# Pacific Identities:

# Patterns in the Racial Identifications of Mixed-Race Pacific Islanders

[Working Paper 03-04:13]

Carolyn A. Liebler Minnesota Population Center University of Minnesota 537 Heller Hall 271 – 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. South Minneapolis, MN 55455 liebler@pop.umn.edu phone: 612-627-4407 fax: 612-627-4382

and

Shawn Malia Kanaʻiaupuni Policy Analysis & System Evaluation Kamehameha Schools 567 S. King Street Honolulu, HI 96813 shkanaia@ksbe.edu phone: 808-541-5365 fax: 808-541-5395

November 2003

Copyright © 2003 by Carolyn A. Liebler and Shawn Malia Kana'iaupuni

#### Overview

Mounting scientific knowledge recognizes and explores "race" as a social construction. We have learned that the meanings of race categories change and vary across time, observer, and circumstance (Perlmann and Waters 2002; Harris 2002); that people sometimes change their racial identifies and identifications<sup>1</sup> over the course of their lives (Liebler 2001; Passel 1996); and that people of mixed heritage (whether recent or long past) have identities that are in some sense optional (Waters 1990; Xie and Goyette 1997; Liebler 2001, 2004; Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003; Roth 2002). It is on the latter of these observations that we focus in this research. Specifically, we explore factors that affect the racial identification decisions of Americans who trace their heritage to the Pacific Islands.

We argue that strong cultural connections and ties to the Pacific Islands are key to Pacific Islander racial identity. In particular, birthplace in the islands and language retention reflect characteristics that may lead to the preservation of cultural practices and beliefs. Similarly, family connections to other places and groups also influence racial identity processes, such that greater exposure or links to other non-Pacific experiences may weaken Pacific Islander identification. Additionally, among multiracial or biracial families, power dynamics within households are sure to play a role in the racial identification of children.

After exploring the differences between Pacific Islander groups, we show that certain commonalities in experience outweigh differences. We find that the racial identification of mixed race children from a variety of Pacific Islander heritages can be analyzed together without substantial loss of detail. To examine possibly broader conclusions about factors behind racial identification decisions, we also draw comparisons between our analysis of the Pacific Islander case and the cases of mixed-race people who are part-American Indian, part-Asian American, or part-African American.

#### Pacific Islanders and the Study of Racial Identity

Although Pacific Islanders represent a very small minority group, they present an unusually rich case for the study of race, racial identity, and racial formation. With centuries of interracial and interethnic unions on their native islands and on the continent (Labov & Jacobs 1986; Parkman & Sawyer 1967), those Pacific Islanders who live in the United States have highly diverse backgrounds. The most recent census data highlight this diversity; more than half of the 874,000 people who reported themselves to be Pacific Islander also reported another race (Grieco 2001).

Like Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders, Asian Americans and American Indians also experience high rates of intermarriage. Pacific Islanders have been compared to both Asians and to American Indians in terms of their socioeconomic and health outcomes (Fernandez 1996), but the parallels in racial identity experiences between the three groups are unclear. Specific factors affecting racial identity have been shown to differ depending on the specific racial composition of the family (Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003).

The racial identifications of children from a variety of mixed-heritage backgrounds have been explored using the 1990 Census data, which is the most recent census data requiring a singular response to the "race question."<sup>2</sup> The forced-single-answer format in these data allows researchers a glimpse of multiracial family's thoughts on a mixed-race child's 'primary' race. Xie and Goyette (1997) found that about 40% of children with one Asian parent were reported to be Asian and they identified a set of variables predictive of each child's race response. Liebler (2001, 2004) conducted similar analyses with part-American Indian children (50% of whom were reported to be American Indian) and identified different predictors of racial identification. Roth (2002) focused her parallel analyses on children who are part-Black, again finding unique predictors of identification as Black (62% of children) or as "other" (12% of children). And Kanaiaupuni and Liebler (2003) analyzed the racial identification of part-Native Hawaiians, finding that connections to the homeland of Hawai'i were highly related to identification as Hawaiian (about 50% of children). In all of these mixed-race groups, the person's racial identification cannot be predicted well without knowing more information about them. The varying results of the studies are discussed in more detail below.

Despite their relatively small population size in the United States, recent census data on multiracial individuals have drawn attention to the diversity of Pacific Islanders. Figure 1 shows the diversity among the origin islands themselves, separated by hundreds of miles of ocean and varying widely in proximity to other continents and cultures. Yet, Pacific peoples were connected by sophisticated traditions of seafaring voyagers, comprising what Captain Cook, in 1778, described as "by far the most extensive nation upon earth" (Rogers 1999). Although excluded from most research on racial identity, present day Pacific Islanders represent a highly multiracial group ripe for aiding our knowledge of identity processes. Understanding this group brings greater nuance and depth to our picture of racial identity and identification choices in the United States. As we increase our knowledge about the ways in which racial boundaries are constructed, we are better equipped to understand social complexities arising from these racial boundaries.

#### FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Our primary research questions are four. First, how do patterns of racial identification among part-Pacific Islanders correspond to characteristics of the child, his/her parents, and the household? Second, how do these patterns differ for various Pacific Islander groups? Third, is it methodologically sound to group Pacific Islanders together in analyses of their racial identifications? And fourth, in what ways are determinants of racial identification among

multiracial Pacific Islanders similar to previously reported determinants of identification among mixed-race part-American Indians (Liebler 2001, 2004), mixed-race part-Asian American children (Xie and Goyette 1997), and mixed-race part-Black children (Roth 2002)? We examine whether certain factors affect racial identification decisions among several types of mixed-race families, regardless of the family's specific racial composition. As do the three studies cited above, we use the 1990 Census 5% public use microdata sample to address these research questions.

#### Hypothesized Predictors of Racial Identification as Pacific Islander

Numerous factors might explain why a mixed-race child is considered the race of one parent rather than the race of the other parent when the family is forced to report only one race. These factors include characteristics of the child, each parent, the household, and the community or state in which the family resides. Because the number of part-Pacific Islander families in the public 1990 Census data is so small, however, we must be extremely parsimonious in choosing among the many potential measures that may be related to racial identification. We focus on selected characteristics that prior work has shown to be closely related to racial identification among Pacific Islanders (Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003; Liebler 2001; Xie and Goyette 1997; Roth 2002). Our hypotheses and variables fall into four related groups: (1) cultural connections or ties to the Pacific Islander's island; (2) cultural connections to other race/ethnic groups; (3) assimilation; and (4) power dynamics within the household.

*Cultural connections*: We hypothesize that cultural connections or ties to the Pacific Islander's island will be associated with higher chances of identifying as Pacific Islander. Prior research showed similar results among part-American Indians, part-Asians, and part-Blacks.

Liebler (2001) found that measures of cultural connection to an American Indian parent's tribe – use of an American Indian language in the household, residence on or near a reservation, and reporting a specific tribe – were closely tied to American Indian racial identification among part-American Indian children. Similarly, Xie and Goyette (1997) found that connections to Asia influence part-Asian-American children's racial identification; they are more likely to be considered Asian-American if they were born in Asia, if their Asian parent speaks a non-English language, and if their non-Asian parent reported Asian ancestry on the 1990 Census. Xie and Goyette (1997) also found a significant contrary result: third- and higher-generation part-Asian children are more likely to be considered Asian than second-generation part-Asian children. They interpret this to support a separate hypothesis (the "awareness hypothesis"), that minorities become more aware of their differences from the majority as they become more structurally assimilated. Along these lines, Roth (2002) found that a White-and-Black child is more likely to be considered Black than "other" if more Blacks live in the neighborhood.

We, too, expect that connections to other race/ethnic groups will reduce the chances that a child is considered Pacific Islander race. Consistent with prior work, we expect parents' mixed ancestry, having Hispanic origin, the presence of other languages in the home, and non-Pacific Islander parent's non-White race to be associated with a relatively low likelihood of reporting Pacific Islander race (Xie and Goyette 1997; Liebler 2001, 2004). As explained below, we measure cultural connections through indicators of birthplace, language use, and the reported ancestry, Hispanic origin, and race of the parents and child.

*Assimilation:* Prior research on the effects of assimilation on racial identity in mixed race families does not lead to a clear a priori hypothesis. Xie and Goyette (1997) used the Asian parent's level of education to measure a family's socioeconomic status, their proxy for assimilation. Their results do not support an assimilation hypothesis; they find that more

educated Asian parents are more likely to have children who are reported as Asian. Extending this work, Liebler (2001) examined measures of each parent's educational attainment and occupational status, as well as the log of the per-capita household income. She found a similar positive relationship among children of more educated American Indian parents, but that mixed children in wealthier households were less likely to be considered American Indian. Rather than assimilation theory, these studies are more consistent with the "awareness hypothesis" mentioned earlier – that differences from the majority group heighten ethnic consciousness among minorities who are more structurally assimilated. In her study of part-Blacks, however, Roth (2002) found that when either parent had advanced education, a White-and-Black child is more likely to be reported as "other" than as Black. Thus, education seems to alter consciousness in Black/White intermarriage, but not in a way that encourages identification as a minority.

Our analyses include a measure of education as an indicator of assimilation. Education also may capture the effects of a Pacific Islander parent's migration to a post-high school institution on the U.S. continent. The experience of living on the continent – where few other Pacific Islanders can be found – may reduce the Pacific Islander parent's ties to their island culture and identity in addition to altering perspectives and lifestyles.

*Power dynamics in the household*: Finally, we hypothesize that permanent or temporary power differentials among the parents affect family dynamics and decisions about the racial identification of children. We expect the child's reported race to tend toward the race of the householder (because it is likely that this person filled out the form) and to tend toward the father's race (because of both surname and patriarchal cultures). Prior research has found that householder status of the American Indian parent and female sex of the parent both increased the chances that part-American Indian children were considered American Indian (Liebler 2001). Studies that did not control for householder status have found that mixed race children are

especially likely to be reported the same race as their father (Xie and Goyette 1997, Roth 2002). In this work, we include indicators of which parent is the householder, which parent is the father, and an interaction between these two measures.

We examine these hypotheses among Pacific Islanders to explore further the factors affecting racial identification among mixed-race people in the United States. Support for these hypotheses among all Pacific Islanders would indicate that similar social forces affect multiracial children of many different backgrounds. It is possible, however, that part-Pacific Islanders as a group have different identity-forming experiences than do mixed-race people from other backgrounds. Because Pacific Islanders are such an extremely small minority group, people outside their families may find it difficult to categorize their race without asking. As a result, Pacific Islanders may have more room for personal choice in racial identification decisions, particularly those of mixed heritage. In addition, Pacific Islander communities on the U.S. continent are often quite small and may have limited influence on identity processes in multiracial households. In contrast, because of their larger population size and spatial concentration, Asian-American, American Indian, and Black communities can be quite dense, thus providing a source of social influence on racial identification processes. Through the analyses in this paper, we hope to measure and understand some of these commonalities and differences of experience between and among these minority groups.

In addition to commonalities, we also expect some variation among the many Pacific Islander groups. The three largest Pacific Islander groups in the United States – Hawaiians, Samoans, and Guamanians – hail from islands that are separated by hundreds of miles of ocean (see Figure 1). The indigenous cultures of Hawaii and Samoa are both Polynesian and both governments are associated with the United States. Guam is in Micronesia, relatively near Asia. Colonized by Spaniards (among others), its cultural links with the U.S. may be weaker. Forces

of assimilation may thereby affect part-Guamanian children differently than the two Polynesian groups. Fiji, on the other hand, is in Melanesia, a region known for its dark-skinned indigenous people. Fijians in the United States may be more subject to discrimination based on their darker skin color. Linked by the vast Pacific Ocean between them, diverse experiences and contexts differentiate the Pacific islands. These, in turn, may translate into variation in identity-shaping experiences and perceptions of part-Pacific Islander families in America.

#### <u>Data</u>

We use data from the 1990 Census (5% public use microdata sample (PUMS)) for our analyses. Respondents to the 1990 Census were asked to report a single racial identification even if they have a mixed race heritage. Although this is not the most recent release of census data, analyses of these data are important for several reasons. First, the census race question was changed in 2000 to allow respondents to mark more than one race. This resulted in a tremendous swell in the enumerated population of Pacific Islanders.<sup>3</sup> Our analyses of 1990 data provide a baseline portrayal of racial identity and identification in this highly multiracial group, to which we can compare future analyses of data from Census 2000. Second, our analyses add to a series of studies of the racial identification of children of interracial marriages that have been conducted using the 1990 Census (Xie and Goyette 1997; Liebler 2001; Kanaiupuni and Liebler 2001; Roth 2002). Thus we are able to take the opportunity to compare our results to those among other groups and draw more substantial conclusions. And third, the 1990 data force a single race choice for individuals with multiple races. Therefore, we can use these data to understand patterns in decision making about which single race was (arguably) considered most important (at the time of the census) for each mixed-race person.

Eight Pacific Islander groups were identified in the 1990 Census public data. Three of the groups were specifically named in the census race question (Hawaiian, Samoan, and Guamanian); members of other Pacific Islander groups were asked to write in their racial identification. Other groups were singled out for identification in the PUMS data because they are either U.S. outlying areas (Northern Mariana Islands) or have relatively large populations in the U.S. (Tahitian, Tongan, Palauan, Fijian). The eight groups fall into three culturally similar areas identified by anthropologists: Polynesia (Hawaii, Samoa, Tahiti, Tonga), Micronesia (Guam, Northern Marianas, Palau), and Melanesia (Fiji). A map showing the relative locations of the Pacific islands discussed in this paper is provided in Figure 1, above.<sup>4</sup>

Because individuals were only permitted to mark one race in 1990, it is difficult to identify people who are mixed-race. We focus on children (under 18 years old) living with a parent of one race married to someone of a different race. For example, our mixed-race "Samoan" sample includes children in families in which a Samoan was married to a non-Pacific Islander. Although inter-ethnic unions among various Pacific Islander groups are common and interesting, we focus on interracial marriages to permit comparisons to prior work on other U.S. minority groups.

We exclude parent-child triads in which either parent or the child has a race that was "allocated" by the Census Bureau, or in which the parent's and child's race/Hispanic origin responses are so different that they are probably not biologically related.<sup>5</sup> In order to keep the sample sizes as large as possible, we include all eligible children in a family in the sample.<sup>6</sup> Finally, in our sample selection, we include only single-family households<sup>7</sup> to increase the chances that a parent<sup>8</sup> or the child him or herself reported the child's race. This is especially important because our goal is to assess determinants of the child's racial identification. In all, 2,836 parent-child triads fit these sample selection criteria.

An examination of the racial identification of all of the part-Pacific Islander children who fit our sample selection criteria (Table 1) reveals that close to half (51.1%) of children are considered the same race as their Pacific Islander parent. Most of the rest were reported to be their other parent's race. Only 21 children in the sample were reported to be a non-specific race: 19 were reported to be "other race" and 2 were "other Micronesian." We include these 21 children in our bivariate descriptive table (Table 1), but are forced to exclude them from our logistic regression analyses (Tables 2 and 3).

#### Measures

*Cultural connections*: We use seven variables to measure cultural connections. They are indicators of: (1) whether the child was born on the Pacific Islander parent's specific island<sup>9</sup>; (2) whether the Pacific Islander parent reported any ancestry that is inconsistent with the race they reported; (3) whether the Pacific Islander parent reports Hispanic origin; (4) whether the Pacific Islander parent was born on his or her specific island; (5) the race of the non-Pacific Islander parent; (6) the Hispanic origin of this parent; and (7) two measures of language use in the home for each specific Islander group.

Our measures for language include whether anyone in the household speaks a language native to that Pacific Islander group. We also look at whether anyone in the household speaks another non-English language. Language is considered native to a Pacific Islander group only if it is an indigenous language, not a language (such as Spanish or French) that was introduced by colonizing Europeans. Although this may affect our results (e.g., most Tahitians speak French and many Guamanians speak Spanish), it seems most consistent with the underlying theory. That is, people who are closely tied to an indigenous culture through language will be especially likely to have a strong and consistent racial identification with that group. *Assimilation*: Our basic measure of parent's education notes whether or not the Pacific Islander parent has attended college for any amount of time. Many Pacific Islanders move to the U.S. continent in order to attend college, so this measure may also capture some aspect of migration history as well as socioeconomic status and extent of assimilation.

*Power dynamics in the household*: Dynamics and power within a household are difficult to measure with these data. We include three measures which may reflect and/or affect these dynamics. First, the sex of the Pacific Islander parent<sup>10</sup> may affect the child's race through child-raising methods (as for American Indians (Liebler 2001)) or distinctive surnames (as for Asian Americans (Xie and Goyette 1997). Second, householder status indicates power in the household. The Census Bureau considers the "householder" to be the person listed first on the form. Because a person who fills out a form is likely to list him or herself first, the householder may be especially likely to have filled out the form. Thus the householder may have the power to report the child's race according to his or her own preference. The majority of "householders" are male so we include an interaction term to take into account the overlap of statuses.

#### Racial Identification within Individual Pacific Islander Groups

We begin our exploration of racial identification among part-Pacific Islander children by examining the characteristics of children from many Pacific Islander groups. Our measures of cultural characteristics, assimilation, and power dynamics within the household are each included in Table 1. The eight island groups and three residual categories described in Table 1 represent all of the available categories of Pacific Islanders identifiable in the 1990 Census public use data. For each group/category, two types of numbers are shown in Table 1; first is a column listing the number of children in our data who have a particular characteristic, and second is a column listing the percentage of children of that group who have that characteristic

*and* who were reported to be their Pacific Islander parent's race. For example, 1,158 of the 2,836 children (41%) in the overall sample were born on their Pacific Islander parent's specified island.<sup>11</sup> Of these 1,158 children, 64.9% were reported to be Pacific Islander, which is significantly greater than the overall percentage who were considered Pacific Islander (51.1%). Figures are shown in **bold** if children with that characteristic are significantly more (or less) likely to be reported as Pacific Islander than are other children from that Pacific Islander group. If the Pacific Islander parent was born on his/her specific island, the child is significantly more likely than average to be considered Pacific Islander. Space constraints preclude a detailed discussion of Table 1, so we focus on the more general meaning of the results. Evaluation of hypotheses is reserved for the regression models, below.

#### TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The single racial identification of mixed-race part-Pacific Islander children varies substantially among children with similar family trees. For example, even among children with one Guamanian parent and one American Indian parent (a small group, indeed; n=19), about half are reported to be Guamanian (52.6%) and the other half are reported to be American Indian. Analyses of the smallest Pacific Islander groups is limited by sample size, but Table 1 suggests some indication of the factors associated with racial identification among children who are part Tahitian, Tongan, Northern Mariana Islander, Palauan, or Fijian. No more than half of children of parents who come from these small Pacific Islands are reported to be Pacific Islanders themselves. Carried out over the long term, this trend would lead to declining Pacific Islander population size due to the types of choices made in mixed-race families who are part-Pacific Islanders by heritage.

The results in Table 1 suggest that cultural connections are important on the whole, despite differences exist between groups. Some of the differences are due to sample size, but not

all. For example, many characteristics of Tahitian parents are significantly related to their child's racial identification (n=9), while only one measured characteristic of Palauan families is significant (the Palauan parent is male) (n=22). Generally, however, children born on the Pacific Island in question are especially likely to be considered the same race as the Pacific Islander parent (with the exception of part-Tongan and part-Fijian children). Also, a child with one White (or Black) parent and one Pacific Islander parent is more likely to be considered White (or Black) than their Pacific Islander parent's race. Conversely, a child in the sample with an Asian, "other race," or Hispanic origin parent is more likely to be considered Pacific Islander.

Living with a Pacific Island language speaker increases the chances that children are considered the same race as their Pacific Islander parent. Yet, living with someone who speaks a non-English, non-Pacific Islander language also increases the likelihood of Pacific Islander race. In view of our hypotheses, this finding is unexpected because we would expect another primary language in the household to indicate strength of ties to some other place. However, this result may reflect the fact that we categorized Pacific Islander languages to include only indigenous languages, not Spanish and French.

Education has smaller and more mixed effects across the groups. Power in the household, measured by male and householder status, generally increases the likelihood of Pacific Islander race. As we might expect, no single effect is consistent across all groups, reflecting different historical and social conditions that also influence identity processes (in particular, part-Fijians often diverge from the patterns).

#### Multivariate results: Comparisons among Pacific Islander groups

The diversity of responses to the single race identification question in the 1990 Census reflect individual differences in the opportunities for and constraints on identification (through

cultural connections, phenotype, socioeconomic status, etc.). Our regression analyses shown in Table 2 examine these multiple influences on racial identification among the three largest Pacific Islander groups (each of which was specifically named on the census race question): Hawaiian, Guamanian, and Samoan. For each group, we conducted a separate logistic regression analysis predicting the child's odds of being considered the race of their Hawaiian, Guamanian, or Samoan parent, as opposed to the race of their non-Pacific Islander parent.

#### TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

A comparison of the columns of Table 2 shows that that there are some convergences in racial identification between these three groups, net of other child and family characteristics. Among these, cultural connections are important flags for racial identification processes. Island birthplace increases the chances of Pacific Islander race among part-Hawaiian and part-Guamanian children. The parent's birth on the island gives an additional boost to the chances of Hawaiian, but not Guamanian, identification. When other factors are taken into account the child's birthplace is not a significant factor in the racial identification of part-Samoan children; whereas a parent's Samoan birthplace is the *only* factor that is significantly to the child's identification. Given the independent, positive effects of both child and parental birthplace, we conclude that first- *and* second-generation part-Hawaiians, part-Guamanians, and part-Samoans appear more likely than otherwise similar third- or higher-generation children (U.S.-born parent and child) to be considered Pacific Islander. This result contrasts with that of Xie and Goyette (1997), who found that second-generation part-Asians were relatively unlikely to be considered Asian.

The second area where we find general convergence is in the effects of ancestry. Our findings suggest that a mixed heritage may indicate weaker intergenerational ties to the Pacific Islander parent's heritage. Specifically, if a Hawaiian parent reports any non-Hawaiian ancestry,

his or her child is less likely to be considered Hawaiian. The same pattern is true among part-Guamanian children and in the pooled models shown below. Perhaps due to smaller sample size, the positive effect of Samoan parent's mixed ancestry is not significant.

We find little support for hypotheses regarding membership in another minority group in our multivariate analyses. A parent's status as a racial or ethnic minority appears to be only slightly related to racial identification in these groups. Part-Pacific Islander children with a racial or ethnic minority parent and a Pacific Islander parent are not less likely to be reported as Pacific Islander.

Consistent with our descriptive results, living with a person who speaks the native language of the Pacific Islander parent's island raises the chances of a child's Pacific Islander racial identification only among one of the three groups. Specifically, if child lives with a Chamorro (the native language of Guam) speaker, the child is over seven times as likely to be reported to be Guamanian. Controlling for other factors, non-English language use is not significantly related to a part-Hawaiian or a part-Samoan child's racial identification no matter what the language. Apart from the positive impact of householder status (of the Guamanian parent) on Guamanian identification, few significant results appear for our measures of assimilation and household power.

In summary, the separate analyses of racial identification among part-Hawaiian, part-Guamanian, and part-Samoan children suggest more differences than similarities in the processes and factors affecting identification among these Pacific Islander groups. The next section turns to the question of whether we can whether we can explain inter-group differences in racial identification with our predictive variables in a single pooled model. We pooled all of the individual samples into one and fit a series of twelve logistic regression models to the data. We present select regression analyses and their fit statistics in Table 3 to illustrate our findings.

#### TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

#### Multivariate results: Commonalities across Pacific Islander groups

We begin the series of comparative logit models with an extremely simplistic model (Model 1) that excludes all parental race or Hispanic origin indicators. Adding only two variables, the Hispanic origin and White/non-White race of the non-Pacific Islander parent, increases the fit substantially, taking into account added degrees of freedom. The BIC statistic is 30 points less in Model (2) (BIC = -18,700) than in Model (1) (BIC = -18,670), indicating improved fit (a general rule to determine better fit is 10 points or greater difference in the BIC statistic – see Raftery 1995).

Other changes to the model specification (not shown) do not always improve the model fit. For example, adding categories for the broad Pacific Islander groupings (Polynesian, Micronesian, or Melanesian) does not improve the fit of the model (BIC = -18,692), even if Hawaiians are separated from the rest (BIC = -18,672) or if individual groups are included (BIC = -18,603). Nor does model fit improve by identifying the specific race of the non-Pacific Islander parent (lowest BIC = -18,672).

Specification of the three largest Pacific Islander groups and an 'other' group, however, does yield improvements. Model (3) which includes Pacific Islander parents grouped as: (a) Hawaiian, (b) Samoan, (c) Guamanian, or (d) other Pacific Islander) results in a better fit (BIC = -18,714). In analyses not shown, we also tested including more detailed race categories for the non-Pacific Islander parent (BIC = -18,693), but observed no improvement over Model (3). Altogether, after testing twelve different models, we find the best fit in Model (4) (BIC = -18,729), which combines Hawaiian, Guamanian, and Samoan families and contrasts them with other Pacific Islander groups. What this analysis tells us is that we are able to explain the differences between the three major Pacific Islander groups by controlling for several key forces in racial identification processes. The results are fairly stable across all models, although the statistical significance of some effects dips slightly in a couple of the models. Most consistently, the pooled model in Table 3 shows the importance of cultural connections to racial identity in mixed race families. Pacific Island birthplace of parents and children are primary predictors of Pacific Islander race identification. A child born on the Pacific Island in question is more than twice as likely to be considered Pacific Islander as a child born elsewhere. The birthplace of the Pacific Islander parent has a parallel, independent effect. Consistent with prior research on Native Hawaiian identity, these results highlight the importance of strong connections to a cultural homeland in the continuation of a racial identity (Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003).

The results show, too, the influence of having another parent (the non-Pacific Islander parent) who is also a racial minority. Children of White/Pacific Islander couples are relatively likely to be considered White, even when other factors are taken into account. This finding compares to children of non-White/Pacific Islander couples, whose children are more likely to report the Pacific Islander parent's race. It is possible that the acceptance of mixed-race people among Pacific Islanders may make identification with this group relatively unproblematic for double-minority children in our sample. We speculate that parents of color may find that their children are accepted in their spouse's Pacific Islander culture and feel comfortable identifying their children as Pacific Islander as opposed to another option. The result may also suggest some underlying negotiations that may differentiate the households of white and Pacific Islander couples.

Our findings also reveal that mixed ancestry of the Pacific Islander parent consistently lowers the chances that a child identifies as Pacific Islander. This stands in contrast to the

argument that because of high rates of intermarriage among Pacific Islanders, distinctions between groups are no longer meaningful (Spickard and Fong 1995). As argued above, reporting mixed ancestry may suggest some weakening of cultural and social ties to the Pacific Islander group. For example, prior research suggests that individuals reporting a Hawaiian race and Hawaiian ancestry are those with the strongest Native Hawaiian racial identification, compared to those who report Hawaiian race along with some non-Hawaiian ancestry group. And those with the weakest ties to their Hawaiian heritage are those reporting no Hawaiian race and only Hawaiian ancestry (Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003, see also Snipp 1989 and Liebler 2004 on American Indians).

Consistent with our hypotheses, householder status doubles the odds of Pacific Islander racial identification. However, assimilation (measured by college attendance) is statistically unrelated, net of other factors. Although we find a significant effect of householder status, we know little about the power dynamics in households that may contribute to it. We could be seeing the results of established power negotiations in which a dominant householder passes on his/her race to the child. On the other hand, we could be observing the result of a rather arbitrary decision that reflects the moment -- the power to make this decision may be held only as long as it takes to fill out the census form. Unfortunately, we cannot observe the counter-factual: assuming both parents are biologically related to the child, we do not know whether the child's race would be reported differently if the other parent was the householder.

Alternatively, this effect may result from the design of the census questionnaire. If the Pacific Islander parent is the householder, that parent was listed first on the census questionnaire and all relationship questions are asked with respect to that person. We would expect that persons filling out the form will naturally list themselves first and also may fill in their child's race the same as their own race. This tendency may be explained in part by different parent-child

relationships. Whereas the householder is known to be the actual natural or adoptive parent of the child, census data do not allow us to know the exact relationship between the householder's spouse and the householder's child.

Another significant effect also may have competing explanations. We found that if the Pacific Islander parent's group was not Hawaiian, Guamanian, or Samoan, the child was substantially less likely to have been reported to be a Pacific Islander (with the numerically small exception of Tahitians). This finding, also shown in Table 1, may suggest that cultural and physical connections to these three relatively large groups are more easily maintained in the United States. We cannot rule out the possibility, however that the census form creates this result by listing only these three Pacific Islander categories. Writing in other specific groups requires more work from respondents, and the absence of other explicit options may also reduce the salience of the remaining Pacific Islander groups for those filling out the form. This possibility cannot be tested using the Census 2000 data because the same three groups were again the only ones specifically mentioned on the questionnaire.

In sum, our comparison of model fit between twelve logistic regression models (eight of which are not shown) reveals that the measures of the races of parents can be dramatically simplified without compromising the explanatory power of the model. We found that it is important to measure whether the non-Pacific Islander parent is a person of color (rather than identifying the specific race-group of either parent), and whether the Pacific Islander parent's group was listed on the census form. The substantive results are consistent across models.

We find the best fit from Model (4), which indicates that a part-Pacific Islander child is significantly more likely to be considered Pacific Islander than otherwise similar children if s/he was born on the island, if his/her Pacific Islander parent was born on the island, if the Pacific Islander parent is the householder, and if the non-Pacific Islander parent is of Hispanic origin.

Pacific Islander identity is less likely (and thus more likely to be the other parent's race) if the Pacific Islander parent reports mixed heritage through the ancestry question, and if the Pacific Islander parent is not Hawaiian, Guamanian, or Samoan.

#### Comparison to other U.S. minority groups

Substantively, our findings generally support earlier work investigating the racial identification of part-Asian Americans (Xie and Goyette 1997), part-American Indians (Liebler 2001), and part-African Americans (Roth 2002) although there are also differences. In the remainder of this article, we compare our results with these prior studies to identify general factors that might affect racial identification decisions in all four sets of mixed-race children.

*Cultural Connections to the Focal Parent's Group:* Three of the studies find a significant relationship between the mixed-race child's racial identification and measures of cultural connection. The exception is among part-African Americans, among whom cultural connections are particularly difficult to measure. Our analyses of part-Pacific Islanders showed a complex relationship between language use and racial identification, and that birthplace of either parent or child on the focal Pacific Island increases the chances that multiracial children were considered Pacific Islander. Mixed heritage reported by American Indian or Pacific Islander parents reduces the chances that mixed-race children are considered the race of the focal parent. We found a linear negative effect of immigrant generation (with exception of Hawaiians, who are an indigenous group), where continental-born children of continental-born parents were least likely to be reported as Pacific Islander. This pattern contrasts with curvilinear effect of immigrant generation that Xie and Goyette (1997) found among part-Asian children. There is no parallel measure for American Indians – birthplace on a reservation is not measured in the census data.

Reflecting the diversity of ethnic interactions in the United States, the effects of other parents' race and Hispanic origin are very mixed. For example, mixed-race children are more often considered American Indian, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander if the other parent reports mixed heritage (Liebler 2001, 2004; Kanaiaupuni and Liebler 2003). Part-Asian children are more likely to be considered Asian if their other parent is White than if their other parent is Black or Hispanic (Xie and Goyette 1997). In contrast, we found that White-and-Pacific Islander children are *less* likely to be considered Pacific Islander than if their other parent is a person of color.

Assimilation and Socioeconomic Status: All four studies included the educational attainment of the focal parent as a simple measure of assimilation and of the family's socioeconomic status. Among part-Asians, "the Asian parent's education increases the likelihood of Asian identification only for third-generation children. For first- and secondgeneration children, the Asian parent's education has no noticeable effects at all (Xie and Goyette 1997:563). Xie and Goyette (1997) do not include a separate measure of the family's income. Among part-American Indians, children with more educated American Indian parents are more likely to be considered American Indian. This is true even though children whose per capita household is lower are more likely to be considered American Indian (Liebler 2001). Among part-Pacific Islanders, whether Pacific Islander parent has attended college at all is not significantly related to the child's racial identification when other factors are taken into account (see Table 3). Further exploratory analysis among part-Pacific Islanders (not shown) reveals that adding a measure of per-capita household income does not change the explanatory power of parent's education. In sum, more highly educated third-generation Asians, more highly educated American Indians, and American Indians with less household income are all relatively likely to share their child's racial identification. Education and income are unrelated to the racial

identification of part-Pacific Islander children when other factors are controlled. They are also unrelated to a White-and-Black child's identification as Black (Roth 2002).

*Power dynamics in the household:* Taken together, these studies also yield mixed conclusions about the effects of the focal parent's gender and/or status as householder. Although studies have found that part-Asian and part-Black children were likely to be identified as the same race as their fathers, they did not account for householder status (Xie and Goyette 1997, Roth 2002). Taking householder status into account, Liebler (2001) found that part-American Indian children are likely to be considered the same race as their mothers. In contrast, we found no relationship between the gender of the Pacific Islander parent and racial identification of his/her child. Instead, we found an effect of householder status in part-Pacific Islander families. More specifically, our pooled analyses (Table 3) show that, among part-Pacific Islander children, children are likely to be reported the same race as the householder, no matter what the householder's gender. This result was driven primarily by dynamics in part-Hawaiian and part-Guamanian families (see Table 2).

In sum, factors affecting racial identification among part-Asian, part-American Indian, part-Black, and part-Pacific Islander children do not tell a wholly consistent story. Hispanic origin in the family, language use in the home, household socioeconomic status, and focal parent's education, gender and householder status all have varied effects depending on the particular group of focus. The most consistent effects relate to connections to the focal parent's homeland and to the family's racial heritage choices: children who were born in their focal parent's homeland (Asia or a Pacific island) are especially likely to be considered their focal parent's race; and children are less likely to be considered the focal parent's race if that parent reports mixed heritage. These consistent results may be disturbing for those who hope to preserve a particular racial identity among mixed-race children. As children of interracial unions age and form their own unions, more and more "Pacific Islander," "American Indian," and "Asian" parents will be of mixed heritage themselves. Parents have control over their child's birthplace and early identity formation as well as their own choices about race and ancestry identity. Less certain, however, is the option to move back to a distant homeland that might strengthen cultural ties and identity. Thus, along with myriad other social and personal factors affecting racial identity, immigration flows into the U.S. and high rates of intermarriage may bring a decline in the proportion of children of mixed-marriages whose single most important racial identification is Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Asian-American. These issues are less salient among mixed-African Americans.

#### Conclusion

In this article, we have brought together a body of research on the racial identification of mixed-race Americans in order to provide a comprehensive and nuanced look at the ways in which racial designation is "optional" for some people. We identified sociologically meaningful patterns in the racial identification decisions of mixed-race people from a wide variety of backgrounds. Among these, we highlighted the importance of connections to homelands and to languages, the identity heightening power of education for some, and questions about the effects of questionnaire wording on identification.

Most factors related to patterns in racial identification are quite stable; for example, connections to an identity based on birthplace and language are not easily weakened. Thus we conclude that for many individuals of mixed heritage, racial identity is not as fluid and fluctuating as may seem from the diversity of responses to the questions. Many people with

complex backgrounds probably retain a stable core of racial identity – whether simple or complex – to which they turn when interpreting the world around them and presenting themselves to it. Ethnic and racial identities continue to guide the actions of mixed race people. Intermarriage does not mean the end of race as a meaningful social category, but it does erode conventional race categories as we knew them at the end of the twentieth century.

Future research is necessary to understand the meanings behind the empirical findings that we have highlighted. Census data provide a limited, quantitative portrait of racial identification and serve the primary purpose of understanding broad patterns and generalizable trends. Yet, the questions raised by our analyses call for more attention to the individual and structural factors that differentiate the experiences of various multiracial groups in the United States. In addition, insights from the psychosocial literature and longitudinal studies will help to shed light on how the identities of multiracial children shift throughout the life course and in subsequent generations.

- Grieco, Elizabeth. 2001. "The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population: 2000." Census 2000 Brief C2KBR/01-14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Fernandez, Edward. 1996. "Comparisons of Selected Social and Economic Characteristics Between Asians, Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians (Including Alaskan Natives)." Population Division Working Paper No. 15. U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Kanaiaupuni, Shawn Malia and Carolyn Liebler. 2003. "Pondering Poi Dog: The Importance of Place to the Racial Identification of Mixed-Race Native Hawaiians." Working Paper #02-03-24. Policy Analysis and System Evaluation, Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu Hawaii.
- Labov, Teresa and Jerry Jacobs. 1986. "Intermarriage in Hawaii, 1950-1983." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48: 79-88.
- Liebler, Carolyn. 2001. *The Fringes of American Indian Identity*. Dissertation (Sociology). University of Wisconsin Madison.
- Liebler, Carolyn. 2004. "Ties on the Fringes of Identity." Forthcoming in *Social Science Research*.
- Parkman, Margaret and Jack Sawyer. 1967. "Dimensions of Ethnic Internarriage in Hawaii." American Sociological Review 32: 593-607
- Raftery, Adrian E. 1995. "Baysian Model Selection in Social Research." *Sociological Methodology* 25:111-95.
- Rogers, Lisa. 1999. Riding Ancient Waves. http://www.neh.gov/news/humanities/1999-05/wayfinders.html.
- Roth, Wendy. 2002. "Creating Racial Options: Labeling of Multiracial Children in Black Intermarriages." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association.
- Snipp, C. Matthew. 1989. American Indians: The First of This Land. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Spickard, Paul & Rowena Fong. 1995. "Pacific Islander Americans and Multiethnicity: A Vision of America's Future?" *Social Forces* 73(4): 1365-1383.
- Xie, Yu and Kimberly Goyette. 1997. "The Racial Identification of Biracial Children with One Asian Parent: Evidence form the 1990 Census." *Social Forces* 76(2): 547-570.

Figure	1:	
$\mathcal{C}$		



<sup>1</sup> In brief, "racial identity" is how a person sees his or her race(s), while "racial identification" is the race(s) they report when asked by a stranger or on a form.

<sup>2</sup> The 1990 Census race question reads: "Fill ONE circle for the race that the person considers himself/herself to be."

<sup>3</sup> If all people who marked it at all are counted in the population, the Pacific Islander population increased by 140% (Greico 2001). Over half of this Pacific Islander population marked at least one other race in 2000.

<sup>4</sup> Generally, Polynesian islands are on the right-hand side of the map, Micronesian islands are north of New Guinea on the left-hand side, and Melanesian islands are on the bottom of the lefthand side. Tahiti is not shown on the map; it is in French Polynesia.

<sup>5</sup> More specifically, the child was not eligible for the sample if the child is reported to be of Hispanic origin but neither parent is Hispanic; if both parents are Hispanic but the child is not; or if the child's race is not the same as either parent's race and is not "other Polynesian," "other Micronesian," "other Melanesian," "Pacific Islander, not specified," or "other race." <sup>6</sup> We use the "cluster" command in STATA to adjust the standard errors in our regression

estimates to account for the bias of having multiple children in one household.

<sup>7</sup> Kanaiaupuni and Liebler (2001) found that the racial identification patterns of part-Native Hawaiian children were similar in multifamily households and single family households.
<sup>8</sup> Parents have enormous influence over a child's understanding of race and his/her own racial identity (see Xie and Goyette 1997; Liebler 2001). Thus, a parent's understanding of the mixedrace child's single most important race may be highly related to the child's actual racial identity.
<sup>9</sup> Note that all of the families lived in the 50 United States at the time of the 1990 Census. <sup>10</sup> All "married" couples in the census data are heterosexual so this also denotes the sex of the non-Pacific Islander parent.

<sup>11</sup> We consider the child's birthplace to also provide some measure of the family's current residence in Hawaii. Of those children living in Hawaii, 92% were born on their Pacific Islander parent's island. Of those living on the U.S. continent, only 9.6% were born on their parent's island.

#### Table 1

Racial Identification of Children<sup>1</sup> of Internacially Married Pacific Islanders: Percent of Children Reported to be the Pacific Islander Parent's Race, by Characteristics of the Family (1990 Census 5% PUMS)

	Pacific Islander Parent's Race																		
	All Pac	cific	Islander								Pol	ynesian							
	Groups Combined		Native Hawaiian		Samoan		Tahitian		Tongan		Other Polynesi		er esian						
	# Kids		% Pac. Isl.	# Kids		% Hawaiian	# Kids		% Samoan	# Kid	s	% Tahitian	# Kids	_	% Tongan	# K	ids	%	Oth.Poly.
Cultural Connections																			
Child's Characteristics																			
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	1,158	*	64.9%	965	*	66.4%	76	*	69.7%	2		100.0%	9		33.3%	8	*		75.0%
PI Parent's Characteristics																			
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	2,293	*	54.2%	1,557	*	58.4%	232	*	56.9%	7	*	85.7%	60		40.0%	1	8	4	44.4%
Reports Ancestry Diff. From Race	1,127	*	45.3%	888	*	48.3%	63		44.4%	5	*	0.0%	4		25.0%	5			0.0%
Is of Hispanic Origin	279		55.2%	140		61.4%	4		75.0%	0			0			C	)		
Non-PI Parent's Characterisitcs																			
White	1,816	*	45.9%	1,173	*	48.3%	204	*	48.0%	12		50.0%	57		36.8%	1	9		31.6%
Black	120		43.3%	57		54.4%	25		40.0%	0			1		0.0%	2			0.0%
Asian	618	*	62.0%	496	*	64.9%	25	*	80.0%	0			0			2	*		100%
American Indian	64		54.7%	30		66.7%	5		20.0%	0			3	*	100%	C	)		
"Other Race" <sup>2</sup>	218	*	66.5%	105	*	70.5%	35	*	77.1%	0			0			C	)		
Is of Hispanic Origin	399	*	62.2%	236	*	67.4%	34	*	70.6%	0			4		75.0%	0	)		
Household Characteristics																			
Languages Spoken in Household																			
Includes Language of PI Parent	527		52.6%	99		60.6%	171		57.3%	0			39		46.2%	$\epsilon$			50.0%
Incl. Other Non-Engl. Lang.	1,970	*	55.5%	1,393	*	59.6%	178		53.9%	9	*	66.7%	36		44.4%	1	5	4	40.0%
Assimilation																			
Has Attended Any College	1,403	*	49.0%	939		53.1%	141		48.9%	5	*	0.0%	32		28.1%	1	5		33.3%
Power Dynamics in the Household																			
Is Considered the Householder	1,414	*	59.0%	971	*	61.4%	154	*	59.7%	3	*	0.0%	34		50.0%	1	1		54.6%
Is Male	1,379	*	57.8%	927	*	60.0%	160	*	61.3%	3	*	0.0%	33	*	54.6%	9	*		66.7%
Householder and Male	1,273	*	58.6%	859	*	60.8%	146	*	61.6%	3	*	0.0%	30	*	56.7%	9	*		66.7%
Total	2,836		51.1%	1,861		54.4%	294		53.1%	12		50.0%	61		39.3%	2	3		34.8%

continued...

<sup>1</sup> Each child is the natural or adopted child of the householder in a single family household. All eligible children in a household are included in the sample; this bias is taken into account in the regression <sup>2</sup> 207 of the 218 "other race" parents are of Hispanic origin. There are a total of 399 non-PI parents of Hispanic origin in this sample.

<sup>3</sup>The only Melanesians who fit the sample selection criteria are Fijians.

Note: Numbers are in bold and marked with an asterisk if a chi-squared test shows that this variable is significantly(p<=0.05) related to the child's racial identification families with a PI parent from this group.

#### Table 1, Continued

### Racial Identification of Children<sup>1</sup> of Interracially Married Pacific Islanders: Percent of Children Reported to be the Pacific Islander Parent's Race, by Characteristics of the Family (1990 Census 5% PUMS)

					Pa	cific Island	ler Parent's Ra	ace							
					Micror	nesian				Melanesian <sup>3</sup>			Pacific Islander,		
	Guamanian/ Chamorro		Northern Mariana Islander		Palauan		Other Micronesian		Fijian		Island Not Specified				
	# Kids	-	% Guam.	# Kids	% N. Mar. Is.	# Kids	% Palauan	# Kids	% Oth. Mic.	# Kid	5	% Fijian	# Kids	% PI, not sp.	
Cultural Connections															
Child's Characteristics															
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	40	*	77.5%	2	0.0%	7	42.9%	28	21.4%	14		28.6%	7	28.6%	
PI Parent's Characteristics															
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	296		44.3%	7	0.0%	20	30.0%	52	23.1%	24		37.5%	20	30.0%	
Reports Ancestry Diff. From Race	121	*	33.9%	3	0.0%	3	33.3%	4	0.0%	16		37.5%	15	26.7%	
Is of Hispanic Origin	125		52.0%	0		0		5	0.0%	3		0.0%	2	0.0%	
Non-PI Parent's Characterisitcs															
White	256	*	41.0%	6	0.0%	16	43.8%	36	22.2%	15	*	60.0%	22	31.8%	
Black	22		31.8%	0		4	25.0%	5	60.0%	4		0.0%	0		
Asian	64		53.1%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	15	20.0%	6	*	0.0%	6	33.3%	
American Indian	19		52.6%	0		1	0.0%	4	25.0%	0			2	0.0%	
"Other Race" <sup>2</sup>	74	*	59.5%	0		0		0		0			4	0.0%	
Is of Hispanic Origin	104	*	55.8%	0		0		9	33.3%	3		0.0%	9	11.1%	
Household Characteristics															
Languages Spoken in Household															
Includes Language of PI Parent	139	*	53.2%	0		14	42.9%	42	26.2%	7	*	71.4%	10	20.0%	
Incl. Other Non-Engl. Lang.	240		47.5%	7	0.0%	11	27.3%	48	25.0%	21		42.9%	21	33.3%	
Assimilation															
Has Attended Any College	194		42.8%	6	0.0%	13	30.8%	31	22.6%	13	*	61.5%	14	21.4%	
Power Dynamics in the Household															
Is Considered the Householder	190	*	56.8%	0		3	0.0%	17	41.2%	12		25.0%	19	26.3%	
Is Male	187	*	55.6%	0		6	* 0.0%	20	35.0%	13		23.1%	21	23.8%	
Householder and Male	175	*	54.9%	0		3	0.0%	17	41.2%	12		25.0%	19	26.3%	
Total	435		46.0%	9	0.0%	22	36.4%	60	25.0%	25		36.0%	34	26.5%	

<sup>1</sup> Each child is the natural or adopted child of the householder in a single family household. All eligible children in a household are included in the sample; this bias is taken into account in the regression analyses. All children in this sample are under 18 years old. See text for further details on sample selection.

<sup>2</sup> 207 of the 218 "other race" parents are of Hispanic origin. There are a total of 399 non-PI parents of Hispanic origin in this sample.

<sup>3</sup> The only Melanesians who fit the sample selection criteria are Fijians.

Note: Numbers are in bold and marked with an asterisk if a chi-squared test shows that this variable is significantly(p<=0.05) related to the child's racial identification families with a PI parent from this group.

#### Table 2

## Parsimonious Logistic Regression Predicting the Racial Identification of Children of Interracially Married Pacific Islanders from One of Three Groups: Native Hawaiians, Guamanians, and Samoans

Odds of a child being reported Pacific Islander parent's race as opposed to the race of the other parent

	Child repor Native Ha	ted to be waiian	Child report Guamanian/O	ed to be Chamorro	Child report Samoa	ed to be an	
	Odds Ratio	Ζ	Odds Ratio	Ζ	Odds Ratio	Ζ	
Cultural Connections							
Child's Characteristics							
Born in Hawaii / Guam / Samoa	2.11	4.33	12.57	3.22	28.16	1.73	
Pacific Islander Parent's Characteristics							
Born in Hawaii / Guam / Samoa	2.12	3.40	0.66	-1.19	2.92	2.22	
Non-Hawaiian / Non-Guamanian / Non-Samoan Ancestry	0.73	-2.02	0.19	-4.27	1.34	0.54	
Is of Hispanic Origin	1.38	1.14	2.34	2.08			
Non-Pacific Islander Parent's Characteristics							
Race is Not White (White is comparison)	1.36	1.72	1.79	1.78	2.22	1.48	
Is of Hispanic Origin	2.01	2.82	1.53	1.04	1.58	0.60	
Household Characteristics							
Languages Spoken in Household							
Includes Hawaiian / Chamorro / Samoan	1.13	0.39	1.98	1.99	1.03	0.07	
Includes other Non-English Language	1.30	1.30	0.86	-0.49	0.97	-0.08	
Assimilation							
Has Attended Any College	1.08	0.48	0.80	-0.74	0.66	-1.02	
Power Dynamics in the Household							
Is Considered the Householder	1.99	1.96	7.46	2.46	0.32	-1.13	
Is Male	1.12	0.28	3.96	1.59	1.19	0.26	
Householder and Male	0.90	-0.20	0.11	-1.83	9.53	1.73	
Constant	0.31	-3.79	0.81	-0.47	0.54	-0.98	
Log Likelihood	-1144	4.0	-251.	5	-175.6		
df	12	5	12		11		
1	1,84	3	431		294		

1990 Census 5% PUMS

Note: Data are unweighted because the sample is not representative of all households. All eligible children in a household were included in the data but this bias is taken into consideration in the regression. A measure of Hispanic origin of Samoan parents was not included because n=4. A z-score (which is the ratio between the coefficient and the standard error) whose absolute value is greater than 1.96 indicates that the effect is significant at the  $p \le 0.05$  level. See text for details of sample selection. Twenty children who otherwise fit sample selection criteria were excluded because their racial identification does not match either parent.

#### Table 3

Parsimonious Logistic Regression Models Predicting the Racial Identification of Children of Interracially Married Pacific Islanders in America: Odds of Child's Race Matching the Pacific Islander Parent's Race, As Compared to Odds of Matching the Other Parent's Race, 1990 Census 5% PUMS

	(1)		C	2)	Ű	3)	(4)		
	Odds Ratio	<u>Z</u>	Odds Ratio	<u>Z</u>	Odds Ratio	<u>Z</u>	Odds Ratio	$\underline{p} \underline{Z}$	
Cultural Connections									
Child's Characteristics									
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	2.38	(6.56)	2.36	(6.38)	2.29	(5.99)	2.34	(6.28)	
Pac. Isl. Parent's Characteristics		()		()				(	
Born on PI parent's Pacific Island	1.36	(1.93)	1.50	(2.47)	1.48	(2.32)	1.50	(2.43)	
Reports Ancestry Different From Race	0.66	(-3.20)	0.66	(-3.18)	0.63	(-3.49)	0.63	(-3.44)	
Pacific Islander Group				. ,					
Hawaiian (comparison)									
Samoan					0.93	(-0.30)			
Guamanian/Chamorro					0.90	(-0.62)			
Hawaiian, Guamanian, or Samoan (co	omparison)								
Other PI, not incl. Hawaiian, Guam.,	or Samoan				0.39	(-3.54)	0.40	(-3.54)	
Non-Pac. Isl. Parent's Characteristics									
Simplified Race (White is Comparison)									
Not White			1.33	(2.07)	1.31	( <b>1.96</b> )	1.31	(1.93)	
Is of Hispanic Origin			1.82	(3.13)	1.80	(3.09)	1.79	(3.06)	
Household Characteristics									
Languages Spoken in Household									
Includes Language of PI Parent	1.08	(0.47)	1.07	(0.42)	1.29	(1.34)	1.24	(1.28)	
Incl. Other Non-Engl. Lang.	1.27	(1.71)	1.16	(1.03)	1.17	(1.08)	1.17	(1.11)	
Assimilation									
Has Attended Any College	0.89	(-1.01)	0.95	(-0.46)	0.95	(-0.44)	0.95	(-0.40)	
Power Dynamics in the Household									
Is Considered the Householder	2.01	(2.43)	2.11	(2.57)	2.02	(2.45)	2.04	(2.48)	
Is Male	1.19	(0.58)	1.20	(0.58)	1.19	(0.56)	1.20	(0.58)	
Householder and Male	0.90	(-0.25)	0.86	(-0.35)	0.90	(-0.25)	0.89	(-0.27)	
Constant	0.41	(-4.73)	0.33	(-5.60)	0.37	(-4.56)	0.35	(-5.17)	
Log Likelihood	-180	04.7	-178	81.8	-170	62.9	-1763.3		
df	9	)	1	1	1	4	12		
BIC statistic	-18,	670	-18,	700	-18,	,714	-18,729		
N	2,8	15	2,8	15	2,8	15	2,	815	

Notes: Data are unweighted because census data weights are not appropriate for highly selective samples. All eligible children in a household were included in the data; this bias is taken into consideration in the regression's standard errors using the "cluster" command in STATA. See text for details of sample selection. BIC statistics provide a measure of relative goodness of fit; a more negative BIC statistic (by at least 10 points) provides strong evidence of a better fit (Raftery 1995). Significant Z-statistics (p<=0.05) are highlighted in bold.