REFUGEES' EMPLOYMENT, JOB AND LIFE SATISFACTION, PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM, AND EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

by

GINA MARIA FURR

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Counseling Psychology
and Human Services
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science

December 2008

"Refugees' Employment, Job and Life Satisfaction, Perceptions of Racism, and Experiences of Discrimination," a thesis prepared by Gina Maria Furr in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science degree in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Human Services. This thesis has been approved and accepted by:

Krista M. Chronister, Chair of the Examining Committee

11-25-08
Date

Committee in Charge: Dr. Krista M. Chronister, Chair

Accepted by:

Dean of the Graduate School

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Gina Maria Furr for the degree of Master of Science

in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Human Services

to be taken December 2008

Title: REFUGEES' EMPLOYMENT, JOB AND LIFE SATISFACTION, PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM, AND EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

Approved: _____
Krista M. Chronister

I utilized an ecological framework to explore the relationships between Cuban and Haitian refugees' perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination, perceptions of racism in the United States, education, and satisfaction with life in the U.S. when they first immigrated and their employment status, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and overall U.S. life satisfaction two years after immigrating. Multiple linear regression analyses showed that the proposed models (a) significantly predicted refugees' job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, income satisfaction, and life satisfaction at Time 2, but not employment; (b) significantly predicted Cubans' job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and pay satisfaction at Time 2; (c) significantly predicted Haitians' pay satisfaction at Time 2; and (d) significantly predicted males' and females' job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, income satisfaction, and life satisfaction at Time 2. Additional analyses confirmed ethnic

and sex differences in model results. Implications for research, theory, and practice are discussed.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Gina Maria Furr

PLACE OF BIRTH: Lincoln, Nebraska USA

DATE OF BIRTH: May 25, 1982

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene OR

University of Nebraska – Lincoln, Lincoln NE

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Science, Counseling Psychology and Human Services, December 2008, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, Psychology, 2005, University of Nebraska – Lincoln

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Multicultural Issues

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Outreach Specialist, University of Oregon Counseling and Testing Center, 2008

Graduate Assistant, University of Oregon Bias Response Team, 2006-2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Assistant Professor Krista Chronister for her assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. In addition, special thanks are due to Dr. Alejandro Portes, director at the Center for Migration and Development at Princeton University, who provided support and guidance in using data they had collected and archived. I also thank my friends and family for their patience, understanding, and support.

This thesis is dedicated to my family and loved ones who are Cuban refugees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that 37 million immigrants live currently in the United States (Martin, 2006). Approximately half of all U.S. immigrants are women and 20 million are not yet U.S. citizens (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). There are more than 20 million immigrants working in the U.S., which makes up approximately 15 percent of the total U.S. workforce (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). As "economic actors" (Steir, 1991) seeking to improve their circumstances, many immigrants arrive to the U.S. with economic goals and expectations. In fact, immigrant workers earn more than $300 billion each year in wages and pay over $100 million each year in taxes, making the economic contributions of immigrants larger than the cost of welfare services for immigrants (Bhagat & London, 1999).

Despite immigrants' and refugees' contributions to the U.S. economy, the national cultural context in which they arrive is often unwelcoming and riddled with barriers that denigrate and impede their ability to obtain sufficient employment, attain financial stability, and live healthy and satisfying lives. These barriers include, but are not limited to, racism, xenophobia, classism, and sexism (Coates & Carr, 2005; Dumper, 2002; Kogan, in press); forms of discrimination that negatively impact immigrants' self-esteem, perceived value, and self-confidence (Dumper, 2002). Moreover, discrimination

negatively impacts immigrants' and refugees' economic (Coates & Carr, 2005; Stier, 1991), physical (Rivera, Torres, & Carre, 1997), social (Zlobina et al., 2006), and psychological development (Aroian et al., 1998; Aycan, 1999; Aycan & Berry, 1996; Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005; Canabal & Quiles, 1995; Dumper, 2002).

Although immigrants and refugees are critical to the U.S. economy and make up a large part of the national workforce, few scholars have examined immigrants' and refugees' employment and vocational development experiences in the U.S. The need for such research is critical as un(der)employment rates continue to be highest for first generation immigrants and foreign-born non-U.S. citizens (Slack & Jensen, 2007). A greater understanding of immigrants' and refugees' employment experiences also may allow researchers and service providers to foster immigrants' economic development, and more effectively target those individual and contextual factors that place immigrants at greater risk for un(der)employment or unjust and unfair employment across time and contexts.

A primary value of the fields of counseling and vocational psychology is to conduct research and provide services that challenge the status quo, foster distributive justice, and illuminate systems of oppression that hinder individuals' and communities' abilities to pursue the good life as they define it (Blustein, McWhirter, & Perry, 2005; Nelson, Prilleltensky, & MacGillivary, 2001; Prilleltensky, 1997; Vera & Speight, 2003). Greater attention to immigrants' and refugees' employment and vocational development, which is intimately linked to the health and economic outcomes of these populations, is clearly aligned with this value.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to explore the relationships between refugees' perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination, perceptions of racism in the United States, prior education, and satisfaction with life in the U.S. when they first immigrated and their employment status, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and overall U.S. life satisfaction two years after immigrating. The term 'refugee' was used to identify all individuals who arrive in the United States and who have been persecuted or have a founded fear of persecution in their home country, regardless of their U.S. determined legal status as 'immigrant,' 'refugee,' 'asylum seeker,' etc. (Yakushko, in press). Legal definitions of 'immigrants' and 'refugees' imply that there are drastic differences in the background contextual experiences between these groups; however, there are also drastic differences in background contextual experiences within these groups due to political, historical, and cultural circumstances. These within and between group differences are important to consider when working with a person who has been labeled by the government as an 'immigrant' or 'refugee' because their assigned label may not be an accurate indicator of that individual's history and experience.

This paper will contribute to the dearth of literature on refugee populations and their employment and vocational experiences by using a large, longitudinal dataset to examine how Haitian and Cuban refugees' perceptions of discrimination and life satisfaction are related to their employment outcomes over time, and explore between and within group similarities and differences in such perceptions and outcomes. Findings from this study may contribute to scholars' understanding of what initial immigration

perceptions influence the short- and longer-term employment outcomes of refugees, and those contextual factors that are most salient to refugees' vocational development soon after arriving to the United States. Furthermore, my definition of 'refugee' is based on an individual's experience and fear of persecution in his/her home country, and not on the political label. Consequently, this study examines the influence of specific contextual barriers that are relevant to this specific population. It is hoped that sample focus and study findings, therefore, may be more useful for clinicians and researchers who work with persons who come to the United States to escape persecution.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Vocational Development Within Context

My conceptualization of refugees' employment experiences was guided by a contextual model of human development; in particular, Urie Bronfenbrenner's ecological model (1979, 1989). Contextual frameworks, like the ecological model, have enhanced scholars' understanding of human development as a fluid process that involves the bi-directional interaction between the individual and the multiple contexts in which the individual is embedded (see Figure 1). Moreover, the ecological model purports that an individual is constantly changing, and is not merely acted upon, but rather exerts influence on his/her environment. Studying the human experience across contexts has proven most effective at understanding human behavior and in creating effective interventions because the dynamic interactions among individual, family, sociocultural, and sociopolitical factors are considered. Contextual conceptualization and intervention are critical because the development and expression of human behavior is influenced directly by the environments in which the individual is developing, and the expression of human behavior may change/ look different depending on the context in which the behavior is observed (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Chronister, McWhirter, Kerewsky, 2004; Stormshak & Dishion, 2002).

Contextual frameworks have guided vocational theory development as well. The most recent advancement in vocational theory is Social Cognitive Career Theory (see Figure 2) (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994, 2000), which conceptualizes vocational development as a process influenced by individual factors (e.g., personality, sex, temperament), contextual barriers and affordances (e.g., access to economic resources), and learning experiences (e.g., educational experiences, relationships with role models). A contextual model like SCCT more comprehensively captures the multifaceted career development needs and experiences of groups that experience oppression (e.g., LGBTQ, ethnic minorities, and individuals who are incarcerated) (Chartrand & Rose, 1996; Chronister & McWhirter, 2003, 2006; Morrow, Gore, & Campbell, 1996). Moreover, a contextual model allows scholars to identify targets of intervention that are associated with both the individual and the context; such a conceptualization prevents scholars from locating the source of career development struggles and failures with the individual, and working only with the individual to adjust to/ accept oppressive structures.

Considering context is critical to the study of refugees' economic and vocational development because their success is greatly influenced by their migration experiences in the country of origin context and in the host country context. Refugees' economic and vocational development may change dramatically and frequently due to migration and acculturation experiences, including the negotiation of ever-changing family, employment, and cultural contexts (Serdarevic & Chronister, 2005; Yakushko & Chronister, 2005). According to ecological theories of human development, refugees' experiences and perceptions that occur during the dramatic shift in context upon arrival in

the U.S. is a critical factor in determining future developmental paths, including vocational development. Additionally, ecological theories highlight the importance of assessing barriers and strengths at each level of the ecology.

The focus of this study, therefore, was on how refugees' early experiences in the U.S., including their early perceptions of barriers to employment, impact later vocational outcomes. I was interested specifically in how prior education, early employment, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perceptions of racism in the U.S., and initial satisfaction with life in the U.S. were related to employment, job satisfaction, income, income satisfaction, and satisfaction with U.S. life two years after migration. Although there is a growing body of literature that focuses on the influence of perceived discrimination on the career-development of various marginalized groups (Chartrand & Rose, 1996; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Morrow, Gore, & Campbell, 1996), there is a dearth of research (exception Barry & Gilo, 2003) on refugees' perceptions of vocational barriers after migration.

In summary, I used the ecological framework and extant literature on immigrants' and refugees' economic development to identify contextual variables that impact refugees' employment and life satisfaction in the U.S., and to conceptualize research questions and hypotheses. In the following sections, I summarize the existing literature regarding the influence of refugees' early migration experiences on their later development, adjustment, and acculturation as well as the different contextual barriers that impact refugees' vocational development, specifically.

A Focus on Early Migration Experiences

The chronosystem of the ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1989) represents the effects of time on individual development; changes within a person and in the environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). The cumulative effect of transitional periods is assumed to impact individual development well after the actual time of transition. For refugees, therefore, a contextual examination of their experiences means that the migration process is especially important to 'setting the stage' for continued development in the new country over time. Extant research and literature has, in fact, confirmed the importance of examining refugees' early migration experiences on their subsequent acculturation and development . For example, in an extensive longitudinal examination of Haitian refugees' migration experiences to the United States, Stepick and Portes (1986) concluded that the context in which refugees arrived (e.g., politically hostile, undocumented status, xenophobic) had a significant impact on refugees' employment outcomes even after accounting for prior education and English fluency. The influence of refugee status and acculturative stress on refugees' mental and physical health, and vocational outcomes also has been confirmed by other research with Puerto Rican, Korean, Turkish immigrant populations (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Canabal & Quiles, 1995; Kim et al, 1993; Rees, 2002).

Early migration experiences, along with early employment and experiences of life satisfaction in a new country are important because these experiences provide refugees' with learning opportunities, including skill development, efficacy development, and observation of role models -- all of which enhance refugees' self-esteem, satisfaction,

outcome expectations, and goal identification and planning (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). For example, if a refugee perceives early success in obtaining employment, SCCT asserts that the individual's self-efficacy will improve and expectations regarding his/her vocational success will be positive. In contrast, a refugee who is not satisfied with employment opportunities upon arrival is more likely to have poor employment future expectations and unmet goals.

In sum, extant research and literature confirms that refugees' employment and other life experiences soon after arrival in a new country are very impactful on future development, including refugees' future economic and employment outcomes, life satisfaction, and health. For the purposes of this study, I focused on examining the influence of early migration factors on refugees' employment and life satisfaction outcomes two years after migration. In the next section, I describe the specific early migration barrier perceptions that I included in this study.

Barriers to the Vocational Development of Refugees

The present study focused on how refugees' perceived discrimination upon arrival to the U.S., and the influence of these perceptions on refugees' employment and life satisfaction outcomes two years later. According to SCCT, people are influenced by the occurrence of events as well as how they perceive their environment and various events (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000). For example, a refugee may not be hired for a job or advance in a job because of racist and xenophobic hiring and other discriminatory employment practices. To understand the impact of an event, such as not being hired,

scholars must attend to the interaction between the objective event and the individual's perception. The objective event that occurred is that the refugee was not hired. The refugee's perception of the event, however, is subjective and will vary as different meanings are attributed to the event. The refugee may perceive the event as discriminatory, and consequently choose not to pursue similar job opportunities; or, the refugee may perceive the event as the result of him/her not having enough experience for the job, and consequently, s/he may choose to pursue other job experiences that make him/her more competitive for the original job position.

Regrettably, despite the economic and cultural contributions of refugees to U.S. society, refugees frequently experience vocational barriers associated with the macro- and exo-systems; specifically, xenophobia, racism, and the public policies rooted in such discrimination. Examples of discrimination toward refugees at the level of the macro- and exo-systems, include, for example: the United States government recently passed a bill for the construction of a 700-mile wall along the U.S.-Mexico border (Griswold, 2006); U.S. policies have been created to reinstate stringent immigration policies and erase the provisions created in the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (Martin, 2006); for more than a decade, the U.S. government has steadily decreased the number of refugees its admitted (Yakushko, in press); and public opinion polls conducted continually since 1965 have shown xenophobia to be on the rise in the U.S as a majority of Americans want both legal and illegal immigration reduced (Martin & Midgley, 2003). After September 11th, in particular, Americans have shown a heightened sensitivity to immigration and those who are foreign-born, with 65 percent of respondents to a poll

administered after 9/11 stating that they agreed that all immigration should be stopped (Martin & Midgley, 2003). Intense xenophobia, expressed often through a country's cultural values, policies, and the behaviors of its community members, presents significant contextual barriers to refugees' ability to secure just employment, become economically self-sufficient, and live a satisfying life (Yakushko, in press).

Government sponsored refugee resettlement programs also can present significant contextual barriers to refugees' long-term vocational development and life satisfaction. Although resettlement programs are important and meet some of the immediate needs of refugees, these resettlement programs fail to consider the long-term and multi-contextual economic and employment needs of U.S. refugees. Such programs are typically "quick fix" solutions that focus on finding refugees immediately available jobs and housing (McSpadden, 1998), and refugees who are able to find employment are often paid low wages for undesirable jobs, a phenomenon known as underemployment that is common-place among refugees (De Anda, 2005; Slack & Jensen, 2007). Ignoring refugees' contextual needs with 'quick fix' programs inhibits their longer-term social and economic development, fulfillment of their potential, and realization of their capacity to contribute to U.S. society.

Previous Vocational Research with Immigrants and Refugees

At the macro level, in addition to the barriers discussed above, research has shown employers prefer job candidates who are culturally similar to themselves and not from a stigmatized group (Coates & Carr, 2005). At the micro level, research has shown

that refugees' expectations of discrimination are more influential in career-decision making than self-efficacy beliefs (Barry & Grilo, 2003) regardless of education and experience. In other words, refugees who expect to be discriminated against may be less likely to seek gainful employment regardless of their beliefs about their ability to succeed in the job. As refugees learn to expect rejection at the job site, they may change their behavior to avoid rejection by not applying to desirable jobs, often resulting in decreased employment. Additionally, perceived discrimination and unemployment reduce refugees' psychological well-being (Blustein, 2006, 2008; Vinokurov, Birman, & Trickett, 2000; Werkeyten & Nekuee, 1999) as compromised goals, unmet expectations, limited resources, acculturative stress, and changes in identity negatively influence an individual's mental health.

Of the seriously limited extant research on refugees' vocational development, researchers have focused on acculturation processes and the influence of gender and nationality on vocational development and employment. In general, literature suggests looking at gender and nationality groups separately because they often have very different experiences and therefore very different development and adjustment processes (Padilla, 2003). Research with immigrants in the United States has shown that females experience more distress and perceive more discrimination than males throughout the general acculturation and adjustment process (Aroian, 1998). Research also shows that an immigrant's country-of-origin, and that country's relationship with the United States, are significant factors in predicting the amount of discrimination and psychological distress that an immigrant will be experience (Coates & Carr, 2005). Gender and country-of-

origin are important factors in refugee development partly because gender and country-of-origin are related to refugee privilege prior to and post migration (England, Garcia-Beaulieu, & Ross, 2004).

Study Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between refugee's experiences upon arrival to the United Stated with various employment outcomes and satisfaction with life in the United States two years later. Consistent with recommendations from literature suggesting that groups should be separated based on sex and nationality (Padilla, 2003), I analyzed the data for males and females as well as Cubans and Haitians. My goal was to examine and compare Cuban and Haitian, and males' and females' micro- and macro- perceptions of discrimination, prior education, early employment status, and early satisfaction with life in the United States with later employment status, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and later satisfaction with life in the United States. Due to the dearth of existing research on refugee's vocational development and employment experiences, the following research questions were formulated without hypotheses:

> *Research Question One:* Do Cuban and Haitian refugees differ on measures of employment, personal experiences of discrimination, perception of U.S. racism, satisfaction with life in the U.S., education, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and satisfaction with life the U.S.?

Research Question Two: Do female and male refugees differ on measures of employment, personal experiences of discrimination, perception of U.S. racism, satisfaction with life in the U.S., education, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and satisfaction with life the U.S.?

Research Question Three: Do refugees' early employment, personal experiences of discrimination, perception of U.S. racism, satisfaction with life in the U.S., and education completed predict their employment, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and satisfaction with life in the U.S. two years later?

Research Question Four: Do the predictive relationships as outlined in Research Question 3 differ for Haitian and Cuban refugees?

Research Questions Five: Do the predictive relationships as outlined in Research Question 3 differ for female and male refugees?

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Participants

I utilized a non-experimental and longitudinal extant data set, The Adaptation Process of Cuban and Haitian Refugees (APCHR; Portes & Stepick, 1985), to compare the adaptation experiences of male and female Cuban and Haitian refugees. Researchers have found previously that the APCHR sample is statistically representative of refugee households (defined as households containing at least one adult refugee) in South Florida (Portes & Stepick, 1985). Participants of the present study represented a subset of the original APCHR data and included 422 adults (35% female) living in various urban and rural South Florida communities. The present study sample included 290 Cubans who arrived to the United States from the port of Mariel in 1980, and 132 Haitians who arrived by boat during the same time period. Participants identified as "head of household" and ranged in age from 13 to 68 years ($M = 34.07$, $SD = 10.50$), and reported an average of 7.66 years of formal education ($SD = 4.49$). Participants' average self-reported English ability was 3.94 ($SD = 1.19$), based on a Likert scale ranging from 1-5, with lower numbers indicating greater English language ability. There was great diversity in the context of participants' migration experiences and these data are provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Sex, Country of Origin, Age, Education, and English for Groups in the Sample

	Whole Sample *M (SD)*	Male *M (SD)*	Female *M (SD)*	Cuban *M (SD)*	Haitian *M (SD)*
Sex					
Male (*n)*	269	269		218	51
Female (*n)*	151		151	70	81
Country of Origin					
Cuba (*n)*	290	218	70	290	
Haiti (*n)*	132	51	81		132
Age (years)	34.07 (10.50)	34.83 (10.00)	32.73 (11.24)	35.83 (9.87)	30.25 (10.85)
Self-Evaluation of English	3.94 (1.19)	3.84 (1.22)	4.12 (1.14)	4.01 (1.21)	3.78 (1.16)

Note. Self evaluation of English total score range = 1 - 5.

Table 2

Percentages of Top Four Responses to "Aspect of the US Most Attractive", "Reason for Coming to the US", and "Principle Problem Faced Since Arrival" for Various Groupings of the Whole Sample

	Male		Female		Cuban		Haitian	
Aspect of the US Most Attractive	General Freedom	21%	Attitudes of People	17%	General Freedom	28%	Attitudes of People	33%
	Personal Freedom	11%	Consumer Choice	10%	Consumer Choice	15%	Personal Freedom	16%
	Attitudes of People	11%	Personal Freedom	9%	US Economy	8%	Drug Use	10%
	Consumer Choice	6%	General Freedom	7%	Personal Freedom	8%	Financial Security	8%
Reason for Coming to the US	Communism	28%	Work Status	22%	Communism	44%	Work Status	33%
	Freedom	13%	Communism	16%	Freedom	17%	Better Life	16%
	Work Status	11%	Join Family	10%	Join Family	9%	Expected Mobility	13%
	Better Life	9%	Expected Mobility	9%	Political Prisoner	7%	Schools	7%

Table 2 (continued)

	Male		Female		Cuban		Haitian	
Principle	No Problems	25%	Unemployment	38%	English	17%	Unemployment	44%
Problem	Unemployment	22%	No Problems	18%	Unemployment	15%	No Problems	23%
Faced Since	English	11%	English	7%	Language Problem	11%	Lack Money	4%
Arrival	Language Problem	6%	Language Problem	5%	Obtaining Work	5%	Illness	4%

I identify here a few trends about participants' migration experiences. All participants reported that unemployment was the most frequent and largest problem faced since their arrival. Cuban participants reported most frequently that their reason for migration was due to a disagreement with the communist government and Haitian participants most frequently reported economic reasons for migrating (i.e. working conditions in Haiti, expectations for a better life, expectations of economic mobility).

Context of Immigration. The information in this section is adapted from the original articles utilizing the ACPHR data (Portes & Stepick 1985; Stepick & Portes, 1986) and provide a context for participants' migration experiences.

Together, the Cuban and Haitian inflows of 1980 added approximately 140,000 people to the U.S. population. Although this number probably represents no more than 10% of the combined total of legal and undocumented immigrants who migrated during that year, the Cuban and Haitian inflows had an enormous impact because of the manner of these immigrants' arrival to the U.S. and the associated publicity. The image of thousands of ragged refugees arriving in overloaded boats from Mariel and of desperately poor Haitians coming aboard barely seaworthy craft had a profound effect on the American public mind. A reluctant U. S. government refused to grant the new arrivals political asylum, admitting them only on a temporary basis as "entrants, status pending."

For this study's purposes, what is important are those aspects that made refugees' reception and settlement difficult and which lead to the expectation of a common and disadvantaged employment situation. Between the months of April and October of 1980,

124,779 Cubans arrived in the United States, more than in the preceding eight years. During May 1980 alone, more refugees arrived than in 1962, the previous record year of Cuban immigration. This unexpected exodus had its origin in the Cuban government's decision to permit the departure of disaffected and other "undesirable" elements from the island. Calling the deportees "scum," the Cuban government proceeded to insure that the label would stick by deliberately placing aboard the boats hundreds of individuals with criminal records, mental patients, and social deviants (Clark et al., 1981). Haitian emigration was not a government-sponsored initiative, but one promoted by private entrepreneurs offering sea transport for profit. Haitian boat arrivals had been detected by the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) previously, but the number of individual arriving by boat did not exceed an average of 3000 per year. In 1980, however, the number of Haitian arriving by boat swelled to over 15,000. Although still a manageable flow, this influx of boats took place closely after the Mariel boatlift, and consequently, the two Cuban and Haitian immigration waves and national groups became one in the public mind.

Coming in the midst of an economic recession, Mariel Cubans and Haitian boatpeople found employment opportunities highly restricted and confronted widespread hostility among domestic minorities with whom they were to compete in the labor market. The very negative images diffused by the media aggravated their situation. In particular, wide publicity was given to the "undesirables" arriving aboard the Mariel flotilla, despite the fact that subsequent research showed that hardened criminal, mental patients, and other deviants did not exceed 5% of the population (Bach et al., 1981;

Boswell & Curtis, 1984). Although never mentioned explicitly, the fact that Haitian arrivals were uniformly Black, and that the proportion of Blacks among Mariel entrants was several times greater than among earlier Cuban cohorts, also contributed significantly to a less-than-favorable reception (Bach et al., 1981; Portes et al., 1981).

Policies of the federal government toward the two new immigrant groups concentrated on stopping the inflows and easing the situation in the most heavily impacted communities. The Carter administration pressured the Cuban government to close Mariel and finally succeeded in October 1980. Simultaneously, a maritime interdiction program was initiated to turn back Haitian refugees at sea. At about the same time, the Federal Emergency Management Agency removed processing of new Cuban entrants from Miami and reorganized it in military camps in the North. Harsh conditions in the camps gave rise to a series of riots during the spring of 1981. In Miami, INS kept a substantial number of Haitians in detention and concentrated on demonstrating the economic motives of their migration and, hence, their ineligibility for political asylum. Several hundred Haitians were repatriated until litigation before the courts slowed the process (Stepick, 1982).

The federal government's refusal to grant either group political asylum deprived them of benefits under the new 1980 Refugee Act. Although subsequent congressional action alleviated this situation, emergency aid was limited and most of it lapsed by 1983. Lacking either jobs or government assistance, many refugees had to rely on private charity or invent jobs in a burgeoning "informal" economy in Miami.

The events of 1980 represented not only a remarkable episode in American immigration history, but they also left behind thousands of newcomers whose social and economic adaptation was most problematic. These were unwelcome immigrants, wanted apparently by no one and often lacking even families to receive them. Unlike other refugees arriving at the same time, whose resettlement was sponsored and guided from the start by the federal government, 1980 entrants had little access to any of the set paths of early adaptation. This situation did not foretell positive future outcomes.

Measures

Predictor Variables. All data for independent variables were collected during the initial participant interview. Data on perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination came from a single forced-answer question that assessed if the individual experienced discrimination by Euro-Americans since living in the U.S. Responses were coded 1 (yes), 2 (unsure), or 3 (no). Data on perceptions of U.S. racism were derived from a single forced-answer interview question that assessed whether or not the individual believed racism existed in the United States. Responses were coded 1 (yes), 2 (unsure), or 3 (no). Participants were also asked during the initial interview to state their initial feelings of satisfaction with life in the U.S. using a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied). Data regarding educational attainment were recorded as a continuous variable by asking participants the number of school years they completed. Participants were also asked to indicate their current employment state, with responses coded as 1 (employed) or 2 (unemployed).

Employment Outcomes. Participants were asked five questions to assess employment outcomes, and this employment outcome data were collected during a follow-up interview that took place two years after the initial interview. Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with their job, income, and life in the U.S. using a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied). Participants were also asked to state their employment status (1 = employed or 2 = not employed) and monthly income in U.S. dollars.

No information is available on the reliability or validity of the interview protocol.

Procedures

Participants were recruited for the original APCHR study using a stratified multi-stage method. To ensure representativeness, the sampling strata for Cuban participants were based on political divisions within Dade County and the surrounding rural areas. Haitian sampling strata were three adjacent counties where a majority of residents were Haitians. A target sample of 500 was used for each stratum. Neighborhood blocks known to contain high concentrations of the population of interest were identified as sampling areas. Neighborhood blocks in each area were numbered and then randomly selected. Every household on a selected block became eligible for inclusion in the original APCHR study.

Interviewers who spoke the native language of the potential qualifying participant contacted one member of each household, in-person, on selected blocks at the selected

household. Interviewers asked household members who were between the ages of 18 and 60, and who arrived in the U.S. in 1980 or after, to provide information about his/her self and other eligible household members. Interviewers obtained informed consent and emphasized that information would be kept confidential and not shared with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. All participant data were collected as part of a larger interview protocol created by the original authors (Portes & Stepck, 1985). The initial interview and a two-year follow up interview each lasted for approximately one hour and were conducted by trained research assistants. Both interviews were comprised of identical questions. Interviews were semi-structured and constructed first in Spanish, and then translated and tested in Haitian Creole. All interviews were conducted in the native language of the participant.

Data Analyses

Data analyses occurred in three phases. First, study variables were examined for systematic missing data and I examined boxplots and scatterplots to determine normality distribution of the data. Second, I used Pearson's *r* analyses to examine correlational relationships among study variables at both time points. I used independent samples *t*-tests to examine group differences on all study variables. I used Chi-square analyses to examine group differences for categorical variables (personal experiences of discrimination, perception of U.S. racism, and employment status). Third, I used multiple linear regressions to examine the model's ability to predict each outcome variable.

Finally, regression models were compared across sex and ethnic groups using Fisher's and Steiger's Z-tests.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Missing data ranged between 4.9% - 23.7% on individual items at T1, and between 39.8% and 57% on individual items at T2. Most missing data were from the Haitian sample. Only those participants who had data for both T1 and T2 were included in all study analyses; thus a total of 436 participants (n = 138 Haitian and n = 296 Cuban) of the original 1,015 (43%) were included in all study analyses. No information was available to explain the large amounts of missing data at T1 and the high rate of participant attrition at T2, but my hypothesis based on previous research is that the high attrition is most likely because refugee populations are a high risk and mobile group for whom tracking contact information is very difficult (Spring et al., 2003).

Data were normally distributed for all study variables except years of education completed (EDUC) and satisfaction with life in the U.S. at T1 (T1SATISF); both were slightly positively skewed. Given that multiple linear regression is robust to violations of the normality assumption with larger sample sizes (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), no data was transformed.

Results of intercorrelational analyses among all study variables are provided in Table 3. Pearson correlation results were small to moderate in strength. For both refugee

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Main Study Variables for Whole Refugee Sample (N = 436)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. EDUC	7.66	4.49	–									
2. RACISM	1.68	.47	.01	–								
3. DISCRIM	2.11	.99	.08	.40*	–							
4. T1SATISF	2.14	1.12	-.25*	-.28*	-.36*	–						
5. T1EMPLOY	1.40	.49	-.23*	-.13*	-.13*	.33*	–					
6. T2EMPLOY	1.03	.18	-.00	-.02	.13*	-.05	.09	–				
7. JOBSATISF	2.39	1.06	-.19*	-.11*	-.14*	.27*	.28*	.28*	–			
8. PAYSATISF	2.81	1.06	-.16*	-.11*	-.11*	.26*	.25*	.20*	.75*	–		
9. INCOME	788.41	465.03	.27*	.04	.08	-.23*	-.27*	-.20*	-.46*	-.45*	–	
10. T2SATSIF	2.14	1.05	-.33*	-.18*	-.27*	.50*	.23*	.05	.42*	.44*	-.26*	–

Note. Variable score ranges: EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM (perception of racism in the United States) = 1-3; DISCRIM (perception of personal experiences of discrimination) = 1-3; T1SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1) = 1-5; T1EMPLOY (employment at time 1), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; T2EMPLOY (employment at time 2), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; JSATISF (job satisfaction) = 1-5; PAYSATISF (pay satisfaction) = 1-5; INCOME (monthly income) = amount of monthly income in US dollars; T2SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 2) = 1-5.
*$p < .05$

groups, predictor variables were significantly correlated with criterion variables. Some general correlational trends worth noting include: the strongest correlation ($r = .75$, $p < .05$) was found at T2 between income (INCOME) and job satisfaction (JOBSATISF), indicating that increased satisfaction with income was directly correlated with increased job satisfaction at T2; level of education prior to arrival (EDUC) was moderately and negatively correlated with employment at T1 (T1EMPLOY) ($r = -.23$, $p < .05$), suggesting that more education completed prior to migration was associated with employment soon after arrival. There was no significant correlation, however, between education and employment at Time 2 (T2EMPLOY), indicating that employment two years after arrival was not related to prior education completed.

Satisfaction with U.S. life at T1 (T1SATISF) was correlated with many variables, indicating that higher life satisfaction at T1 was associated with higher education levels, less perceived discrimination (DISCRIM), employment at T1, and higher employment satisfaction. Interestingly, although U.S. life satisfaction was negatively correlated with employment at T1 it was not significantly related to employment at T2.

Perception of racism \ in the U.S. (RACISM) was negatively correlated with job, pay, and U.S. life satisfaction at T2, and also with employment at T1, indicating that those who perceived more racism in the U.S. were likely to be unemployed and less satisfied with their jobs, pay, and life in the U.S. at T2. Correlations found for perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination were similar to those found for perceptions of racism in the U.S., indicating that those who reported more experiences of discrimination were also more likely to be unemployed at the time and to be less satisfied with their

jobs, pay, and life in the U.S. at T2. Perception of personal experiences of discrimination was also positively correlated with employment at T2 ($r = .130, p < .05$), but negatively correlated with employment at T1 ($r = -.134, p < .05$), indicating that stronger perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination were correlated with being unemployed at T1 and with being employed at T2. See Tables 4 and 5 for a summary of correlations for ethnic and sex groups.

Research Question One

There were significant group mean differences between Cubans and Haitians on all studyvariables. Independent samples *t*-tests used to determine group differences at T1 indicated that Cubans completed higher education levels compared to Haitians [Cubans: $M = 9.00$, $SD = 4.00$; Haitians: $M = 4.77$, $SD = 4.13$; $t(415) = 9.92, p < .05$]; perceived less racism in the U.S. [Cubans: $M = 1.78$, $SD = .42$; Haitians: $M = 1.46$, $SD = .50$; $t(386) = 6.53, p < .05$]; perceived fewer personal experiences of discrimination [Cubans: $M = 9.00$, $SD = 4.00$; Haitians: $M = 4.77$, $SD = 4.13$; $t(415) = 9.92, p < .05$]; were more satisfied with life in the U.S. at T1 [Cubans: $M = 1.74$, $SD = .85$; Haitians: $M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.13$; $t(406) = -13.34, p < .05$]; and were more likely to be employed at T1 compared to Haitians [$\chi^2 (1, n = 253) = 90.12, p < .05$].

Chi-square results used to determine group differences in employment at T2 indicated that Cubans were more likely to be unemployed compared to Haitians [$\chi^2 (1, n = 14) = 10.29, p < .05$]. Independent samples *t*-tests used to determine group differences on all continuous variables at T2 indicated that Cubans had higher incomes compared to

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Main Study Variables for Cuban (n = 296) and Haitian (n = 138) Refugees

Variables	M^1	SD^1	M^2	SD^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. EDUC	9.00	4.00	4.77	4.13	–	-.15*	-.23*	-.03	-.05	-.06	-.11	-.09	.22*	-.13*
2. RACISM	1.78	.42	1.46	.50	-.18	–	.27*	-.18*	-.09	-.07	-.04	-.02	-.08	-.04
3. DISCRIM	2.41	.91	1.32	.74	.00	.16	–	-.22*	.01	.13*	-.02	-.07	-.02	-.07
4. T1SATISF	1.74	.85	3.10	1.13	.01	-.07	.11	–	.12*	.03	.25*	.22*	-.18*	.45*
5. T1EMPLOY	1.30	.46	1.61	.49	-.26*	.06	-.02	.39*	–	.15*	.21*	.16*	-.25*	.07
6. T2EMPLOY	1.04	.21	1.01	.09	.01	–	-.05	-.09	.07	–	.40*	.30*	-.25*	.14*
7. JOBSATISF	2.18	1.02	2.85	.98	.02	-.01	.04	-.03	.20*	.01	–	.75*	-.46*	.37*
8. PAYSATISF	2.61	1.02	3.26	1.02	.04	-.04	.33*	.02	.22*	-.02	.68*	–	-.47*	.36*
9. INCOME	866.50	519.63	616.84	236.91	.07	.09	-.05	.06	-.13	-.05	-.33*	-.26*	–	-.19*
10. T2SATSIF	1.77	.87	2.96	.92	-.11	.04	.10	.03	.14	.10	.24*	.35*	-.04	–

Note. Correlations for Cuban refugees are above the diagonal and correlations for Haitian refugees are below the diagonal. M_1 and SD_1 = means and standard deviations for Cuban refugees; M_2 and SD_2 = means and standard deviations for Haitian refugees. Variable score ranges: EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM (perception of racism in the United States) = 1-3; DISCRIM (perception of personal experiences of discrimination) = 1-3; T1SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1) = 1-5; T1EMPLOY (employment at time 1), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; T2EMPLOY (employment at time 2), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; JSATISF (job satisfaction) = 1-5; PAYSATISF (pay satisfaction) = 1-5; INCOME (monthly income) = amount of monthly income in US dollars; T2SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 2) = 1-5.
A, *t* tests and χ^2 results showed all variable means were significantly different between ethnic groups, $p < .05$
*$p < .05$

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Main Study Variables for Male (n = 269) and Female (n = 151) Refugees

Variables	M^1	SD^1	M^2	SD^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. EDUC	8.59	4.23	6.02$^+$	4.48	–	-.12	-.09	-.14*	-.07	.01	-.11	-.11	.23*	-.21*
2. RACISM	1.70	.46	1.66	.48	-.19*	–	.41*	-.29*	-.09	.06	-.06	-.10	.02	-.16*
3. DISCRIM	2.20	.98	1.95$^+$	1.00	.25*	.37*	–	-.34*	.01	.15*	-.16*	-.18*	.13	-.25*
4. T1SATISF	1.95	1.02	2.50$^+$	1.21	-.30*	-.28*	-.36*	–	.22*	-.09	.22*	.22*	-.22*	.49*
5. T1EMPLOY	1.27	.45	1.62$^+$	.49	-.28*	-.17*	-.26	.36*	–	.20	.24*	.14*	-.22*	.09
6. T2EMPLOY	1.03	.18	1.03$^+$	.18	-.02	-.15	.11	.02	.07	–	.30*	.21*	-.20*	.09
7. JOBSATISF	2.24	1.02	2.67$^+$	1.07	-.20*	-.20*	-.05	.28*	.22*	.27*	–	.75*	-.44*	.40*
8. PAYSATISF	2.63	1.01	3.15$^+$	1.09	-.10	-.12	.07	.23*	.26*	.18*	.72*	–	-.43	.43*
9. INCOME	892.28	520.20	599.84$^+$	259.35	.13	.08	-.23*	-.04	-.13	-.28*	-.49*	-.46*	–	-.26*
10. T2SATSIF	1.97	.98	2.44$^+$	1.09	-.41*	-.21*	-.26*	.44*	.30*	-.01	.39*	.39*	-.10	–

Note. Correlations for male refugees are above the diagonal and correlations for female refugees are below the diagonal. M_1 and SD_1 = means and standard deviations for male refugees; M_2 and SD_2 = means and standard deviations for female refugees. Variable score ranges: EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM (perception of racism in the United States) = 1-3; DISCRIM (perception of personal experiences of discrimination) = 1-3; T1SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1) = 1-5; T1EMPLOY (employment at time 1), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; T2EMPLOY (employment at time 2), 1 = employed, 2 = unemployed; JSATISF (job satisfaction) = 1-5; PAYSATISF (pay satisfaction) = 1-5; INCOME (monthly income) = amount of monthly income in US dollars; T2SATISF (satisfaction with U.S. life at time 2) = 1-5.

+ *t* tests or χ^2 results showed means were significantly different between ethnic groups, $p < .05$

*$p < .05$

Haitians [Cubans: $M = 1.04$, $SD = .21$; Haitians: $M = 1.01$, $SD = .09$; $t(420) = 1.99$, $p < .05$]; more job satisfaction [Cubans: $M = 2.18$, $SD = 1.02$; Haitians: $M = 2.85$, $SD = .98$; $t(420) = -6.32$, $p < .05$], more pay satisfaction [Cubans: $M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.02$; Haitians: $M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.02$; $t(420) = -6.06$, $p < .05$], higher income [Cubans: $M = 866.50$, $SD = 519.63$; Haitians: $M = 616.84$, $SD = 236.91$; $t(420) = 5.27$, $p < .05$], and more satisfaction with life in the U.S. [Cubans: $M = 1.77$, $SD = .87$; Haitians: $M = 2.96$, $SD = .92$; $t(420) = -12.84$, $p < .05$].

Research Question Two

There were significant group mean differences on study variables for males and females. At T1, male participants had more education [Males: $M = 8.59$, $SD = 4.23$; Females: $M = 6.02$, $SD = 4.48$; $t(415) = 5.83$, $p < .05$], had perceived fewer personal experiences of discrimination [Males: $M = 2.20$, $SD = .98$; Females: $M = 1.95$, $SD = 1.00$; $t(336) = 2.19$, $p < .05$], and were more likely to be employed [$\chi^2 (1, n = 253) = 74.19$, p . 05]. At T2 males had higher incomes [Males: $M = 892.28$, $SD = 520.20$; Females: $M = 599.84$, $SD = 529.35$; $t(418) = 6.47$, $p < .05$], higher job satisfaction [Males: $M = 2.24$, $SD = 1.02$; Females: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.07$; $t(418) = -4.09$, $p < .05$], higher pay satisfaction [Males: $M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.01$; Females: $M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.09$; $t(418) = -4.91$, $p < .05$], and higher satisfaction with life in the U.S. [Males: $M = 1.97$, $SD = .98$; Females: $M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.10$; $t(418) = -4.51$, $p < .05$]. Males and females did not differ significantly in perceptions of racism existing in the U.S. at T1 and employment rates at T2. A summary of group comparisons is reported in Tables 4 and 5.

Research Question Three

For the first regression model I entered the following T1 variables as predictors: employment, completed education, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perception of racism in the U.S., and satisfaction with life in the U.S. Employment at T2 was entered as the criterion variable. The regression model accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in employment at T2 [$R^2 = .04$, $F(5,299) = 2.64$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors showed that perceived personal experiences of discrimination [t (299) = 2.54, $p < .05$] and employment [t (299) = 2.10, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the model. Perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 2% ($.15^2 = .02$) of the variance in employment at T2, employment at T1 accounted for 1% ($.12^2 = .01$) of the variance in employment at T2, while the other predictors accounted for the remaining 1% of variance explained. Interpretation of the contribution of employment at T1 to the model is difficult because it did not show a bivariate correlation with the criterion variable. Model results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Employment at Time 2 for Whole Refugee Sample

	Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	B	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
RACISM	-0.03	-0.01	-0.09	-0.09
DISCRIM	0.03	0.16*	0.14	0.15*
T1EMPLOY	0.04	0.13*	0.12	0.12*
T1SATISF	-0.12	-0.08	-0.07	-0.07

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

For the second model, I entered the following T1 variables as predictors: employment, completed education, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perception of racism in the U.S., and satisfaction with life in the U.S. Job satisfaction at T2 was entered as the criterion variable. This regression model accounted for 14.5% of the variance in job satisfaction [$R^2 = .145$, $F(5,299) = 10.14$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors showed that T1 employment [t (299) = 3.88, $p < .05$], completed education [t (299) = -2.24, $p < .05$], and T1 satisfaction with life in the U.S. [t (299) = -2.13, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the

model. Employment at T1 accounted for 5% ($.22^2 = .05$) of the variance explained, while completed education accounted for 2% ($-.13^2 = .02$), satisfaction with life in the U.S. at T1 accounted for 1% ($.12^2 = .01$), and the other variables accounted for the remaining 6% of variance explained. Judgments about the relative importance of the predictors are difficult because they are significantly correlated. The correlations among the predictor variables entered into the second regression model ranged from -.12 to -.38. Model results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction for Refugees

	Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.03	-0.13*	-0.12	-0.13*
RACISM	-0.03	0.13	-0.01	-0.01
DISCRIM	-0.07	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07
T1EMPLOY	0.47	0.22*	0.21	0.22*
T1SATISF	-0.03	-0.13*	0.11	0.12*

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

For the third model, I entered the following T1 variables as predictors: employment, completed education, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perception of racism in the U.S., and satisfaction with life in the U.S. Pay satisfaction at T2 was entered as the criterion variable. This model accounted for 14.1% of the variance in pay satisfaction [$R^2 = .141$, $F(8,192) = 9.81$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors showed that T1 employment [t (299) = 3.88, $p < .05$] and T1 satisfaction with life in the U.S. [t (299) = -2.13, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the model. Employment at T1 accounted for 4% ($.20^2 = .04$) of the explained variance in pay satisfaction, T1 satisfaction with life in the U.S. accounted for 3% ($.16^2 = .03$), while the other variables accounted for the remaining 7.1% of variance explained. Judgments about the relative importance of the predictors are difficult because they are significantly correlated. The correlations among the predictor variables ranged from -.12 to -.38. Model results are summarized in Table 8.

For the fourth model, I entered the following T1 variables as predictors: employment, completed education, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perception of racism in the U.S., and satisfaction with life in the U.S. Income at T2 was entered as the criterion variable. This model accounted for 12.5% of the variance in income [$R^2 = .125$, $F(5,299) = 8.57$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors showed that T1 employment [t (299) = -4.03, $p < .05$] and competed education [t (299) = 2.91, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the model. Early employment accounted for 5% ($-.22.^2 = .05$) of the explained variance in income, T1 satisfaction with life in the U.S. accounted for 3% ($.17^2 = .03$), while the

other variables accounted for the remaining 4.5% of variance explained. Judgments about the relative importance of the predictors are difficult because they are significantly correlated. The correlations among the predictor variables ranged from -.12 to -.38. Model results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 8

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Pay Satisfaction for Refugees

	Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.02	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07
RACISM	-0.06	-0.03	-0.02	-0.03
DISCRIM	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
T1EMPLOY	0.45	0.21*	0.19*	0.20*
T1SATISF	0.19	0.20*	0.17*	0.18*

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 9

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monthly Income for Refugees

	Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	17.95	0.17*	0.16	0.17*
RACISM	-6.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
DISCRIM	18.94	0.04	0.04	0.04
T1EMPLOY	-229.21	-0.23*	-0.22	-0.23*
T1SATISF	-28.31	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

For the fifth model, I entered the following T1 variables as predictors: employment at T1, completed education, perception of personal experiences of discrimination, perception of racism in the U.S., and satisfaction with life in the U.S.. Satisfaction with life in the U.S. at T2 was entered as the criterion variable. This model accounted for 34.5% of the variance in satisfaction with life in the U.S. [R^2=.345, $F(5,299) = 31.44, p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors showed that T1 satisfaction with life in the U.S. [t (299) = 7.48, $p < .05$] and completed education [t (299) = -4.39, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the model. Satisfaction with life in the U.S. at T1 accounted for 16% ($.49^2 = .16$) of the

variance explained, prior education accounted for 6% ($.17^2 = .03$), while the other variables accounted for the remaining 10.5% of the variance explained for T2 satisfaction with life in the U.S. Judgments about the relative importance of the predictors are difficult because they are significantly correlated. The correlations among the predictor variables ranged from -.12 to .54. Model results are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Satisfaction with Life in the U.S. at Time 2 for Refugees

	Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.05	-0.22*	-0.21	-0.25*
RACISM	-0.10	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05
DISCRIM	-0.09	-0.09	-0.08	-0.10
T1EMPLOY	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.03
T1SATISF	0.38	0.42*	0.35	0.40*

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Comparing Groups by Ethnicity

I ran the exact same regression models, as described in the previous section, to examine ethnic differences between Cubans and Haitians. The regression models predicted all employment outcomes for the Cuban group; however, the models predicted only pay satisfaction for the Haitian group. Regression results are summarized for Cubans and Haitians in Tables 11-15.

Among Cubans, the first regression model accounted for 5% of the variance in T2 employment for Cubans [$R^2 = .05$, $F(5,220) = 2.25$, $p < .05$]. The model could not be examined for Haitians due to homogeneity of variance on T2 employment. Homogeneity of variance was due to the fact that only one Haitian who was unemployed at T2 had complete data, therefore, the model predicting T2 employment could not be run. Examination of the relative strength of the individual predictors among Cubans showed that only T1 employment [$t(220) = 3.88$, $p < .05$] made a statistically significant contribution to the model. Employment at T1 accounted for 2% ($.14^2 = .02$) of the explained variance in T2 employment, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 3% of variance explained.

The second regression model accounted for 12% of the variance in job satisfaction for Cubans [$R^2 = .12$, $F(5,220) = 6.21$, $p < .05$], but was insignificant for Haitians [$R^2 = .06$, $F(5,73) = .94$, $p > .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among Cubans showed that early employment [t (220) = 3.68, $p <$ .05], early satisfaction with life in the U.S. [t (220) = 2.57, $p < .05$], and completed education [t (220) = -2.05, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the

Table 11

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Employment at Time 2 for Cuban and Haitian Refugees

	Cuban				Haitian			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-	-	-	-
RACISM	-0.05	-0.12	-0.11	-0.11	-	-	-	-
DISCRIM	0.03	0.13	0.12	0.12	-	-	-	-
T1EMPLOY	0.06	0.14*	0.14	0.14*	-	-	-	-
T1SATISF	-0.01	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-	-	-	-

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 12

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction for Cuban and Haitian Refugees

	Cuban				Haitian			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.04	-0.14*	-0.13	-0.14*	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02
RACISM	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
DISCRIM	-0.07	-0.06	-0.05	-0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
T1EMPLOY	0.53	0.23*	0.23	0.24*	0.49	0.27	0.23	0.23
T1SATISF	0.22	0.17*	0.16	0.17*	-0.09	-0.11	-0.10	-0.10

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 13

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monthly Income for Cuban and Haitian Refugees

	Cuban				Haitian			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	21.63	.16*	0.16	0.16*	6.46	0.12	0.11	0.11
RACISM	-85.01	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	66.10	0.14	0.13	0.14
DISCRIM	23.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	-34.18	-0.11	-0.11	-0.11
T1EMPLOY	-315.15	-0.28*	-0.27	-0.28*	-78.13	-0.17	-0.14	-0.15
T1SATISF	-62.99	-0.10	-0.09	-0.10	33.02	0.16	0.14	0.15

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 14

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Satisfaction with Life in the U.S. at Time 2 for Cuban and Haitian Refugees

	Cuban				Haitian			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.03	-0.12	-0.11	-0.12	-0.03	-0.16	-0.15	-0.15
RACISM	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	-0.18	-0.10	-0.10	-0.10
DISCRIM	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
T1EMPLOY	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.35	0.19	0.16	0.17
T1SATISF	0.42	0.40*	0.38	0.39*	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.10

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 15

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Pay Satisfaction for Cuban and Haitian Refugees

	Cuban				Haitian			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.03	-0.02	-0.11	-0.12	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.10
RACISM	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.03	-0.26	-0.12	-0.12	-0.13
DISCRIM	-0.13	-0.11	-0.10	-0.11	0.45	0.32*	0.32	0.33*
T1EMPLOY	0.46	0.21*	0.20	0.21*	0.65	0.31*	0.27	0.29*
T1SATISF	0.22	0.17*	0.16	0.17*	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

model. Early employment accounted for 6% ($.24^2 = .06$) of the variance explained, early satisfaction with life in the U.S. accounted for 3% ($.17^2 = .03$), and prior education accounted for 2% ($-.14^2 = .02$), while the other variables accounted for the remaining 1% of the variance explained for job satisfaction.

The third regression model accounted for 12% of the variance in income for Cubans [$R^2 = .18$, $F(5,220) = 9.54$, $p < .05$], but was insignificant for Haitians [$R^2 = .07$, $F(5,73) = 1.07$, $p > .05$]. Examination of the relative strength of the individual predictors among Cubans showed that early employment [$t(220) = -4.29$, $p < .05$] and completed education [$t(220) = 2.46$, $p < .05$] made statistically significant contributions to the model. Early employment accounted for 8% ($-.28^2 = .08$) of the variance explained and prior education accounted for 3% ($.16^2 = .03$), while the other variables accounted for the remaining 1% of the variance in income.

The fourth regression model accounted for 18% of the variance in U.S. life satisfaction for Cubans [R^2=.18, $F(5,220) = 9.54$, $p < .05$], but was insignificant for Haitians [$R^2 = .11$, $F(5,73) = 1.82$, $p > .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among Cubans showed that early satisfaction with life in the U.S. was the only significant contributor to the model [$t(220) = 6.24$, $p < .05$] accounting for 15% ($-.28^2 = .08$) of the variance explained by the model, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 3% of the variance explained for U.S. life satisfaction.

For Cubans, the fifth regression model accounted for 11% of the variance in pay satisfaction [$R^2 = .11$, $F(5,220) = 5.52$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among Cubans showed that early employment [$t(220) = 3.20$, $p <$

.05] and early satisfaction with U.S. life [$t(220) = 2.52, p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early employment accounted for 4% ($.21^2 = .04$) and early U.S. life satisfaction for 3% ($.17^2 = .03$) of the variance explained by the model, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 4% of explained variance. For Haitians, this model accounted for 19% of the variance explained for pay satisfaction [$R^2 = .19, F(5,73) = 3.42, p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among Haitians showed that perceived personal experiences of discrimination [$t(73) = 2.99, p < .05$] and early employment [$t(73) = 6.24, p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 11% ($.33^2 = .11$) and early employment for 8% ($.28^2 = .08$) of the variance explained by the model.

Research Question Four. I used Fisher's Z-test to compare model fit for Cubans and Haitians. Results revealed that there was no significant difference between the predictive performance for pay satisfaction for these two groups , $Z = .90, p > .05$. A comparison of the model structures between the two groups was also conducted by applying the Cuban model to the data from the Haitian refugees and comparing the resulting "crossed" R with the "direct" R originally obtained from the Cuban group. Using Steiger's Z-test, the direct $R = .230$ and the crossed $R = -.088$ were significantly different, $Z = 3.48, p < .01$, which indicated that the model was structured differently for the two populations. Although there was no significant difference in model performance between the Cuban and Haitian groups, the contributions of each of the factors differed significantly for these groups; T1 employment and T1 satisfaction with U.S. life

predicted pay satisfaction for Cubans, and T1 perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination and T1 employment predicted pay satisfaction for Haitians.

Comparing Groups by Sex

I ran all regression models as described in previous sections for males and females. The regression models predicted all employment outcomes for males and many outcomes for females; however, the models did not predict employment for females. Tables 16-20 summarize the results.

For males, the first regression model accounted for 6% of the variance in employment [$R^2 = .06$, $F(5,198) = 2.30$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors for males showed that early employment [$t(198) = 2.31$, $p < .05$] and early satisfaction with U.S. life [$t(198) = -2.11$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early employment accounted for 3% ($.16^2 = .03$) and early U.S. life satisfaction for 2% ($.15^2 = .02$) of the variance explained by the model, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 1% of explained variance. For females, this model was not significant [$R^2 = .19$, $F(5,73) = 3.42$, $p < .05$].

For males, the second regression model accounted for 12% of the variance in job satisfaction [$R^2 = .12$, $F(5,198) = 5.21$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among males showed that early employment [$t(198) = 3.38$, $p < .05$] and perceived personal experiences of discrimination [$t(198) = -2.19$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early employment accounted for 5% ($.23^2 =$

Table 16

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Employment at Time 2 for Male and Female Refugees

	Male				Female			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.04
RACISM	-0.02	-0.05	-0.04	-0.04	-0.08	-0.21	-0.19	-0.19
DISCRIM	0.01	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.28	0.25	0.25
T1EMPLOY	0.06	0.16*	0.16	0.16*	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.02
T1SATISF	-0.03	-0.17*	-0.15	-0.15*	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.08

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 17

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction for Male and Female Refugees

	Male				Female			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.02	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.25*	-0.22	-0.24*
RACISM	0.08	0.04	0.03	0.04	-0.17	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08
DISCRIM	-0.17	-0.17*	-0.15	-0.15*	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.12
T1EMPLOY	0.53	0.23*	0.23	0.23*	0.35	0.21	0.15	0.17
T1SATISF	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.17

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 18

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Pay Satisfaction for Male and Female Refugees

	Male				Female			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.02	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.02	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07
RACISM	-0.07	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.06	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03
DISCRIM	-0.16	-0.15*	-0.14	-0.14*	0.24	0.22*	0.20	0.22*
T1EMPLOY	0.36	0.16*	0.15	0.16*	0.56	0.26*	0.23	0.25*
T1SATISF	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.27	0.30*	0.25	0.27*

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 19

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monthly Income for Male and Female Refugees

	Male				Female			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	18.71	0.15*	0.14	0.15*	12.74	0.21*	0.19	0.21*
RACISM	-22.75	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	48.34	0.09	0.08	0.09
DISCRIM	74.44	0.14	0.12	0.13	-93.47	-0.36*	-0.32	-0.33*
T1EMPLOY	-273.92	-.23*	-0.22	-0.23*	-76.93	-0.15	-0.14	-0.13
T1SATISF	-44.82	-.09	-0.08	-0.08	-5.41	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

Table 20

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Satisfaction with Life in the U.S. at Time 2 for Male and Female Refugees

	Male				Female			
	Coefficients		Correlations		Coefficients		Correlations	
Variable	b	β	Part	Partial	b	β	Part	Partial
EDUC	-0.04	0.02*	-0.16	-0.18*	-0.07	-0.30*	-0.27	-0.34*
RACISM	-0.07	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.07	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04
DISCRIM	-0.08	-0.09	-0.08	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.08	-0.10
T1EMPLOY	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.21	0.10	0.12	0.09
T1SATISF	0.40	0.43*	0.37	0.40*	0.32	0.38*	0.38	0.31*

Note. EDUC = number of completed years of education; RACISM = perception of racism in the United States (score range 1-3); DISCRIM = perception of personal experiences of discrimination (score range 1-3); T1EMPLOY = employment at time 1 (score range 1-3); T1SATISF = satisfaction with U.S. life at time 1 (score range 1-5).
* $p < .05$

.05) of the variance in job satisfaction and perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 2% ($-.15^2 = .02$) of the variance in job satisfaction, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 5% of explained variance. For females, this model accounted for 20% of the variance explained for job satisfaction [$R^2 = .20$, $F(5,95) = 4.67$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among females showed that early employment [$t(95) = -2.42$, $p < .05$] was the only significant contributor to the model, accounting for 6% of explained variance, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 14% of variance explained.

For males, the third regression model accounted for 10% of the variance in pay satisfaction [R^2=.10, $F(5,198) = 4.51$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among males showed that early employment [$t(198) = 2.26$, $p < .05$] and perceived personal experiences of discrimination [$t(198) = -2.00$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early employment accounted for 3% ($.16^2 = .03$) of the variance in pay satisfaction and perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 2% ($-.15^2 = .02$) of the variance explained by the model, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 5% of explained variance. For females, this model accounted for 22% of the variance explained for pay satisfaction [$R^2 = .22$, $F(5,95) = 5.40$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among females showed that early U.S. life satisfaction [$t(95) = -2.42$, $p < .05$], early employment [$t(95) = -2.42$, $p < .05$], and perceived personal experiences of discrimination were the only significant contributors to the model. Early satisfaction with

life in the U.S. accounted for 7% ($.27^2 = .07$) of the variance in pay satisfaction, early employment accounted for 6% ($.25^2 = .06$) of explained variance, and perceived personal experiences of discrimination for 5% ($.22^2 = .05$) of the variance explained by the model, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 5% of explained variance.

For males, the fourth regression model accounted for 12% of the variance in income [$R^2 = .12$, $F(5,198) = 5.48$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among males showed that early employment [$t(198) = -3.35$, $p < .05$] and completed education [$t(198) = 2.14$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early employment accounted for 5% ($-.23^2 = .05$) of the variance in income and perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 2% ($.15^2 = .02$) of the variance in income, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 5% of explained variance. For females, this model accounted for 16% of the variance explained for income [$R^2 = .16$, $F(5,95) = 3.57$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among females showed that perceived personal experiences of discrimination [$t(95) = -3.39$, $p < .05$], and completed education [$t(95) = 2.06$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Perceived personal experiences of discrimination accounted for 11% ($-.33^2 = .11$) of the variance and completed education accounted for 4% ($.25^2 = .06$) of explained variance, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 1% of explained variance.

For males, the fifth regression model accounted for 27% of the variance in U.S. life satisfaction [$R^2 = .27$, $F(5,198) = 14.72$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among males showed that early U.S. life satisfaction [$t(198) =$

6.11, $p < .05$] and completed education [$t(198) = -2.16$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early U.S. life satisfaction accounted for 16% ($.40^2 = .16$) of the variance in U.S. life satisfaction and completed education for 3% ($-.18^2 = .03$) of the variance, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 8% of explained variance. For females, this model accounted for 43% of the variance explained for U.S. life satisfaction [$R^2 = .43$, $F(5,95) = 14.35$, $p < .05$]. Examination of relative strength of the individual predictors among females showed that early satisfaction with U.S. life [$t(95) = 3.98$, $p < .05$] and completed education [$t(95) = -3.47$, $p < .05$] were the only significant contributors to the model. Early satisfaction with U.S. life accounted for 14% ($.38^2 = .14$) of the variance in life satisfaction and completed education accounted for 12% ($-.34^2 = .12$) of explained variance, while the other variables accounted for the remaining 17% of explained variance.

Research Question Five. To address the fifth research question I performed a Fisher's Z-test to compare significant model fit results for males and females. . The Fisher's Z-test revealed that there was no significant difference in the predictive performance of the model in these populations for job satisfaction ($Z = .99$, $p > .05$), pay satisfaction ($Z = 1.46$, $p > .05$), income ($Z = .45$, $p > .05$), or satisfaction with life in the U.S. at Time 2 ($Z = 1.69$, $p > .05$). A comparison of the model structures for both groups

was also conducted using Steiger's Z, which was calculated by applying the model derived from the male refugees to the data from the female refugees and comparing the resulting "crossed" R with the "direct" R originally obtained from the male group. Results indicated that the differential structure of the regression weights between sex groups for the models predicting job satisfaction ($Z = -2.69, p < .05$), pay satisfaction ($Z = -2.65, p < .05$), and income ($Z = -3.84, p < .05$) warrant further interpretation. There were no significant structure differences, however, for the model predicting T2 U.S. life satisfaction found between male and female groups ($Z = -1.60, p > .05$).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between refugees' early perceptions of personal experiences of discrimination and of racism in the United States, prior education, and satisfaction with life in the U.S. and their employment status, job satisfaction, monthly income, income satisfaction, and overall U.S. life satisfaction two years after immigrating. Overall, multiple linear regression results indicated that the proposed regression models (a) significantly predicted refugees' job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, income satisfaction, and life satisfaction at Time 2, but not employment; (b) significantly predicted Cubans' job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and pay satisfaction at Time 2; (c) significantly predicted Haitians' pay satisfaction at Time 2; and (d) significantly predicted males' and females' job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, income satisfaction, and life satisfaction at Time 2. Fisher's Z and Steiger's Z test results indicated significant ethnic and sex differences in model results.

I set out to answer a preliminary set of research questions with data collected between 1980 and 1983 (Portes & Stepick, 1986) from recent Cuban and Haitian immigrants. A significant limitation of the data that must be considered when interpreting present study findings is that there was no data for Haitians who were unemployed at T2;

but rather, data was used only for employed Haitians, employed Cubans, and unemployed Cubans at T2.

Overall, significant ethnic group differences were found on every study variable at the initial time of measurement and at 2-year follow-up. Shortly after arrival, compared to Haitians, Cubans had more education, perceived less racism and discrimination, were more satisfied with life in the US, and were more likely to be employed. Two years after migration Cubans were making more money and were more satisfied with their jobs, pay, and life in the U.S. than their Haitian counterparts. These findings support research purporting that initial migration experiences "set the stage" for future development (Portes & Stepick, 1985; Stepick & Portes, 1986), and that it is important to study groups separately because they have different experiences (Padilla, 2003). Previous research has shown that immigrant groups that are more similar to their host country are subject to less discrimination and attain greater economic success (Coates & Carr, 2005). It could be argued that Americans were more familiar with Cuban culture than Haitian culture. The unfamiliarity with Haitian culture and migration may have resulted in Cubans and Haitians experiencing different levels or intensities of xenophobia, and as a result, different employer responsiveness and overall employment outcomes. Moreover, present study results showed that Haitians perceived greater levels of racism and discrimination in the U.S. than Cubans. As purported by SCCT (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), ethnic differences in perceptions of racism and discrimination also may have impacted each group's vocational self-efficacy, outcome expectations, for pursuing specific jobs, and the contextual barriers and supports that each group encountered as they pursued their

employment goals. Although refugees may share similar goals and visions of the "American dream", marginalization is associated with individuals' perception of fewer opportunities and more barriers (Barry & Grilo, 2003; Fuoad & Byars-Winston, 2005), and these perceptions significantly impact their vocational development.

Similar to ethnic group comparison findings, male and female refugees also appeared to have discrepant experiences. Males had more education, perceived less discrimination, made more money, and were more satisfied with their jobs, pay, and life in the U.S. First, female refugees' lower educational achievement prior to migration may explain the significant sex differences in employment, pay, and life satisfaction at T2 (England et al 2004; Portes & Stepick, 1985). It is evident that such disparities in education prior to migration continue to impact female refugees' vocational development in the United States. Second, it is central to consider gender roles and male privilege. Females are often responsible for childcare and meeting family needs as well as meeting job requirements. These multiple demands may limit the employment opportunities available, in general, to females, as well as limit employment opportunities to jobs that pay less and/or are less valued by society. Consequently, female refugees may experience less employment mobility, receive fewer pay raises, and feel decreased satisfaction with their employment and income. Third, males in the United States continue to generally receive higher wages and more prestigious employment compared to females (Lips, 2003), which may contribute further to differences in male and female refugee experiences. Early employment, prior education, and early satisfaction with life in the U.S. were the strongest contributing factors to employment outcomes at follow-up. This

finding is consistent with research emphasizing the importance of early experiences on refugee development (Portes & Stepick, 1985). The models moderately predicted income and satisfaction with job and pay. These findings indicate that prior education and early employment do indeed "set the stage" for success and may provide an early pathway for continued success by building on capital that refugees bring with them when they migrate and early experiences of success. The model results are not surprising given that refugees who have more privilege or social capital in terms of educational achievements, work experience and employability, and who feel more satisfied with their lives upon arrival to the U.S. would experience more positive vocational outcomes 2 years after migration when compared to refugees with less educational and work experience and achievements. More clarification is needed about what contributes to feelings of satisfaction and the role of positive early experiences as a protective factor for refugees. Understanding what leads refugees to experience early satisfaction and positive experiences would allow psychologists to create prevention strategies and specific public policy recommendations.

With regard to ethnic differences, profound differences were found between how the model worked for Cuban and Haitian groups. This was not surprising given the groups' initial differences that helped to "set the stage" differently for each group. Previous research has emphasized that perceptions of discrimination, xenophobia and other vocational barriers play significant roles in refugees' employment experiences such as whether or not they are employed, unemployed, or underemployed (Barry & Grilo, 2003). Perceived discrimination was as an important predictor of employment outcomes for Haitians (who also reported more perceived discrimination than Cubans). Another

important trend discovered by analyzing ethnic groups separately was that the model predicted employment outcomes only for Cuban refugees; there was only one outcome for which the model had utility for Haitians (pay satisfaction). One reason that the model may not have predicted employment outcomes for Haitians would be sample homogeneity in terms of employment, life, and educational experiences prior to and after migration to the U.S. That is, having limited options combined with strong contextual forces such as xenophobic discrimination may have severely restricted the range of experiences for Haitians such that they may be considered statistically equivalent. Haitians perceived more discrimination than Cubans, and the amount of discrimination they perceived was an important factor in determining their pay satisfaction two years after migration, supporting findings from previous research that early experiences and discrimination, specifically, impact employment outcomes (Barry & Grilo, 2003; Portes & Stepick, 1985). Early experiences of discrimination are likely to create negative outcome expectations which influence vocational interests, goals, and actions (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). In other words, upon establishing expectations for discrimination in employment combined with the real contextual barriers related to discrimination and les formal educational and advanced employment experiences, refugee's employment interests may shift to jobs that are easier to get, that pay less, or those which operate on the black market which may be less satisfying. More group specific longitudinal data relating contextual factors to employment outcomes is needed in order to clarify and elaborate on these results.

With regard to sex differences, study results comparing male and female groups had more similarity and the models were judged to work equally well for both groups. There were, however, differences in which variables were most important for each group; that is, perceived discrimination, early employment, prior education, and early satisfaction with life in the U.S. did not impact employment outcomes equally for males and females. Rather, as Padilla (2003) points out, the experiences and meaning attributed to those experiences differed for males and females. Although perceived discrimination was an important factor for both male and female pay satisfaction, for job satisfaction perceived discrimination was only important for males while for income it was only important for females. The differential influence of perceived discrimination may be reflective of differences between all males and females in the United States and indicates that females who perceived more discrimination were paid less while males who perceived more discrimination were less satisfied with their jobs but that perceived discrimination did not influence their income. It is likely that the difference is pay between females and males is linked to discriminatory employment practices that place female refugees at greater risk by compounding the barriers associated with xenophobia with those of sexism.

Implications of Findings

The general theme of these findings is that a variety of early experiences are important in shaping refugees' future employment outcomes in the United States. Early experiences create new learning experiences that shape interests, goals, and behavior, and

provide individuals with social, cultural, and economic capital that differentially impacts their success in the U.S. Further, early experiences specifically related to perceptions of discrimination are important to the vocational development of refugees. This study's findings are also ethnic group specific. Several researchers have emphasized the importance of studying culturally specific immigrant and refugee groups (Padilla, 2003) and the considerable differences that found in this study between Cuban and Haitian refugee groups support this idea. Overall, findings support a contextual conceptualization of refugee vocational development. It is clear that developmental trajectories may vary depending upon prior context, arrival experiences, host country values and attitudes, and other individual and group level factors. Findings also suggest that research on the vocational development of refugees may be enhanced by using longitudinal data collection and including various contextual factors such as reason for coming, prior education, cultural distance from host country, etc. Findings emphasize that the practice of vocational counseling with refugees will be enhanced by conceptualizing refugees' situation and development ecologically and developing contextually appropriate interventions.

Future research may expand upon these findings in several ways. Continuing to utilize longitudinal designs will allow researchers to gain better understanding of trajectories. Attrition is likely to consistently be a problem when working with refugee populations, especially over a long period of time. Researchers can, however, collect data prior to attrition that may indicate why individuals no longer participate. It may also be important to design studies with statistical analyses in mind that are robust to missing

data, due to likely high rates of attrition with this population (Spring et al., 2003). Researchers who are able to design a new study may also want to include more variables that are specific to ecological (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and SCCT models (Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994), this will allow for better interpretability of results. As we learn more about the vocational development of refugees it will also be important to move beyond identifying trajectories to identifying moderators and mediators of change and development.

Strengths and Limitations

As the first empirical study of refugee vocational development, this study has many strengths and limitations. Strengths of this study include the use of a longitudinal data set with a large sample of refugees and the use of subjective perception data. The longitudinal data and large sample size is rare for this population and gave us adequate power to detect sex and ethnic group differences and to examine what early migration factors were related to employment and life satisfaction outcomes two years after migration. Utilizing measures of subjective perception is also critical to understanding the experience of refugees; an important part of multicultural research (Sue et al 1998) and vocational development based on a social cognitive model (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). This study provides a greater understanding of how refugees' perceptions of discrimination in the United States impacted their future employment outcomes two years after migration.

There are also limitations to consider when interpreting the results of this study. First, because the data was not collected using an experimental design, strong causal conclusions cannot be made. Second, there was also a large amount of missing data for unemployed Haitians at follow-up and that was not explained in the initial data collection literature (Portes & Stepick, 1985). Missing data issues decreased the power, prohibited use of certain analyses, and biased conclusions towards employed Haitians. Third, no information was available about the reliability and validity of the measures used for the original study.

REFERENCES

Aroian, K. J., Norris, A. E., Patsdaughter, C. A., & Tran, T. V. (1998). Prediction psychological distress among former Soviet immigrants. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 44,* 284 – 294.

Aycan, Z., & Berry, J. W. (1996). Impact of employment-related experiences on immigrants' psychological well-being and adaptation to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 28,* 240 – 251.

Bach, R. L., Bach, J. B., & Triplett, T. (1981). The flotilla 'entrants': Latest and most controversial. *Cuban Studies, 11,* 29 – 48.

Barry, D. T., & Grilo, C. M. (2003). Cultural, self-esteem, and demographic correlates of perception of personal and group discrimination among East Asian immigrants. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 73,* 223 – 229.

Bhagat, R. S., & London, M. (1999). Getting started and getting ahead: Career dynamics of immigrants. *Human Resource Management Review, 9,* 349 – 365.

Blustein, D. L. (2008). The role of work in psychological health and well-being: A conceptual, historical, and public policy perspective. *American Psychologist, 63,* 228 – 240.

Blustein, D. L., McWhirter, E. H., & Perry, J. C. (2005). An emancipatory communitarian approach to vocational development theory, research, and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33,* 141 – 179.

Boswell, T. D., & Curtis, J. R. (1984). *The Cuban experience.* Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Bronfenbrennder, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22,* 723 – 742.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. *Annals of Child Development, 6,* 187 – 249.

Bryant-Davis, T., & Ocampo, C. (2005). The trauma of racism: Implications for counseling, research, and education. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33,* 574 – 578.

Canabal, M. E., & Quiles, J. A. (1995). Acculturation and socioeconomic factors as determinants of depression among Puerto Ricans in the United States. *Social Behavior and Personality, 23,* 235 – 248.

Chartrand, J. M., & Rose, M. L. (1996). Career intervention for at-risk populations: Incorporating social cognitive influences. *Career Development Quarterly, 44,* 341 – 344.

Chronister, K. M., McWhirter, B. T., & Kerewsky, S. D. (2004). Counseling and ecological prevention practice. In R. K. Conyne & E. P. Cook (Eds.), *Ecological counseling: An innovative approach to conceptualizing person-environment interaction* (pp. 315 – 338). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Chronister, K. M., & McWhirter, E. H. (2003). Applying social cognitive career theory to the empowerment of battered women. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81,* 418 – 425.

Chronister, K. M., & McWhirter, E. H. (2006). An experimental examination of two career interventions for battered women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53,* 151 – 164.

Clark, J. M.,Lasaga, J. I., & Reque, R. S. (1981). *The 1980 Mariel exodus: An assessment and prospect.* Washington, D.C.: Council for Inter-American Security.

Coates, K., & Carr, S. C. (2005). Skilled immigrants and selection bias: A theory-based field study from New Zealand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29,* 577 – 599.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

DeAnda, R. M. (2005). Employment hardship among Mexican-origin women. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science, 27,* 43-59.

Dumper, H (2002) *Missed opportunities: A skills audit of refugee women in London from the teaching, nursing and medical professions*. London, Greater London Authority.

England, P., Garcia-Beaulieu, C., & Ross, M. (2004). Women's employment among blacks, whites, and three groups of Latinas: Do more privileged women have higher employment? *Gender Society, 18,* 494 – 509.

Fouad, N. A., & Byars-Winston, A. M. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: Meta-analysis of race/ethnicity differences. *The Career Development Quarterly, 53,* 223 – 233.

Griswold, D. (2006, November 11). Departing congress approves 700-mile 'wall to nowhere.' *The Sun.* Retrieved November 23, 2006, from http://www.mwcsun.com/opinion/local_story_315094521.html?keyword=secondarystory.

Hackett, G., & Byars, A. M. (1996). Social cognitive theory and the career development of African American women. *Career Development Quarterly, 44,* 322 – 341.

Kim, K. C., Hurh, W. M., & Kim, S. (1993). Generation differences in Korean immigrants' life conditions in the United States. *Sociological Perspectives, 36,* 257 – 270.

Kogan, I. (2004). Last Hired, First Fired? The unemployment dynamics of male immigrants in Germany. *European Sociological Review, 5,* 445-461.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45,* 79 – 122.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (2000). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 36 – 49.

Lips, H. M. (2003). The gender pay gap: Concrete indicator of women's progress toward equality. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 3,* 87 – 109.

Martin, P. (2006). The battle over unauthorized immigration to the United States. *Population Reference Bureau.* Retrived November 25, 2006, from http://www.prb.org/Template.cfm?Section=PRB&template=/contentmanagement/contentdisplay.cfm&contentID=13774.

Martin, P., & Midgley, E. (2003, June). Immigration: Shaping and reshaping America. *Population Bulletin, 56.* Retrived November 25, 2006, from http://www.prb.org/pdf/58.2ImmigrShapingAmerica.pdf.

McSpadden, L. A. (1998). "I must have my rights!": The presence of state power in the resettlement of Ethiopian and Eritrean refugees. *In* Power, Ethics, and Human Rights: Anthropological Studies of Refugee Research and Action. R. M. Krulfeld and J. L. MacDonald, eds. Pp 147-172. Lanhan, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Morrow, S. L., Gore, P. A. Jr., & Campbell, B. W. (1996). The application of a sociocognitive framework to the career development of lesbian women and gay men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48,* 136 – 148.

Nelson, G., Prilleltensky, I., & MacGillivary, H. (2001). Building value-based partnerships: Toward solidarity with oppressed groups. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29,* 649 – 677.

Padilla, A. M., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25,* 35 – 55.

Portes, A., Clark, J. M., & Lopez, M. M. (1981). Six years later, a profile of the process of incorporation of Cuban exiles in the United States: 1973 – 1979. *Cuban Studies, 11,* 1 – 24.

Portes, A., & Stepick, A. (1985). Unwelcome immigrants: The labor market experiences of 1980 (Mariel) Cuban and Haitian refugees in south Florida. *American Sociological Review, 50,* 493 – 514.

Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist, 52,* 517 – 535.

Rivera, R., Torres, M. E., Carre, F. J. (1997). Role burdens: The impact of employment and family responsibilities on the health status of Latino women. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 8,* 99 – 113.

Serdarevic, M., & Chronister, K. M. (2005). Research with immigrant populations: The application of an ecological framework to mental health research with immigrant populations. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 7,* 24 – 24.

Slack, T., & Jensen, L. (2007). Underemployment across immigrant generations. *Social Science Research, 36,* 1415 – 1430.

Spring, M., Westermeyer, J., Halcon, L., Savik, K., Robertson, C., Johnson, D. R., et al. (2003). Sampling in difficult to access refugee and immigrant communities. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 191,* 813–819.

Stepick, A. (1982). Haitian refugees in the U.S. *Minority Rights Group, report #52.* London: MRG.

Stepick, A., & Portes, A. (1986). Flight indo despair: A profile of recent Haitian refugees in south Florida. *International Migration Review, 20,* 329 – 350.

Stier, H. (1996). Immigrant women go to work: Analysis of immigrant wives' labor supply for six Asian groups. *Social Science Quarterly, 72,* 67 – 82.

Stormshak, E. A., & Dishion, T. J. (2002). An ecological approach to child and family clinical and counseling psychology. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 5,* 197 – 215.

Sue, D. W., Parhap, T. A., Santiago, G. B. (1998). The changing face or work in the United States: Implicatons for individual, institutional, and societal survival. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4,* 153 – 164.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

US Census Bureau (2005). Selected Characteristics of the Native and Foreign-Born Populations. Retrived November 26, 2006 from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/STTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-qr_name=ACS_2005_EST_G00_S0602&-ds_name=ACS_2005_EST_G00_.

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 253 – 272.

Vinokurov, A., Birman, D., Trickett, E. (2000). Psychological acculturation correlatese of work status among Soviet Jewish refugees in the United States. *International Migration Review, 34,* 538 – 559.

Werkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (1999). Subjective well-being, discrimination and cultural conflict: Iranians living in the Netherlands. *Social Indicators Research, 47,* 281 – 306.

Yakushko, O. (In press). Xenophobia: Understanding the roots and consequences of negative attitudes towards immigrants. *The Counseling Psychologist.*

Yakushko, O., & Chronister, K. M. (2005). Immigrant women and counseling: The invisible others. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83,* 292 – 298.

Zlobina, A., Basabe, N., Paez, D., & Furnham, A. (2006). Sociocultural adjustment of immigrants: Universal and group-specific predictors. *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30,* 195 – 211.