# IMPLICATIONS FOR SONS AND DAUGHTERS WHEN MEXICAN IMMIGRANTS LEGALIZE AND NATURALIZE

Frank D. Bean

Susan K. Brown

Mark A. Leach

University of California, Irvine

PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS NOT A COMPLETED DRAFT.

Revision of a paper presented at the conference, "The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth and Families in Comparative Perspective," Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University, October 29-30, 2004. Some of the research on which the paper is based was supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Development (RO1-39075) and the Hewlett Foundation. Appreciation is also expressed to the Russell Sage Foundation, which underwrote the collection of data for the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) study. Infrastructural assistance from the Center for Research on Immigration, Population and Public Policy at the University of California, Irvine is also gratefully acknowledged.

# IMPLICATIONS FOR SONS AND DAUGHTERS WHEN MEXICAN IMMIGRANTS LEGALIZE AND NATURALIZE

Over the past four decades, the issue of Mexican migration has garnered much of the public policy attention devoted to reforming immigration law in the United States (Bean and Lowell 2004). Part of the reason for the pre-eminence accorded Mexicans is that they constitute the largest of the country's recent legal immigrant groups. In 2005, for example, 161,445 Mexicans gained legal permanent residency, or 14.4 percent of the all such persons (Office of Immigration Statistics 2006). But much of Mexicans' derives from their making up such an overwhelmingly large component of unauthorized migration flows. Roughly 300,000 unauthorized Mexicans established *de facto* U.S. residency in 2005, bringing the total number of unauthorized Mexicans to 6.2 million (or 56 percent of all unauthorized persons in the country) (Passel 2006). These numbers dwarf those from any other nation. Moreover, almost all observers think policies to curtail or "regularize" unauthorized migration should be adopted before changes in legal immigration policy are considered, thus ensuring that the issue of unauthorized Mexican migration occupies a prominent place in the public policy debate about immigration (U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform 1994).

But another issue also boosts Mexican migration to the top of the immigration policy agenda, namely, doubts about the economic incorporation of Mexican immigrants. Almost all Mexican migrants arrive with very little money or education and are consigned to the bottom tier of the workforce. Consequently, analysts often conclude that their prospects for joining the American mainstream are dim (Hanson 2003; Camarota 2001). However, such inferences have frequently been based on the assumption that the children of immigrants, and maybe even their grandchildren, will share the characteristics of those who have just arrived (see Bean, Brown, and Rumbaut 2006). But the members of immigrant groups change, both as the immigrant

generation itself stays longer in the United States and as immigrants give way to their children. Reaching adequate conclusions about Mexican incorporation thus depends not only on assessing what happens to immigrants after they arrive in the United States, but also on studying what happens to the second generation. In this paper, we introduce new data to focus on how changes in the unauthorized and citizenship status of Mexican immigrant parents relate to their children's socioeconomic status (their acquisition of human capital, occupation, and earnings). Such trajectories not only help to reveal the rapidity with which Mexican immigrants are joining the American economic mainstream, they also provide policy-relevant information about how pathways to legalization and citizenship dampen or enhance economic progress among the children of immigrants.

Our assessment is based on a new research project that focuses on the children of immigrants in metropolitan Los Angeles, the most ideal city in the country for scrutinizing such dynamics in the case of the Mexican-origin population. Not only is greater Los Angeles important for its size – more than 17 million people as of 2004 – it is one of the two major immigrant gateway metropolises in the country, along with New York (Sabagh and Bozorgmehr 2003). Nearly a third of LA's population is foreign-born, with nearly two-thirds of this group from Latin America (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2006). Los Angeles, more so than any other city, has been a receiving center for Mexicans for generations (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970). It is now home to nearly 6 million persons of Mexican origin, or more than one-third of its population. Most important, it has long been the major urban destination of *unauthorized* Mexican entrants (Bean, Passel, and Edmonston 1990). Not surprisingly as a result, California was the state where the most people legalized their migration status when given the opportunity under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) (González Baker 1997). Los

Angeles is thus the best place in the country to study how changes in the legal and citizenship status of Mexican migrants affect their children.

## WHY LEGALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP FOSTER INCORPORATION

### The Benefits of Legalization

Becoming a legal permanent resident offers obvious tangible benefits to immigrants. Legalization entitles immigrants to a "green card," which not only enables them to work legally, it also brings access to a wide range of jobs, legal protections, financial services and travel opportunities unavailable to the authorized. Legalization also works indirectly to provide the sorts of stable working conditions and job experience that enhance wages and reduce the necessity for workers to rely only on social contacts for jobs (Aguilera and Massey 2003; Massey 1987). Legal immigrants are thus less likely to be subjected to exploitation in the labor market. Moreover, they are eligible to naturalize and thereby gain even greater access to certain kinds of employment and public assistance (Bean and Stevens 2003), which also may generate even wider social networks. Such wider social contacts in turn not only foster greater familiarity with employment opportunities (Granovetter 1973), they also strengthen social integration more generally. Legal status thus constitutes an extremely important milestone in the process of immigrant incorporation. By extension, it should also matter for the well-being of the children of immigrants.

### The Benefits of Naturalization

In the United States, the requirements for naturalization generally require that a migrant be an adult, a legal permanent resident, and a resident of the United States for at least five years.

Immigrants must also demonstrate the ability to speak, read, and write English; pass a test on U.S. government and history; and show good moral character (for example, not have a felony conviction), all characteristics valuable in the labor market. Those who naturalize also tend to show more evidence of investment in the United States economy (e.g., through home ownership or self-employment) and less likelihood of emigration, because their countries of origin are far away, poor or largely illiterate (Barken and Khokhlov 1980; Beijbom 1971; Bernard 1936; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1986; Yang 1994). Family status is important, in that those with children are more likely to naturalize (Liang 1994b; Yang 1994). Naturalization also varies with age at immigration (Yang [1994] finds a convex curvilinear relationship) and gender (women are more likely to naturalize: Jasso and Rosenzweig [1986]; Yang [1994]).

The benefits of naturalization are multi-faceted and illustrated by two complementary views about the foundations of citizenship. These reveal that citizenship brings not only labor market and political benefits but also generates social benefits. The first perspective sees citizenship as involving distinctly political-economic rights (Ong 1999), such as voting and access to certain employment and labor market opportunities (Aleinikoff 2001). Those who become citizens can expect to be able to vote and to pursue new job possibilities; in turn, they are assumed to embrace largely uniform national identifications (Aleinikoff 2003; Schuck 1998). This framework on citizenship envisions immigrants individually and quite explicitly naturalizing for political and economic reasons. In this view, the major benefits of naturalization include not only access to those jobs in government and defense that require citizenship, and to public assistance, but also the right to vote and the ability to sponsor relatives for immigration.

A second perspective emphasizes additional bases for citizenship (Bloemraad 2006; Feldblum 2000), some of which may involve the operation of post-nationalist and

transnationalist forces, implying in some instances a diminishing relevance of national citizenship altogether (e.g., Bauböck 1994; Carens 1987; Jacobson 1996; Soysal 1994). Such approaches also note the existence of multiple kinds of citizenship and often the prevalence of transnational, including dual, citizenship (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994; Gilbertson and Singer 2003; Ong 1999; Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt 1999), all of which point to the social contextual material and symbolic benefits of naturalization (Liang 1994b; Morawska 2001; 2003; Van Hook, Brown, and Bean 2006). Bloemraad (2004; 2006) and Van Hook, Brown, and Bean (2006) note that the tangible and intangible support provided to newcomers from social, institutional and state sources helps to shape immigrant contexts of reception (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Reitz 2003) and influence how welcome immigrants feel at arrival, how much settlement help they receive, and how much assistance they can draw upon when learning the skills required for naturalization (e.g., knowledge of civics and English).

Possible Differences in the Effects of Mother's and Father's Status

We thus expect that when immigrant parents become legal permanent residents and naturalized citizens that this will generate improvements in the life situations of their children, including likely enhancements in their children's human capital attainment and economic well-being, consistent with the status-attainment literature showing the importance of family background on educational and occupational outcomes (e.g. Blau and Duncan 1967; Featherman and Hauser 1978; Teachman 1987). But mother's versus father's status could have different implications for children's outcomes. Because the migration process is gendered in important ways (Harzig 2006; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994, Suárez-Orozco and Qin 2006), particularly in the case of Mexican labor migration, mothers and fathers may have different reasons for migrating

and differential opportunities for legalizing their status. Solo male migrants who legalize often subsequently apply for spouses to come from Mexico, and some wives may thus enter the United States legally even though their husbands were initially unauthorized. Also, wives who enter without authorization may have more trouble gathering the paperwork often necessary for legalization, such as employment records or utility or rental receipts that show continuous residence, especially if the women work in domestic labor or move into households where the records are kept only in the man's name (González Baker 1997). Such considerations suggest father's legal status and citizenship may have a greater effect than the mother's status on the acquisition of human capital among the second generation. Alternatively, the frequently greater involvement of mothers in child socialization (Matthews 1987) especially among Mexican immigrant mothers, whose sex-role attitudes may often be traditional (Ortiz and Cooney 1985, González-López 2003), may lead to greater effects for mother's status. Finally, these socialization effects may be gendered, so that the influence of a more traditionally oriented mothers may affect daughters more than sons, particularly since Mexican-origin girls report higher academic motivation and aspirations than boys (Gowan and Treviño 1998; Plunkett and Bámaca-Gómez 2003; Williams, Alvarez, and Hauck 2002)). Because we have no theoretical basis for predicting which of these kinds of influence might predominate, we thus treat this matter here as an empirical question.

## DATA AND APPROACH

Our data come from a new survey called Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA), supported by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation. Conducted in 2004, the study targeted the young-adult children of immigrants from large

immigrant groups in Los Angeles and obtained information from 4,780 persons ages 20 to 40 who had at least one immigrant parent. In addition to Mexicans, the groups surveyed included persons whose parents' national origin was Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, Salvadoran or Guatemalan. Because of the centrality of the Mexican origin group to the immigrant experience in Los Angeles, the Mexican sample was designed to be a random probability sample of all Mexican-origin persons (whatever their generational status) residing in households with telephones in the greater five-county metropolitan region. The sample size was 1,369. The survey obtained information on parents' migration status, both at the time of entry to the United States and at the time of the IIMMLA interview. We also collected data on whether the parents had naturalized.

Because we define second-generation respondents as those having at least one immigrant parent, it is important to note that the generational statuses of the parents may differ. In a few cases, mothers were foreign-born but fathers native-born or vice versa, meaning that one parent could not have had either a legalization or naturalization experience. Because respondents with one native-born parent nonetheless constitute a meaningful comparison group, we include them here in a separate category because they provide a useful benchmark for children's economic attainment. We thus examine six nativity/migration status/naturalization trajectories for the mothers and fathers of the IIMMLA 1.5 and second-generation respondents of Mexican origin. These trajectories are (together with the terms we use for them) : 1) Native-Born: father (mother) is native-born ; 2) Authorized/Citizen: father (mother) is authorized at entry, later naturalized; 3) Authorized/Green Card: father (mother) authorized at entry, not naturalized by time of interview; 4) Unauthorized/Citizen: father (mother) unauthorized at entry, naturalized by interview; 5) Unauthorized/Green Card: father (mother) unauthorized at entry, obtained legal permanent

residency, but not naturalized at interview; and 6) Unauthorized/Unauthorized: father (mother) unauthorized at both entry and interview.

## FINDINGS

How have the pathways to legalization and citizenship among unauthorized immigrants affected their children's chances of joining the American economic mainstream? In trying to answer this question, we note first that calculating the fraction of our respondents whose parents came as unauthorized entrants depends on knowing the number of parents who in fact were immigrants. Roughly 10 percent of the fathers and the mothers were born in the United States and thus could not be immigrants, although their children qualify as 1.5 and second generation because of the immigrant status of the other parent. In addition, another 119 fathers and 81 mothers never migrated to the United States, a group constituting 12.7 percent of the fathers and 8.7 percent of the mothers in the sample (see Table 1). We omit both these groups in calculating fractions of 1.5 and second-generation persons with unauthorized fathers and mothers. But what about the 60 fathers and nine mothers whose status was unknown (because the respondent either did not know that parent or that parent's migration status at entry)? These parents could in fact have migrated to the United States. In recognition of this, we calculate two percentages of persons with unauthorized parents -- one assuming that these parents were unauthorized and the second assuming they were not. We also calculate these percentages a third way, namely by not including this group of 60 fathers and nine mothers at all. The three resulting sets of percentages are shown in the first six rows of Table 2. They reveal that a little less than half of the 1.5 and second generation respondents' fathers came to the United States as unauthorized migrants (about 46 percent in the case of the middle estimate), meaning also that slightly more than half

came as legal entrants. Among the mothers, the percentage who came as unauthorized migrants is nearly as high as for the fathers (roughly 43 percent). These estimates are reasonably close to previous ones for the fraction of unauthorized entrants from Mexico eventually settling in California during the '50s, '60s and '70s (Bean, Passel, and Edmonston 1990).

By the time of the IIMMLA interview, most of the unauthorized fathers had become legalized permanent residents. Specifically, only about 5 to 14 percent of the fathers remained unauthorized. Among mothers, about 5 to 6 percent remained unauthorized. If we assume the level of the middle estimate for the percentage that legalized, this would mean that nearly 9 of every 10 unauthorized entrants had attained legal status by 2004. Overall, it would mean that about 19 of every 20 total known entrants were either legal or had attained legal permanent resident status by the time of the interview. This very high percentage of legal fathers and mothers among the children of Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles provides testimony to the legalization pathways provided by of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) (Bean, Vernez, and Keely 1989), as well as to the legislation's effectiveness and the successful implementation of the law's legalization provisions (González Baker 1990).

How does legalization, including IRCA legalization in the case of many of these fathers and mothers, relate to the human capital attainments of their young adult children? In Table 3, we see that those respondents whose fathers legalized are about 25 percent less likely to drop out of high school (16.9 percent versus 22.5 percent) and about 70 percent more likely to graduate from college. Similarly, they are nearly 13 percent more likely to prefer speaking English at home, work in jobs with about 7 percent higher occupational prestige, and report earnings that are about 30 percent higher than those whose fathers did not legalize. Thus, in general, having a father who had the opportunity to legalize, and did so, appears to confer appreciable economic

benefits on the 1.5 and second-generation children of Mexican immigrants who entered the country in an unauthorized status.

The results for mothers are generally similar. Becoming a legal permanent resident for mothers is also related to higher children's economic attainment. But notably, when the mother remains unauthorized, their children acquire less human capital than if the father remained unauthorized. Almost 36 percent of those with mothers who remained unauthorized never received a high school diploma, and none received a college degree. The occupational prestige of respondents' jobs is about one-eighth lower when their mothers remained unauthorized than when fathers did, and their income is more than $2,500 lower. Only 28.2 percent of respondents whose mothers remained unauthorized prefer to speak English at home, compared with 45.0 percent of those whose fathers remained unauthorized. This finding tends to support the socialization perspective, that the offspring of that minority of mothers who do not legalize their status have inherited some of the disadvantages carried by their mothers and that mothers' role in the socialization of children may have even more effect than fathers'.

Do additional benefits accrue from naturalizing, either among those whose fathers and mothers entered legally or among those whose fathers and mothers were unauthorized entrants who legalized and also went on to become naturalized citizens? Of the former group, more than two-thirds (66.9 percent of fathers and 70.1 percent of mothers) had naturalized by the time of the interview (Table 2). Of the parents known to be unauthorized entrants, about half of the fathers (49.7 percent) and slightly less than half of the mothers (43.3 percent) had naturalized. Thus, by some 20 to 35 years after most of our respondents' fathers and mothers came to the country, about three-fifths of the mothers and fathers had become citizens, including many who started out as unauthorized entrants. Again, it is worth noting that most of these parents qualified

for legalization and citizenship by virtue of the legalization programs of IRCA, which created two major pathways to legalization for unauthorized migrants in the country at that time (Bean, Vernez, and Keely 1989). Most of the parents of our respondents migrated to the United States during an era when almost all of them would have been eligible for one or the other program. Although we did not obtain data on whether our respondents' parents in fact became legal through IRCA's programs, about three-fourths of the unauthorized Mexican immigrants estimated to be in the country during the 1980s legalized as a result of IRCA (Bean, Passel and Edmonston 1990; Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002).

Examining the experiences of the children of immigrants in the Los Angeles sample thus provides a useful illustration of what might occur among unauthorized Mexican immigrants and their children if new legalization programs and pathways to citizenship are adopted. The IIMMLA data indicate that the legalization and citizenship trajectories of those coming illegally are importantly related to children's outcomes (Table 4). These patterns hold up even when we control for the effects of parents' education and respondents' age, both of which could affect the outcomes. Thus, we note that when parents who were initially unauthorized changed their legal status, and particularly when they also became naturalized citizens, this pathway is related to a substantially reduced likelihood of educational failure among their children. For example, 57 percent fewer such children (those whose fathers entered unauthorized but went on to legalize and then eventually naturalize) failed to finish high school than in the case of children whose fathers stayed unauthorized (13.5 percent versus 31.3 percent for those whose fathers remained unauthorized; see Table 4). In the case of finishing college, the children of unauthorized fathers who eventually naturalized graduated from college at twice the rate of children whose fathers

remained unauthorized (19.3 percent for the former versus 9.6 percent for the latter). The gaps are even broader for the children of mothers who changed status versus those who did not.

To be sure, the number of children going on to college in these cases is not inordinately high. Nonetheless, migration status and citizenship trajectories clearly matter, as indicated by the fact that sizeable premiums attach to occupational prestige, income, and the tendency to speak English among the children of parents who took advantage of the opportunity to legalize and naturalize compared to those who remained unauthorized. For example, the premium that obtains in the case of mothers is almost 12 percent for occupational prestige; about 26 percent for income; and about 31 percent for speaking English (Table 4). To be more specific in the case of income, those whose fathers entered as unauthorized migrants but then went on to legalize (most probably as a result of IRCA, as noted above), as well as to become naturalized citizens, reported an adjusted average income of $23,199 in 2004. Those who had fathers, however, who entered illegally but then stayed unauthorized (i.e., were still unauthorized at the time of the IIMMLA interview in 2004), reported adjusted incomes that averaged only $16,879. In other words, the former group made $6,320 more than the latter, or 37 percent higher annual incomes, a considerable income premium for legalization and naturalization. The premium for those whose mothers legalized and naturalized versus those whose mothers remained unauthorized is only slightly less, $4,590, or 26 percent.

Some of the outcomes appear to influence daughters more than sons (Tables M2 and F2). In particular, the trajectory from unauthorized immigrant to naturalized citizen has differential effects upon children. When mothers both legalize and naturalize, daughters average .2 more years of schooling than sons. But when fathers follow the same trajectory, daughters average .5

years less schooling than sons. That advantage conferred by mothers to daughters may stem from greater acculturation on the mothers' part.

In completing this paper, we intend to create a path analysis and explore the role of more factors than the ones shown in our preliminary analysis. Our primary outcome variable will be educational attainment, but we also wish to examine income, SEI and English preferences.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The children of unauthorized Mexican immigrants who changed their legal status have better economic outcomes than the children of immigrants who remained unauthorized. Those better outcomes provide a basis for assessing some of the long-term effects on incorporation of legislation that provided pathways to legalization or citizenship. Our findings suggest that the kind of legalization and citizenship possibilities made available by IRCA enhance educational attainment, English usage, occupational prestige, and incomes on the part of the children of unauthorized immigrants. In short, pathways to legalization and citizenship may smooth the way for children of immigrants to become societal stakeholders in general. A lack of such pathways may risk increasing the number of children growing up in poor and vulnerable households and adding to the size of any existing immigrant underclass. That the absence of legalization and citizenship pathways could limit economic integration is also reinforced by research showing that parental legalization and citizenship are related to more civic engagement in the case of the children of Mexican immigrants, an outcome that has generally been found to foster economic success among immigrants (DeSipio, Bean and Rumbaut 2005).

These effects of parents' migration status hold for both fathers and mothers. The effects do not appear to be gendered in any consistent ways. For example, fathers' legalization and

naturalization status has a greater effect on children's income than mothers' status, but mothers' status has the greater effect on children's education. The level of legalization and naturalization among both fathers and mothers is high, also showing few gendered effects over the course of several decades since the parents' arrival in the United States. However, mothers' trajectories, particularly when they lead to from unauthorized status to naturalization, appear to have more influence on daughters than they do on sons. This finding would be consistent with the socialization literature.

It is worth noting that the above results do not mean that the parents' legalization and citizenship cause children's higher economic status *per se*, although they may, particularly by improving access to economic opportunities available only to legal immigrants or citizens. It is possible that our results derive, at least in part, from processes of selectivity. That is, perhaps the smartest and most industrious of the parents are also the more likely to legalize and obtain citizenship, and the influence of such tendencies helps to account for the gains in education and income among their children rather than legal and citizenship status *per se*. However, even if this were the case, it would not suggest that legalization and citizenship pathways are unimportant. The reason is that the presence of such opportunities, including even the prospect that they might emerge, is a prerequisite for selectivities to occur. Indeed, without legalization and citizenship opportunities, the migration of the motivated and industrious might be substantially reduced, which itself could contribute to the further development of an impoverished, vulnerable, and perhaps alienated underclass of unauthorized migrants in the United States. That the chance to become full members of society matters is indicated by the fact so many immigrants, particularly Mexican immigrants, legalized and became citizens when

they were presented with the opportunity to do so by IRCA. An important reason was undoubtedly because they perceived that they and their children would benefit.

If legalization and citizenship programs had been unavailable at the time, it is unlikely the parents would have fared as well in America as they did. They would have had to live and work underground to a much greater degree, and in all probability would have lacked the resources to provide as well for their children, including the resources to help pay for college. Without the possibility to legalize and become citizens (i.e., in the form of signals of both a welcoming social reception and of the existence opportunities to legalize), they would have been less likely to have tried as hard as they did (Van Hook, Brown, and Bean 2006). In short, even if some of the economic achievements of the children of unauthorized immigrants who legalized and became citizens derived from selectivity, such mechanisms may not operate to benefit children if fathers lack the chance to legalize and become citizens. And in fact, as noted above, when with the IIMMLA data we control fathers' and mothers' education in regression models predicting children's economic attainment and human capital outcomes, we find that the premiums associated with legalization and citizenship either do not change or actually increase (adjusted results shown in Table 4). Migration and citizenship opportunities thus appear to matter considerably. By providing environments that encourage educational attainment and economic achievement among the children of immigrants, legalization and citizenship pathways seem likely to facilitate not only the economic integration of the immigrant generation, but also that of 1.5 and second-generation Mexican immigrants.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, Michael B., and Douglas S. Massey. 2003. “Social Capital and the Wages of Mexican Migrants: New Hypotheses and Tests.” *Social Forces* 82: 671-701.

Aleinikoff, T. Alexander. 2001. "Policing Boundaries: Migration, Citizenship, and the State." Pp. 267-291 in G. Gerstle and J. Mollenkopf (eds.), *E Pluribus Unum? Contemporary and Historical Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____. 2003. "Between National and Postnational: Membership in the United States." Pp. 110-129 in C. Joppke and E. Morawska (eds.), *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barkan, E. R. and N. Khokhlov. 1980. "Socioeconomic Data as Indexes of Naturalization Patterns in the United-States - a Theory Revisited." *Ethnicity* 7:159-190.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.

Bauböck, Rainer. 1994. *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. "Mexican Immigrant Political and Economic Incorporation." *Perspectives on Politics* 4: 309-313.

Bean, Frank D. and B. Lindsay Lowell. 2004. "NAFTA and Mexican Migration to the United States." Pp. 263-284 in Sidney Weintraub (ed.), *NAFTA'S Impact on North America: The First Decade*. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and international Studies.

Bean, Frank D., Jeffrey S. Passel, and Barry Edmonston. 1990. *Undocumented Migration to the United States: IRCA and the Experience of the 1980s*. Washington: The Urban Institute Press.

Bean, Frank D., and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bean, Frank D., Georges Vernez, and Charles B. Keely. 1989. *Opening and Closing the Doors: Evaluating Immigration Reform and Control*. Santa Monica, CA., and Washington, D.C.: the RAND Corporation and the Urban Institute.

Beijbom, U. 1971. *Swedes in Chicago: A Demographic and Social Study of the 1846-1880 Immigration*. Chicago: Chicago Historical Society.

Bernard, W. S. 1936. "Cultural Determinants of Naturalization." *American Sociological Review* 1:943-953.

Blau, Peter, and Otis Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Academic Press.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2004. "Who Claims Dual Citizenship? The limits of Postnationalism, the Possibilities of Transnationalism, and the Persistence of Traditional Citizenship." *International Migration Review* 38:5-42.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrations and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Camarota, Steven A. 2001. "Immigration From Mexico: Assessing the Impact on the United States." Washington, D.C.: Center for Immigration Studies. http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/Mexico/toc.html

Carens, Joseph H. 1987. "Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders." *The Review of Politics* 49:251-273.

DeSipio, Louis, Frank D. Bean, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2005. "Immigration Status and Naturalization Across Generations: The Consequences of Parental Unauthorized Migration or Naturalization on the Civic and Political Behaviors of 1.5 and 2nd Generation Young Adults in Los Angeles." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC: September.

Featherman, David, and Robert Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.

Feldblum, Miriam. 2000. "Managing Membership: New Trends in Citizenship and Nationality Policy." Pp. 475-499 in T. A. Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (eds.), *From Migrants to Citizens: Membership in a Changing World*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Gilbertson, Greta A. and Audrey Singer. 2003. "The Emergence of Protective Citizenship in the USA: Naturalization Among Dominican Immigrants in the Post-1996 Welfare Reform Era." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26:25-51.

González Baker, Susan. 1990. *The Cautious Welcome*. Santa Monica, CA and Washington, D.C.: The RAND Corporation and The Urban Institute.

_____. 1997. "The 'Amnesty' Aftermath: Current Policy Issues Stemming from the Legalization Programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act." *International Migration Review* 31: 5-27.

González-López, Gloria. 2003. "*De madres a hijas*: Gendered Lessons on Virginity across Generations of Mexican Immigrant Women." Pp. 217-240 in *Gender and U.S.*

*Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Edited by Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gowan, Mary, and Melanie Treviño. 1998. “An Examination of Gender Differences in Mexican-American Attitudes Toward Family and Career Roles.” *Sex Roles* 38: 1079-1093.

Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:360-380.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. *The Mexican-American People: The Nation’s Second Largest Minority.* New York: Free Press.

Hanson, Victor Davis. 2003. *Mexifornia: A State of Becoming*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.

Harzig, Christiane. 2006. “Domestics of the World (Unite?): Labor Migration Systems and Personal Trajectories of Household Workers in Historical and Global Perspective.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 25: 48-73.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jacobson, David. 1996. *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jasso, Guillermina, and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1986. "Family Reunification and the Immigration Multiplier: U.S. Immigration Law, Origin-Country Conditions, and the Reproduction of Immigrants." *Demography* 23 294-311.

Liang, Zai. 1994b. "Social Contact, Social Capital, and the Naturalization Process: Evidence from Six Immigrant Groups." *Social Science Research* 23: 407-437.

Massey, Douglas S. 1987. “Do Undocumented Migrants Earn Lower Wages than Legal Immigrants? New Evidence from Mexico.” *International Migration Review* 2: 236-274.

Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Matthews, Glenna. 1987. *"Just a Housewife": The Rise and Fall of Domesticity in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morawska, Ewa. 2001. "Immigrants, Transnationalism, and Ethnicization: A Comparison of This Great Wave and the Last." Pp. 175-212 in G. Gerstle and J. Mollenkopf (eds.), *E Pluribus Unum? Contemporary and Historical Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____. 2003. "Immigrant Transnationalism and Assimilation: A Variety of Combinations and the Analytic Strategy It Suggests." Pp. 133-176 in C. Joppke and E. Morawska (eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States: From Post-national to Transnational*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Office of Immigration Statistics. 2006. Statistical Yearbook of Immigration, Department of Homeland Security. Washington, D.C.

Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logic of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ortiz, V. and R. Cooney. 1985. "Sex-role Attitudes and Labor Force Participation Among Hispanic Females and non-Hispanic White Females." Pp. 174-182 in R. O. de la Garza, F. D. Bean, C. M. Bonjean, R. Romo, and R. Alvarez (eds.), *The Mexican American Experience: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 2006. The Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized Migrant Population in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Plunkett, Scott W., and Mayra Y. Bámaca-Gómez. 2003. “The Relationship Between Parenting, Accultural, and Adolescent Academics in Mexican-Origin Immigrant Families in Los Angeles.” *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 25: 222-239.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies. The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley and New York: University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro, Luis Guarnizo, and Patricia Landolt. 1999. "Introduction: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:217-237.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 2003. "Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants." La Jolla: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Sabagh, Georges, and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. 2003. "From 'Give Me your Poor' to 'Save Our State': New York and Los Angeles as Immigrant Cities and Regions." Pp. 99-123 in David Halle (ed.), *New York & Los Angeles: Politics, Society, and Culture, A Comparative View*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schuck, Peter H. 1998. *Citizens, Strangers, and In-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Soysal, Tasemin Nuhoglu. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Teachman, Jay D. 1987. “Family Background, Educational Resources, and Educational Attainment.” *American Sociological Review* 52: 548-557.

Suárez-Orozco, Carola, and Desirée Baolian Qin. 2006. “Gendered Perspectives in Psychology: Immigrant Origin Youth.” *International Migration Review* 40: 165-198.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2006. American Community Survey for metropolitan Los Angeles. http://www.census.gov/acs/www/.

U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. 1994. *U.S. Immigration Policy: Restoring Credibility*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Hook, Jennifer, Susan K. Brown, and Frank D. Bean. 2006. "For Love or Money? Welfare Reform and Immigrant Naturalization." *Social Forces* (forthcoming).

Williams, L. Susan, Sandra D. Alvarez, and Kevin s. Andrade Hauck. 2002. "My Name Is Not María: Young Latinas Seeking Home in the Heartland." *Social Problems* 49: 563-584.

Yang, Philip Q. 1994. "Explaining Immigrant Naturalization." *International Migration Review* 28:449-477.

**Table 1. Entry Status and Citizenship Trajectories, Fathers and Mothers of 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Distribution by Father's Status | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All | | Those with Foreign-born Fathers | | Those with Foreign-born Fathers and Known Migration Status | | Those with Foreign-born Fathers Who Could Have Migrated or Did to U.S. | | Those with Foreign-born Fathers and Known to Have Migrated to U.S. | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Status Unknown[a] | 60 | 6.4 | 60 | 7.1 | -- | -- | 60 | 8.3 | -- | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 119 | 12.7 | 119 | 14.1 | 119 | 15.2 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Not Foreign-Born | 93 | 9.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 239 | 25.6 | 239 | 28.4 | 239 | 30.6 | 239 | 33.1 | 239 | 36.0 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 118 | 12.6 | 118 | 14.0 | 118 | 15.1 | 118 | 16.3 | 118 | 17.8 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 152 | 16.3 | 152 | 18.1 | 152 | 19.4 | 152 | 21.0 | 152 | 22.9 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 114 | 12.2 | 114 | 13.5 | 114 | 14.6 | 114 | 15.8 | 114 | 17.2 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 40 | 4.3 | 40 | 4.8 | 40 | 5.1 | 40 | 5.5 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Total for Fathers | 935 | 100.0 | 842 | 100.0 | 782 | 100.0 | 723 | 100.0 | 663 | 100.0 |

| | Distribution by Mother's Status | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All | | Those with Foreign-born Mothers | | Those with Foreign-born Mothers and Known Migration Status | | Those with Foreign-born Mothers Who Could Have Migrated or Did to U.S. | | Those with Foreign-born Mothers and Known to Have Migrated to U.S. | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Status Unknown[a] | 9 | 1.0 | 9 | 1.1 | -- | -- | 9 | 1.2 | -- | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 81 | 8.7 | 81 | 9.7 | 81 | 9.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Not Foreign-Born | 98 | 10.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 300 | 32.1 | 300 | 35.8 | 300 | 36.2 | 300 | 39.7 | 300 | 40.2 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 128 | 13.7 | 128 | 15.3 | 128 | 15.5 | 128 | 16.9 | 128 | 17.1 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 138 | 14.8 | 138 | 16.5 | 138 | 16.7 | 138 | 18.3 | 138 | 18.5 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 142 | 15.2 | 142 | 17.0 | 142 | 17.1 | 142 | 18.8 | 142 | 19.0 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 39 | 4.2 | 39 | 4.7 | 39 | 4.7 | 39 | 5.2 | 39 | 5.2 |
| Total for Mothers | 935 | 100.0 | 837 | 100.0 | 828 | 100.0 | 756 | 100.0 | 747 | 100.0 |

a Did not know parent or parent's status

**Table 2. Fathers and Mothers Entering the Country with Various Migration Statuses and then Legalizing and Naturalizing, 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Fathers | Mothers |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Percent Entering Unauthorized | 46.2 [a] | 42.7 [a] |
| | 42.3 [b] | 42.2 [b] |
| | 50.6 [c] | 43.4 [c] |
| Percent Unauthorized at Interview | 13.8 [a] | 6.3 [a] |
| | 5.5 [b] | 5.2 [b] |
| | 6.0 [c] | 5.2 [c] |
| Percent Legalizing of Entrants with Known Status | 94.0 | 94.8 |
| Percent Naturalizing of Known Legal Entrants | 66.9 | 70.1 |
| Percent Naturalizing of Known Unauthorized Entrants | 49.7 | 43.3 |
| Percent Naturalizing of All Known Eligible | 62.8 | 61.9 |

[a] Assumes those parents with unknown status were all unauthorized.
[b] Assumes those parents with unknown status were all authorized.
[c] Only for parents with known entry status.

**Table 3. Levels of Human Capital and Economic Attainment by Father's and Mother's Legal Statuses at Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Fathers | Mothers |
|---|---|---|
| Respondent Education | | |
| % Less than High School Diploma | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 11.8 | 15.3 |
| Authorized at Entry | 13.2 | 14.0 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 16.9 | 15.0 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 22.5 | 35.9 |
| Status Unknown | 26.7 | 11.1 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 37.0 | 49.4 |
| % Bachelor's Degree or Higher | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 19.4 | 8.2 |
| Authorized at Entry | 16.2 | 19.2 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 17.3 | 15.7 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Status Unknown | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 8.4 | 8.6 |
| Average Years of Education | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 13.5 | 12.7 |
| Authorized at Entry | 13.2 | 13.4 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 13.0 | 11.4 |
| Status Unknown | 12.4 | 13.0 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 11.8 | 10.9 |
| % Prefer to Speak English at Home | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 71.0 | 80.6 |
| Authorized at Entry | 65.5 | 62.9 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 50.8 | 46.1 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 45.0 | 28.2 |
| Status Unknown | 41.7 | 66.7 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 32.8 | 28.4 |

(Continued on Next Page)

**Table 3 (continued). Levels of Human Capital and Economic Attainment by Father's and Mother's Legal Statuses at Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Fathers | Mothers |
|---|---|---|
| Average Occupational Socioeconomic Prestige | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 40.4 | 42.4 |
| Authorized at Entry | 42.3 | 41.9 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 41.3 | 41.4 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 38.5 | 34.0 |
| Status Unknown | 39.6 | 42.6 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 38.8 | 36.9 |
| Average Personal Income | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 23,194 | 25,847 |
| Authorized at Entry | 23,847 | 23,466 |
| Unauthorized / Authorized | 22,105 | 20,014 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 16,988 | 14,218 |
| Status Unknown | 19,567 | 16,056 |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 17,395 | 19,685 |

**Table 4. Human Capital and Economic Attainment by Father's and Mother's Entry Status and Citizenship Trajectories, 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Father's | | Mother's | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unadjusted | Adjusted[1] | Unadjusted | Adjusted[1] |
| Respondent Education | | | | |
| % Less than High School Diploma | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 11.8 | 14.4 | 15.3 | 15.3 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 10.9 | 12.9 | 11.3 | 13.2 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 17.8 | 17.5 | 20.3 | 19.2 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 14.5 | 13.7 | 11.6 | 10.6 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 20.2 | 17.7 | 18.3 | 13.3 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 22.5 | 31.5 | 35.9 | 42.5 |
| Status Unknown | 26.7 | -- | 11.1 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 37.0 | -- | 49.4 | -- |
| % Bachelor's Degree or Higher | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 19.4 | 15.6 | 8.2 | 4.4 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 16.7 | 14.5 | 22.3 | 21.3 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 15.3 | 16.9 | 11.7 | 12.8 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 19.1 | 19.5 | 20.3 | 21.4 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 14.9 | 19.1 | 11.3 | 16.3 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 10.0 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
| Status Unknown | 8.3 | -- | 0.0 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 8.4 | -- | 8.6 | -- |
| Average Years of Education | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 13.5 | 13.3 | 12.7 | 12.5 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 13.3 | 13.2 | 13.7 | 13.5 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 13.0 | 13.1 | 12.9 | 13.0 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 13.3 | 13.4 | 13.5 | 13.6 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 13.0 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 13.3 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 13.0 | 12.2 | 11.4 | 11.3 |
| Status Unknown | 12.4 | -- | 13.0 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 11.8 | -- | 10.9 | -- |
| % Prefer to Speak English at Home | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 71.0 | 71.1 | 80.6 | 92.0 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 69.5 | 69.9 | 67.0 | 81.0 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 57.6 | 65.5 | 53.1 | 70.7 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 61.8 | 72.6 | 55.1 | 75.3 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 36.0 | 50.7 | 37.3 | 65.3 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 45.0 | 47.7 | 28.2 | 52.0 |
| Status Unknown | 41.7 | -- | 66.7 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 32.8 | -- | 28.4 | -- |

(Continued on next page)

1 Controlling for Father's and Mother's Years of Schooling and Respondent's Age

**Table 4 (continued). Human Capital and Economic Attainment by Father's and Mother's Entry Status and Citizenship Trajectories, 1.5 and 2nd Generation Mexican-Origin Respondents**

| | Father's | | Mother's | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unadjusted | Adjusted[1] | Unadjusted | Adjusted[1] |
| Average Occupational Socioeconomic Prestige | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 40.4 | 39.3 | 42.4 | 40.9 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 42.1 | 41.6 | 42.5 | 42.1 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 42.9 | 43.3 | 40.3 | 40.6 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 41.6 | 41.6 | 41.7 | 41.8 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 40.8 | 41.9 | 41.2 | 42.6 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 38.5 | 38.7 | 34.0 | 36.9 |
| Status Unknown | 39.6 | -- | 42.6 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 38.8 | -- | 36.9 | -- |
| Average Personal Income | | | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 23,194 | 20,501 | 25,847 | 22,818 |
| Authorized / Naturalized | 26,151 | 24,922 | 25,000 | 23,754 |
| Authorized / Green Card | 19,182 | 20,905 | 19,871 | 20,371 |
| Unauthorized / Naturalized | 23,638 | 23,564 | 21,960 | 22,627 |
| Unauthorized / Green Card | 20,061 | 23,216 | 18,123 | 22,439 |
| Unauthorized / Unauthorized | 16,988 | 17,244 | 14,218 | 18,036 |
| Status Unknown | 19,567 | -- | 16,056 | -- |
| Never Lived in U.S. | 17,395 | -- | 19,685 | -- |

1 Controlling for Father's and Mother's Years of Schooling and Respondent's Age

**Table F2. Characteristics by Gender and Father's Immigration and Naturalization Status upon Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generations**

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Respondent Education | | |
| % Less than High School Diploma | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 5.0 | 17.0 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 5.7 | 15.0 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 15.6 | 20.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 17.1 | 11.8 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 21.4 | 18.2 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 25.0 | 20.0 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | | |
| % College Degree or Higher | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 15.0 | 22.6 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 17.0 | 16.5 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 10.9 | 20.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 15.8 | 22.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 17.1 | 11.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 15.0 | 5.0 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 8.5 | 8.2 |
| Mean Years of Education | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 13.5 | 13.5 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 13.5 | 13.2 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 13.1 | 13.6 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 13.6 | 12.3 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 12.0 | 11.9 |
| Mean Occupational SEI | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 42.1 | 39.2 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 43.8 | 40.8 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 44.1 | 41.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 42.7 | 40.6 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 41.7 | 39.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 40.4 | 36.8 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 41.9 | 36.3 |

(Continued on next page)

**Table F2 (continued). Characteristics by Gender and Father's Immigration and Naturalization Status upon Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generations**

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Mean Income | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 18,200 | 26,962 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 20,250 | 30,853 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 17,289 | 21,426 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 18,796 | 28,480 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 17,586 | 24,000 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 15,125 | 18,850 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 16,798 | 19,588 |
| % Prefer to Speak English at Home | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 67.5 | 73.6 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 68.9 | 69.9 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 59.4 | 55.6 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 57.9 | 65.8 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 34.3 | 38.6 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 50.0 | 40.0 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 33.0 | 38.8 |
| Sample N | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 40 | 53 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 106 | 133 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 64 | 54 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 76 | 76 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 70 | 44 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 20 | 20 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 94 | 85 |

**Table M2. Characteristics by Gender and Mother's Immigration and Naturalization Status upon Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generations**

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Respondent Education | | |
| % Less than High School Diploma | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 17.2 | 12.5 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 7.7 | 14.1 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 18.2 | 22.6 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 10.8 | 12.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 19.0 | 17.2 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 31.3 | 39.1 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 45.2 | 45.8 |
| % College Degree or Higher | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 8.6 | 7.5 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 20.8 | 23.5 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 12.1 | 11.3 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 18.9 | 21.9 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 11.9 | 10.3 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 4.8 | 10.4 |
| Mean Years of Education | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 12.6 | 12.9 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 13.9 | 13.5 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 13.6 | 13.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 11.4 | 11.4 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 10.6 | 11.6 |
| Mean Occupational SEI | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 43.1 | 41.4 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 44.8 | 40.8 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 41.1 | 39.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 42.5 | 40.7 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 43.2 | 38.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 34.4 | 33.7 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 39.7 | 36.1 |

(Continued on next page)

**Table M2 (continued). Characteristics by Gender and Mother's Immigration and Naturalization Status upon Entry and at Time of Interview, 1.5 and 2nd Generations**

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Mean Income | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 26,871 | 24,363 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 19,658 | 29,085 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 16,242 | 23,734 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 18,946 | 25,445 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 14,792 | 22,948 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 9,375 | 17,587 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 12,893 | 24,948 |
| % Prefer to Speak English at Home | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 75.9 | 87.5 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 63.1 | 70.0 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 57.6 | 48.4 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 47.3 | 64.1 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 39.3 | 34.5 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 25.0 | 30.4 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 26.2 | 37.5 |
| Sample N | | |
| Not Foreign-Born | 58 | 40 |
| Authorized -> Naturalized | 130 | 170 |
| Authorized -> Green Card | 66 | 62 |
| Unauthorized -> Naturalized | 74 | 64 |
| Unauthorized -> Green Card | 84 | 58 |
| Unauthorized -> Unauthorized | 16 | 23 |
| Status Unknown / Not Applicable | 42 | 48 |