THE TRANSMISSION OF WOMEN'S FERTILITY, HUMAN CAPITAL AND WORK ORIENTATION ACROSS IMMIGRANT GENERATIONS*

Francine D. Blau
Cornell University, NBER, IZA and CESifo

Lawrence M. Kahn
Cornell University, IZA, CESifo, and NCER (Australia)

Albert Yung-Hsu Liu
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Kerry L. Papps
University of Oxford and IZA

January 2010

*We are indebted to Susan Dynarski and participants at the Society of Labor Economists meetings in Boston, May 2009 for helpful comments and suggestions, Peter Brummund for excellent research assistance, and the Russell Sage Foundation for financial support. Portions of the research for this paper were completed while Blau and Kahn were Visiting Fellows in the Economics Department of Princeton University, supported by the Industrial Relations Section.

THE TRANSMISSION OF WOMEN'S FERTILITY, HUMAN CAPITAL AND WORK ORIENTATION ACROSS IMMIGRANT GENERATIONS

Abstract

Using 1995–2006 Current Population Survey and 1970–2000 Census data, we find that the fertility, education and labor supply of US-born women with foreign-born parent(s) are significantly positively affected by the immigrant generation's levels of these variables, with the effect of the fertility and labor supply of women from the mother's source country larger than that of women from the father's source country and the effect of the education of men from the father's source country larger than that of women from the mother's source country. Transmission rates for immigrant fertility between generations are higher than for labor supply or education, with considerable intergenerational assimilation toward native levels of schooling and labor supply, but more persistence for fertility.

(*JEL* D10, J16, J22, J24, J61)
Keywords: gender, immigration, labor supply, human capital, fertility.

I. Introduction

A steady flow of new immigration has resulted in an increase in the foreign-born share of the US population from 4.8 percent in 1970 to 11.1 percent in 2000, with a further increase to 12.5 percent in 2006. Perhaps more dramatically, the percentage of the foreign-born population that came from Europe or North America fell from 70.4 to 18.5 percent between 1970 and 2000, with a corresponding increase in the Asian and Latin American share from 28.3 to 78.2 percent (US Bureau of the Census web site: http://www.census.gov). An additional feature of this shift that is less frequently noted is that the immigrant population increasingly comes from countries with a more traditional division of labor by gender than the United States, and this tends to be reflected in their US labor supply behavior (Blau, Kahn and Papps forthcoming). Immigrant women also tend to have more children than native-born women do, although this difference has declined among the most recent immigrants as fertility levels around the world have fallen.

As the share of the population that is foreign-born rises, an increasing share of the population in future years will consist of individuals with parents who were born in other countries. If a traditional division of labor by gender among immigrants is transmitted to their children, the growing immigrant share in the population and the shift toward a more traditional division of labor among immigrants (relative to natives) can have substantial effects on the future labor supply and fertility behavior of women born in the United States. However, second-generation immigrants (i.e., individuals born in the United States with at least one foreign-born parent) may assimilate toward native levels of labor supply and fertility as they become acculturated to work and family size norms in the United States or as they respond to labor market opportunities here. If so, the current immigrant-native gaps in these outcomes will not have large long-term effects.

In this paper, we study the transmission of first-generation immigrants' education, labor supply and fertility behavior to second-generation women. We focus particularly on women due to the salience of the gender role issue. The study of the intergenerational transmission of values and behavior among immigrants is also relevant to a broader literature examining the impact of "culture" or preferences and beliefs developed in a different time or place on current economic behavior (Fernández 2008). The persistence of immigrant-native differences in behavior into the second immigrant generation in the face of the broader economic and social forces working towards assimilation would appear to constitute particularly strong evidence of the impact of culture, although it could also reflect the impact of unmeasured differences between immigrant and native families in human capital and work orientation.

Our research design uses the March Current Population Surveys (CPS) from 1995 to 2006, which contain information on each respondent's country of birth and the country of birth of each of her parents. For each US-born woman with a foreign-born mother or father, we retrieve Census data on the labor supply, fertility and schooling of immigrants from the indicated country (in the case of one foreign-born parent or two foreign-born parents born in the same country) or countries (in the case of immigrant parents born in different countries). We use Census data from 1970, 1980, 1990 or 2000 depending on the age of the second-generation woman in order to attach information on immigrants who were likely to be her parents' ages. Using this information on immigrants as explanatory variables, we then estimate regression models of schooling, fertility, and labor supply for second-generation women where we seek to determine the strength of the intergenerational transmission of these outcomes. As pointed out by Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000), such measures of the characteristics of the preceding generation capture the combined effect of (i) parental behavior per se and (ii) the ethnic capital associated with the characteristics and behavior of one's nationality group more broadly. Using

this approach, we cannot distinguish between these two types of effects. It might be argued, however, that the combined effect is the most relevant "bottom line" from a policy perspective.

II. Relationship to Previous Literature and Contribution of the Study

Our analysis builds on some recent papers that have studied the impact of source country or parental characteristics on the labor supply, education or fertility of immigrants' descendants. Using the 1990 Census, Antecol (2000) found that source country female labor force participation rates (measured as of 1990) were weakly positively correlated with US labor force participation among "second and higher generation" individuals, defined by their answer to the Census question on ancestry. Similarly, using 1970 Census data on US-born women with foreign-born fathers, Fernández and Fogli (2009) found that source country female labor supply and fertility each had a positive effect on the corresponding outcome of second-generation women in the United States. (The 1970 Census was the last to collect data on foreign parentage.)

Blau and Kahn (2007) analyzed the intergenerational assimilation of Mexican-American women's schooling, labor supply and fertility in the United States during the 1994–2003 period. The experience of Mexican-Americans is of interest because Mexico has a relatively traditional gender division of labor in the family and because it is currently the largest source of immigrants to the United States. They found that current Mexican immigrant women had far lower levels of schooling and labor supply, as well as higher fertility levels, than native non-Hispanic whites. However, second-generation Mexican women had education and labor supply outcomes much closer to those of the native women; the fertility gap, while also indicating assimilation, was larger relative to the mean level for natives. While these differences across generations were measured at the same time (and therefore many of the immigrants studied were not likely to be among the cohort of parents of the second-generation women in the sample used in this paper),

they suggest considerable assimilation in the second generation, an issue we examine more systematically in this paper.

Also relevant to our study are two previous papers examining intergenerational transmission which use a similar methodology to ours, although neither explicitly examined gender roles. Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000) examined the intergenerational transmission of earnings, education and marital assimilation, matching two cohorts of native-born individuals with foreign-born fathers to characteristics of their parental generation in earlier Censuses. Second-generation individuals from the 1970 Census were matched to 1940 immigrant data on men from the father's birth country; and second-generation individuals from the 1994–1996 CPS were matched to 1970 Census data on immigrant men. The authors found that there was significant intergenerational transmission of education and wages, with a roughly similar rate of intergenerational transmission for each cohort. In an earlier study, Borjas (1993) found similar results correlating wages of 1940 immigrant fathers with second-generation sons in the 1970 Census.

We contribute to the literature on gender and intergenerational transmission of immigrant behavior in several ways. First, our CPS data has information on *both* parents' countries of birth, permitting us to gauge the strength of intergenerational transmission for individuals with two foreign-born parents compared to those with only one, as well as the relative importance of the characteristics of immigrant mothers versus immigrant fathers (or immigrant women from the fathers' source country). In contrast, Antecol (2000) used data on self-reported ancestry of US-born respondents. Data on self-reported ancestry are less precise in that they include information on second *and* higher order generations. Further, Duncan and Trejo's (2007) study of Mexican-Americans suggests that more successfully-assimilated native-born individuals are less likely to report a foreign ancestry. While Fernandez and Fogli (2009) (as well as Card, DiNardo, and Estes (2000) and Borjas (1993)) also use data on parents' countries of birth, they are only able to

match second-generation individuals with their fathers, due to incomplete Census data on the birthplace of foreign-born mothers.[1] Our current data from the 1995–2006 CPS also provide an updated consideration of these issues compared to the 1970 Census data employed by Fernandez and Fogli (2009). Since 1970, there have been considerable changes in the composition of immigrant parents by source country, as well as in aggregate female labor force participation and fertility rates that might affect the findings.

Second, we include a new test of intergenerational transmission that may shed light on the potential role of the intergenerational transmission of gender roles compared to other unobservables. Unlike previous work on female labor supply, we estimate our models on second-generation men. An effect of immigrant mothers' labor supply behavior that is unique to or stronger for second-generation women than men suggests that the effect for women reflects parental gender roles rather than other unmeasured factors that may be expected to have a similar effect for both men and women.

Third, while Blau and Kahn (2007) showed that second-generation Mexican-American women had educational and labor supply outcomes much closer to native outcomes than was the case for contemporaneous immigrants, they did not conduct a direct test of the strength of intergenerational transmission. To investigate this, one needs variation in the behavior of immigrants, and our research design exploits the considerable diversity of labor supply, fertility and education among immigrants from different parts of the world.

Finally, while our study is methodologically similar to Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000), they did not examine the variables of primary interest here, fertility and labor supply. Further, as previously mentioned, we include information on the place of birth of both parents. In addition, our later CPS data set includes many more observations on second-generation individuals than

[1]In particular, when both parents were foreign-born, the 1970 Census reported only the father's country of birth. (As noted above, the Census stopped collecting data on parents' birth country after 1970.) While Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000) used the same CPS data we do (although for fewer years) and thus had access to information on both parents' countries of birth, they used only information on the father's country of birth in order to make their analyses of 1970 to 1994–1996 assimilation consistent with their 1940 to 1970 analysis.

were available to Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000) from the 1994–96 CPS; this has the further advantage of enabling us to distinguish a far greater number of source countries. Further, they used a single year to compute parental characteristics, e.g., matching their second generation CPS sample to immigrants in the 1970 Census. In contrast, as explained below, we use information on the age of second-generation individuals in the 1995–2006 CPS to form an estimate of their parents' age and then match to the appropriate Census, interpolating between adjacent decennial Censuses if necessary. In this way we can more closely match second-generation individuals with their parents.

III. Data and Descriptive Patterns

The 1995–2006 March CPS files comprise our basic data source. We focus our analysis on the "second generation": individuals who were born in the United States with at least one parent born in an identifiable foreign country, although we establish an initial baseline by comparing them to "natives", who were born in the United States with both parents also born in the United States. Among the second generation, we distinguish those with only one immigrant parent (father or mother) from those with two immigrant parents. Based on tabulations of average age differences between immigrant parents and their resident children in the 1970 Census, we assume that second-generation individuals were 27 years younger than their immigrant mothers and 31 years younger than their immigrant fathers.[2] We then use the information on the respondent's current age, the year of the CPS in which they are observed (i.e., between 1995 and 2006), and these assumptions about the parent-child age gap to locate the Censuses between 1970 and 2000 that were conducted closest to the time their immigrant parents would have been 40 years old, linearly interpolating across adjacent Censuses if needed.

[2]Tabulations of average age differences were for (single and married) immigrant mothers and (married) immigrant fathers and their resident children.

Suppose, for example, that an immigrant parent would have been 40 years old in 1984; then we give the CPS respondent the weighted average of the Census-based outcomes (i.e., schooling, labor supply, and fertility) of immigrants from the parent's country of origin for 1980 and 1990, with a 0.6 weight for 1980 and a 0.4 weight for 1990. These Census-based outcomes are themselves age-adjusted (in a procedure described in the Appendix) in order to take into account compositional effects among immigrants. For example, immigrants from a particular country in, say, 1980 may be especially young; their current labor supply may thus not be representative of their lifetime behavior. Age-adjusting the immigrant outcomes makes our measures more representative.[3] We restrict our CPS sample to ages 25–49. The lower age limit of 25 was selected to focus on individuals who have generally completed their education; the upper age limit of 49 was selected because the 1960 Census data are relatively poor for matching source countries compared to later Censuses, and thus we go back only to the 1970 Census in collecting immigrant characteristics. We are able to construct 69 country groups: far larger than Card, DiNardo and Estes' (2000) sample of 33 countries.[4]

Table 1 provides some motivation for the study by comparing the outcomes of interest—children, schooling and annual work hours—for immigrant and native women in 1980 and 2000, using the 1980 Census (a Census year in which many of the immigrant parents would have been surveyed) and our CPS data. The outcomes are adjusted for age and evaluated at age 40.[5] In 1980, immigrants had a substantial education deficit of 1.4 years (11%); they also worked 78 (7.6%) fewer hours and had .14 (8.3%) more children. Across the two years, while immigrants' educational deficit remained roughly constant in percentage terms, immigrant-native fertility and

[3]Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000) also age-adjusted immigrant and second generation outcomes for similar reasons.
[4]In addition to having fewer years of the CPS available, the number of countries distinguished by Card, DiNardo and Estes was also limited by the need to maintain comparability with the 1940 Census data they used for their analysis of second generation individuals observed in 1970. Note that, although Puerto Rico is a US territory, it is treated as a foreign birth place for the purposes of our analyses.
[5] In Table 1, in order to make the CPS and Census data comparable, natives are defined as all individuals born in the US regardless of their parents' birthplace. In the regression analyses presented below, which are based on the CPS, we define natives as individuals born in the US with both parents also born in the US.

labor supply differences increased both absolutely and relatively.[6] Immigrants now have .21 (15.3%) more children and work 193 (12.9%) fewer hours than natives. Thus, traditional patterns have become more pronounced among immigrants (relative to natives). This highlights the importance of learning the extent to which these patterns will be transmitted by immigrants to their children.

Table 2 provides mean values for selected demographic variables for native and second-generation women and men. The incidence of second-generation women and men with both parents foreign born is slightly under half of the second-generation sample; the remainder are divided between mother-only and father-only foreign-born, with a somewhat higher incidence of the former. Thus, previous work which focuses on individuals whose father was foreign born (e.g., Fernandez and Fogli 2009; Card, DiNardo and Estes 2000; Borjas 1993) misses over a quarter (28%) of the potential sample of second-generation individuals—i.e., those with immigrant mothers and native fathers. If gender role transmission from mother to daughter is especially strong, this omission could be particularly important for a study of the transmission of gender roles. Another distinction that is missed by focusing only on fathers is the possibility that two immigrant parents may come from different source countries, although, among second-generation women and men with both parents foreign-born, the parents come from the same source country in the vast majority (86–87%) of the cases.

Tabulations of the source countries of the immigrant parents of the second generation in our 1995–2006 CPS data (results not shown) highlight the shifting composition of the second generation over time. Compared to the 1970 Census data analyzed by Fernandez and Fogli, contemporary second-generation individuals were much less likely to have European parents. For example, in Fernandez and Fogli's 1970 sample of second-generation women, fully 71% had

[6]While Table 1 shows that fertility among the current stock of immigrants has risen relative to natives, as noted earlier, Blau, Kahn and Papps (forthcoming) found declining relative fertility among *recent* immigrants over the 1980–2000 period. Thus, fertility patterns are sensitive to whether one is measuring the stock or the flow. However, even among recent immigrants, Blau, Kahn and Papps found sharply falling relative labor supply; thus for both the stock and the flow of immigrants, the native-immigrant gap in women's labor supply is growing.

fathers born in Europe. Italy was by far the largest source country accounting for 28% of the sample or about 40% of those with European-born fathers, while Mexico accounted for only 12% of the sample. In contrast, our CPS data indicate that, among contemporary US-born women whose fathers were foreign born, only 34% of the fathers came from Europe, while 23% came from Mexico. Just 8% of all fathers (and 24% of the European-born fathers) came from Italy.[7] (We obtained similar percentages for second-generation women with foreign-born mothers.) Thus, over the 1970–2006 period, the origins of the second generation have changed in ways dictated by the changing source countries of immigrants. The continued shift of immigrant source countries towards Latin America and Asia means that the future second generation will reflect these further developments.

In terms of base line demographics, we first note that second-generation individuals are slightly younger than natives. Below, we present results in which we correct for these age differences. Second, reflecting immigrant-native differences and the shifting composition of immigrants over time, the share of Hispanics and Asians is higher and the share of blacks is lower among the second generation than among natives. This pattern likely reflects true differences across these groups, but, particularly for Hispanics, may also reflect tendencies in self-reporting which result in more assimilated individuals being less likely to report Hispanic heritage (Duncan and Trejo 2007).[8] Finally, in terms of the outcomes of interest in this study, we see that the second generation looks very similar to natives in their fertility, years of schooling and work hours. (Number of children present is not tabulated for men since the results would be misleading as an indicator of fertility.[9]) Indeed, if anything, they appear to be a slightly better educated group than their native counterparts.

[7]These percentages were obtained using the CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each CPS year received the same weight.
[8]As noted above, Duncan and Trejo (2007) focused on Mexican heritage.
[9] Women generally retain custody of children when a marriage breaks up or children are born out of wedlock.

Thus, the simple means suggest that, *on average*, the immigrant-native differences in education, fertility, and labor supply that existed among past immigrant women have disappeared in one generation, suggesting considerable assimilation of the second generation. These conclusions are broadly confirmed by the regression results presented in Table 3, which control for age and CPS year and also distinguish between second-generation family type (i.e., mother only, father only or both parents foreign born). Not controlling for race/ethnicity, second-generation individuals from families with one immigrant parent are significantly better educated than natives; this is the case for all second-generation family types when race/ethnicity is controlled for. For women, there are no significant effects for the second generation variables in number of children or annual work hours, except that, controlling for race/ethnicity, second-generation women with two immigrant parents have significantly fewer children. For men, labor supply of those with one immigrant parent is the same or higher than natives. The labor supply of second-generation men with both parents foreign-born is a bit lower than that of natives but this difference is small relative to the male means in Table 2 and significant only in the specification not controlling for race and ethnicity.

These findings of second-generation assimilation relative to natives would appear to be inconsistent with the expectations of scholars such as Perlmann and Waldinger (1997) and Portes and Zhou (1993), who predicted that the children of post-1965 immigrants might well have more trouble assimilating than previous generations. This expectation, formed before the availability of representative survey data on the second generation in the form of the CPS files we use here, was based on the relatively disadvantaged status of Latin American immigrants post-1965. In contrast to these predictions, Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000) found relatively high levels of second-generation assimilation in wages and education in the 1990s (as well as similar levels of assimilation to those of the children of immigrants from the 1940 Census). Our results reinforce the conclusions of Card, DiNardo and Estes, using updated and more comprehensive CPS data

for a larger number of source countries and explicitly examining variables associated with the gender roles of second-generation women.

However, while the second generation has roughly converged to native levels, this does not rule out the possibility that there is variation in the behavior of second-generation individuals, with some groups behaving considerably differently from natives. Moreover, the current population of immigrant women exhibits larger differences relative to natives than did the previous generation. Our empirical analysis seeks to determine whether the behavior of immigrant parents is transmitted to their US-born children. To the extent that it is, the growth in traditional behavior of immigrants relative to natives across immigrant generations will have implications for the second generation to come.

IV. Empirical Procedures and Regression Results

A. Empirical Procedures

We analyze intergenerational transmission of fertility, labor supply and education for second-generation women and men (US-born individuals with one or both parents born in another country) from the 1995–2006 March CPS files by estimating models of the following form:

(1) $$y_{it} = B'Z_{it} + \sum_c a_c X_{cit} + u_{it}$$

where for each individual i in year t with mother or father born in country c, y is an outcome variable including number of children present (women only), years of schooling, or annual work hours (including those with zero hours); Z is a vector of controls to be discussed shortly, X is a vector of immigrant parent characteristics, and u is a disturbance term.[10] Standard errors are clustered using the following procedure. We create clustering groups based on the parents'

[10] Beginning in 1994, the CPS coded education in categories, as did the 2000 Census. We mapped these into years of schooling attained by using Jaeger's (1997) suggested algorithm.

birthplace and the years of the Census used to match parents with second generation individuals. Suppose, for example that the mother was born in Mexico, and we determine that the appropriate Censuses for computing her characteristics are 1970 and 1980. Then this country-Census combination would form one cluster. If the mother was born in the US, we use the father's birth country and Census years.

The vector X includes age-adjusted characteristics of immigrants in the parents' generation. Variables associated with traditional gender roles, i.e., fertility and labor supply, are included to measure the effects both of the home environment and cultural attitudes. For this reason we include controls both for the characteristics of immigrant women from the source country of the respondent's mother *and* from the respondent's father. Labor supply of immigrant women is measured annual work hours. To control further for the home environment and for the socio-economic status of the respondent's family, we include controls for immigrant mother's and immigrant father's education levels. As described in the Appendix, these variables are simulated for age 40 for immigrants from each source country. As noted, we assume that mothers are 27 years older and fathers 31 years older than respondents and locate the Census (Censuses) nearest the parental age of 40, interpolating between Censuses where necessary. Thus, second-generation CPS respondents from the same origin country can have different values for these variables depending on their age: older respondents will be matched with immigrants from earlier Censuses.

In the results presented below, the vector X generally includes all three types of immigrant behavior for which we have measures: fertility, labor supply and schooling. An alternative is to include only the immigrant outcomes for the same behavior as the dependent variable (i.e., fertility in the second-generation fertility equation, etc.). The specification including measures of all three types of behavior simultaneously may be appropriate in that it reduces the likelihood of spurious correlation. So for example, a positive association between

first- and second-generation fertility might be due to lower education levels of women in both generations rather than to intergenerational transmission of fertility per se. On the other hand, immigrant fertility (or plans for family size) may be the fundamental cause of immigrant schooling and immigrant labor supply levels. If so, including immigrant labor supply and schooling in the fertility equation could lead us to underestimate the full impact of immigrant fertility on the second generation. Therefore, we also present some results for models with only the matching behavior on the right hand side.

The vector Z includes two dummy variables among the three possible parent combinations in our regression sample: (i) immigrant father and native mother and (ii) immigrant mother and native father (the omitted category is both parents immigrants); it also includes race and ethnicity dummies (black, non-Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic; and Hispanic (of any race); the omitted category is white non-Hispanic),[11] age, age squared, and year dummies. Note that we do not include in our main specification the respondent's marital status, education or location variables. Part of the assimilation process involves children's marriage, education and location decisions; therefore, by excluding these variables, we are allowing the full effects of parental behavior to be observed. For example, more assimilated second-generation individuals may be less likely to continue to live in ethnic enclaves. Nonetheless, since these channels are of interest, we also present some results with these controls for comparison purposes.

Note that we include in Z a vector of race and ethnicity indicators. We believe that this is an appropriate specification because minority individuals may face discrimination or other barriers in labor markets or in education that could affect decisions about fertility, schooling or labor supply. Since minority immigrants tend to come from particular source country areas such as Asia and Latin America, failure to control for race and ethnicity could induce a spurious

[11] A small number of non-Hispanic individuals of other races (mostly native Americans) were omitted from the sample.

correlation between parental and child behavior that could instead be due the common treatment in the United States of members of minority groups. On the other hand, race and ethnicity may be proxies for "regional" ethnic capital (for example the Latin American region) and thus one might also want to estimate the extent of intergenerational correlation not controlling for race and ethnicity. Therefore, in addition to our basic specification, we also discuss some results from models that exclude race and ethnicity.

We first consider results pooling all second-generation family types. These illustrate average effects of parental behavior. Later, we probe these results further by stratifying the samples by second-generation family type to see whether the impact of parent behavior differs according to whether mother only, father only, or both parents were foreign-born. This disaggregation of the impact of family type represents a departure from earlier work on second-generation outcomes, which, as we have seen, defined the second generation only in terms of father's place of birth or generalized ancestry.

B. Basic Regression Results

Our basic results are shown in Tables 4a (women) and 4b (men). The tables present regression coefficients and hypothesis tests for the impact of parental generation behavior for two specifications. The first specification examines the impact of only the matching parental characteristics on the dependent variable (e.g., fertility of immigrants from the mother's and father's source country on the respondent's fertility). The second specification includes measures of all three types of parental characteristics. As noted in the tables, we control for race and ethnicity, year, age, age squared, and second-generation family type. We also briefly compare our results to those from regressions not controlling for race and ethnicity (see Tables A-1a and A-1b).

We first consider the results for parental education in columns (1) and (2). The results indicate positive intergenerational transmission of education, with a strikingly similar level and

pattern of transmission for women and men. This is consistent with a pattern of intergenerational transmission that is not related to gender roles. The effects are found to be stronger through immigrant fathers than immigrant mothers. In the matching models, both parental effects are significantly positive, but the coefficient on father's schooling (.20 to .23) is two to four times larger than the coefficient on mother's schooling (.06 to .10). When additional parental variables are added, the coefficient on mother's schooling becomes insignificant for both men and women, whereas the coefficient on father's schooling is not appreciably changed. In both specifications, the difference between the coefficients on father's and mother's education is highly significant. The larger effect of father's education may be because it better captures the socio-economic status of the family than mother's education and it is the family's socio-economic status that is the source of the intergenerational effect.

The sum of the education effects for fathers and mothers is an estimate of the impact of one additional year of education for each parent in the first generation on the educational attainment of second-generation individuals with both parents foreign born; this sum is highly significant in both specifications. The largest estimated transmission rate, roughly .3 (.305 for women and .296 for men), is obtained for this sum in the specification including only the matching variables (column 1). This effect implies that a four year difference in parental education between immigrants and natives (over twice the immigrant-native difference in Table 1) results in a second-generation difference of 1.2 years. By the next generation, at the same rate of transmission, the effect is nearly gone (i.e., it is reduced to .36 years). When we exclude the race and ethnicity variables, the effect of parents' education becomes stronger, as shown in Tables A-1a and A-1b. The comparable sums of the parental effects in column (1) are .452 (men) and .476 (women), and are highly significant. From our earlier discussion on the advisability of controlling for race and ethnicity, as well as the other parental characteristics (i.e.,

fertility and labor supply), these estimates are likely to be an upper bound for the true assimilation effect.

It is interesting to compare our findings to earlier work by Card, DiNardo and Estes (2000). They found intergenerational transmission coefficients for schooling between 1970 immigrant parents and second-generation men or women in the CPS to be on the order of .4. As we have seen, our study differs from theirs in that we have available more years of CPS data and identify a larger number of source countries. Nonetheless, when we exclude race and ethnicity variables, as they did, our highest estimates, .45 to .48 (for the matching specification and summing mother's and father's coefficients in Tables A-1a and A-1b), are fairly close to their estimate. Moreover, when we define second generation in the same way they did, i.e., solely based on having a foreign-born father,[12] our results for the matching specification excluding race and ethnicity are virtually identical to theirs: 0.390 for men and 0.387 for women. The difference between these estimates highlights that there are alternative ways of defining the transmission rate when data are available on place of birth of mothers as well as fathers.

When additional parental characteristics are controlled for (Table 4a, column 2), an interesting finding that emerges is that higher levels of fertility of immigrant mothers lead to lower levels of second-generation education. Effects for the fertility of immigrant women from the father's country are smaller in magnitude and insignificant, although the difference in coefficients for mothers and fathers is not significant for women. The negative impact of immigrant family size on second-generation education is consistent with a quality-quantity tradeoff in fertility (Becker 1991) and a comparison of the results for columns (1) and (2) suggests that a mechanism for intergenerational transmission of immigrant mother's education is through family size.

[12] This includes individuals with mother only immigrant as "natives."

The magnitude of the effect of parental generation family size on second generation education is large. To illustrate its magnitude, we computed the mean and standard deviation of the number of children of immigrant mothers aged 35–45 in the 1980 Census (an age group centered around the 40 year figure used to construct the parental generation explanatory variables and a Census year in which many of the immigrant parents would have been surveyed). We found that among this group, fertility averaged 2.32 children with a standard deviation of 1.26. When we add the mother's fertility effect to that for immigrant women from the father's country, a one standard deviation increase in immigrant women's fertility lowers second-generation women and men's education by about 1.33 years. This is an economically important effect that is highly statistically significant. Similar and somewhat larger negative effects are obtained when we do not control for race/ethnicity (see, Tables A-1a and A-1b). Previous research (Blau, Kahn and Papps forthcoming) has found falling immigrant fertility levels for recent cohorts, as fertility has been declining sharply around the world. If this lower level continues or further decreases occur, our results predict important increases in the education levels of second-generation immigrants.

Finally, there is some suggestive evidence of a positive effect of mother's working on education for women; however the effect of hours worked of women from the father's source country is negative, though not significant. Adding the employment effects for both parents leads to an insignificantly positive impact on schooling.

Turning now to the results for fertility, which are only available for women, we again find considerable evidence of intergenerational transmission (see Table 4a). The fertility of female immigrants from both the mother's and father's source countries positively affects second-generation fertility. These effects are both significant in the specification in which only these matching variables are included. When we control for other parental characteristics, the effect of mother's fertility remains significant but of decreased magnitude, while the effect of the

fertility of women from the father's source country remains of comparable magnitude, but loses statistical significance. In both specifications, however, the sum of the effects of fertility from the mother's and father's source countries is highly significant. In addition, particularly in the matching specification, it appears that mother's fertility has a stronger effect than the fertility of immigrant women from the father's home country, although the difference in these effects is not statistically significant.

The sum of the two fertility effects is of comparable magnitude in both specifications—about .5 (.488 to .540). As we have seen, the standard deviation of number of children in the immigrant mothers' generation was 1.26 in 1980. Thus, our regression estimates imply that a one standard deviation increase in immigrant fertility leads to roughly a 0.6 child increase in second-generation women's fertility. However, if the intergenerational transmission effect stays at .5 from the second to the third generation, then the effect of the initial one standard deviation increase in immigrant fertility (1.26 children) falls to about 0.3 children for the grandchildren's generation. This implies that even high fertility immigrants will have grandchildren that have assimilated most of the way to the native fertility level, since only about 25% of any excess immigrant fertility remains two generations later (i.e., .5*.5=.25). We may also consider the estimated intergenerational transmission effects when we omit controls for race/ethnicity (Table A-1a). Excluding these controls, as well as controls for the first generation's schooling and labor supply, the average transmission effect of fertility (summing the coefficients for women from the mothers' and fathers' source countries) is a highly significant .74, implying that after two generations, 55% (.74*.74=.5520) of excess immigrant fertility would remain, instead of about 25%. However, when we control for immigrant schooling and labor supply, we obtain slightly

smaller transmission results not controlling for race and ethnicity, i.e. .43 compared to roughly .5 controlling for race and ethnicity.[13]

Other fertility results in the specifications controlling for other parental characteristics (column 4 in Tables 4a and A-1a) include significantly negative effects of immigrant mothers' labor supply on fertility, with opposing positive and insignificant effects for the labor supply of immigrant women from the father's source country. The sum of the two labor supply effects on fertility is negative for both specifications but insignificant. In addition, in the specification that does not control for race and ethnicity, father's education is also significantly negatively related to second generation fertility. The sum of this effect and a very small positive effect of mother's education is negative and close to statistical significance.

Finally, we consider the results for annual work hours. Looking first at the results for women in Table 4a, we again see considerable evidence of intergenerational transmission in both specifications (columns 5 and 6), with statistically significant positive effects for the sum of the coefficients on work hours of mothers and women from the father's source country that are somewhat larger in the matching model (0.47) than in the model controlling for other parental characteristics (.44). In addition, the impact of mother's labor supply behavior is larger than the effect of women from the father's source country, significantly so in the specification controlling for other factors. The results are quite similar when we do not control for race and ethnicity (Table A-1a).

These findings for the impact of immigrant women's labor supply on second-generation women's annual hours may be due to the impact of culture, specifically the intergenerational transmission of women's roles, but they may alternatively be due to other unobservables that could potentially affect men and women similarly. The results for men in Table 4b should help us shed light on this. The results are somewhat ambiguous in this respect in that we also find a

[13] These comparisons across specifications suggest that, to some degree, immigrant generation schooling and labor supply contain similar information to race and ethnicity.

positive effect of the labor supply of women in the mother's generation on second-generation men. There are however three differences in the results for women and men that suggest at least part of the impact for women does reflect gender-specific cultural factors. One is that the transmission rate for men, on the order of 0.3, is smaller than the transmission rates for women of 0.4 to 0.5, although the gender difference in these transmission rates does not achieve statistical significance. The second is that, for men, the impact of mother's labor supply is roughly the same as the effect of women from the father's source country, whereas for women the effect of mother's labor supply is larger, though the difference is not always statistically significant—this gender difference is suggestive of a "role model" effect for women. Finally, in the specification that does not include controls for race and ethnicity (Table A-1b), for men the female labor supply variable coefficients become very small in magnitude and are no longer statistically significant when additional parental characteristics are included, whereas they remain statistically significant and retain their magnitude for women. Nonetheless, the findings for men do suggest some caution in interpreting the results for women as entirely due to cultural factors specifically related to gender roles.

The magnitude of the labor supply transmission rates for women is a bit lower than that for fertility, roughly 0.45 compared to 0.5. In the 1980 Census, the mean annual work hours of immigrant mothers 35–45 years old was 867 (with a standard deviation of 943). For the sample with both parents immigrants, then, a one standard deviation decrease in immigrant labor supply (i.e., a very large decrease of 943 hours) leads to roughly a 424 hour decrease in second-generation women's annual hours relative to natives (29% compared to the 1464 hour mean for native women in the CPS data); this is reduced to 191 hours (13%) in the subsequent generation.

Previous research has found that between 1980 and 2000, immigrant women's labor supply fell relative to natives (Blau, Kahn and Papps forthcoming). Our estimates can be used to forecast the impact of this decrease on the labor supply of future second-generation women.

Specifically, in 1980, married immigrant women worked on average 823 hours (including those with 0 hours), while married native women worked 887 hours, or 8% above the immigrant level; by 2000, these figures had risen to 983 for immigrants and 1302 for natives, or 32% higher work hours for natives. Suppose instead that immigrant women's work hours had risen by the same percentage as those of natives during this period. Then immigrant work hours in 2000 would have averaged 1208 instead of only 983. We would predict that this additional 225 hours of immigrant labor supply would raise second-generation women's labor supply by 101 hours (using our transmission rate of 0.45), or by about 7% of the 1464 hour mean for native women in the CPS data. Put differently, we expect the fall in immigrants' relative labor supply between 1980 and 2000, which was indeed substantial, to have only minor consequences for second-generation women's relative labor supply.

C. Alternative Specifications

While our basic results are estimated for the full sample of second-generation individuals, married and unmarried, it is also of interest to examine the effects for the subsample of married individuals, especially since we are examining outcomes that may be related to adherence to traditional gender roles. Results from estimating the model on married women and men are shown in Tables 5a and 5b. Our findings for the transmission of education are quite similar to those presented earlier, showing statistically significant, positive intergenerational transmission rates for education that are similar for men and women and similar to those obtained for the full sample. And, as in the full sample, significantly larger effects are obtained for fathers' than for mothers' education, and statistically significant negative effects are obtained for immigrant mothers' fertility on second-generation women's and men's educational attainment.

For married women, the results for fertility and labor supply are quite similar to those for the full sample. Positive transmission rates are obtained for both fertility and labor supply that are about the same as those obtained for the full sample for labor supply and a bit larger than

those obtained for the full sample for fertility. Effects for mother's fertility and labor supply on the matching outcome are always significant and larger than the corresponding effects for women from the father's source country (although the difference is significant only for annual hours in the specification that includes controls for all immigrant parents' characteristics). The sums of the effects for mothers and women from the fathers' source country are always significant. In contrast, we find no statistically significant effects of parental labor supply for married men, and these effects are also small in magnitude. This difference in the labor supply results for married men and women further suggests that at least a component of the results for women does indeed reflect gender-specific factors or gender roles.

As discussed earlier, we have excluded controls for region and for the respondent's own educational attainment because they are likely to be endogenous. However, in fact our results are robust to the inclusion of these variables—see Tables A-2a and A-2b.[14] Although, as may be seen in the tables, the respondent's own education is significantly negatively related to number of children for women and significantly positively related to labor supply for men and women, the magnitude of the effects of immigrant parents' characteristics on second generation outcomes is only slightly reduced.[15] This suggests that the fertility and labor supply results reported earlier reflect the impact of culture rather than a simple transmission of human capital, or at least measurable human capital, across generations.

Finally, the regression results presented above pool all family types. This is valid in that these results represent the overall average effects of the parental variables, however the aggregate results may not accurately reflect the relationships within each family type. Thus, in Tables 6a and b, we present results for the specification including controls for all parental

[14] The regional controls were dummies for 8 of the 9 Census divisions (with New England the omitted category), and for the states of California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York and Texas. Controls for the indicated states were included because of the relatively high representation of immigrants in these states.

[15] In the fertility regression for all women, the coefficient on immigrant mother's fertility, while larger than its standard error, is no longer significant. However, the sum of mother's fertility and the fertility of women from the father's source country is highly significant.

characteristics separately by family type: both parents immigrants (both parents); mother only immigrant (mother only); and father only immigrant (father only). Before discussing the results we note that, in the specification that is limited to both parents foreign born, there is a very high correlation between the mother and father variables that measure the same characteristic (i.e., education, fertility, and labor supply) due to the very high proportion of such families (86–87 percent) in which both mother and father come from the same source country (see, Table 2).[16] Thus, for this sample we focus our discussion the sum of the mother's and father's coefficients—all statements below refer to this sum.

Overall, the results in Tables 6a and b for education are quite consistent with those we presented earlier. For both men and women, we see strong evidence of a significant positive effect of parental education for the both-parent (again, the sum of the mother's and father's coefficients) and the father-only samples; in the mother-only sample, while the coefficients on mother's education are positive, they are small and insignificant. This supports our earlier finding of positive intergenerational transmission of education primarily through father's education. For the both-parent and mother-only samples, we continue to find statistically significant negative effects of family size on the subsequent education of the children. And, for women, the coefficient on number of children of women from the father's source country in the father-only sample (which may be a proxy for family size for this group), although not significant, is negative and larger than its standard error in absolute value.

Moving on to fertility, the results (available only for women) again match up well. For all three family types we find statistically significant evidence of positive transmission of number of children in the immigrant generation to the second generation. The transmission rate is somewhat larger in mother-only than in father-only families, but the difference is not large.

[16] Specifically, for second generation women (men) with both parents foreign born, the correlation between mom_f_edn and dad_m_edn is .916 (.910); between mom_f_nchild and dad_f_nchild .924 (.928); and between mom_f_hours and dad_f_hours .935 (.938).

Finally, for both men and women we find, for the both-parent sample, statistically significant evidence of positive transmission of labor supply from immigrant mothers and from immigrant women from the father's source country (the sum) on second generation labor supply, with a transmission rate that is larger for women than for men. However, in the mother-only or father-only foreign born samples, we find no evidence of an effect of the labor supply of mothers or of women from the fathers' source country on the labor supply of second-generation women or men. This suggests that our earlier findings on the intergenerational transmission of labor supply from the specification pooling all family types may be limited to individuals with both parents foreign born.

V. Conclusions

In this paper, we have studied the transmission of first generation immigrant women's education, labor supply and fertility behavior to the second generation. Our research design used the March Current Population Surveys (CPS) from 1995 to 2006, which contain information on each woman's country of birth and the country of birth of each of her parents. We then used Census data from 1970, 1980, 1990 or 2000, depending on the age of the second-generation woman, to attach information on labor supply, fertility and schooling of immigrants from the relevant source country(ies) who were likely to be her parents' ages. Using this information on immigrants as explanatory variables, we estimated regression models of the fertility, schooling and labor supply of second-generation women. For education and labor supply, to seek evidence on the extent to which the findings reflected transmission of gender roles, these results were compared to analogous results for men. (Since fertility is measured by number of children present, it would be a misleading indicator for men.)

Overall, we found that second-generation women's fertility and labor supply are significantly positively affected by the immigrant generation's fertility and labor supply respectively, with the effect of mother's fertility and labor supply generally larger than that of women from the father's source country. The latter finding is suggestive of an effect due to the intergenerational transmission of gender roles. However, we also find statistically significant evidence of positive transmission of first generation female labor supply for second-generation men's labor supply, suggesting some caution in interpreting the female findings as entirely due to intergenerational transmission of gender roles, rather than other unobservables that would be expected to affect men and women similarly. Nonetheless, a number of differences in the findings for men and women do suggest at least some gender-specific cultural factors. In particular, transmission rates are lower for men than women and, for men, the effect of mother's labor supply is roughly comparable in size to the effect of women from the father's source country. In addition, the labor supply results for women in the subsample of married women are quite similar to the results for all women, whereas there is no evidence of a transmission effect of labor supply for the subsample of married men.

Although results for education are also strongly indicative of intergeneration transmission, this transmission does not appear to be related to gender roles, in contrast to the findings for fertility and labor supply. Specifically, both the magnitude and the pattern of transmission are strikingly similar for women and men. For both women and men, second-generation educational attainment is significantly positively affected by that of their parents, with a stronger effect of father's than mother's education. Moreover, second-generation women's and men's schooling levels are negatively affected by immigrant mother's fertility, suggesting a quality-quantity tradeoff for immigrant families.

We find roughly comparable transmission rates for immigrant fertility and labor supply to the second generation in results controlling for race and ethnicity, and stronger intergenerational

transmission rates for fertility than labor supply when such controls are excluded. In particular, taking our maximum estimates, an increase in immigrant fertility by one child per woman raises the second generation's fertility level by about .5 children relative to natives, controlling for race and ethnicity, and by .74 when we do not control for these factors. At these rates of transmission, after two generations 25%–55% of any immigrant excess fertility will be left. The transmission rate for labor supply for women is a bit smaller—a maximum estimate of about .47 with or without controls for race and ethnicity. This means after two generations, 22% of any immigrant shortfall in labor supply is left. The transmission rate for schooling is similar to that for labor supply. Transmission rates for men and women are about .3 when race and ethnicity is controlled for and .47 when these variables are omitted, implying that 9-22% of any immigrant generation educational disparity will be left after two generations. Overall, these results suggest a considerable amount of assimilation across generations toward native levels of schooling and labor supply, although fertility effects show more persistence. However, since the fertility of immigrant women is rapidly falling relative to natives in the most recent immigrant cohorts (Blau, Kahn and Papps forthcoming), little future excess fertility in the second generation is anticipated. And even though immigrant women's labor supply has decreased relative to natives, our relatively low estimates of intergenerational transmission suggest that this reduction will not have major consequences for the second generation of the future.

Data Appendix

The data on second-generation immigrants (individuals with at least one parent born in the United States) and natives (individuals with both parents born in the United States) come from the 1995–2006 March Supplements of the Current Population Survey (CPS) obtained from the National Bureau of Economic Research, which contains information on the place of birth of respondents and their parents. Although data on birth place were also available for 1994, we did not include 1994 in our analysis because this information was available only for a condensed set of source countries. The regression sample consists of native-born individuals between ages 25 and 49 with at least one foreign born parent, excluding people reporting other race (i.e. other than the categories of white, black, or Asian/Pacific Islander) or people with an allocated source country, mother's source country, or father's source country. We also exclude individuals with regional residual categories for countries of birth in the Census and the CPS. We combine countries in the CPS and the Census when necessary to align the set of countries available as places of birth. For example, we combine "England," "Scotland," "Wales," "United Kingdom, ns," and "Northern Ireland" in the Census and match it to "Great Britain," "England," "Scotland," and "Northern Ireland" in the CPS. A total of 69 countries of origin are represented in our CPS data set. Although Puerto Rico is a US territory, it is treated as a foreign birth place for the purposes of these analyses. In all analyses, CPS sampling weights are taken into account, and the CPS data are re-weighted so that each year receives equal weight.

We estimate immigrant parent characteristics by source country using the 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Census public use microdata samples obtained from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. The 1970 data is a combination of the 1 percent Form 1 state sample, the 1 percent Form 1 metropolitan area sample, the Form 2 state sample, and the Form 2 metropolitan

area sample. The 1980, 1990, and 2000 data are the 5 percent state samples. We take a 1 percent random sample of households where all members are white and native-born and retain the full sample of all other respondents. Regression-adjusted means of parent characteristics for each Census year are based on a model including source country fixed effects, age, age squared, the interaction of immigrant and age, and the interaction of immigrant and age squared. The regression sample for mothers (fathers) consists of women (men) between ages 18 and 64, excluding people of other race, with an allocated source country, or from a country that does not correspond to the set of countries available in the CPS.

We match second-generation immigrants in the CPS to their immigrant "parents" in the Census by source country. We assume that mothers are 27 years older than their children based on estimates from the single and married immigrant women in the 1970 Census regression sample with at least one child. Similar calculations for married men underlie our assumption that fathers are 31 years older than their children. We assign parent characteristics based on the year when the immigrant parent is 40 years old. If this year is exactly a Census year (1970, 1980, 1990, or 2000), we use data from that particular Census. If it is an interior year, we use linear interpolation to compute a weighted average between the two nearest Censuses. For example, if the immigrant parent is 40 years old in 1984, then the parent characteristics would be a weighted average of the estimates from 1980 (.6 weight) and 1990 (.4 weight). If immigrant parents are 40 years old before 1970 (after 2000), we use immigrant parent characteristics from 1970 (2000).

Starting with the 2003 CPS, respondents can report multiple races, whereas in earlier years respondents were able to select only one race. Over the 2003–2006 period, 1.3 percent of the sample selected two named races. In coding race for these years, we defined (i) whites as those who listed their race as white alone, (ii) blacks as those who listed their race as black alone

or in combination with another race, (iii) Asians or Pacific Islanders as those who listed their race as Asian or Pacific Islander alone or in combination with another race (except black), (iv) Others as all others, including American Indian or Alaskan Native alone or in combination with white, as well as those who designated multiple races without specifying them, or more than two named races. Non-Hispanics of "other" race were dropped from the sample due to their low representation (0.9 percent of the sample).

References

Antecol, Heather, "An Examination of Cross-Country Differences in the Gender Gap in Labor Force Participation Rates," *Labour Economics* 7, no. 4 (July 2000): 409-426.

Becker, Gary S., *A Treatise on the Family* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).

Blau, Francine D. and Lawrence M. Kahn, "Gender and Assimilation among Mexican Americans," in George J. Borjas, ed., *Mexican Immigration to the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp.57-106.

Blau, Francine D., Lawrence M. Kahn and Kerry L. Papps, "Gender, Source Country Characteristics and Labor Market Assimilation Among Immigrants: 1980-2000," *Review of Economics and Statistics* (forthcoming).

Borjas, George J., "The Intergenerational Mobility of Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics* 11, No. 1 (January 1993): 113-135.

Card, David, John DiNardo and Eugena Estes, "The More Things Change: Immigrants and the Children of Immigrants in the 1940s, the 1970s, and the 1990s," in George J. Borjas, ed., *Issues in the Economics of Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 227-269.

Duncan, Brian and Stephen J. Trejo, "Ethnic Identification, Intermarriage, and Unmeasured Progress by Mexican Americans," in George J. Borjas, ed., *Mexican Immigration to the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 229-267.

Fernández, Raquel , "Culture and Economics," in the New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, 2nd edition, edited by Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence E. Blume (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 333-340.

Fernández, Racquel and Alessandra Fogli, "Culture: An Empirical Investigation of Beliefs, Work, and Fertility,"*American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 1 (January 2009): 146-177.

Jaeger, David A., "Reconciling the Old and New Census Bureau Education Questions: Recommendations for Researchers," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 15, issue 3 (July 1997): 300-309.

Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger, "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present-A Reconsideration," *International Migration Review* 31, no. 4, Special Issue: Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans (Winter 1997): 893-922.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou, "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 November 1993): 74-96.

Table 1: Age Adjusted Means for Immigrant and Native Women (Evaluated at Age 40)

Variable	Natives (1)	Immigrants (2)	Difference (2) - (1)
1980[a]			
Years of Schooling	12.4	11.1	-1.4
Number of Children	1.69	1.83	0.14
Annual Work Hours (including 0's)	1025.0	947.1	-77.8
2000[b]			
Years of Schooling	13.6	12.0	-1.6
Number of Children	1.35	1.56	0.21
Annual Work Hours (including 0's)	1493.5	1300.6	-192.9

[a]Based on 1980 Census data. Age adjusted based on separate native and immigrant regressions that include age, and age squared, evaluated for 40 year olds.

[b]Based on 1995-2006 CPS data. Age adjusted based on separate native and immigrant regressions that include age, age squared, and year fixed effects, evaluated for 40 year olds in 2000. CPS sampling weights are employed in the regressions, adjusted so that each year receives equal weight.

Note: Census and CPS samples consist of women age 25 to 49, excluding those with allocated or unmatched birthplace; natives are US-born; immigrant are foreign-born. See the text and other table notes for additional information on the CSP sample.

Table 2: Selected Means for Women and Men: Natives and Second-Generation Immigrants, 1995–2006

	Women		Men	
Variable	Natives	Second Generation Immigrants	Natives	Second Generation Immigrants
Age	37.46	36.07	37.45	35.97
Asian, non-Hispanic	0.005	0.063	0.005	0.074
Black, non-Hispanic	0.153	0.036	0.130	0.031
White, non-Hispanic	0.806	0.548	0.830	0.554
Hispanic	0.036	0.354	0.035	0.34
Married	0.623	0.587	0.602	0.535
Years of Schooling	13.57	13.82	13.47	13.77
Number of Children	1.12	1.13	-	-
Annual Work Hours (including 0s)	1,464.3	1,452.9	2,021.6	1,985.9
Imm Mother/Native Father	-	0.281	-	0.283
Imm Father/Native Mother	-	0.265	-	0.251
Both Parents Immigrants	-	0.454	-	0.466
- from Different Source Countries	-	0.137	-	0.134
- from Same Source Country	-	0.863	-	0.866
Sample Size	286,870	21,919	260,432	20,118

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS.

Notes: The sample consists of individuals age 25–49 excluding those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Natives are US-born with both parents also US-born. Second Generation Immigrants are US-born with at least one parent foreign-born. Means are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight.

Table 3: Regression Results for Models Including Only Family Type and Basic Controls

	(1) Years of Schooling	(2) Years of Schooling	(3) Number of Children	(4) Number of Children	(5) Annual Work Hours	(6) Annual Work Hours
Women: Second-Generation Type:						
Foreign-Born Mother, US-Born Father (sgi_momonly)	0.404***	0.488***	-0.002	-0.023	1.957	9.505
	(0.103)	(0.054)	(0.036)	(0.029)	(18.563)	(18.430)
Foreign-Born Father, US-Born Mother (sgi_dadonly)	0.310**	0.496***	-0.010	-0.048	8.084	20.906
	(0.156)	(0.070)	(0.038)	(0.030)	(19.484)	(17.734)
Both Parents Foreign Born (sgi_both)	0.082	0.567***	0.006	-0.079**	-24.928	0.021
	(0.210)	(0.100)	(0.052)	(0.035)	(20.635)	(18.115)
Includes Controls for Race/Ethnicity	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
r squared	0.005	0.033	0.090	0.092	0.002	0.003
p(sgi_momonly=sgi_dadonly)	0.380	0.917	0.836	0.514	0.795	0.624
p(sgi_momonly=sgi_both)	0.026	0.427	0.853	0.124	0.308	0.696
p(sgi_dadonly=sgi_both)	0.084	0.397	0.688	0.408	0.216	0.400
Men: Second-Generation Type:						
Foreign-Born Mother, US-Born Father (sgi_momonly)	0.471***	0.526***			51.726**	43.954***
	(0.104)	(0.056)			(22.541)	(15.748)
Foreign-Born Father, US-Born Mother (sgi_dadonly)	0.401**	0.560***			17.910	26.142
	(0.173)	(0.087)			(24.674)	(16.813)
Both Parents Foreign Born (sgi_both)	0.182	0.549***			-90.711***	-30.176
	(0.197)	(0.101)			(27.019)	(20.469)
Includes Controls for Race/Ethnicity	No	Yes			No	Yes
r squared	0.003	0.031			0.007	0.034
p(sgi_momonly=sgi_dadonly)	0.545	0.695			0.139	0.387
p(sgi_momonly=sgi_both)	0.039	0.825			< 0.001	0.002
p(sgi_dadonly=sgi_both)	0.132	0.893			0.001	0.030

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of native and second-generation women and men age 25-49 excluding those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. There are 308,789 women in the sample and 280,550 men. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and year fixed effects.

Table 4a: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Fertility, Education, and Annual Hours
(All Second-Generation Women)

	Years of Schooling		Number of Children		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-0.718**	0.348***	0.271*		14.333
		(0.297)	(0.083)	(0.157)		(90.719)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.101***	-0.010		0.017		-6.730
	(0.021)	(0.040)		(0.019)		(11.074)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		0.066**		-0.037**	0.294***	0.351***
		(0.032)		(0.018)	(0.071)	(0.085)
Father's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.336	0.192**	0.217		5.045
		(0.282)	(0.096)	(0.147)		(80.761)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.204***	0.193***		-0.012		20.642**
	(0.019)	(0.029)		(0.014)		(9.508)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		-0.053		0.021	0.180***	0.087
		(0.035)		(0.018)	(0.069)	(0.093)
r squared	0.134	0.139	0.101	0.102	0.008	0.008
N	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919
Significance tests						
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.369	0.302	0.821		0.945
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.008	< 0.001	0.010		0.855
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	0.001		0.285		0.085
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.803		0.293
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.006		0.007	0.245	0.049
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.795		0.595	< 0.001	< 0.001

[a] In the years of schooling and number of children regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation women age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table 4b: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education and Annual Hours (All Second-Generation Men)

	Years of Schooling		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mother's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-1.004***		-58.617
		(0.265)		(86.435)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.062***	-0.040		-2.971
	(0.023)	(0.033)		(11.208)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		-0.008	0.147*	0.113
		(0.031)	(0.089)	(0.101)
Father's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.008		98.231
		(0.332)		(92.354)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.234***	0.230***		13.516
	(0.023)	(0.033)		(8.775)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		0.013	0.150*	0.189
		(0.038)	(0.085)	(0.119)
r squared	0.128	0.131	0.040	0.041
N	20,118	20,118	20,118	20,118
Significance tests				
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.027		0.289
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.012		0.695
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.323
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.352
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.653	0.984	0.643
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.932	0.015	0.040

[a] In the years of schooling regression, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of all second-generation men; is restricted to those age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table 5a: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education, Fertility, and Annual Hours (Married Women)

	Years of Schooling		Number of Children		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-1.046***	0.409***	0.460***		-36.243
		(0.329)	(0.088)	(0.176)		(116.470)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.115***	-0.021		0.034		-17.810
	(0.025)	(0.044)		(0.024)		(15.240)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		0.051		-0.029*	0.275***	0.341***
		(0.032)		(0.017)	(0.096)	(0.120)
Father's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.269	0.163	0.205		5.587
		(0.332)	(0.104)	(0.170)		(104.081)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.228***	0.230***		-0.008		25.225**
	(0.024)	(0.036)		(0.019)		(12.554)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		-0.074**		0.025	0.145	0.016
		(0.035)		(0.019)	(0.095)	(0.127)
r squared	0.138	0.144	0.116	0.117	0.007	0.008
N	13,081	13,081	13,081	13,081	13,081	13,081
Significance tests						
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.107	0.116	0.343		0.816
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.004	< 0.001	0.003		0.811
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	0.002	< 0.001		0.210		0.049
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.355		0.671
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.010		0.034	0.346	0.091
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.614		0.870	0.001	0.023

[a] In the years of schooling and number of children regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation married women age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table 5b: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education and Annual Hours (Married Men)

	Years of Schooling		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mother's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-0.893***		-30.624
		(0.310)		(75.791)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.109***	0.017		7.761
	(0.029)	(0.041)		(9.543)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		0.004	0.115	0.041
		(0.034)	(0.072)	(0.090)
Father's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.292		-39.480
		(0.365)		(90.679)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.221***	0.202***		-7.974
	(0.022)	(0.040)		(9.437)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		-0.023	0.024	0.027
		(0.040)	(0.081)	(0.123)
r squared	0.146	0.149	0.021	0.022
N	11,949	11,949	11,949	11,949
Significance tests				
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.267		0.951
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.004		0.409
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	0.002	0.008		0.337
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.982
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.599	0.446	0.940
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.729	0.142	0.564

[a] In the years of schooling regression, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation married men age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table 6a: Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education, Fertility, and Annual Hours by Family Type (All Second-Generation Women)

	Years of Schooling			Number of Children			Annual Hours		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Mother's Source Country:									
Female Number of Children	-0.798	-0.635*		-0.018	0.594***		188.965	-122.035	
(mom_f_nchild)	(0.532)	(0.371)		(0.285)	(0.177)		(159.400)	(136.765)	
Female Years of Schooling	-0.170***	0.055		0.034	0.029		-17.277	7.029	
(mom_f_edn)	(0.065)	(0.047)		(0.033)	(0.023)		(17.917)	(17.845)	
Female Annual Work Hours	0.216***	0.013		-0.057	-0.012		0.390	-0.046	
(mom_f_hours)[a]	(0.054)	(0.046)		(0.036)	(0.023)		(0.243)	(0.173)	
Father's Source Country:									
Female Number of Children	-0.332		-0.522	0.365		0.463**	-147.602		19.631
(dad_f_nchild)	(0.508)		(0.391)	(0.253)		(0.217)	(177.168)		(122.120)
Male Years of Schooling	0.312***		0.175***	-0.038		0.009	24.272		33.373***
(dad_m_edn)	(0.054)		(0.043)	(0.025)		(0.020)	(19.328)		(11.399)
Female Annual Work Hours	-0.158**		-0.124**	0.032		0.026	0.198		-0.054
(dad_f_hours)[a]	(0.072)		(0.048)	(0.032)		(0.023)	(0.264)		(0.147)
r squared	0.192	0.066	0.111	0.108	0.109	0.093	0.014	0.009	0.011
N	10,171	5,998	5,750	10,171	5,998	5,750	10,171	5,998	5,750
Sample--Second-Generation Type:	Both Parents	Mother Only	Father Only	Both Parents	Mother Only	Father Only	Both Parents	Mother Only	Father Only
Significance tests									
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)	0.621			0.438			0.293		
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)	0.011			0.116			0.699		
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001			0.178			0.233		
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	0.001			0.890			0.604		
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)	0.001			0.117			0.695		
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)	0.348			0.503			< 0.001		

[a] In the years of schooling and number of children regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Clustered standard errors by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of all second-generation women age 25-49 excluding those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), dummies for race and ethnicity, and year fixed effects.

Table 6b: Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education and Annual Hours by Family Type (All Second-Generation Men)

	Years of Schooling			Annual Hours		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children	-1.169**	-0.804*		186.574	-141.574	
(mom_f_nchild)	(0.578)	(0.422)		(181.694)	(114.434)	
Female Years of Schooling	-0.156**	0.032		-27.405	1.179	
(mom_f_edn)	(0.062)	(0.052)		(22.628)	(11.125)	
Female Annual Work Hours	0.025	-0.061		0.471*	0.067	
(mom_f_hours)[a]	(0.081)	(0.056)		(0.273)	(0.172)	
Father's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children	0.041		0.097	-67.378		21.816
(dad_f_nchild)	(0.646)		(0.516)	(154.696)		(120.791)
Male Years of Schooling	0.309***		0.237***	36.069*		12.844
(dad_m_edn)	(0.062)		(0.040)	(19.204)		(11.204)
Female Annual Work Hours	-0.009		-0.004	0.019		-0.033
(dad_f_hours)[a]	(0.079)		(0.064)	(0.236)		(0.191)
r squared	0.181	0.050	0.111	0.046	0.035	0.023
N	9,317	5,686	5,115	9,317	5,686	5,115
Sample--Second-Generation Type:	Both Parents	Mother Only	Father Only	Both Parents	Mother Only	Father Only
Significance tests						
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)	0.297			0.420		
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)	0.006			0.330		
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001			0.105		
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001			0.575		
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)	0.822			0.341		
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)	0.791			0.009		

[a] In the years of schooling regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Clustered standard errors by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of all second-generation men age 25-49 excluding those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), dummies for race and ethnicity, and year fixed effects.

Table A-1a: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Fertility, Education, and Annual Hours, not Controlling for Race/Ethnicity (All Second-Generation Women)

	Years of Schooling		Number of Children		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-0.923***	0.451***	0.299*		24.171
		(0.309)	(0.061)	(0.153)		(92.304)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.186***	0.038		0.008		-8.055
	(0.021)	(0.040)		(0.018)		(10.885)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		0.074**		-0.041**	0.308***	0.362***
		(0.036)		(0.018)	(0.062)	(0.084)
Father's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.382	0.292***	0.135		37.435
		(0.377)	(0.103)	(0.153)		(81.740)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.290***	0.258***		-0.035**		22.235**
	(0.024)	(0.037)		(0.015)		(9.037)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		-0.034		0.012	0.197***	0.107
		(0.042)		(0.019)	(0.063)	(0.090)
r squared	0.12	0.127	0.096	0.098	0.007	0.008
N	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919	21,919
Significance tests						
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.293	0.262	0.495		0.922
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.005	< 0.001	0.022		0.573
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	0.002	0.001		0.134		0.058
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.146		0.242
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.021		0.013	0.253	0.054
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.523		0.325	< 0.001	< 0.001

[a] In the years of schooling and number of children regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation women age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for rmother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table A-1b: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education and Annual Hours, not Controlling for Race/Ethnicty (All Second-Generation Men)

	Years of Schooling		Annual Hours	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mother's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)		-1.186***		-114.745
		(0.276)		(92.607)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	0.134***	0.003		3.830
	(0.025)	(0.034)		(11.848)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]		-0.007	0.198**	0.027
		(0.035)	(0.098)	(0.114)
Father's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)		-0.086		8.922
		(0.411)		(109.691)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.318***	0.293***		17.988**
	(0.025)	(0.038)		(9.027)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]		0.020	0.185*	0.061
		(0.043)	(0.097)	(0.121)
r squared	0.115	0.120	0.028	0.031
N	20,118	20,118	20,118	20,118
Significance tests				
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)		0.031		0.106
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)		0.009		0.187
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.193
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001		0.111
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)		0.604	0.875	0.256
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)		0.819	0.165	0.155

[a] In the years of schooling regression, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of all second-generation men; is restricted to those age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table A-2a: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education, Fertility, and Annual Hours Controlling for Respondent's Education and Region (All Women and Married Women)

	Years of Schooling		Number of Children		Annual Hours	
	All	Married	All	Married	All	Married
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)	-0.696**	-0.998***	0.250	0.429**	52.725	42.907
	(0.291)	(0.322)	(0.162)	(0.183)	(90.430)	(114.839)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	-0.010	-0.021	0.017	0.035	-7.676	-18.799
	(0.039)	(0.044)	(0.020)	(0.024)	(11.260)	(15.029)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]	0.067**	0.054*	-0.032**	-0.026	0.259***	0.306**
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.082)	(0.121)
Father's Source Country:						
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)	-0.304	-0.207	0.206	0.183	21.386	43.843
	(0.277)	(0.329)	(0.138)	(0.165)	(82.133)	(108.743)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.196***	0.235***	-0.003	-0.001	3.138	10.244
	(0.029)	(0.037)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(9.862)	(12.849)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]	-0.050	-0.068**	0.021	0.023	0.097	0.067
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.099)	(0.131)
Respondent's Years of Schooling	--	--	-0.050***	-0.036**	85.067***	65.581***
			(0.013)	(0.016)	(5.706)	(6.648)
r squared	0.144	0.152	0.114	0.123	0.055	0.035
N	21,919	13,081	21,919	13,081	21,919	13,081
Significance tests						
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)	0.346	0.092	0.859	0.378	0.824	0.996
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.004	0.459	0.477
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.473	0.290	0.517	0.201
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.474	0.211	0.729	0.602
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)	0.007	0.011	0.013	0.049	0.238	0.227
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)	0.719	0.747	0.650	0.894	0.003	0.018

[a] In the years of schooling and number of children regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation women age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for region, race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.

Table A-2b: Results for the Effect of Immigrant Parent Characteristics on Second Generation Education and Annual Hours Controlling for Respondent's Education and Region (All Men and Married Men)

	Years of Schooling		Annual Hours	
	All	Married	All	Married
	(1)	(2)	(5)	(6)
Mother's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (mom_f_nchild)	-0.991***	-0.871***	-4.791	11.969
	(0.266)	(0.306)	(85.454)	(73.963)
Female Years of Schooling (mom_f_edn)	-0.033	0.021	-0.002	7.921
	(0.034)	(0.041)	(10.538)	(8.759)
Female Annual Work Hours (mom_f_hours)[a]	-0.010	0.003	0.099	0.027
	(0.029)	(0.034)	(0.088)	(0.087)
Father's Source Country:				
Female Number of Children (dad_f_nchild)	-0.061	-0.290	40.683	-59.492
	(0.327)	(0.356)	(76.964)	(79.541)
Male Years of Schooling (dad_m_edn)	0.226***	0.201***	-6.685	-21.018**
	(0.032)	(0.039)	(8.272)	(9.035)
Female Annual Work Hours (dad_f_hours)[a]	0.009	-0.019	0.137	0.011
	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.105)	(0.112)
Respondent's Years of Schooling	--	--	73.535***	51.975***
			(4.456)	(4.333)
r squared	0.138	0.157	0.087	0.053
N	20,118	11,949	20,118	11,949
Significance tests				
p(mom_f_nchild-dad_f_nchild=0)	0.039	0.267	0.733	0.587
p(mom_f_nchild+dad_f_nchild=0)	0.008	0.005	0.702	0.551
p(mom_f_edn-dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	0.008	0.669	0.057
p(mom_f_edn+dad_m_edn=0)	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.533	0.164
p(mom_f_hours-dad_f_hours=0)	0.682	0.662	0.800	0.927
p(mom_f_hours+dad_f_hours=0)	0.974	0.772	0.059	0.716

[a] In the years of schooling regressions, this variable is expressed in 100's.

Source: 1995-2006 March CPS and 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses.

Notes: * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Standard errors clustered by parent's source country (mother then father) crossed with which census(es) provided the data. The sample consists of second-generation men age 25-49; and excludes those with allocated or unmatched birthplace, allocated or unmatched parent birthplace, and those of other race. Regressions are weighted using CPS sampling weights adjusted so that each year receives equal weight. Regressions include age (quadratic), and dummies for region, race and ethnicity, mother-only and father-only family type, and year fixed effects.