The state takes a neutral stance toward Dominicans; a group described as concentrated in co-ethnic working-class areas of New York and a small number of other cities (Portes and Rumbaut, 1996).

American society as it actually is.” In this view, American society is rife with barriers to the integration of non-white groups into the mainstream. *Therefore, reports of negative linguistic receptivity are expected to increase with exposure, education and skin tone due to the nature of experiences plus their interpretation.*

Boundary Work

Experiences that emanate from efforts to hierarchically position immigrants through ethno-racial framing result, in part, from tactics employed by the native-born mainstream to marginalize others. Tactics range from ignoring Spanish speakers to name-calling and confrontation (Cobas and Feagin, 2008; Feagin and Cobas, 2008). For example, mock Spanish is derisive speech based on the corruption of language; it insults as a pejorative characterization (e.g. “grassy ass,” not “gracias”). Spanish speakers are racialized because mockery activates negative imagery that indexes otherness. Hill (2008, p. 122) claims such “explicit attacks are part of everyday practices among Americans of English-language heritage” and “African Americans have often joined in attacks on Spanish and its speakers.” Further, “pressure to exclude Spanish from public space is intense...what is at stake is white privilege, their right to control the symbolic resources of Spanish” (Hill, 2008, p. 126). Limited evidence suggests some mock forms are viewed negatively by the highly educated, Spanish proficient and women (Callahan, 2010).

Additional boundary work is performed by immigrants and their native-born co-ethnics. Speaking Spanish may counter black-white racialization by indexing a cultural boundary separating Dominicans from African Americans, regardless of nativity (Bailey, 2001; Howard, 2003; Toribio, 2006). However, Spanish is potentially involved in navigating boundaries among native-born and foreign-born Latinos (García Bedolla, 2003). One study claims some U.S.-born Dominican students maintain distance from their immigrant counterparts who are described by a respondent as speaking “so much Spanish they sound like hicks” (Bailey, 2001, p. 209).

This is a reminder that boundary work involving accents, vocabulary and claims about language competency can serve personal interests in impression management (Roth, 2012). Specifically, *pretending not to speak English* or *not to speak Spanish* are options for some immigrants (Urciouli, 1996). Feigning ignorance can minimize inter-ethnic conflict or promote intra-ethnic solidarity, at the risk of resentment among the excluded (Barrett, 2006). Resentment is likely when one refuses to speak or pretends not to speak a language to gain the upper hand by putting a monolingual interlocutor in his/her “place.” Another situation with negative overtones arises when *non-Latinos speak Spanish to Spanish speakers* because of a faulty assumption about English ability (Urciouli, 1996). This crosses the line as an incursion into linguistic space that signals a loss of control.

Little is known about the prevalence of these tactics, the characteristics of those who use them, or the characteristics of those who are their targets. Skin tone is potentially a key determinant (Roth, 2012). In theory, light skin provides leeway to pass for white and dark skin provides leeway to pass for African American. In practice, the latter is uncommon because it confers few advantages. *Therefore, those with the lightest skin should be the most likely to feign ignorance of Spanish to emphasize compatibility with the mainstream and*

those with the darkest skin should be most likely to feign ignorance of English to separate themselves from African Americans. As for exposure to such practices by others, reports of linguistic insults should increase with skin tone. Needless to say, other covariates such as education and exposure may affect interests in using these tactics and the ability to use them in interactions with then native born.

Research Objectives

The first objective is to generate a comprehensive portrait of linguistic incorporation among Dominican immigrants in Reading, PA. Although the literature is saturated with national-level studies of proficiency, there are no in-depth investigations of language-related experiences in new majority-minority destinations.⁶ These cities would initially appear to offer a favorable environment for Spanish due to population composition alone (Hwang and Xi, 2008; Linton, 2004; Linton and Jiménez, 2009). Still, the situation on the ground might be more complex given strong claims about the universal prevalence of white enmity and the composition of the Latino population. In Reading, Puerto Ricans form the majority (55%) of Latinos and two-thirds are mainland born. Dominicans are a much smaller share (18%) and mainly foreign-born (70%) speakers of a devalued dialect of Spanish. As pointed out by community informants, such differences may contribute to cleavages that spill over to interpersonal relations given the marginalization of Dominicans as “blacks” in Puerto Rico (Duany, 2005, p. 259). Poor Spanish skills among mainland-born Puerto Ricans and co-ethnics who see immigrants as “backward” are additional sources of friction in this milieu.

The second objective is to demonstrate how linguistic incorporation is structured by building on a standard narrative that points to the consequences of exposure and education for English acquisition. The “left-hand” side of the equation is expanded to include indicators of receptivity-related experiences with language in the specific city of residence as dependent variables. The “right-hand” side of the equation is expanded to include skin color as an indicator of phenotype and time in Reading as an indicator of exposure to the city itself. Such steps promise to reveal dimensions of linguistic incorporation that are often neglected in studies that are unable to examine receptivity-related experiences and exposures in specific places.

The third objective ties these issues together by examining reports of experiences attributed to ethno-racial hostility in general. The claim that ethno-racial hostility is channeled through the spoken word is subjected to empirical scrutiny with an inquiry into the implications of second-language acquisition and negative language-related experiences. This effort to delineate the implications of these variables for experiences that residents tie to ethno-racial background includes an inquiry into their possible role as linguistic mechanisms for the

⁶The lack of in-depth information on Dominicans and language in new destinations may be symptomatic of a blasé attitude among social scientists. Language is a “secondary” issue in studies of assimilation, perhaps due to the accumulation of evidence about proficiency (Stepick and Stepick, 2010). Research consistently shows that English proficiency is inevitable among the descendants of immigrants and even multi-ethnic world cities such as Los Angeles are “graveyards” for foreign languages (Rumbaut, Massey and Bean 2006). Moreover, evidence of its role in socio-economic attainment is consistent. This study demonstrates that viewing language solely in these terms is limiting. There is more to linguistic incorporation than English acquisition and there is more to English acquisition than its economic consequences as form of capital.

effects of exposure and skin color. Collectively, these objectives promise to illuminate the assimilation-racialization nexus.

Data and Methods

The analysis is based on interviews with 61 adult immigrants from the Dominican Republic in Reading, PA during 2004. Because probability sampling of rare populations is inefficient, respondents were recruited using several methods: a mass mailing to addresses on blocks with a large number of Latinos, door-to-door canvassing, word-of-mouth referrals and approaching people in public. Bilingual personnel conducted interviews using a CAPI survey written in Spanish and English.

Two features of this sample should be noted. First, the full sample is analyzed. Multiple imputation is relied on to eliminate case attrition due to incomplete data (Schafer, 1997). Second, representativeness is an issue for all studies, especially those based on non-probability samples of rare populations. This concern is assuaged here by similar demographic profiles of the survey respondents and their counterparts in the census.⁷ Therefore, the composition of the study sample is unlikely to distort results that pertain to the prevalence of various experiences.

Dependent Variables

Three sets of language-related dependent variables are examined: (1) English proficiency and use in various settings; (2) negative experiences from the use of Spanish and English; and (3) experiences with specific tactics for using language to manage the presentation of self.

Proficiency and Use—*Proficiency* is assessed from the self-reported ability to *speak* and to *understand* English using four categories ranging from “not at all” (coded as 1) to “very well” (4). These items are summed to form a Speech Index ranging in value from 2 to 8 that is analyzed in its original metric for the multivariate analysis.⁸ An additional measure taps oral self-defense capability as a proficiency-related skill: “Would you be able to defend yourself in English if you got into a heated argument with an American?” This item may touch on the insecurity that Zentella (2003, p.63) implies is widespread since “even bilinguals find themselves incapable of defending themselves adequately in gatekeeping situations in which they can be losers” (also García Bedolla 2003). Spanish is not examined because almost all of these immigrant respondents are proficient in their mother tongue.

⁷Some relevant comparisons based on weighted data from the 2000 Census (N_{unweighted}=52) for those in the metropolitan area (Berks County) age 18+ who were born in the Dominican Republic are as follows:

	Reading Survey	Census
% Does not speak English	19.7	18.7
Mean Years in U.S.	12.4	12.0
% College	18.0	15.0
% Male	50.8	46.6

⁸A logarithmic transformation of this measure is unnecessary. The results are not sensitive to this decision.

Language use in private and public is examined as well. Private-sphere use occurs *at home* and in social networks comprised of *friends* and *neighbors*. Public-sphere use occurs in *grocery stores, banks, church services* and *medical facilities*. Response categories are “Spanish only” (1), “more Spanish than English” (2), “about the same of each” (3), “more English than Spanish” (4), and “English only” (5). The private-sphere items that refer to use in social networks are combined into a Total Use Index (TUI) ranging in value from 3 to 15. This is logged to reduce skewness in the multivariate analysis. The data cannot support a multivariate analysis of the public-sphere items because too few cases remain when the sample is restricted to those who engage in each activity.

Receptivity—Insights into receptivity are available from reports of negative *interpersonal experiences*. Ethno-racial animosity, in general, is reflected in responses to the question: “How often do you hear people make insensitive or insulting remarks about someone’s *racial or ethnic background* in Reading?” Parallel questions ask how often respondents hear “insensitive or insulting remarks” about the “inability to speak *English*” and the “inability to speak *Spanish* in Reading.” Response categories range from “never” to “very often.” These items are the core variables for the analysis, but additional items tap beliefs about whether “Spanish speakers are ‘put down’ when they try to speak English in Reading” and whether it is “easy or difficult for Dominicans in Reading to maintain their Spanish?” The latter offers insights into the *conduciveness of the environment* to mother-tongue retention.

Institutional receptivity is assessed with two dichotomous measures of experiences in the city: (1) ever being “forbidden” to speak Spanish at work or in school and (2) whether institutional agents such as employers, police, teachers or realtors treated them unfairly due to language.

Boundary-defining Tactics—Experiences with specific boundary-defining tactics are examined with “yes/no” questions on whether they ever talked to *others who “pretended not to know Spanish,”* whether they “*pretended not to speak Spanish*” and whether they “*pretended not to speak English*” in Reading. *Resentment* is another signifier of boundaries: “Do you resent it when an American tries to speak to you in Spanish?”

Independent Variables

Exposure—The timing of exposure is captured by *age at entry* to the United States. Amount of exposure is indicated by cumulative *years in the United States* and *years in Reading*. To reiterate, the latter extends prior research that is unable to examine exposure to a particular place of residence.

Education—Respondents with a high school degree are contrasted to those without a high school degree. Sparse frequencies for those with post-secondary degrees prevent a more detailed treatment.

Skin Tone—Phenotype is based on interviewer-reported *skin tone* using a five-point ordinal scale: “very light”(coded 1), “light” (2), “medium” (3), “dark” (4), or “very dark brown” (5). This variable is analyzed in its original metric despite the (theoretical) possibility

that those in the middle of the spectrum face unique challenges. There is no evidence of curvilinear associations with these data.

Gender—The responses of men and women are contrasted, despite the fact that the literature on linguistic incorporation is not organized around gender (Akresh, 2007 is a limited exception). Gender is included for exploratory purposes to acknowledge its importance in organizing the life chances of immigrants.

Methodological Notes

Several methodological caveats are necessary. First, omitted variable bias is a potential issue due to sample size constraints on the number of independent variables that could be included here. This concern is allayed by additional analyses which indicate that other potential covariates such as citizenship, employment and parenthood provide few insights into the dependent variables. Age is omitted to avoid linear dependencies from redundant measures (age = age at migration + years of residence). In this vein, inferences for the remaining variables are not threatened by multicollinearity. Variance-inflation and condition indexes for all predictors fail to approach the critical thresholds for diagnosing collinearity in the regression models presented below (Belsley, Kuh and Welsch, 2004).⁹

Second, the possibility of simultaneity bias limits the ability to unravel associations between language proficiency, language use in social networks and negative experiences with language.¹⁰ This is addressed here with a conservative modeling strategy that excludes these measures as predictors of one another. Such concerns are less pressing for the research objective which draws attention to ethno-racial hostility as a function of language skills, experiences with language and the covariates.

Third, statistical tests are used cautiously despite non-probability sampling. Borderline significant coefficients ($p < .10$) are identified to reduce the elevated risk of a Type II error for small samples.¹¹ The use of statistical tests in this type of situation is common (Leahey, 2005). Such tests have heuristic value for informing judgment when there is no principled alternative to reduce uncertainty (Henkel, 1976; see Dawson, 2009; Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral, 2000; Gravlee, 2005). In this vein, all logistic regression estimates were also generated using Firth's penalized likelihood method to adjust for small-sample bias. Needless to say, these steps only provide rough guidance to avoid crossing over the thin line that separates science from science fiction.

Lastly, a compromise is necessary to balance research priorities and analytic strategies. The descriptive objective requires attention to a broad set of indicators. Such breadth cannot be replicated for analytic objectives that require attention to several independent variables

⁹The variables of greatest concern are age at entry, years in the United States and years in Reading. The associations (r^2) between these measures range from .08 to .10.

¹⁰Simultaneity bias would occur if proficiency affected the use of language and the use of language affected proficiency. Similarly, language skills might affect exposure to negative experiences with language and negative experiences with language might affect language skills (or their assessment).

¹¹The likelihood of failing to reject a false null (a Type II error) is a function of statistical power. Power increases with the true effect size in the population (unknown here), sample size (fixed at $N = 61$ here) and the p -value for significance. Raising the p -value for significance decreases the likelihood of this error.

without sacrificing coherence. Therefore, multivariate analyses will be limited to dependent variables that satisfy three conditions: (1) they are theoretically important; (2) the total sample is “at risk” rather than a subset; and (3) substantial variation is evident (at least 30-70% split for a dichotomy). The most important indicators of receptivity are those that directly reflect experiences with language.

Results

The presentation of results is partitioned into sections that address the descriptive and analytic objectives for each substantive topic. To set the stage, it should be kept in mind that the typical respondent has spent a non-trivial amount of time in the United States. S/he is a 40 year-old non-citizen who entered the United States at the age of 28. About five of those 12 years spent “in country” have been in Reading by someone who is near the middle of the spectrum on skin tone. Half are classified as “very light” (16%) or “light” (34%) and half are classified as “medium” (38%) or “dark/very dark” (12%). Respondents are also as likely as not to have dropped out of high school (54%) and to be male (51%).

Proficiency and Use

Table 1 describes English proficiency and use. The top panel shows that a substantial majority are at a disadvantage in language production. Just 12% speak English “very well” and 23% speak it “well.” This leaves two-thirds in the bottom categories. In contrast, more respondents claim to understand spoken English. Half are in the top two categories, but few understand English “very well” (13%). Surprisingly, the fact that two-thirds appear to be at a speaking disadvantage does not mean that most are linguistically insecure. The majority (62%) claims to have the necessary verbal skills to argue with an American in an emotion-charged situation, with 25 of these 38 immigrants having participated in such an argument before (not shown). Of course, the juxtaposition of findings which indicate that the typical respondent lacks English skills and has linguistic confidence in a high-stakes argument is of interest. This may stem from the absence of a need for a well-developed set of language skills to forcefully present one's point-of-view in an argument where tone of voice along with knowledge of a few choice action verbs or commands will suffice.

A low level of proficiency does not indicate that English is devalued. Nearly everyone claims the ability to speak English (95%) is “extremely” or “very” important (not shown). At the same time, over 90% describe Spanish in the same way, perhaps because it resonates as the mother tongue and as a means of communication. Most are Spanish dominant in social networks comprised of friends (81%), neighbors (73%), and family at home (70%). Spanish is also common in the public sphere, especially for communication at work and at church services. As for grocery shopping and medical care, we see these are realms where substantial numbers claim to conduct their affairs in English. Roughly equal shares rely primarily on one language or the other (38%-44%). Nonetheless, the local business environment is obviously conducive to the use of Spanish with over 60% of respondents claiming to use it at least as much as English in each setting.

Table 2 presents parameter estimates from regressions for measures of proficiency and language use that are generally consistent with the standard narrative. Two common threads

run throughout. First, unequivocal support is generated for the timing of arrival to the United States. Those who arrive at younger ages are more proficient, more confident in their language self-defense skills and more reliant on English in social networks. Second, the relative absence of attention to phenotype in studies of proficiency is supported by the failure of skin tone to achieve significance.

Additional support for the standard narrative is shown with the bivariate regressions for the speech and self-defense measures of proficiency. Specifically, self-reported English ability is positively associated with both measures of cumulative exposure in column 1. The professed capability for linguistic self-defense also increases with years in the United States (odds ratio = 1.09, $p < .05$) and in Reading (odds ratio = 1.16, $p < .06$) in the bivariate model in column 3. However, the multivariate results indicate that the latter is the only indicator of cumulative exposure to approach significance, and it is solely for the Speech Index. Those with more time in Reading tend to have higher values on the Speech Index ($b = .08$, $p = .07$ in col. 2). Of course, this is a non-trivial finding. Regardless of age-of-entry, time in this majority-minority city promotes the acquisition of English. Because time in Reading counts as time in country, it is worth knowing that this connection is not solely responsible for the failure of years in the United States to achieve significance for the Speech Index. Additional analyses of this index and the self-defense item reveal that the reduction is primarily due to the inclusion of age-at-entry.¹²

Less consistency is evident in the effects of the other covariates across the dependent variables. The only significant estimates for the other variables are shown for the Speech Index. As hypothesized, those with a high school degree (or above) tend to have higher levels of proficiency than those without a high school degree. As for gender, men tend rate their English-language skills more highly than women. This intriguing finding may be worth pursuing in future research to determine whether it reflects true differences in skills or differences in how skills are viewed.¹³

The bottom panel reveals that these simple models fit the data adequately. The multivariate model improves the fit of an intercept-only model for each dependent variable. The six independent variables account for an impressive 44% of the variation in the Speech Index. Just 15% of the variation in the use index is explained.

Receptivity and Boundary Work

Table 3 provides frequencies for indicators of receptivity and boundary work. These results show a negative undercurrent, despite estimates that fall short of the universal prevalence that would be expected from a strong version of the racialization perspective. On the one hand, two-thirds claim that Spanish speakers are not “put down” when they speak English, almost 80% have not been forbidden to speak Spanish and 90% have not been treated

¹²The self-defense measure and the TUI are positively associated with proficiency. Age-of-entry is non-significant when the Speech Index is included in the multivariate model for self-defense. This would be expected if proficiency is a mechanism for age-of-entry, but endogeneity is an issue because the Speech Index and the defense measure are self-assessments.

¹³Additional analysis indicates that this does not reflect economic or life cycle differences between men and women. Notwithstanding the aforementioned caveat about endogeneity, the gender effect does disappear when either the TUI or the item in the index that measures language used with friends is controlled for. Men are more likely than women to use English with friends (see Akresh 2007).

unfairly by institutions because of language. On the other hand, the majority hears insensitive comments about English “very often” (17%) or “occasionally” (40%) and the share that feels Spanish speakers are denigrated when they speak English (32%) is substantial. To reiterate, the latter item refers to personal beliefs as opposed to experiences. Only 8 of those claiming speakers are “put down” said that this *ever* happened to them in the city (not shown).

A similar portrait emerges for Spanish, a language that all respondents (86%) claim is “easy” to maintain in Reading. Over three-fifths of respondents rarely hear insults, but the prevalence of disparaging remarks about Spanish ability is non-trivial with 11% hearing such comments “very often” and 27% hearing them “occasionally.”¹⁴ In short, negative experiences with English and Spanish are neither universal nor ignorable for a substantial share of Dominicans in the city.

Additional insights into receptivity are available from tactics for interpersonal boundary work. Personally feigning linguistic ignorance is relatively uncommon, but most have been exposed to others who have done so. About one-fourth of those who speak some English have *ever* pretended not to know it and almost no one admits to doing so for Spanish (3%). The low percentage that has pretended not to speak Spanish may be due to several factors, including the distastefulness of denying one's heritage and the rarity of situations where it would be advantageous to close an avenue for effective communication. Another consideration is that masking an ability to speak one's mother tongue lacks credibility for immigrants whose English is limited or accented. This does not mean that such experiences are unknown. Two-thirds have interacted with others who allegedly masked their ability to speak Spanish. Last, is the incursion of non-native speakers of Spanish into linguistic space. Few resent an American talking to them in Spanish. Apparently, some boundary issues involving language cross-over are not salient in Reading.

Because of the need to exclude variables that fail to satisfy the selection criteria from further consideration, the remainder the analysis will primarily focus on exposure to insults. Table 4 presents odds ratios from logistic regressions to contrast frequent (very often/occasional) and infrequent (rarely/never) exposure to negative remarks about the ability to speak both English and Spanish. Here we see that no parameter estimate approaches significance in any bivariate or multivariate additive model. This is why the likelihood-ratio tests indicate that the covariates are uninformative as a set (columns 2 and 5).

Such findings are consistent with a strong racialization claim that negative language-related experiences do not recognize social distinctions. However, all effects are assumed to be additive. The additivity assumption is systematically supported by numerous non-significant tests for interactions among the covariates, except for one test which indicates that a more nuanced approach is necessary. Column 3 shows a significant estimate for skin tone * years in the United States for insults about English. An odds ratio (OR) of 1.14 ($p < .05$) indicates that exposure to a negative language climate increases disproportionately with exposure to

¹⁴The only significant association between measures of receptivity is for hearing insults about English and Spanish. Those exposed to insensitive comments about the ability to speak one language are also likely to hear comments about the ability to speak the other language.

the United States for those with darker skin. Moreover, the full implications of this interaction are evident from regressions within skin tone categories (not shown). The association between exposures to insults and the United States is *negative* with an odds ratio of .35 among those with “very light” or “light” skin ($p = .054$). Among those with darker skin, the association is *positive* with an odds ratio of 1.19 ($p = .044$). Thus, offsetting effects explain why skin tone is inconsequential in additive models. *Cumulative exposure entails fewer negative comments for those with lighter skin and more negative comments for those with darker skin.*¹⁵

The next task would be to determine the social correlates of the measures of boundary work. As noted, there are insufficient cases to analyze those who are at risk of performing some types of boundary work (pretending not to know English) or insufficient variation in others (pretending not to know Spanish). This leaves exposure to those who feign ignorance of Spanish as the only remaining indicator that can satisfy the selection criteria for a separate analysis. Because these results are similar in many ways to those presented above, they are withheld to preserve space. No variable approaches significance in bivariate or multivariate additive models. This lack of support for any hypothesis is initially consistent with claims that negative treatment is universal. Nonetheless, a significant interaction suggests exposure matters for those with darker skin ($OR = 1.12$, $p = .06$). Those with darker skin and time in country appear to be particularly likely to claim exposure to others who pretended not to know Spanish.

Language and Ethno-racial Receptivity

To come full circle, the remaining task is to examine reports of experiences with ethno-racial enmity more broadly. Table 3 shows that 43% of Dominicans “very often” (13%) or “occasionally” (30%) hear disparaging comments in this regard. This is lower than what might be expected given that 75% of all respondents mention frequently hearing negative remarks about English *or* Spanish. In other words, negative language-related experiences are neither necessary nor sufficient for experiences to be interpreted negatively in ethno-racial terms.

Table 5 presents odds ratios from logistic regressions for ethno-racial insults. These models show the effects of the main independent variables before and after three language-related measures are controlled for. Turning first to language-related skills and experiences, we see the likelihood of hearing insulting ethno-racial remarks is positively associated with English proficiency in bivariate and multivariate models. In addition, disparaging ethno-racial commentary is associated with disparaging comments about language abilities in English ($OR = 2.98$, $p = .053$) and Spanish ($OR = 3.05$, $p = .051$) in the bivariate models. The odds of frequently hearing hostile racial remarks are three times higher for those who frequently hear insults about each language than for those who hear insults about language infrequently. Although the multivariate estimate for hearing insults about English falls short

¹⁵Including the Speech Index in additive models produces parameter estimates of 1.79 ($p < .05$) for English insults and 1.23 ($p = n.s.$) for Spanish insults without affecting the estimates of other variables. It cannot be determined whether English proficiency increases exposure to negativity or exposure to negativity lowers self-reported English skills (or both). Regardless, this variable does not affect the significant interaction.

of the significance threshold, the magnitude of the odds ratio is highly suggestive and non-ignorable nonetheless (OR = 2.71, $p=.11$ column 3). Thus, the evidence generally suggests that those who are English proficient and hear insults about both languages are substantially likely to report hearing insults about ethnic background.

These language-related variables affect reported exposure to ethno-racial hostility without serving as mechanisms for the effects of other variables. Specifically, skin tone stands out as a predictor of exposure to insults in bivariate (OR = 1.82, $p = .056$) and all multivariate models (e.g., OR = 2.26, $p<.05$ in column 2). Reporting frequent exposure to negative ethno-racial comments increases substantially with the darkness of one's skin, regardless of controls. These results indicate that negative experiences with receptivity have an ethno-racial dimension that is linked to language, but experiences are not reducible to language.

The evidence that proficiency matters for exposure to insults about ethnic background is noteworthy, but the standard narrative from research on proficiency cannot be easily extended to ethno-racial hostility. The absence of significant associations in all models for the timing of exposure, the accumulation of exposure to the United States and Reading, and education suggest the necessity to turn elsewhere for insights.

One place to turn is gender. According to multivariate models, men are less likely than women to report hearing negative commentary about ethnic background. There are at least three possible explanations for this finding, including the possibility of gender differences in the likelihood of being targeted. Women might be more likely to be targeted if they are considered less of a retaliatory threat. However, this is unlikely because it implies that gender would matter for language-based experiences. The greater likelihood of women to mention negative ethno-racial experiences is not replicated for experiences with language and cannot be explained by them. Another possibility is that women's greater likelihood of mentioning frequent exposure to ethno-racial insults reflects what they overhear of conversations in settings that they are exposed to in their daily routines (e.g., work, schools, playgrounds, shopping). Last, is sensitivity to personal appearance and its intersections with ethno-racial distancing due to "negrophobia" (Candelario 2007). Confusion over racial background could have different implications for women during social interaction, regardless of skin color.¹⁶ Obviously, additional attention is warranted in future research to evaluate these explanations.

Conclusion

The first objective of this research was to generate a comprehensive portrait of the linguistic incorporation of Dominican immigrants in the emerging majority-minority city of Reading, PA. This requires attention to English acquisition because population composition may affect the incentives and opportunities to learn a new language. As predicted, a relatively low level of proficiency is evident. The 35-40% of respondents who report speaking English "only," "very well," or "well" is less than the half (55%) of all Dominican immigrants nationally and in New York (51%) who are in these categories (ACS). This may be

¹⁶Gender does not interact with skin tone or other covariates for any dependent variable examined in this study.

surprising given that relatively few are recent migrants from the island and 80% are secondary migrants from other U.S. cities. It is less surprising from the standpoint of the hypothesis posed at the outset about how immigration-induced changes in population composition may affect the language environment's conduciveness to the maintenance of Spanish through daily communication in private and in public settings. Nonetheless, fears about the demise of English are misplaced. Everyone acknowledges that it is important to learn English.

Examining linguistic incorporation experientially in terms of receptivity drew attention to a strong version of the racialization perspective that emphasizes the universality of ongoing experiences with hostility among those who are positioned as racially apart from the mainstream. The evidence indicates that this is an overstatement. However, deleterious language-related experiences affect a substantial segment of the population. Such experiences appear to be more common in "the streets" than in the "hallways" of institutions where few mention the denial of opportunities to communicate in Spanish or unfair treatment due to language. A substantial majority hears insulting remarks about spoken English (57%) and a substantial minority overhears disparaging remarks about Spanish ability at least occasionally (37%). These results suggest that focusing exclusively on reactions by the mainstream loses sight of language as a "problem" among Latinos.¹⁷

Although negative talk is a barometer of the stance of society towards immigrants, more tactics are potentially involved in voicing distinctions than derogatory utterances. Distinctions are reinforced by feigning ignorance. Feigning ignorance of English is more common than feigning ignorance of Spanish, but most do not admit to personally engaging in either behavior. Still, the majority claims to have experienced this in their interactions with others. Such claims could reflect the efforts of native-born co-ethnics to distance themselves from immigrants or errors in judgment about the language skills of others in a city with many mainland-born Puerto Ricans. Similarly, there is no information on how often language cross-over occurs with non-Latinos who communicate in Spanish. Nonetheless, few respondents resent this as an incursion into linguistic space, perhaps because cross-over does not require bad intentions or pernicious usage (mockery). The notion that this is a major source of consternation may reflect the origin of such claims in qualitative research on bilingual Puerto Ricans in New York. English proficiency is necessary for resentment to form. Regardless, information on the prevalence of various language-related problems is important for understanding the reception of immigrants in new destinations.

The second objective focused on the etiology of different dimensions of linguistic incorporation, starting with a standard narrative of second-language acquisition that emphasizes the consequences of exposure. As hypothesized, English acquisition and use in various settings are negatively associated with age of entry to the United States. However, changing settlement patterns directs attention to exposure to the cities where immigrants

¹⁷The emerging literature on the language dynamics that are involved in racialization provides valuable starting point for investigating these issues (Feagin and Cobas 2014). Greater attention needs to be paid to the content, the sources, the targets, and the interpretation of comments along with situational triggers for negative commentary about both languages over time.

live; that is, away from exposure to the nation that they are *in*. This distinction cannot be made in studies that lack information on length of residence in different places. The results indicate that proficiency is more strongly associated with time in Reading than in the United States. In other words, time in a majority-minority city promotes the second-language acquisition even where the prevalence of English-proficiency is low.¹⁸ This is consistent with the conventional wisdom, apart from what might be expected given statements about the impact of composition alone in areas where people can lead their daily lives in Spanish.

The analysis then turned to negative experiences that are indicative of receptivity. Results initially suggested that the standard narrative does not advance our understanding of receptivity. The absence of significant predictors and poor-fitting multivariate additive models are consistent with a strong version of the racialization thesis which claims negative experiences are ubiquitous across social groups. At the same time, further analysis revealed a more complicated pattern than is implied by the additive models. Tests for interaction indicate that time and color coalesce in the accumulation of street-level “educational” experiences that reflect intolerance. Exposure to insults about English is amplified by time for those with dark skin. Thus, exposure matters for negative experiences among those who may be marginalized because of skin color. Such findings underscore the value of nuance for understanding how characteristics emphasized in the standard narrative intersect with others to shape experiences with racialization.

The third objective was to examine experiences with ethno-racial receptivity more broadly. This analysis demonstrated that experiences which signal mistreatment because of race or ethnic background cannot be reduced to language, even though a connection is undeniable. Strong associations are evident between negative ethno-racial experiences and negative experiences with Spanish and English (albeit tentatively so for the latter in one multivariate model). The likelihood of mentioning frequent exposure to insults about ethnic background is also greater among the English proficient. Evidently, proficiency exacerbates exposure to deleterious acts in the process of promoting integration into the mainstream through access to opportunities. This is an underappreciated irony of linguistic incorporation.

There is more to experiences attributed to ethno-racial hostility than language alone. Most notably, the findings for skin tone are consistent with what might be expected from knowledge of the marginalization of Dominicans and the structural constraints that they face in American society. The likelihood of negative ethno-racial experiences is strongly associated with the darkness of one's skin, regardless of language. Exposures to insulting remarks about English as a function of the darkness of skin also accumulate with time the United States. Thus, color is a fundamental source of heterogeneity in the experiences of Dominican, even in a majority-minority city. Strong evidence of its impact in Reading is a reminder of an observation that Park and Burgess (1934, p. 758) made nearly a century ago

¹⁸The same conclusion would be reached if this issue was approached by substituting the proportion of all time in the United States that has been spent in Reading for one of the other measures. Proficiency is positively associated with the *share* of time in-country that has been spent in Reading. Of course, the last word remains to be written about duration of residence because the incentives for learning a language may change with the composition of cities over time. Long-term and short-term residents have different levels of exposure to the same city, but cities change. The lived experiences of long-term residents are complicated by the fact that they encompass the city at different points in its history. Such issues are difficult to unravel with cross-sectional data.

about how the United States can accommodate “every sort of normal human difference except the purely external ones, like the color of the skin.”

In closing, this investigation reveals several directions for future research. Because “all assimilation is local,” the most obvious place to start is with comparative (multi-group, multi-city) studies to demonstrate how language intersects with various dimensions of ethnicity across new destinations that potentially differ in receptivity.¹⁹ This will require sustained attention to all segments of local populations to delineate the multiplicity of boundaries that are involved in distinctions based on national-origins. Such efforts promise insights into the integration of immigrants in new destinations; that is, the extent to which they become *part of* the larger community or remain *apart from* the larger community. The challenges of generating this information are undoubtedly formidable, albeit less formidable than those faced by immigrants living in places struggling to determine who belongs.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates the insights of Edwin Lamboy and the referees. Support was provided by the Russell Sage Foundation (88-04-01) and the Population Research Institute at The Pennsylvania State University through core funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD041025).

References

- Akresh IR. Contexts of English language use among immigrants to the United States. *Int Migr Rev*. 2007; 41(4):930–955.
- Alba, R.; Nee, V. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2003.
- Araújo Dawson B. Discrimination, stress, and acculturation among Dominican immigrant women. *Hispanic J Behav Sci*. 2009; 31(1):96–111.
- Bailey B. The language of multiple identities among Dominican Americans. *J Linguist Anthr*. 2001; 10(2):190–223.
- Barrett R. Language ideology and racial inequality: Competing functions of Spanish in an Anglo-owned Mexican restaurant. *Lang Soc*. 2006; 35(2):163–204.
- Bean, FD.; Stevens, G. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2003.
- Belsley, DA.; Kuh, E.; Welsch, RE. *Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources of Collinearity*. New York: Wiley; 2004.
- Birdsong, D. Interpreting age effects in second language acquisition. In: Kroll, JF.; DeGroot, AMB., editors. *Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2005. p. 109–127.
- Bonilla-Silva E. From bi-Racial to tri-Racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic Racial Stud*. 2002; 27(6):931–950.
- Borjas, GL. *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1999.
- Brubaker, R. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2004.
- Callahan L. Speaking with disrespect: A study of reactions to mock Spanish. *Lang Inter Comm*. 2010; 10(4):299–317.
- Candelario, GEB. *Black Behind the Ears: Dominican Racial Identity from Museums to Beauty Shops*. Duke University Press; 2007.

¹⁹Of course, this is inspired by Tip O'Neill's famous aphorism that “all politics is local.” The truth is that assimilation is “largely local,” but not totally so because of national and global telecommunications.

- Chiswick, BR. Top ten myths and fallacies regarding immigration. In: Suárez-Orozco, M.; Louie, V.; Suro, R., editors. *Writing Immigration: Scholars and Journalists in Dialogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2011. p. 136-148.
- Chiswick, BR.; Miller, P. *The Economics of Language*. London: Routledge; 2007.
- Cobas JA, Feagin JR. Language oppression and resistance: The case of middle class Latinos in the United States. *Ethnic Racial Stud.* 2008; 31(2):390-410.
- Duany J. Reconstructing racial identity: Ethnicity, color, and class among Dominicans in the United States and Puerto Rico. *Lat Am Perspect.* 1998; 25(3):147-172.
- Duany J. Dominican migration to Puerto Rico: A transnational perspective. *Cent J.* 2005; 17(1):243-268.
- Espenshade TJ, Fu H. An analysis of English-Language proficiency among U.S. immigrants. *Am Sociol Rev.* 1997; 62:288-305.
- Feagin JR, Cobas JA. Latinos/as and White racial frame: The Procrustean bed of assimilation. *Sociol Inq.* 2008; 78(1):39-53.
- Feagin, JR.; Cobas, JA. *Latinos Facing Racism: Discrimination, Resistance, and Endurance*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm; 2014.
- Flippen C, Parrado E. Forging Hispanic communities in new destinations: A case study of Durham, North Carolina. *City Community.* 2012; 11(1):1-29. [PubMed: 24482612]
- García Bedolla L. The identity paradox: Latino language, politics and selective dissociation. *Latino Studies.* 2003; 1(2):264-283.
- Gravlee CC. Ethnic classification in Southeastern Puerto Rico: The cultural model of 'color'. *Soc Forces.* 2005; 83(3):949-970.
- Henkel, RE. *Tests of Significance*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage; 1976.
- Hersch J. Profiling the new immigrant worker: The effects of skin color and height. *J Labor Econ.* 2008; 26(2):345-386.
- Hersch J. The persistence of skin color discrimination for immigrants. *Soc Sci Res.* 2011; 40(5):1337-1349.
- Hill, JH. *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.
- Hirschman C. The origins and demise of the concept of race. *Popul Dev Rev.* 2004; 30(3):385-415.
- Howard D. Reappraising race? Dominicans in New York City. *International Journal of Population Geography.* 2003; 9(4):337-350.
- Hwang S, Xi J. Structural and individual covariates of English language proficiency. *Soc Forces.* 2008; 86(3):1079-1084.
- Itzigsohn, J. *Encountering American Faultlines: Race, Class, and the Dominican Experience in Providence*. New York: Russell Sage; 2009.
- Itzigsohn J, Dore-Cobral C. Competing identities: Race, ethnicity and panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States. *Sociol Forum.* 2010; 15(2):225-247.
- Lamboy, E. *Caribbean Spanish in the Metropolis: Spanish language among Cubans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans in the New York City Area*. New York: Routledge; 2004.
- Leahey E. Alphas and asterisks: The development of statistical significance testing standards in sociology. *Soc Forces.* 2005; 84(1):1-24.
- Lavariega Monforti J, Sanchez GR. The politics of perception: An investigation of the presence and sources of perceptions of internal discrimination among Latinos. *Soc Sci Quart.* 2010; 91(1):245-265.
- Lee, BA.; Iceland, J.; Sharp, G. *The US2010 Project*. New York: Russell Sage; 2012. Racial and ethnic diversity goes local: Charting change in American communities over three decades.
- Liberato, ASQ.; Feagin, JR. Becoming American and maintaining ethnic identities: The case of Dominican Americans. In: Shaw-Taylor, Y.; Tuch, SA., editors. *The Other African Americans: Contemporary African American Families in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers; 2007. p. 177-215.
- Lichter DT. Integration or fragmentation? Racial diversity and the American future. *Demography.* 2013; 50(2):359-391. [PubMed: 23440733]

- Linton A. A critical mass model of bilingualism among U.S.-born Hispanics. *Soc Forces*. 2004; 83(1): 279–314.
- Linton A, Jiménez TR. Contexts for bilingualism among U.S.-born Latinos. *Ethnic Racial Stud*. 2009; 32(6):967–95.
- Massey, DS. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage; 2008.
- Montgomery D. The engine of change. *The Washington Post*. 2008 Apr 22.
- Oropesa RS. Neighbourhood disorder and social cohesiveness among immigrants in a new destination: Dominicans in Reading, PA. *Urban Stud*. 2012; 49(1):112–129.
- Oropesa RS, Jensen L. Dominican immigrants and discrimination in a new destination: The case of Reading, Pennsylvania. *City Community*. 2010; 9(3):274–298. [PubMed: 25506273]
- O'Neil K, Tienda M. A tale of two counties: Natives' opinions toward immigration in North Carolina. *Int Migr Rev*. 2010; 44(3):728–761. [PubMed: 23436953]
- Park, RE.; Burgess, EW. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1934.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, RG. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Second. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1996.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, RG. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2001.
- Roth W. Racial mismatch: The divergence between form and function in data for monitoring racial discrimination of Hispanics. *Soc Sci Quart*. 2010; 91(5):1288–1311.
- Roth, W. *Race Migrations: Latinos and the Cultural Transformation of Race*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press; 2012.
- Ruggles, SJ.; Alexander, T.; Genadek, K.; Goeken, R.; Schroeder, MB.; Sobek, M. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota; 2010.
- Rumbaut, RG. The making of a people. In: Tienda, M.; Mitchell, F., editors. *Hispanics and the Future of America*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2006. p. 16–65.
- Rumbaut RG, Massey DS, Bean FD. Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in Southern California. *Popul Dev Rev*. 2006; 32(3):447–460.
- Schafer, J. *Analysis of Incomplete Data*. London: Chapman and Hall; 1997.
- Stepick A, Stepick CD. The complexities and confusions of segmented assimilation. *Ethnic Racial Stud*. 2010; 33(7):1149–1167.
- Stevens G. Age at immigration and second language proficiency among foreign-born adults. *Lang Soc*. 1999; 28(4):555–578.
- Stevens G. The age-length-onset problem in research on second language acquisition among immigrants. *Lang Learn*. 2006; 56(4):671–692.
- Tienda M, Fuentes N. Hispanics in Metropolitan America: New Realities and Old Debates. *Annu Rev Sociol*. 2014; 40:499–520.
- Toribio AJ. Language variation and the linguistic enactment of identity among Dominicans. *Linguistics*. 2000; 38(5):1133–1159.
- Toribio, AJ. Linguistic displays of identity among Dominicans in national and diasporic settings. In: Brutt-Griffler, J.; Davies, CE., editors. *English and Ethnicity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2006. p. 131–155.
- Urciuoli, B. *Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press; 1996.
- Van Tubergen F, Kalmijn M. A dynamic approach to the determinants of immigrants' language proficiency: The United States, 1980–2000. *Int Migr Rev*. 2009; 43(3):519–543.
- Waters, M. Debating immigration: Are we addressing the right issues?. In: Suárez-Orozco, M.; Louie, V.; Suro, R., editors. *Writing Immigration: Scholars and Journalists in Dialogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2011. p. 236–250.
- Wimmer A. The making and unmaking of ethnic boundaries: A multilevel process theory. *Am J Sociol*. 2008; 113(4):970–1022.
- Winn, P. *Americas*. Pantheon; New York: 1992.

- Zentella, AC. Spanish in New York. In: García, O.; Fishman, JA., editors. *The Multilingual Apple*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter; 2002. p. 167-200.
- Zentella, AC. José can you see? Latin@ responses to racist discourse. In: Sommer, D., editor. *Bilingual Aesthetics*. New York: Palgrave; 2003. p. 51-68.
- Zuñiga, V.; Hernández-León, R. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2006.

Highlights

- Dominicans in this Hispanic majority city live in a Spanish-language milieu.
- This milieu is conducive to negative experiences with both English and Spanish.
- Negative experiences are neither universal nor unstructured among Dominicans.
- Negative experiences with English are structured by dark skin tone and exposure.
- Language plays a role with dark skin tone in hostile ethno-racial experiences.

Table 1
Frequencies: Proficiency and Use (N=61)

	Total %
Proficiency	
Speaks English	
Very well	11.5
Well	23.0
Not well/Not at all	65.6
Understands Spoken English	
Very well	13.1
Well	37.7
Not well/Not at all	49.2
Ability to defend self in English	
Yes	62.3
No	37.7
Use in Private Sphere	
Home	
English dominant	13.3
Both	17.1
Spanish dominant	69.6
Neighbors	
English dominant	12.3
Both	14.4
Spanish dominant	73.3
Close friends	
English dominant	15.1
Both	4.0
Spanish dominant	80.9
Use in Public Sphere	
Co-workers (N=42)	
English dominant	16.7
Both	16.7
Spanish dominant	66.7
Church Services (N=43)	
English dominant	2.3
Both	7.0
Spanish dominant	90.7
Grocery Store (N=36)	
English dominant	38.9
Both	16.7
Spanish dominant	44.4
Medical Care (N=40)	

	Total %
English dominant	37.5
Both	20.0
Spanish dominant	42.5

Note: Spanish dominant speakers use “only” Spanish or “more Spanish than English.” English dominant speakers use “only” English or “more English than Spanish.”

Table 2
Proficiency and Use: Ordinary Least Squares and Logistic Regressions (N=61)

	Speech Index			Self-Defense			Total Use Index		
	Bivariate			Bivariate			Bivariate		
	b	b		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio		b	b	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(5)	(6)	
Intercept			5.27***		5.30			1.66***	
<u>Immigration</u>									
Years in U.S.	.05*	.00	1.09**	1.04	1.04		-.00	-.01*	
Years in Reading	.17***	.08*	1.16*	1.10	1.10		.03	.02	
Age of Entry	-.08***	-.07***	.92***	.94**	.94**		-.02**	-.02***	
<u>Education</u>									
High School	.69	.67*	1.16	1.06	1.06		.26	.11	
Not High School									
<u>Phenotype</u>									
Skin tone	.03	.19	.72	.74	.74		-.07	-.06	
<u>Gender</u>									
Male	.92**	.61*	2.08	1.76	1.76		.15	.17	
Female									
F		8.87***						2.86**	
Likelihood-ratio χ^2				14.85**					
r ² (adjusted)		.44						.15	

Note: The average r² is reported along with the median F statistic and likelihood-ratio χ^2 across the imputed files.

* p < .10,

** p < .05,

*** p < .01

Table 3
Language Receptivity and Boundary Work (N=61)

	Total %
Interpersonal Receptivity	
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	
Hear insults about race or ethnic background	
Very often	12.8
Occasionally	29.7
Rarely/Never	57.5
<u>English</u>	
Spanish speakers "put down" in Reading when speak English	
Yes	31.8
No	68.2
Hear insults/insensitive remarks about spoken English	
Very often	17.0
Occasionally	39.6
Rarely/Never	43.4
<u>Spanish</u>	
Hear insults/insensitive remarks about spoken Spanish	
Very often	10.6
Occasionally	26.6
Rarely/Never	62.8
Maintenance of Spanish in Reading	
Easy	86.3
Difficult	13.7
Institutional Receptivity	
Forbidden to speak Spanish at Work or School in Reading	
Yes	20.9
No	79.1
Treated unfairly by institutions because of language in Reading	
Yes	11.5
No	88.5
Interpersonal Boundary Work	
Pretended not to know English (N=49)	
Yes	26.4
No	72.7
Others pretend not to know Spanish	
Yes	67.2
No	32.8
Pretended not to know Spanish	
Yes	3.3
No	96.7

	Total %
Resent American speaking to R in Spanish	
Yes	8.2
No	91.8

Note: The frequencies for “pretending not to know English” are based on those who speak some English.

Table 4
Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions: Interpersonal Receptivity (N = 61)

	Insults Inability to Speak English		Insults Inability to Speak Spanish	
	Bivariate (1)	Multivariate (2)	Bivariate (4)	Multivariate (5)
<u>Immigration</u>				
Years U.S.	.99	.99	1.04	1.04
Years Reading	1.05	1.06	1.06	1.07
Age of Entry	1.01	1.01	1.02	1.03
<u>Education</u>				
High School	1.75	1.72	.45	.47
Not High School	----	----	----	----
<u>Phenotype</u>				
Skin Tone	1.13	1.18	1.27	1.13
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	.76	.80	1.12	1.01
Female	----	----	----	----
<u>Interaction</u>				
Skin Tone * Years U.S.			1.14**	
Likelihood-Ratio χ^2		2.93	12.59*	6.49
Degrees of Freedom		6	7	6

Note: All measures are dichotomous with a value of "1" assigned to negative experiences. For hearing insults about the inability to speak English and Spanish, a "1" corresponds to "very often" or "occasionally" and a "0" corresponds to "rarely" or "never." The likelihood-ratio χ^2 is the median value across imputed data files.

*
p < .10,

**
p < .05

Table 5
Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions: Insults about Race or Ethnicity (N=61)

	Bivariate		Multivariate		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<u>Insults English Ability</u>					
Often/Occasionally	2.98*		2.71		
Rarely/Never	-----		-----		
<u>Insults Spanish Ability</u>					
Often/Occasionally	3.05*			3.33*	
Rarely/Never	-----			-----	
Speech Index	1.34*				1.92**
<u>Immigration</u>					
Years in U.S.	1.04	1.07	1.06	1.05	1.08
Years in Reading	1.05	1.01	.99	.99	.96
Age of Entry	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.05
<u>Education</u>					
High School	1.59	1.99	1.73	2.53	1.37
Not High School	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
<u>Phenotype</u>					
Skin Tone	1.82*	2.26**	2.25**	2.32**	2.09**
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	.52	.34*	.34*	.32*	.20**
Female	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Likelihood-Ratio χ^2		11.76*	14.97*	16.18**	17.91**
Degrees of Freedom		6	7	7	7

Note: All measures are dichotomous with a value of "1" assigned to negative experiences. For hearing insults about the inability to speak English and Spanish, a "1" corresponds to "very often" or "occasionally" and a "0" corresponds to "rarely" or "never." The likelihood-ratio χ^2 is the median value across imputed data files.

*
 p < .10,

**
 p < .05