Sociological Perspectives
1–25

DOI: 10.1177/0731121421057121
journals.sagepub.com/home/spx
SAGE

The Correlates of Panethnic Identification: Assessing Similarities and Differences among Latinos and Asians in the United States

Beksahn Jang[1], Kelsey E. Gonzalez[1], Liwen Zeng[1], and Daniel E. Martínez[1]

Abstract

Latinos and Asian-Americans constitute the largest recent immigrant groups in the United States. Upon arrival, immigrants from these groups generally identify with their national origin despite being categorized as "Asian" or "Latino" for state enumeration. While both are racialized and excluded from mainstream identities, they differ in their internal linguistic and religious diversities, socioeconomic status, and immigration experiences. Sociologists theorized that Asian-American panethnicity is based on structural commonalities while Latino panethnicity is built upon cultural commonalities. We elaborate the theoretical understanding of contexts associated with this identification and find alternative underpinnings that shape both groups' panethnic identification. We find generation since immigration is a common basis for elevated likelihood of panethnic identification for both groups. However, among Asian-Americans, we find English proficiency and age increase people's odds of identifying with a panethnic identity over a national origin term, whereas for Latinos, political affiliation and religiosity increase these odds.

Keywords

Asia and Asian America, Latina/o sociology, racial and ethnic minorities

Immigrants from Asian and Latin American counties have represented the fastest growing ethno-racial immigrant subgroups in the United States since the 1960s, with more than 19 million foreign-born Latinos and 12 million foreign-born Asians[1] residing in the country (Flores 2017; G. Lopez, Ruiz, and Patten 2017). Upon arrival, Latino and Asian immigrants face challenges adjusting to a new life. Immigrants must adapt to new occupations and economic positions while interacting with different and perhaps unfamiliar racial and ethnic groups. As they become embedded in a new environment, immigrants are also faced with new labels and collective experiences that shape ethno-racial identification. As an identity, panethnicity simultaneously deals with groups' responses to being assigned to ethno-racial categories by the state, the emergence of feelings of panethnic unity between groups, and the challenge of maintaining internal distinctions that make groups unique (Okamoto and Mora 2014). Panethnic identities are frequently

[1]The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA.

Corresponding Author:
Kelsey E. Gonzalez, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA.
Email: kelseygonzalez@email.arizona.edu

enacted not as mutually exclusive of national origin and ethnic identities but as layered and contextually activated.

Although most Asian Americans and Latinos identify primarily on the basis of a national origin term, approximately 20 percent of both Asian Americans and Latinos claim a panethnic label as their *primary* identity (Flores 2017; G. Lopez et al. 2017). Daniel E. Martínez and Kelsey E. Gonzalez (2021) found that rates of panethnic identification have generally increased among Latino-Hispanics over time across consecutive empirical studies. The authors also found that those who identified primarily as panethnic had lower odds of being registered to vote but higher odds of having a positive outlook on life compared to Latino-Hispanics who identified as "American." However, three decades of sociological research has suggested that the factors underpinning panethnicity differ between Asians and Latinos (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000; A. H. Kim and White 2010; D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). While Asian American panethnicity is based on structural commonalities such as income and education, Latino panethnicity builds more on cultural commonalities like language, including the use of Spanish and familiarity with Spanish surnames, as well as a common religion (i.e., Catholicism). Indeed, Asian Americans and Latinos face vastly different social contexts and experiences due to the external racialization they face, varied legal and immigration contexts, differences in socioeconomic status, and internal linguistic and religious diversities (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Ricourt and Danta 2003). Despite these differences, immigrants from Asian and Latin American countries represent the largest immigrant groups in the United States. Moreover, Asian Americans and Latinos alike routinely experience racialization and racialized exclusion in U.S. society. As such, there are theoretical grounds for why Asian Americans and Latinos may have different reasons for establishing and prioritizing panethnic identities.

Previous studies have largely approached panethnicity through qualitative interviews of members of a single ethnic or racial group (Junn and Masuoka 2008; Okamoto and Mora 2014; Park 2008; Wong et al. 2011). Although these methods capture the contextual nature and complexity of multiple overlapping identities, a more strictly positivist orientation can allow for comparisons across groups when similarly structured surveys are utilized (Croll 2007). Our study utilizes two comparable nationally representative surveys of Asian Americans and Latinos to empirically test the correlates of panethnic label preference (i.e., Latino/Hispanic or Asian/Asian American) at the individual-level over identification with a national origin term (e.g., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, etc.). Such an approach can aid in identifying patterns of label preferences that are common across groups and ways in which those groups may be distinct. While we find similarities in terms of immigration-related factors, we also find notable differences between Asian Americans and Latinos in terms of the sociodemographic correlates of panethnic label preference, likely reflecting the different racialization processes that each group has experienced in the U.S. context.

Panethnicity

Dina G. Okamoto and G. Cristina Mora (2014) define panethnicity as the construction of a collective category that ties together various ethnic, religious, or national origin groups. The process of forming this identity engages with a tension between the importance of maintaining subgroup distinctions and the need to build a sense of broader unity. Case studies of panethnicity have found that immigrant groups have varying attitudes regarding the relation between panethnic identification and national origin identities, with some groups perceiving panethnic identities as complementary (Mora 2014) and others as threats to their national origin identity (Dhingra 2007; Jones-Correa and Leal 1996). Panethnic, ethnic, and national identities are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Rather, individuals may simultaneously carry multiple social identities as they move through different social contexts. These contexts may activate different and multi-layered

identities, be they ethnic, racial, panethnic, and/or national origin. Drawing from social identity theory and self-identification processes, we see primary panethnic identification as a dialectical process that engages both self-identification (assertion) and other-designation (assignment) processes (Cornell and Hartman 2007; Phinney et al. 2001).

The process of panethnic identity formation is closely tied to the literature of racialization and racial discrimination. Despite immigrants' continued preference to be recognized on the basis of their national origin (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Wong et al. 2011), they are assigned racial and ethnic labels in their host societies (Cornell and Hartman 2007). "Asian" and "Latino" are socially constructed categories imposed upon immigrants by government agencies and the public through a racialized process of exclusion and segregation that serves to obscure diversity between and within ethnic populations (Foner and Fredrickson 2004). This social construction carries implications, as various resources and privileges are often distributed along ethno-racial lines through state-sponsored racialization projects such as the U.S. Census and public benefits programs (Lewis 2004; Omi and Winant 2014). While "Asian" is both a racial and panethnic label, "Latino" is generally considered as an ethnicity. Nonetheless, Latinos are often racialized in U.S. society and, consequently, many Latinos identify *racially* as Latino (Golash-Boza 2006; Martínez and Gonzalez 2021; C. Rodriguez 2000). In this process, groups are classified into categories based on their perceived physical and cultural characteristics that are presumed to have a biological basis (Espiritu 1993; Omi and Winant 2014). Everyday experiences of social, political, and economic exclusion, feelings of linked fate, communal membership, and the imposition of official classification systems can promote the internalization of imposed ethno-racial categories, ultimately increasing the likelihood that Asians and Latinos will self-identify with those assigned labels (Jenkins 1994). Given the significant impact of exclusion and "othering" along panethnic lines, panethnic categories often serve as a powerful resource for political mobilization. Panethnic labels can be utilized by racial minority group leaders seeking to mobilize an expanded support base for voting and community activism (Masuoka 2008; T. E. Min 2014; Okamoto 2003; Okamoto and Mora 2014). Panethnic organizations are also known to draw upon state panethnic categories in the process of constructing panethnic cultural and historical narratives (Hanson 1997; Laitin 1986; Pallares 2002), serving a critical role in political strategies bringing together diverse groups by constructing common interests (Nagata 1979; Trottier 1981).

David Lopez and Yen Espiritu (1990) laid the theoretical groundwork for understanding the individual-level contexts and factors that shape panethnic identification. The authors argued that the more similar national origin groups within a panethnic label are in terms of language, religion, and socioeconomic status, the more likely they are to identify panethnically. They contended that cultural commonality, defined as shared language and religion, is one pathway facilitating panethnic identification. Sharing a common language generates feelings of cultural similarity and provides the basic capacity to interact and organize (D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). Although a shared religion may too increase panethnic identification (D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990), further research has revealed that religious organizations often work to preserve ethnic identities (Cadge and Ecklund 2007).

Another pathway to panethnic identification outlined by David Lopez and Yen Espiritu (1990) is based on structural and economic factors, including income, education, and economic position. For example, Ann H. Kim and Michael J. White (2010) found that panethnic groups are generally segregated and live in greater proximity to each other than in proximity to other ethno-racial groups. Other research has confirmed that shared experiences of labor market exclusion can generate feelings of broader panethnic identification among immigrants (Bonacich 1973; P. G. Min 2006; Okamoto 2003, 2006). Furthermore, when Asians of different national origins share similar occupational tendencies and are segregated from groups of a different race, they exhibit higher rates of panethnic organizing (Okamoto 2003).

While many Asian Americans and Latinos identify panethnically, asserting a panethnic identity label as their primary identity term represents a distinct form of panethnic identification. We found that roughly 20 percent of Asian Americans and Latinos alike selected a panethnic identity label over their national origin term. As such, we ask: (1) what factors help explain primary panethnic label preference among Asian Americans and Latinos, and (2) do these factors operate similarly for both groups?

The Case of Asian Americans and Latinos

The vast majority of immigrants today are of Asian or Latin American ancestry, encompassing 81 percent of all foreign-born residents in the United States as of the 2010 Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2010). Asian Americans[2] tend to be more homogeneous in terms of state racial classification, socioeconomic status, and geographic concentration than Latinos, but are highly diverse in terms of language and religious affiliation (D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). In contrast, Latinos are more homogeneous linguistically and religiously but are internally diverse along lines of state racial classification, socioeconomic status, generation-since-immigration, and geographic concentration (D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). Before the 1960s, Japanese and Chinese Americans were the largest Asian immigrant groups in the United States (U.S. Census 1860-1960). After 1965, Asian immigration to the United States surged with arrivals from a much wider set of countries. The majority of Latino immigrants prior to 1960 were Mexican and, to a lesser extent, Puerto Rican, whereas Cubans and people from other Latin American counties emigrated in much larger numbers thereafter, particularly in the 1990s and 2000s (Tienda and Sánchez 2013).

Asian Americans and Latinos have had markedly different histories of racialization in the United States, yet both have been socially constructed as "racialized others." The process of racializing Asians can be illustrated through racial stereotypes and legal restrictions (Espiritu 2008; Ngai 2014; Okihiro 1994; Tuan 1998). Before the Second World War, Asians were stereotyped as the "yellow peril" and "sneaky Orientals" who posed an economic threat to White laborers, a cultural menace to American racial purity, and a military threat to national security (Bonacich 1972; Marchetti 1994; Okihiro 1994; Takaki 1998; Wu 1982). Legal restrictions, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1892 and the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924, were enacted to establish the national origins quota system, which constituted a "racial and national hierarchy that favored some immigrants over others" (Ngai 2014:47). Thus, except for Filipinos, who were considered "non-citizen U.S. nationals" from 1899 to 1946 due to the annexation of the Philippines after the Spanish-American War, large numbers of Chinese and other Asians were excluded from American soil until the mid-1960s. Since then, Asians have been racially stereotyped as "the model minority," "honorary whites," and "forever foreigners" (Espiritu 2008; Tuan 1998; Xu and Lee 2013; Zhou 2004), and have frequently been racially categorized together (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1986), despite their diversity in language and religion. Claire Jean Kim (1999) argued that Asian Americans are racially triangulated vis-a-vis their position between Whites and Blacks by being racially valorized due to their socio-economic achievements yet civically ostracized due to their presumed lack of cultural assimilability. The model minority myth is indeed integral to the racialization and marginalization of Asians. On one hand, it undercuts the persistence of racism by discounting structural disadvantages that Asian and other racial minorities face, thus supporting the American ideology of individualism (C. J. Kim 1999; Park et al. 2015). On the other hand, by setting Asians as the "model," it pits Asians against other racial and ethnic minorities. As the "honorary whites," Asians serve to buffer racial conflicts between White and Black, which thus maintains white supremacy within the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Xu and Lee 2013).

The racialization of Latinos has taken a different path, including a longstanding debate regarding the ethno-racial status of Latinos (Frank, Akresh, and Lu 2010). Latinos' racialization is not a recent phenomenon but rather traces back to U.S. westward expansion and the annexation of one-third of Mexico's territory after the 1848 Mexican-American War. Though the racial boundaries between Whites and Mexicans were not as clearly delineated or "bright" as those between Whites and Blacks, Mexicans have historically been seen as "in between," 'off-white,' and "partly colored" (Fox and Guglielmo 2012:329). Though Mexicans were re-classified as "White" by the 1940 census, one early example of the explicit categorical racialization of Mexicans as "non-White" was the U.S. Census Bureau classification of "Mexican" as a distinct racial category in the 1930 census. Methods to classify people of Latin American ancestry in the United States varied over future censuses, up to the current separation of the ethnic "Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin" question from the race question. As an "internally colonized" group (Acuña 2000), Mexicans, much like early Japanese and Chinese immigrants, were subjected to individual racism, institutional discrimination, and racialized extra-legal violence by Whites throughout much of U.S. history (G. Rodriguez 2008; Telles and Ortiz 2008) as well as state-sanctioned displacement such as the forced repatriation and deportation via the Mexican Repatriation of the 1930s and Operation Wetback in 1954. This historical racialization of Mexicans has undoubtedly contributed to the contemporary racialization of Latinos. Moreover, similar to Asian Americans, public conceptualizations of what it means to be a "real" American also play a role in the racialization of Latinos (Rosaldo 1997), because "despite their citizenship, [Latinos] continue to be marked as alien citizens, with both their citizenship and their Americanness challenged" (Flores-González 2017:14).

Overall, the cases of Asian Americans and Latinos suggest there is a degree of dissimilarity on aspects such as language, religion, and socioeconomic status. However, both groups, as minorities, share common experiences of racialized assimilation and exclusion from the "American" identity, although these processes have unfolded differently for each group. We conceptualize panethnicity as a response to this process of becoming embedded in an environment in which race plays a central role in organizing group relations. With these distinctions and commonalities in mind, in the following section we provide a set of propositions regarding the correlates of panethnic identification at the individual level. We broadly divide these relationships into those focusing on language and religion, structural factors, immigration-related factors, and political factors. We provide general hypotheses for the expected outcomes, noting whether these expected relationships will be similar or different for Asians and Latinos. Because our analyses draw on individual-level survey data, we must be clear that our propositions are stated with regards to micro-level processes that ultimately stem from group-level differences. Nevertheless, we contend that our hypotheses do not constitute ecological fallacies because they are based on likely differences between Asian Americans and Latinos in the distribution of certain sociodemographic characteristics *on average*. It is the average variation among Asian Americans and Latinos in the values of the factors we examined that allows us to make distinguishing generalizations between the two groups.

Hypotheses

Language and Religion

Shared language is generally associated with a shared identity because it promotes communication between groups and preconditions collective organization. Language also acts as a source of common culture across national origin groups (Oboler 1995). Languages are central to ethnic identities and the connection to home countries and are therefore frequently the point around which ethnic communities are organized (D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). Compared to Latinos,

Asian Americans speak a much wider variety of languages, making English the language of choice for communication between Asian subgroups (Espiritu 1993). Lacking a common language, English fluency is therefore more critical to Asian panethnicity than Latino panethnicity. As such, we expect that English fluency will be a significant predictor of Asian Americans' preference for panethnic identity labels.

Proposition 1A (P1A): English fluency will increase the relative odds that Asian American respondents select a panethnic identity label over a national origin term.

Proposition 1B (P1B): English fluency will not affect the relative odds that Latino respondents select a panethnic identity label over a national origin term.

Religion is found to be a significant characteristic of ethnic identity and a source of ethnic conflict (Jeung 2004; Yinger 1985). Studies of immigrant religious organizations frequently find that these institutions help to reinforce and maintain ethnicity (Cadge and Ecklund 2007). Pyong Gap Min (1992, 2006) finds that, among Korean Christians and Indian Hindus, religious organizations work to preserve ethnic traditions by building connections between ethnic and religious rituals. Similarly, Milagros Peña and Lisa M. Frehill (1998) found that Latina women were more likely to place high importance on their religion when they were embedded in the Latino ethnic community. These findings suggest that religious organizational involvement preserves ethnic identity, likely causing frequent attendees to place greater emphasis on their national origin identities rather than a panethnic one. We expect that religious attendance will significantly decrease the relative odds of selecting a panethnic identity label over national origin.

Proposition 2A (P2A): Frequent religious attendance will decrease the relative odds of Asian American respondents selecting a panethnic identity label over a national origin term.

Proposition 2B (P2B): Frequent religious attendance will decrease the relative odds that Latino respondents will select a panethnic identity label over a national origin term.

Socioeconomic Status

We define structural factors as elements relating to socioeconomic status (SES), operationalized as income and education. Individuals with higher SES are known to be associated with active political participation and public sphere engagement (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995). Those with greater SES-related resources may have the biographical availability (McAdam 1986) or flexibility to organize politically, exposing them to broader panethnic categories. Prior research has also found that education promotes awareness of racial inequality and perceptions of discrimination (Espiritu 1993; Portes and MacLeod 1996), which we expect will increase the preference for a panethnic identity label. Overall, we predict that both higher income and higher levels of education will be associated with increased odds of selecting a panethnic label over a national origin term.

Proposition 3A (P3A): Higher socioeconomic status, measured through income and education, will increase the relative odds of panethnic identity label selection over a national origin term for Asian Americans.

Proposition 3B (P3B): Higher socioeconomic status, measured through income and education, will increase the relative odds of panethnic identity label selection over a national origin term for Latinos.

Immigration Status: Generation and Citizenship

Immigrant generation should be positively associated with panethnic identity label selection over a national origin term among Asian Americans and Latinos. Previous literature suggests that first generation immigrants are more likely to settle in ethnic enclaves, which leads to social and geographic isolation from other ethnic groups (Malone et al. 2003). First generation immigrants may also carry biases from their home country, retaining some of the hostilities towards immigrants from rival countries (DeSipio 1996; Lien 2001) thereby inhibiting feelings of kinship with their co-panethnics. However, as immigrants proceed into their second and later generations they become more likely to identify panethnically (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Kao and Joyner 2006; Portes and MacLeod 1996). The increased odds can partly be explained by their higher sensitivity to racial discrimination than first-generation immigrants (Goto, Gee, and Takeuchi 2002; Perez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2009), thereby increasing group consciousness along panethnic lines rather than assimilating into an "American" identity (Golash-Boza 2006). Group consciousness refers to the broad feelings that members of a group share a linked fate and have a common sense of belonging. It is commonly conceptualized of as the intermediary mechanism converting experiences of discrimination and othering into identification with a panethnic group (Martínez and Gonzalez 2021; Masuoka 2006).

Proposition 4A (P4A): Second and later generations of Asian Americans will have higher relative odds of claiming a panethnic identity label over a national origin term than their first-generation counterparts.

Proposition 4B (P4B): Second and later generations Latinos will have higher relative odds of claiming a panethnic identity label over a national origin term than their first-generation counterparts.

Citizenship can shape panethnic identification in two ways: first, through the provision of state-ensured rights and protections, and, second, by generating a sense of connection among subgroups. In the first, because non-citizens lack certain legal protections, not having citizenship can act as a serious barrier to engagement in political activities (T. E. Min 2014). Avoiding such engagement is likely to reduce engagement in activities and contact with agents that promote panethnic group consciousness. In the second, when citizenship is obtained, it can foster feelings of acceptance and embeddedness in a new home and generate a predisposition to defend and uphold the functions of the state (Eriksen 2002; Gellner 2009). In this sense, panethnic identification may act as a signal of acceptance of one's new home.

Proposition 5A (P5A): Asian Americans with U.S. citizenship will have higher relative odds of claiming a panethnic identity label over a national origin term than non-citizens.

Proposition 5B (P5B): Latinos with U.S. citizenship will have higher relative odds of claiming a panethnic identity label over a national origin term than non-citizens.

Political Affiliation

Survey data have consistently shown that the majority of Latinos claim Democratic Party affiliation (Fraga et al. 2012; Saavedra Cisneros 2016). In contrast, Asian Americans do not exhibit clear support for any one party. Most studies find that Asian Americans frequently claim no party preference or preference for Independents (Hajnal and Lee 2011; Le and Ong 2018), while others find that Asian Americans' party preference is roughly equally distributed among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner 1991). In Zoltan L.

Hajnal and Taeku Lee's (2011) study, many Asian Americans could not differentiate between Republicans and Democrats. We hypothesize that Latino's strong affiliation of Latinos with the Democratic party is positively associated with their panethnic identification. This can be explained by the two-way efforts from both ethnic leaders and political party leaders. On one hand, political leaders can court the large "democratic block" of Latino voters and support Latino leader to build up pan-ethnic coalitions. On the other hand, ethic leaders within Latino communities are motived to promote a strong and concerted party affiliation among individual members so as to bargain for the scarce social resources that are allocated based on state-ascribed racial categories (Mora 2014). This expectation is also supported by David Dutwin and colleagues' (2005) finding that self-identification as "Latino" over "American" was positively associated with Democratic Party identification. Based on the same logic, we would expect no association between party affiliation and panethnic identity among Asians given their divided party affiliations.

Proposition 6A (P6A): Political affiliation will not affect the relative odds of choosing a panethnic identity label over a national origin term for Asian Americans.

Proposition 6B (P6B): Affiliation with the Democratic Party will increase the relative odds of choosing a panethnic identity label over a national origin term for Latinos.

Based on the literature outlined above, we observe both similarities and differences in the theorized factors that contribute to panethnic identification among Asian Americans and Latinos. While research starting with David Lopez and Yen Espiritu (1990) claimed that Asian American panethnicity is based on structural commonalities like income and education and Latino panethnicity builds more on cultural commonalities like language, we theorize that this may be an oversimplification of the vastly different internal structures both Asian Americans and Latinos face. Our study addresses this question by drawing on two nationally representative samples of surveys with Asian Americans and Latinos and by investigating possible similarities and differences in their respective patterns of preference for panethnic identity labels.

Methodology

Data

We draw on two comparable surveys: The Pew Research Center 2012 Survey of Asian-Americans ($N = 3{,}511$) (SAA, Pew Research Center 2012) and the Pew Research Center 2013 National Survey of Latinos ($N = 5{,}103$) (NSL, Pew Research Center 2013). The SAA consists of a nationally representative sample of self-identified Asian adults living in the United States and was conducted January 3 through March 27, 2012 by Abt SRBI in all 50 states. Surveys were conducted in English, Cantonese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. Multiple sampling frames were employed including random-digit-dialing, a list of previously identified Asian households (Taylor 2013), and ethnic-surname lists. The NSL is a nationally representative sample of self-identified Latino adults living in the United States conducted between May and July 2013 by the Social Science Research Solutions (SSRS) on behalf of Pew Research Center. Surveys were conducted via cell phones and landlines by trained bilingual SSRS staff in the same geographic areas as the SAA. Respondents could complete the survey in English or Spanish. The NSL oversampled Latino-dominated areas and areas dominated by non-Mexican Latinos. Probability weights were constructed and applied to account for oversampling for both surveys. We utilize the provided probability weights in our descriptive analyses (see Table 2).

Dependent Variable

Both dependent and independent variables were constructed using identical techniques for the two datasets. Our dependent variable, *Identity*, originated from the survey question: "People sometimes use different terms to describe themselves. In general, which ONE of the following terms do you use to describe yourself MOST OFTEN?" The response categories represented the primary identity label preference between the (1) country of origin/heritage of the respondent (which we call national-origin), (2) panethnic identifiers such as Latino, Hispanic, Asian or Asian-American, or (3) American. We recognize that identities can be complex, multi-layered, and situational. Although individuals utilize multiple identities in practice as they move across social contexts, the survey prompts respondents to select a single identity category from a limited list of options.[3] As such, we conceptualize these choices as reflecting the primary label preferences of respondents exhibited within the survey context (Kukutai and Callister 2009).

Independent Variables and Controls

Each independent variable in our models was created through the same coding process for the two datasets. To explore language and religion effects on panethnic label preference, we considered respondents' English fluency and religious affiliation. Based on the question, "Would you say you can carry on a conversation in English, both understanding and speaking–very well, pretty well, just a little, or not at all?" *English* is a dichotomous variable with 1 representing speaking English "very well" or "pretty well," and 0 signifying speaking little or no English at all. The variable *Religious Affiliation* was created using respondent's present religion, dichotomized with 1 representing any affiliation and 0 representing no religion, "not a believer," atheist, agnostic. The *Religious Attendance* variable represents a collapsed categorical look into the question 'Aside from weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services'? We collapse the options into "One or more times a week," 'One or more times a month "One of more times a year," and "Seldom/Never."

We operationalize socioeconomic status through measures of *Education* and *Income. Education* was measured as a five-item categorical variable representing the highest level of education completed. Annual household *Income* before taxes was coded as a categorical variable, including low ($0 to $29,999), medium ($30,000 to $74,999), and high ($75,000 plus) income brackets. The variable *Region* represents the census region where respondents were residing in the United States when the survey took place.

Political Party refers to an individual's party affiliation or the party they lean toward. Third-party alignment or those who do not lean towards either party were recoded as "other/no preference."

To account for the effects of immigration, we included three variables in our model; *Citizen*, *Generation*, and *National Origin. Citizen* was a dichotomous variable that shows whether the respondent was born in the United States or was a naturalized citizen. *Generation* represented the number of generations since immigration of the respondent. First-generation represented individuals who were born outside of the United States, second-generation represented instances where the individual was born in the United States and at least one parent was born abroad. Finally, third-plus–generation represented cases where both parents had been born in the United States. The third immigration variable represents the national-origin/majority heritage of the respondent.

Two demographic variables were included *Age* and *Gender*. Age was a categorical variable representing four age groups between 18 to 29, 30 to 49, 50 to 64, and 65 or older. *Gender* was coded as 1 = female, 0 = male.

Analytic Approach

We conducted two multinomial logistic regression models to examine panethnic label assertion with matching/equivalent variables from two datasets: The Pew Research Center 2012 Asian-American Survey (SAA) and the Pew Research Center 2013 National Survey Latinos (NSL). Given the fact that our dependent variable, preferred *Identity* between a national-origin, panethnic or American identity label, was not continuous nor logically ordered, a multinomial logistic regression model should be the most appropriate analytic technique (Long and Freese 2014).

We chose to use multiple imputation to address the high percentage of missing values in the dataset. Although a common practice in sociology, using listwise deletion often produces biased results due to non-random missingness. For the Asian American sample, 10.9 percent of *Political Party* were missing and 11.2 percent of *Income* with low missing frequencies on other variables. For Latinos, 17.5 percent of respondents did not report their *Income* and 5 percent did not report *Political Party*. Multiple Imputation addresses the issues of bias by preserving the internal data structure and predicting the missing values (Li, Stuart, and Allison 2015). The number of imputations is determined by the maximum percent missing based on the recommendation by John W. Graham, Allison E. Olchowski, and Tamika D. Gilreath (2007). For Asian Americans, we performed 24 imputations for a final sample of 3,414 and for Latinos, we performed 24 imputations resulting in a final analytic sample of 5,045.

We tested for multicollinearity using Stata 15's Variable Inflation Factor (VIF) on a linear probability model for each dataset. There is no issue of multicollinearity in the Latino dataset, with the highest VIF being 2.51. For the Asian dataset, however, there is slight multicollinearity in *Education* due to small samples for the highest achievements. These large VIFs (VIF = 5.06 for Professional degree holders), are parts of categorical variables with three or more categories with a small reference category, therefore inherently enlarging the VIFs and can be safely ignored (Allison 2012).

Results

Table 1 provided the weighted proportions for our dependent variable, *Identity*, by SAA and NSL followed with a breakdown by national subgroups (e.g. Korean, Mexican, Chinese). Overall, we find that the majority of both Asian Americans and Latinos identified most often with a national origin term (66 and 56 percent, respectively). Asian Americans and Latinos chose a panethnic identity label at similar rates (20 and 21 percent, respectively). Disaggregating the data by national origin reveals greater variations within each panethnic group. Among Asians, Chinese and "Other Asian" report the highest rates of panethnic label selection (29 and 27 percent, respectively), while Koreans and Filipinos report the lowest (14 and 10.1 percent, respectively). Among Latinos, Salvadorans express the highest rates of panethnic identification (37.2 percent) whereas Puerto Ricans and Cubans have the lowest (15.1 and 12 percent, respectively).

Table 3 provides the multinomial logistic regression results to compare how the correlates of panethnic identity label selection function across different racial/ethnic groups. For the purposes of this article, we will only discuss preferences for "Panethnic" relative to "National Origin" (results for "Panethnic" versus "American" and "National-Origin" versus "American" are available upon request). Robustness checks for both models are provided in the Appendix tables A1 and A2.

We proposed in P1A that English fluency would increase Asian Americans' likelihood of primary panethnic identity label selection over national origin. We find support for this proposition. The relative odds of selecting a panethnic identity label are 1.5 times higher ($exp(\beta k)$, $p < .05$) for English-fluent Asian American respondents compared to respondents who claimed poor English fluency. In contrast, English fluency had no significant effect on Latinos' likelihood of preferring panethnic identity labels, supporting P1B.

Table 1. Distribution of Identity Preference by Panethnic Group and National Origin.

"People sometimes use different terms to describe themselves. In general, which ONE of the following terms do you use to describe MOST OFTEN?"

	National origin		Panethnic		American		Depends	
Asian	65%	(0.01)	20%	(0.01)	14%	(0.01)	1%	(0.00)
Chinese	60%	(0.03)	28%	(0.03)	10%	(0.01)	2%	(0.01)
Filipino	70%	(0.03)	10%	(0.02)	19%	(0.03)	2%	(0.01)
Indian	62%	(0.03)	20%	(0.02)	17%	(0.02)	0%	(0.00)
Japanese	61%	(0.03)	16%	(0.03)	22%	(0.03)	1%	(0.01)
Korean	74%	(0.03)	14%	(0.03)	11%	(0.02)	0%	(0.00)
Vietnamese	75%	(0.03)	17%	(0.03)	6%	(0.02)	2%	(0.01)
Other Asian	54%	(0.05)	27%	(0.05)	19%	(0.04)	0%	0.00
Latino	55%	(0.01)	21%	(0.01)	23%	(0.01)	2%	(0.00)
Mexican	56%	(0.01)	21%	(0.01)	21%	(0.01)	1%	(0.00)
Puerto Rican	55%	(0.04)	15%	(0.03)	29%	(0.03)	1%	(0.00)
Cuban	65%	(0.04)	11%	(0.03)	19%	(0.03)	5%	(0.02)
Dominican	65%	(0.05)	18%	(0.04)	16%	(0.03)	1%	(0.01)
Salvadoran	50%	(0.05)	37%	(0.05)	12%	(0.03)	1%	(0.01)
Other Latino	46%	(0.02)	20%	(0.02)	31%	(0.02)	2%	(0.01)

Source. 2012 Survey of Asian-Americans; 2013 National Survey of Latinos.
Note. N = 3,414, 5,045; m = 24. Standard errors in parentheses.

In P2A and P2B, we proposed that frequent attendance of religious services would decrease the relative odds of preferring a panethnic identity label for Asian Americans and Latinos, respectively. We fail to find support for either proposition and indeed find the opposite in the case of Latino frequent attendees. Latinos who attend religious services at least once a week have 28 percent higher relative odds ($p < .05$) of preferring a panethnic label over a national origin term relative to those who seldom or never attend religious services.

We hypothesized in P3A and P3B that higher socioeconomic status would be positively associated with panethnic identity label preference for Asian Americans and Latinos, respectively. Whether we measure socioeconomic status through income level or having graduated college with a 4-year degree, our findings for both groups fail to support these hypotheses.

P4A and P4B hypothesized that second-generation and third-generation-plus Asian Americans and Latino respondents would be more likely than the first-generation immigrants to claim a panethnic identity label over national origin identity. We find support for these hypotheses, with both second-generation and third-generation-plus respondents being more likely to select a panethnic label than first-generation immigrants in both the Asian American and Latino samples. Relative to first-generation immigrants, second generation Asian-Americans are roughly 50 percent more likely to select a panethnic label ($p < .01$), while third-generation + immigrants are 90.9 percent more likely ($p < .01$). For Latinos, third-generation-plus respondents, are 87.5 percent more likely to select a panethnic identity label than their national origin compared to the first generation ($p < .01$).

We proposed in P5A and P5B that citizens would be more likely than non-citizens to claim panethnic identity over national origin identity in both the Asian American and Latino surveys, respectively. We find supporting evidence for Asian Americans and only marginal support for Latinos. Among Asian Americans, being a U.S. citizen increases the relative odds of selecting a panethnic identity label by 74 percent ($p < .001$).[4]

We proposed in P6B that Democrat affiliation would increase the likelihood of choosing a panethnic identity label over a national origin term for Latinos but not in the case of Asian

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Key Independent Variables by Panethnic Group (Weighted & Imputed Data).

	Asian		Latino	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Cultural Variables				
Conversational English Fluency				
Yes	0.84	(0.01)	0.6	(0.01)
Religious Affiliation				
Affiliated	0.74	(0.01)	0.82	(0.01)
Religious Attendance				
One or more times a week	0.32	(0.01)	0.4	(0.01)
One or more times a month	0.13	(0.01)	0.17	(0.01)
One of more times a year	0.22	(0.01)	0.19	(0.01)
Seldom/Never	0.34	(0.01)	0.25	(0.01)
Structural Variables				
Education				
Less than High-school	0.09	(0.01)	0.34	(0.01)
High-school	0.17	(0.01)	0.29	(0.01)
Some College (no 4-yr deg)	0.2	(0.01)	0.21	(0.01)
4-yr College	0.28	(0.01)	0.1	(0.01)
Professional	0.26	(0.01)	0.05	(0.01)
Income				
$0 to $29,999	0.29	(0.01)	0.58	(0.01)
$30,000 to $74,999	0.31	(0.01)	0.29	(0.01)
$75,000+	0.4	(0.01)	0.13	(0.01)
US Region				
Northeast	0.2	(0.01)	0.15	(0.01)
North Central	0.12	(0.01)	0.08	(0.01)
South	0.2	(0.01)	0.36	(0.01)
West	0.48	(0.01)	0.41	(0.01)
Political Variables				
Political Party				
Republican	0.31	(0.01)	0.22	(0.01)
Democrat	0.56	(0.01)	0.59	(0.01)
Other/No Pref	0.13	(0.01)	0.19	(0.01)
Immigration Variables				
Citizen				
Yes	0.75	(0.01)	0.67	(0.01)
Generation				
1st generation	0.76	(0.01)	0.56	(0.01)
2nd gen	0.18	(0.01)	0.19	(0.01)
3rd+ gen	0.06	(0.01)	0.24	(0.01)
National Origin				
Chinese	0.24	(0.01)		
Filipino	0.16	(0.01)		
Indian	0.19	(0.01)		
Japanese	0.1	(0.01)		
Korean	0.11	(0.01)		
Vietnamese	0.13	(0.01)		

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Variable	Asian		Latino	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Other Asian	0.08	(0.01)		
Mexican			0.61	(0.01)
Puerto Rican			0.09	(0.01)
Cuban			0.04	(0.00)
Dominican			0.04	(0.00)
Salvadoran			0.05	(0.01)
Other Latin American			0.17	(0.01)
Demographic Variables				
Age				
18 to 29	0.23	(0.01)	0.3	(0.01)
30 to 49	0.37	(0.01)	0.43	(0.01)
50 to 64	0.23	(0.01)	0.18	(0.01)
65 or older	0.17	(0.01)	0.09	(0.01)
Gender				
Female	0.5	(0.01)	0.5	(0.01)
N =	3,414		5,045	
m =	24		24	

Source. 2012 Survey of Asian-Americans; 2013 National Survey of Latinos.
Note. Standard errors in parentheses.

Americans (P6A). We have found partial support for P6B. Among Latinos, we find that party affiliation has effects on their assertion of a panethnic identity over national origin. Latinos who are politically independent or affiliated with "other" political parties have 28 percent lower relative odds of selecting a panethnic identity label over a national origin term compared to Latino Democrats (1-$exp(\beta k)$; $p < .01$).[5] Meanwhile, no category of party affiliation had a significant effect on the relative odds of selecting a panethnic label for Asian American respondents, as expected.

Discussion

In this paper, we examined the individual-level factors that influence Asian Americans' and Latinos' decisions to choose a panethnic identity label over a national origin term. Using a comparative approach, we sought to identify those aspects that shape individuals' preference for panethnic labels common across both Asian Americans and Latinos and those that are specific to each group. Although different national origin groups prefer to select panethnic labels at different rates, even when we control for national origin, we find consistent factors across groups. The immigration-related factors (i.e., generation) appeared to operate similarly across both groups, specifically with third-generation-plus-immigrants being more likely to select a panethnic label for both of the groups under investigation. This may suggest that these factors may be applied more broadly to immigrant groups as a whole. However, Asian Americans and Latinos exhibited unique factors shaping panethnic label preference that are likely a result of each group's distinct internal diversity.

We found that immigration-related variables, such as citizenship and generation-since-immigration, were associated with panethnic label preference. We theorize that citizenship status signifies structural incorporation. This structural incorporation provides legitimacy for people to

Table 3. Multinomial Logit Regression for Asian Americans and Latinos, (Results for "Panethnic" vs "National Origin" Presented).

	Asian		Latino	
Variable	Relative risk ratio	*SE*	Relative risk ratio	*SE*
Language and Religion Variables				
Conversational English Fluency (Ref: No)				
Yes	1.496*	(0.17)	1.178	(0.10)
Religious Affiliation (Ref: Unaffiliated)				
Affiliated	0.925	(0.14)	0.867	(0.12)
Religious Attendance (Ref: Seldom/Never)				
One or more times a week	0.872	(0.15)	1.281*	(0.11)
One or more times a month	1.047	(0.17)	1.195	(0.14)
One of more times a year	0.905	(0.14)	1.124	(0.13)
Structural Variables				
Education (Ref: Less than High-school)				
High-school	0.939	(0.22)	1.051	(0.11)
Some College (no 4-yr deg)	0.825	(0.23)	1.110	(0.12)
4-yr College	1.174	(0.21)	0.942	(0.15)
Professional	1.127	(0.23)	1.027	(0.18)
Income (Ref: 0 to $30,000)				
$30,000 to $75,000	1.108	(0.14)	1.097	(0.10)
$75,000+	1.122	(0.15)	1.264	(0.15)
US Census Region (Ref: West)				
Northeast	1.012	(0.13)	0.849	(0.12)
Midwest	0.736	(0.19)	1.020	(0.16)
South	1.230	(0.13)	0.891	(0.10)
Political Variables	1.000			
Political Party (Ref: Democrat)	1.000			
Republican	0.982	(0.12)	0.842	(0.10)
Other/No Preference	1.221	(0.16)	0.714**	(0.11)
Immigration Variables				
Citizen (Ref: No)				
Citizen	1.745***	(0.13)	1.221	(0.11)
Generation (Ref: 1st Gen)				
2nd gen	1.508**	(0.14)	1.264	(0.13)
3rd+ gen	1.910**	(0.22)	1.876***	(0.15)
National Origin (Ref: China/Mexico)				
Filipino	0.376***	(0.18)		
Indian	0.665*	(0.17)		
Japanese	0.434***	(0.18)		
Korean	0.518***	(0.17)		
Vietnamese	0.564**	(0.17)		
Other Asian	1.010	(0.23)		
Puerto Rican			0.330***	(0.18)
Cuban			0.515***	(0.20)
Dominican			0.993	(0.18)
Salvadoran			1.372*	(0.16)
Other Latino			1.404**	(0.11)
Demographic Controls				
Age (Ref: 18 to 29)				

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Variable	Asian		Latino	
	Relative risk ratio	*SE*	Relative risk ratio	*SE*
30 to 49	0.756	(0.15)	1.092	(0.11)
50 to 64	0.688*	(0.16)	0.932	(0.12)
65 or older	0.561**	(0.18)	0.762	(0.15)
Gender (Ref: Male)				
Female	1.197	(0.10)	1.018	(0.08)
N =	3,414		5,045	
m =	24		24	
Psuedo R^2 =	.101		.139	

Source. 2012 Survey of Asian-Americans; 2013 National Survey of Latinos.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

vote in elections and participate openly in other formal political activities that may provide opportunities for the formation of panethnic group consciousness. It also prompts assimilation through identification as it promotes feelings of attachment and embeddedness in the adopted culture (Gordon 1964). Generation-since-immigration was another factor positively associated with panethnic label preference for both groups. As immigrant generation increases, we find that so too does the likelihood of selecting a panethnic label relative to a national origin term. This positive relationship between generation-since-immigration and panethnic label preference reflects a process of racialized assimilation (Golash-Boza 2006; J. C. Lee and Kye 2016). In classic and new assimilation theory, immigrants are expected to experience decreases in the strength of ethnic and/or national-origin identification with each successive generation (Alba and Nee 1997; Gordon 1964). However, in a racialized society where immigrants are precluded from entering the mainstream, racialized assimilation theory argues that the racial/ethnic boundary will promote strong racial identification. Extending this to panethnicity, others have suggested that racialization also leads to stronger panethnic identification (Martínez and Gonzalez 2021; Okamoto and Mora 2014; Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

For Asian Americans, we found two distinct mechanisms at play in predicting primary panethnic label preference over a national origin term. English language ability increased the relative odds of identifying primarily with panethnic terms. While the majority of Latino immigrants share Spanish as a common language, the diversity of Asian languages means that English is the default language for cross-subgroup communication. Language matters for panethnic identification because it enables basic communication, generates a feeling of commonality, and is a prerequisite for cross-subgroup mobilization.

The second mechanism we find in predicting Asian American's preference for panethnic labels is age. As the age of the respondent increases, the overall relative odds of identifying panethnically decreases, net of immigrant generation. We suspect that the age effect among Asians might be culturally specific. Scholars have observed a sojourning mentality among Asian immigrants who, despite their length of stay, consider their stay in the United States as temporary and instrumental, and will return to their home country when their immigration goals are fulfilled (Bonacich 1973; Siu 1952; Zhou 2010). This sojourning mentality reflects the Confucian culture of going back to one's roots ("*luo ye gui gen*" 落叶归根) meaning that as people grow older, they are more likely to return to their hometown and/or culture (Choi and Peng 2016; Ling 2004). This may explain a stronger identification with one's national origin over panethnicity for Asians over fifty years of age, particularly among Korean, Japanese, and Chinese heritage groups.

For Latinos, the coefficients associated with panethnic primary identification spurred from frequency of religious attendance and from no or "other" political party affiliation. We found that frequent religious attendance was associated with increased relative odds of panethnic label selection over a national origin term. This was unexpected given the prevalent notion that religious organizations act to preserve country of origin identities (Cadge and Ecklund 2007). Indeed, other research on religious organizations has emphasized their role in uniting diverse national origin groups along religious lines. Mosques have used Islamic practices to unite diverse Middle Eastern migrants in the same way that Catholic churches have emphasized similarities among Latino immigrants (Jamal 2005; Ricourt and Danta 2003). In the case of Latinos, sharing a common language may greatly increase the likelihood of multi-ethnic Latino religious congregations, thereby increasing contact between Latinos of multiple national origins. Such a claim would require detailed data on the ethnic composition of Latino religious congregations' members.

We find a political mechanism for Latino primary panethnic label selection. Independent/other party affiliation were significantly less likely than Democrats to identify panethnically over "national-origin" for Latinos. We interpret this lack of affiliation with either of the two major parties as an indicator of political apathy or a lack of collective engagement, precluding group consciousness and primary panethnic identity. This operationalization is consistent with a more general assumption that group consciousness is simultaneously associated with political participation and panethnic identity. However, it is important to note that Latino Republicans were marginally significantly less likely than Democrats to identify panethnically (coefficient of -0.189 at $p=0.067$) and this association may indicate a Democrat affiliation effect.

Conclusion

For the past three decades, sociologists have claimed that Asian American panethnicity is based on structural commonalities like income and education whereas Latino panethnicity builds more on cultural commonalities like language and religion (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000; A. H. Kim and White 2010; D. Lopez and Espiritu 1990). Using a comparative approach, we find little evidence in our analyses to support these long-standing claims for panethnic identification. We find the common basis for panethnic label preference, at least in the primary sense, to be driven by immigration-related factors (i.e. immigrant generation). For Asian Americans, English proficiency and age, rather than structural factors, like SES, uniquely increase their odds to identify using a panethnic identity label over a national origin term. For Latinos, we find that 'other'/no political affiliation and attending religious services at least once a week increase their odds of asserting a panethnic label, partially aligning with the previous theories of a cultural foundation for Latinos. Despite the variation in the correlates of panethnic label preference across the two groups, about 20 percent of respondents from both groups report they identify primarily using a panethnic label. Our findings therefore suggest that Asians and Latinos are undergoing different pathways to arrive at similar outcomes.

The findings from this study highlight the need for greater comparative work when considering the factors shaping panethnicity. Although surveys serve a crucial role in their capacity to conduct positivist inquiry and compare across groups, they are limited by the structure of the survey questions and the disconnect between the everyday contexts in which identities are enacted and the survey itself as a distinct context. Future empirical work can address this by utilizing survey questions that do not constrain responses in ways that depict identities as commonly understood across participants, equally salient across all claimants, and mutually exclusive (T. Lee 2009). Rather, adopting more complex measures of identity selection should aim to capture the contextually dependent and multilayered character of identities (Okamoto and Mora, 2014). Ideally, future research will conduct further inquiry into the ways in which the survey context itself acts as a place where individuals meaningfully assert identities.

Appendix

Table A1. Multinomial Logit Regression for Asians, Results for "Panethnic" vs "National Origin" Presented.

	Demographic		Lang & religion		Structural		Political		Immigration		All	
Variable	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*
Cultural Variables												
Conversational English Fluency (Ref: No)												
Yes			0.659***	(0.13)							0.403*	(0.17)
Religious Affiliation (Ref: Unaffiliated)												
Affiliated			−0.237	(0.13)							−0.078	(0.14)
Religious Attendance (Ref: Seldom/Never)												
One or more times a week			−0.26	(0.14)							−0.137	(0.15)
One or more times a month			−0.037	(0.16)							0.046	(0.17)
One of more times a year			−0.132	(0.14)							−0.1	(0.14)
Structural Variables												
Education (Ref: Less than High-school)												
High-school					−0.05	(0.21)					−0.063	(0.22)
Some College (no 4-yr deg)					−0.045	(0.21)					−0.192	(0.23)
4-yr College					0.256	(0.20)					0.16	(0.21)
Professional					0.339	(0.20)					0.12	(0.23)
Income (Ref: 0 to $30,000)												
$30,000 to $75,000					0.221	(0.13)					0.103	(0.14)
$75,000+					0.343*	(0.14)					0.115	(0.15)
US Census Region (Ref: West)												
Northeast					−0.006	(0.12)					0.012	(0.13)
Midwest					−0.412*	(0.19)					−0.307	(0.19)
South					0.119	(0.12)					0.207	(0.13)
Political Variables												
Political Party (Ref: Democrat)												
Republican							−0.107	(0.11)			−0.018	(0.12)
Other/No Preference							0.091	(0.15)			0.2	(0.16)

(continued)

Table A1. (continued)

	Demographic		Lang & religion		Structural		Political		Immigration		All	
Variable	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*
Immigration Variables												
Citizen (Ref: No)												
Citizen									0.613***	(0.13)	0.557***	(0.13)
Generation (Ref: 1st Gen)												
2nd gen									0.475***	(0.14)	0.411**	(0.14)
3rd+ gen									0.699**	(0.22)	0.647**	(0.22)
National Origin (Ref: China/Mexico)												
Filipino									−1.018***	(0.17)	−0.977***	(0.18)
Indian									−0.343*	(0.15)	−0.408*	(0.17)
Japanese									−0.842***	(0.18)	−0.835***	(0.18)
Korean									−0.790***	(0.16)	−0.658***	(0.17)
Vietnamese									−0.792***	(0.16)	−0.573**	(0.17)
Other Asian									−0.012	(0.22)	0.01	(0.23)
Demographic Controls												
Age (Ref: 18 to 29)												
30 to 49	−0.414**	−0.13	−0.311*	(0.13)	−0.581***	(0.13)	−0.408**	(0.13)	−0.228	(0.14)	−0.28	(0.15)
50 to 64	−0.532***	−0.14	−0.344*	(0.14)	−0.629***	(0.14)	−0.525***	(0.14)	−0.391*	(0.15)	−0.374*	(0.16)
65 or older	−0.941	−0.15	−0.666***	(0.16)	−0.937***	(0.16)	−0.933***	(0.15)	−0.696***	(0.17)	−0.578**	(0.18)
Gender (Ref: Male)												
Female	0.076	−0.09	0.117	(0.09)	0.134	(0.09)	0.071	(0.09)	0.148	(0.10)	0.18	(0.10)
N =	3,414		3,414		3,414		3,414		3,414		3,414	
m =	24		24		24		24		24		24	
Psuedo R^2 =	.009		.03		.026		.01		.088		.101	

Source. 2012 Survey of Asian-Americans.
Note. Raw Coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table A2. Multinomial Logit Regression for Latinos, Results for "Panethnic" vs "National Origin" Presented.

	Demographic		Lang & religion		Structural		Political		Immigration		All	
Variable	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*
Cultural Variables												
Conversational English Fluency (Ref: No)												
Yes			0.441***	(0.08)							0.164	(0.10)
Religious Affiliation (Ref: Unaffiliated)												
Affiliated			−0.12	(0.11)							−0.143	(0.12)
Religious Attendance (Ref: Seldom/Never)												
One or more times a week			0.273*	(0.11)							0.248*	(0.11)
One or more times a month			0.199	(0.13)							0.178	(0.14)
One of more times a year			0.153	(0.12)							0.117	(0.13)
Structural Variables												
Education (Ref: Less than High-school)												
High-school					0.154	(0.10)					0.05	(0.11)
Some College(no 4-yr deg)					0.277**	(0.11)					0.104	(0.12)
4-yr College					0.11	(0.14)					−0.06	(0.15)
Professional					0.209	(0.18)					0.027	(0.18)
Income (Ref: 0 to $30,000)												
$30,000 to $75,000					0.185*	(0.09)					0.093	(0.10)
$75,000+					0.389**	(0.14)					0.234	(0.15)
US Census Region (Ref: West)												
Northeast					−0.335***	(0.10)					−0.164	(0.12)
Midwest					−0.043	(0.16)					0.02	(0.16)
South					−0.267**	(0.09)					−0.115	(0.10)
Political Variables												
Political Party (Ref: Democrat)												
Republican							−0.173	(0.10)			−0.172	(0.10)

(continued)

Table A2. (continued)

	Demographic		Lang & religion		Structural		Political		Immigration		All	
Variable	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*	Coefficient	*SE*
Other/No Preference							−0.432***	(0.11)			−0.337**	(0.11)
Immigration Variables												
Citizen (Ref: No)												
Citizen									0.354***	(0.10)	0.2	(0.11)
Generation (Ref: 1st Gen)												
2nd gen									0.321*	(0.13)	0.234	(0.13)
3rd+ gen									0.720***	(0.14)	0.629***	(0.15)
National Origin (Ref: China/Mexico)												
Puerto Rican									−1.227***	(0.16)	−1.110***	(0.18)
Cuban									−0.754***	(0.19)	−0.664***	(0.20)
Dominican									−0.081	(0.15)	−0.007	(0.18)
Salvadoran									0.314*	(0.15)	0.316*	(0.16)
Other Latino									0.342***	(0.10)	0.339**	(0.11)
Demographic Controls												
Age (Ref: 18 to 29)												
30 to 49	−0.106	−0.1	−0.005	(0.10)	−0.096	(0.10)	−0.09	(0.10)	0.086	(0.10)	0.088	(0.11)
50 to 64	−0.201	−0.11	−0.095	(0.11)	−0.186	(0.11)	−0.206	(0.11)	−0.09	(0.12)	−0.07	(0.12)
65 or older	−0.521***	−0.13	−0.368**	(0.14)	−0.407**	(0.14)	−0.538***	(0.13)	−0.348*	(0.14)	−0.272	(0.15)
Gender (Ref: Male)												
Female	0.001	−0.07	−0.006	(0.08)	0.023	(0.08)	0.01	(0.07)	0	(0.08)	0.018	(0.08)
N =	5,045		5,045		5,045		5,045		5,045		5,045	
m =	24		24		24		24		24		24	
Psuedo R^2 =	.01		.074		.062		.017		.118		.139	

Source. 2013 National Survey of Latinos.
Note. Standard errors in parentheses. Raw Coefficients.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Kelsey E. Gonzalez https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6592-8075

Daniel E. Martínez https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6773-4269

Notes

1. There are numerous acceptable terminologies for the two panethnic groups. However, to maintain uniformity throughout this piece we refer to those with heritage from Asia as Asian and those with heritage from Latin America as Latino.
2. Whereas David Lopez and Yen Espiritu (1990) create a separate category for Indo-Americans, we include Indian Americans under the category of Asian Americans. Our system of categorization is both more typical of the literature and is more consistent with state classification schemes. For this paper, Asian American subgroups include Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and other smaller groups who classify themselves as Asian.
3. A very small proportion of respondents volunteered "Depends" (2 percent of Latinos and 1 percent of Asians) and "Don't Know" (1.1 percent of Latinos, 2.7 percent of Asians) as responses. Asking people about how they identify MOST OFTEN appears to be doing an adequate job of capturing primary identity, as there doesn't appear to be issues associated with non-response on the question. Moreover, this form of identity-related survey question is relatively stable across time at grasping people's primary racial/ethnicity identity (at least in the case of NSL, where the question has been repeated over multiple survey waves). We wouldn't expect this level of consistency/reliability across surveys if there were serious measurement error/bias associated with this survey question.
4. For Latinos, the relative odds of identifying panethnically relative to national-origin are 1.22 times higher for citizens than non-citizens, though this is only marginally significant ($p = 0.06$).
5. In addition, Latino Republicans have lower relative odds of identifying panethnically than national-origin when compared to Latino Democrats (15.8% lower relative odds; $p = 0.067$).

References

Acuña, Rodolfo. 2000. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. 4th ed. New York: Pearson.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation: Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *The International Migration Review* 31(4):826–74.

Allison, Paul. 2012. "When Can You Safely Ignore Multicollinearity?" *Statistical Horizons*, September. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (https://statisticalhorizons.com/multicollinearity).

Bonacich, Edna. 1972. "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 37(5):547–59.

Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities." *American Sociological Review* 38(5):583–94.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. *Racism without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2):271–94.

Cadge, Wendy and Elaine Howard Ecklund. 2007. "Immigration and Religion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33(1):359–79.

Cain, Bruce E., D. Roderick Kiewiet, and Carole J. Uhlaner. 1991. "The Acquisition of Partisanship by Latinos and Asian Americans." *American Journal of Political Science* 35(2):390–422.

Choi, Susanne Yuk-Ping and Yinni Peng. 2016. *Masculine Compromise: Migration, Family, and Gender in China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartman. 2007. *Ethnicity and Race*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
Croll, Paul R. 2007. "Modeling Determinants of White Racial Identity: Results from a New National Survey." *Social Forces* 86(2):613–42.
DeSipio, Louis. 1996. *Counting on the Latino Vote; Latinos as the New Electorate*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
Dhingra, Pawan. 2007. *Managing Multicultural Lives: Asian American Professionals and the Challenge of Multiple Identities*. Stanford, CA: University of California Press.
Dutwin, David, Mollyann Brodie, Melissa Herrmann, and Rebecca Levin. 2005. "Latinos and Political Party Affiliation." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27(2):135–60.
Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2002. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London, England: Pluto Press.
Espiritu, Yen Le. 1993. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Espiritu, Yen Le. 2008. *Asian American Women and Men: Labor, Laws, and Love*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Flores, Antonio. 2017. *Facts on Latinos in America, 2015*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
Flores-González, Nilda. 2017. *Citizens but not Americans: Race and Belonging among Latino Millennials*. New York: New York University Press.
Foner, Nancy and George M. Fredrickson. 2004. *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race and Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Fox, Cybelle and Thomas A. Guglielmo. 2012. "Defining America's Racial Boundaries: Blacks, Mexicans, and European Immigrants, 1890-1945." *American Journal of Sociology* 118(2):327–79.
Fraga, Luis R., John A. Garcia, Rodney E. Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, and Gary Segura. 2012. *Latinos in the New Millenium: An Almanac of Opinion, Behavior and Policy Preferences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Frank, Reanne, Ilana Redstone Akresh, and Bo Lu. 2010. "Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In?" *American Sociological Review* 75(3):378–401.
Gellner, Ernest. 2009. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Golash-Boza, T. 2006. "Dropping the Hyphen? Becoming Latino(a)-American through Racialized Assimilation." *Social Forces* 85(1):27–55.
Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Goto, Sharon G., Gilbert C. Gee, and David T. Takeuchi. 2002. "Strangers Still? The Experience of Discrimination among Chinese Americans." *Journal of Community Psychology* 30(2):211–24.
Graham, John W., Allison E. Olchowski, and Tamika D. Gilreath. 2007. "How Many Imputations Are Really Needed?" *Prevention Science* 8:206–13.
Hajnal, Zoltan L. and Taeku Lee. 2011. *Why Americans Don't Join the Party: Race, Immigration, and the Failure (of Political Parties) to Engage the Electorate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Hanson, Jeffery R. 1997. "Ethnicity and the Looking Glass: The Dialectics of National Indian Identity." *American Indian Quarterly* 21(2):195–208.
Itzigsohn, José and Carlos Dore-Cabral. 2000. "Competing Identities? Race, Ethnicity and Panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States." *Sociological Forum* 15(2):225–47.
Jamal, Amaney. 2005. "The Political Participation and Engagement of Muslim Americans: Mosque Involvement and Group Consciousness." *American Politics Research* 33(4):251–544.
Jenkins, Richard. 1994. "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17(2):197–223.
Jeung, Russell. 2004. *Faithful Generations: Race and New Asian American Churches*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Jones-Correa, Michael and David L. Leal. 1996. "Becoming 'Hispanic': Secondary Panethnic Identification among Latin American-origin Populations in the United States." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(2):215–54.

Junn, Jane and Natalie Masuoka. 2008. "Asian American Identity: Shared Racial Status and Political Context." *Perspectives on Politics* 6(4):729–40.

Kao, Grace and Kara Joyner. 2006. "Do Hispanic and Asian Adolescents Practice Panethnicity in Friendship Choices?" *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5):972–92.

Kim, Ann H. and Michael J. White. 2010. "Panethnicity, Ethnic Diversity, and Residential Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(5):1558–96.

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics & Society* 27(1):105–38.

Kukutai, Tahu and Paul Callister. 2009. "A 'Main' Ethnic Group? Ethnic Self-prioritisation among New Zealand Youth." *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 36:16–31.

Laitin, David D. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Le, Loan K. and Paul M. Ong. 2018. "Trajectory of Asian American Nonpartisanship: Transitory, Transitional, or End State?" *New Political Science* 40(2):368–83.

Lee, Jennifer C. and Samuel Kye. 2016. "Racialized Assimilation of Asian Americans." *Annual Review of Sociology* 42:253–73.

Lee, Taeku. 2009. "Between Social Theory and Social Science Practice. Toward a New Approach to the Survey Measurement of 'Race.'" Pp. 113–44 in *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*, edited by Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair I. Johnston, and Rose McDermott. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Amanda E. 2004. *"What Group?" Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era of "Color-blindness." Sociological Theory 22*(4):623–46.

Li, Peng, Elizabeth A. Stuart, and David B. Allison. 2015. "Multiple Imputation: A Flexible Tool for Handling Missing Data." *The Journal of the American Medical Association* 314(18):1966–67.

Lien, Pei Te. 2001. *The Making of Asian America through Political Participation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ling, Huping. 2004. *Chinese St. Louis: From Enclave to Cultural Community*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Long, J. Scott and Jeremy Freese. 2014. *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.

Lopez, David and Yen Espiritu. 1990. "Panethnicity in the United States: A Theoretical Framework." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13(2):198–224.

Lopez, Gustavo, Neil G. Ruiz, and Eileen Patten. 2017. *Key Facts about Asian Americans 2017, a Diverse and Growing Population*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Malone, Nolan, Kaari Baluja, Joseph Costanzo, and Cynthia Davis. 2003. *The Foreign-born Population: 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Marchetti, Gina. 1994. *Romance and the Yellow Peril: Race, Sex, and Discursive Strategies in Hollywood Fiction*. 1st ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Martínez, Daniel E. and Kelsey E. Gonzalez. 2021. "Panethnicity as a Reactive Identity: Primary Panethnic Identification among Latino-Hispanics in the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 64(3):365–86.

Masuoka, Natalie. 2006. "Together They Become One: Examining the Predictors of Panethnic Group Consciousness Among Asian Americans and Latinos." *Social Science Quarterly 87*(5):993–1011.

Masuoka, Natalie. 2008. "Defining the Group: Latino Identity and Political Participation." *American Politics Research* 36(1):33–61.

McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92(1):64–90.

Min, Pyong Gap. 1992. "The Structure and Social Functions of Korean Immigrant Churches in the United States." *International Migration Review* 26(4):1370–94.

Min, Pyong Gap. 2006. *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Min, Tae Eun. 2014. "The Impact of Panethnicity on Asian American and Latino Political Participation." *Ethnicities* 14(5):698–721.

Mora, G. Cristina. 2014. *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats & Media Constructed a New American*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Nagata, Judith A. 1979. *Malaysian Mosaic: Perspectives from a Poly-ethnic Society*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Ngai, Mae M. 2014. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America: Updated Edition*. Revised ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Oboler, Suzanne. 1995. *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re)Presentation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Okamoto, Dina G. 2003. "Toward a Theory of Panethnicity: Explaining Asian American Collective Action." *American Sociological Review* 68(6):811–42.
Okamoto, Dina G. 2006. "Institutional Panethnicity: Boundary Formation in Asian-American Organizing." *Social Forces* 85(1):1–25.
Okamoto, Dina G. and G. Cristina Mora. 2014. "Panethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40(2014):219–39.
Okihiro, Gary Y. 1994. *Margins and Mainstreams: Asians in American History and Culture*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
Pallares, Amalia. 2002. *From Peasant Struggles to Indian Resistance: The Ecuadorian Andes in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
Park, Jerry Z. 2008. "Second-generation Asian American Pan-ethnic Identity: Pluralized Meanings of a Racial Label." *Sociological Perspectives* 51(3):541–61.
Park, Jerry Z., Brandon C. Martinez, Ryon Cobb, Julie J. Park, and Erica Ryu Wong. 2015. "Exceptional Outgroup Stereotypes and White Racial Inequality Attitudes toward Asian Americans." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 78(4):399–411.
Peña, Milagros and Lisa M. Frehill. 1998. "Latina Religious Practice: Analyzing Cultural Dimensions in Measures of Religiosity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37(4):620–35.
Perez, Debra Joy, Lisa Fortuna, and Margarita Alegria. 2009. "Prevalence and Correlates of Everyday Discrimination among U.S. Latinos." *Journal of Community Psychology* 37(4):487–504.
Pew Research Center. 2012. *2012 Asian-American Survey Background and Code Book*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
Pew Research Center. 2013. *2013 Survey of U.S. Latinos Background and Code Book*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
Phinney, Jean S., Gabriel Horenczyk, Karmela Liebkind, and Paul Vedder. 2001. "Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-being: An Interactional Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues* 57(3):493–510.
Portes, Alejandro and Dag MacLeod. 1996. "What Shall I Call Myself? Hispanic Identity Formation in the Second Generation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19(3):523–47.
Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Ricourt, Milagros and Ruby Danta. 2003. *Hispanas de Queens: Latino Panethnicity in a New York City Neighborhood*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Rodriguez, Clara. 2000. *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Race in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.
Rodriguez, Gregory. 2008. *Mongrels, Bastards, Orphans, and Vagabonds: Mexican Immigration and the Future of Race in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
Rosaldo, Renato. 1997. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism." Pp. 27–38 in *Latino Cultural Citizenships*, edited by W. V. Flores and R. Benmayor. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Saavedra Cisneros, Angel. 2016. *Latino Identity and Political Attitudes: Why Are Latinos not Republican?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Siu, Paul C. P. 1952. "The Sojourner." *American Journal of Sociology* 58(1):34–44.
Takaki, Ronald. 1998. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans, Updated and Revised Edition*. Revised and Updated ed. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
Taylor, Paul. 2013. *Rise of Asian American Appendix 1: Survey Methodology*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
Telles, Edward, and Ortiz V. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
Tienda, Marta and Susana M. Sánchez. 2013. "Latin American Immigration to the United States." *Daedalus* 142(3):48–64.

Trottier, Richard W. 1981. "Charters of Panethnic Identity: Indigenous American Indians and Immigrant Asian Americans." Pp. 271–305 in *Ethnic Change*, edited by C. F. Keyes. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Tuan, Mia. 1998. *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2010. *Decennial Census of Population and Housing*. Retrieved October 23, 2021 (https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census.html).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1986. *Recent Activities against Citizens and Residents of Asian Descent*. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Wong, Janelle, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, Taeku Lee, and Jane Junn. 2011. *Asian American Political Participation: Emerging Constituents and Their Political Identities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wu, William F. 1982. *The Yellow Peril: Chinese Americans in American Fiction, 1850-1940*. 1st ed. Hamden, CT: Archon Books.

Xu, Jun and Jennifer C. Lee. 2013. "The Marginalized 'Model' Minority: An Empirical Examination of the Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Social Forces* 91(4):1363–97.

Yinger, J. Milton. 1985. "Ethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11(1):151–80.

Zhou, Min. 2004. "Are Asian Americans Becoming 'White?'" *Contexts* 3(1):29–37.

Zhou, Min. 2010. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Author Biographies

Beksahn Jang is a PhD Candidate in the School of Sociology at the University of Arizona. His research focuses on political sociology, race and ethnicity, and immigration.

Kelsey E. Gonzalez is a PhD Candidate in the School of Sociology at the University of Arizona. Her research focuses on computational social science and networks analysis in connection to thematic interests in racial and panethnic identities, health disparities, and social norms.

Liwen Zeng is a PhD Candidate in the School of Sociology at the University of Arizona. Her research interest focuses on sociology of mental health, health disparities, migration, raceðnicity, and social stratification.

Daniel E. Martínez is an associate professor in the School Sociology at the University of Arizona. His research interests include Chicano and Latino identity, unauthorized immigration, the criminalization of immigration, and the sociology of race and ethnicity.