children with noncitizen family heads moved downward irrespective of generation.

In contrast, the share of poor children who successfully exited poverty in a consecutive year is highest among first generation children with citizen family heads, followed by second generation children with citizen heads. Among these children, about 45 to 50 percent were able to move above the poverty threshold in the following year. About 38 percent of first generation children with noncitizen heads and native children are able to exit poverty. Second generation children with noncitizen family heads are least likely to escape poverty with 35 percent. The data in Table 2 show that between 1996-2001, second generation children with noncitizen heads are most vulnerable in terms of both upward and downward transitions. On the other hand, first generation children with noncitizen family heads are more likely to slip into poverty than natives regardless of generation, but their likelihood of exiting poverty is not that different from that of natives.

Transitions into Poverty

Table 3 lists logistic regression models of children's transition from non-poor to poor. Model 1 shows the simple bivariate relationship between children's generation and family head's citizenship and transition into poverty. The result confirms the findings from Table 2. Immigrant children of all categories are more likely to fall into poverty, except for second generation children with citizen heads. Model 1 displays that children with noncitizen heads are most likely to make downward transition regardless of generation. For example, among children with noncitizen family heads, second generation children are 2.8 times more likely, and first generation children are 2.7 times more likely to drop into poverty. The likelihood of making downward transition is lower for first generation children with noncitizen heads; compared to natives, they are 1.9 times more likely to move down. No statistical

difference exists between natives and second generation children with citizen heads.

Model 2 adds sociodemographic and contextual factors that are likely to influence children's transition into poverty. As expected, non-white children have higher risks of falling into poverty. Black, Latino, Asian and other children are about 1.6 to 1.9 times more likely to fall into poverty compared to White children.[7] The age of the family head and the head's education also play an important role. The negative estimate for the "head's age" indicates that the likelihood of making a downward transition decreases with the head's age, but the positive effect for the "head's age squared" suggests that the probability decrease at an increasing rate. As expected, the estimates for the head's education show that the higher the level of education completed, the lower the likelihood of their children falling into poverty. The number of children in a family also has significant detrimental impact on downward transition. Children in a female-headed family are extremely vulnerable to downward transition. They are 1.6 times more likely to fall into poverty than children who are not in female-headed family. As previous studies suggest (Lichter and Eggebeen 1994), a parent's employment conditions children's downward movement. The estimated coefficient indicates that the chance of falling into poverty decreases by 2 percent when parents work additional one week.

Geographic variables do affect children's likelihood of falling into poverty. Children in the central city are more likely to move downward compared to children in suburban and rural areas. Regional effects illustrate that children in the Midwest are less likely to fall into poverty, while children in the South are more likely to fall into poverty relative to children in the Northeast. The positive parameter estimate for the "years since 1996" indicates that the likelihood of downward transition increased since 1996. The negative effect of the real GDP growth rate suggests that macro economic condition do matter in children's poverty dynamics.

When sociodemographic and contextual predictors are controlled, the effects of estimated coefficients of all immigrant children except for second generation children with citizen heads are attenuated. The estimated coefficient of first generation children with citizen heads becomes even insignificant. Now only immigrant children with noncitizen family heads remain more likely to make downward transitions irrespective of generation. This attenuation largely results from the differences between immigrant children and native children in the means for family and contextual characteristics that are associated with poverty. That is, among children who drop into poverty, immigrant children are more likely to be non-white, to live in central city, and be more likely to have family heads with less education, and have parents who work less compared to native children. These factors increase the prospects for falling into poverty, and controlling for these characteristics explain the attenuation in the coefficients of immigrant children.[8]

In order to assess the effects of income types received in alleviating the downward transition, a set of dummy variables indicating a receipt of various income sources in a year prior to the survey is introduced in Model 3. The result illustrates that educational benefits and interests do have an ameliorative impact on the transition into poverty. In particular, children in a family with interests and dividends in a preceding year are 46 percent less likely to fall into poverty than those without income from this source. Even educational benefits significantly ameliorate the downward transition of children. Children in a family with educational benefits are 19 percent less likely to fall into poverty.

In contrast to the ameliorative impacts that these income sources exert, children in a family with income from self-employment and public assistance are more than twice as likely to make the downward transition. The association of receiving public assistance and the probability of remaining in poverty is also noted by Gottschalk and

Danziger (2001), and my results do not contradict their findings. This ironic result may be rooted in the nature of public assistance itself. Only very poor and those at the very bottom of income distribution qualify for public assistance. Together with the meager amount received, this result implies the difficulty of those receiving public assistance in sustaining themselves above poverty threshold. The inclusion of income factors does not attenuate the disadvantage of immigrant children with noncitizen heads observed in Model 2. While the coefficient of second generation children with noncitizen heads is slightly attenuated, the coefficient of first generation children with noncitizen heads even increased from .351 to .390.

To observe how the effects of these predictors differ by children's generations, Model 4 is re-estimated separately for natives, second, and first generation children by the family head's citizenship. Since there is not enough number of cases for independent analyses when first generation children are classified by the family head's citizenship, I pooled all first generation children. In order to control for the head's citizenship status, I created a new dummy variable that equals one if the heads are noncitizens (the reference is citizen) and included in the model for first generation children. I also included results for significance tests for the differences in coefficients between the native model and the immigrant models, respectively.[9] However, since the first generation model is not strictly the same with the other models, caution is warranted when making a comparison between natives and first generation. The results are presented in Table 4.

Results confirm the importance of several characteristics of children, family and contextual factors. More important, they reveal major native-immigrant differences as well as differences within immigrant generation. For natives, the factors that influence the downward transition generally mirror those in Model 3 in Table 3. For immigrant children, determinants of poverty transition are diverse. Among individual

characteristics, the negative effect of being Latino is significantly stronger for second generation children with noncitizen heads than natives. Interestingly, the beneficial effect of the family head's education is much weaker, and detrimental effect of being in female-head family is much weaker for second generation children with noncitizen heads.

Differences in the effects of coefficients across generation are also found in contextual factors. First, the detrimental effect of residing in central city is evident for all categories of immigrant children, but this variable does not have influence on natives. The negative effect of central city residence appears to be particularly strong for first generation children. The patterns of regional effect are quite different across groups. Second generation children with citizen heads in the South are significantly more likely to make downward transition than natives. In contrast, second generation children with noncitizen heads and first generation in the Midwest and the West are advantaged than their native counterparts.

Differences in the effects of time since 1996 and the real GDP growth rate bear emphasis. Since 1996, natives have become significantly more likely to make downward transitions, while immigrant children have not been constrained by the time effect. In particular, second generation children with citizen heads and first generation children have become significantly less likely to make downward transitions since 1996, compared to native children. The GDP growth rate significantly affects children's prospect of downward movement, except for second generation children with citizen heads. Second generation children with noncitizen heads are responsive to the direction of national economy. In contrast, the response of first generation children to the direction of national economy is inexplicable. They are more likely to drop into poverty when the economic growth is high. Further analyses reveal that the effect of national economy is slow to reach for first generation

children. When the GDP growth rate is lagged for additional year, the coefficient of GDP growth rate turns negative and significant.[10]

Among income types received, the positive effect of interests and dividends is found for all groups of children. In addition, educational benefits help to deter children from falling into poverty for second generation children with noncitizen heads. The effect of educational benefit is particularly strong for second generation children with noncitizen heads. In contrast, children in a family with income from self-employment are significantly more likely to drop into poverty, and this effect is strong for second generation children with citizen heads. The negative association between receiving public assistance and downward transition is evident for all groups except second generation children with citizen heads.

Transitions out of Poverty

Next, I turn to the analysis of children's upward transition. The models in Table 5 parallel Table 3, but show the effects of predictors on children's upward mobility from poor to non-poor. Model 1 in Table 5 is the base model that indicates the relationship between the transition out of poverty and children's generation and family head's citizenship. The result confirms the findings in Table 2. Immigrant children with citizen heads are significantly more likely to exit poverty than native children regardless of their generation. On the other hand, second generation children with noncitizen heads are 13 percent less likely to escape poverty. First generation children with noncitizen heads are not particularly more likely to make an upward transition relative to native children.

Model 2 adds the effects of sociodemographic and contextual variables. Results broadly mirror those in Model 2 in Table 3 except that contextual variables such as central city, region, years since 1996, and real GDP growth rate do not influence

upward transitions. Now, the coefficients of all immigrant children except second generation children with noncitizen heads are attenuated. Second generation children with noncitizen heads become statistically indistinguishable from natives once these predictors are controlled. Since a higher share of native children are in female-headed families, controlling this factor alone lowers the advantage of immigrant children over natives.[11]

Model 3 further introduces variables indicating types of income received. The result indicates that in addition to interests, income from earnings and child support significantly contributes to children's upward movement. Specifically, children in a family with earnings as well as those with child support are 1.2 times more likely to exit poverty relative to children in a family without income from these sources. Receiving interests considerably increases the probability of exiting poverty. Children in a family with interests and dividends are 1.8 times more likely to escape poverty relative to children without this income source. Mirroring the results in Table 3, self-employment and public assistance are associated with lower likelihood of moving above poverty. In particular, children in a family with public assistance are only half as likely to make upward transition, while children with self-employment income are about 20 percent less likely to exit poverty.

When income variables are included, a very different picture emerges. Now, the likelihood of escaping poverty is significantly lower for second generation children with noncitizen heads, and significantly higher for first generation children with citizen heads. The other two groups, second generation children with citizen heads and first generation children with noncitizen heads become statistically indistinguishable from native children. Since a higher share of native children receive self-employed income and public assistance which are associated with lower likelihood of upward mobility, controlling these income sources even decreases the likelihood of upward movement

for second generation children with noncitizen heads.

The generation-specific models in Table 6 address whether the determinants of exit from poverty differ across native, second, and first generation children by family head's citizenship. Echoing the pooled model, the results indicate that children with family heads without high school education, in female-headed families, in a families with a large number of children, with parents working less, are considerably disadvantaged. However, there are some interesting generational differences in the determinants of upward transition.

Among sociodemographic predictors, effects of head's education and the number of weeks worked by parents are worth noting. Consistent with the downward models, the beneficial effect of having a well-educated family head is much stronger for second generation children regardless of the head's citizenship. The beneficial effect of the number of weeks worked by parents is stronger for second generation children with noncitizen heads.

There are some differences in the effects of contextual factors. Unlike the result obtained from the downward model, central city increases the chances of upward movement for only first generation children. Effects of time since 1996 and GDP growth rate are observed only for selective groups. The effect of time indicates that only second generation children with citizen heads became significantly more likely to exit poverty since 1996. Second generation children with noncitizen heads are strongly influenced by the GDP growth rate.

The effects of income variables also show diverse patterns by group. Having earnings helps natives and second generation children move above poverty, but the effect is notably strong for the latter. The negative association between self-employed income and upward movement is observed only for second generation children with noncitizen heads. Likewise, ameliorative effect of educational benefit is evident only

for second generation children with citizen heads. Receiving interests and dividends contributes to upward movement, but this positive effect is evident for only natives and second generation children with noncitizen heads, and the effect is much stronger for the latter. Child support is associated with upward movement for only natives. All groups except for second generation children with noncitizen heads show the negative association between receiving public assistance and upward movement. This association is particularly strong for second generation children with citizen heads and weak for second generation with noncitizen heads.

Summary and Conclusions

The child poverty rate in the United States remains one of the highest among industrialized nations and researchers have studied the issue from various aspects. However, poverty and poverty transitions among children of immigrants have been neglected, despite the fact that currently, first and second generation children account for one in five children in the United States. In this paper, I have documented the generational effects on children's poverty transitions from 1996-2001. My focus was twofold. First, I documented differences in the levels of both downward and upward poverty transitions of native and immigrant children. Second, I evaluated what sociodemographic and contextual factors account for differences in the likelihood of poverty transitions between native and immigrant children.

The picture of poverty transition is strikingly different when sociodemographic, contextual, and income factors are taken into account. At the bivariate level, children of immigrants are more likely to fall into poverty than natives except for second generation children with citizen heads. Further analyses reveal that immigrant children with citizen family heads are not particularly more likely to fall into poverty than natives once sociodemographic and contextual factors are controlled irrespective

of generation. However, the lower likelihood of slipping into poverty for immigrant children with noncitizen heads persists. In terms of upward transition, both first and second generation children with citizen family heads are more likely to exit poverty and second generation children with noncitizen heads are less likely to escape poverty when no control variables are included. It turns out that second generation children with noncitizen heads are significantly less likely, and first generation children with citizen heads are significantly more likely to exit poverty than native children, when all controls are included.

Children's poverty dynamics are influenced in predictable ways by conventional factors. For both transitions into and out of poverty, there are penalties to being non-white, with less educated family heads, in female-headed families, and with parents who work less. A measure of the direction of national economy behaves as expected by showing the detrimental effects of low growth and the beneficial effects of high growth. The effects, however, tend to influence downward transition, and the magnitude of the effects differ by children's generation and family head's citizenship. Time since 1996 indicated that children became significantly more likely to slip into poverty, but the effects also differ by the group. Availability of income sources, such as interests, educational benefit and child support help children to escape poverty in both upward and downward transitions.

Models estimated separately by generation uncover some interesting differences in the determinants of transitions into and out of poverty across generations. Of the differences that do emerge, a few bear emphasis. One of the most evident concerns family head's education. For upward models, the beneficial effects of the family head's education are much stronger for immigrant groups. Interestingly, however, this effect is not observed for the downward transition of second generation children with noncitizen heads. The negative effect of central city residence on downward

movement is particularly strong for first generation children. The result of this study is consistent with the research that shows that immigrant children tend to live in poor neighborhoods in central city (Portes and Rumbaut 1996). But this study also implies that central city residence provides opportunities to exit poverty at the same time, especially for first generation children. The results also illustrate that poverty transitions of second generation children with noncitizen family heads are particularly sensitive to the direction of the national economy, and second generation children with citizen heads became significantly less likely to drop into, and more likely to exit poverty.

My results consistently reveal that children of noncitizen family heads are disproportionately exposed to economic hardship. These results suggest that economic disadvantages faced by children of immigrants may be related less to generation per se than to family head's citizenship. Actually, I found that children of noncitizen family heads are more likely to slide into poverty and less likely to move out of poverty than immigrant children with citizen family heads regardless of generation. The results of this study imply that the 1996 welfare reform that restricted access to public assistance based on citizenship has potentially adverse effects on the economic well-being of children of noncitizen immigrants. While early indications of the 1996 reform are that the number of immigrants applying for public assistance is decreasing (Fix and Passel 2002), the strong economy has been critical for this early success. My findings suggest that as economic growth slows, immigrant children with noncitizen heads will be at greater risk of sliding into poverty.

References

Annie E. Casey Foundation. *Children at Risk: State Trends 1990-2000.* 2002. PRB/KIDSCOUNT Special Report. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Blank, Rebecca M. 2000. "Fighting Poverty: Lessons from Recent U.S. History." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(2): 3-19.

Borjas, George J. 2001. "Welfare Reform and Immigration." Pp.369-385 in *The New World of Welfare*, edited by Rebecca M. Blank and Ron Haskins. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Borjas, George J. 1999. *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and The American Economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1978. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." *The Journal of Political Economy* 86(5): 897-921.

Duleep, Harriet O., and Mark C. Regets. 1997. "Measuring Immigrant Wage Growth Using Matched CPS Files." *Demography* 34(2): 239-249.

Duncan, Greg J., W. Jean Yeung, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Judith R. Smith. 1998. "How Much Does Childhood Poverty Affect the Life Chances of Children?" *American Sociological Review* 63(3): 406-423.

Eggebeen, David J., and Daniel T. Lichter. 1991. "Race, Family Structure, and Changing Poverty Among American Children." *American Sociological Review* 56(December): 801-817.

Fix, Michael. 2001. "Comment to Borjas." Pp. 385-390 in *The New World of Welfare*, edited by Rebecca M. Blank and Ron Haskins. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Fix, Michael and Jeffrey Passel. 2002. The Scope and Impact of Welfare Reform's Immigrant Provisions. Discussion Paper 02-03, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Gans, Herbert J. 1992. "Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2): 173-192.

Gottschalk, Peter, and Sheldon Danziger. 2001. "Income Mobility and Exits from

Poverty of American Children." Pp. 135-153 in *The Dynamics of Child Poverty in Industrialised Countries*, edited by Bruce Bradbury, Stephen P. Jenkins, and John Micklewright. Cambridge University Press.

Hao, Lingxin, and Yukio Kawano. 2001. "Immigrants' Welfare Use and Opportunity for Contact with Co-Ethnics." *Demography* 38(3): 375-389.

Hirschman, Charles. 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis." *Demography* 38(3): 317-336.

Jensen, Leif. 1988. "Patterns of Immigration and Public Assistance Utilization, 1970-1980." *International Migration Review* 22(1): 51-83.

Jensen, Leif. 2001. "The Demographic Diversity of Immigrants and Their Children." Pp. 21-56 in *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*, edited by Rubén Rumbault and Alejandro Portes. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jensen, Leif and David J. Eggebeen. 1994. "Nonmetropolitan Poor Children and Reliance on Public Assistance." *Rural Sociology* 59(1): 45-65.

Jensen, Leif and Yoshimi Chitose. 1997. "Immigrant Generations." Pp. 47-62 in *Immigration and The Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*, edited by Alan Booth, Ann C. Crouter and Nancy Landale. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Jensen, Leif, Jill Findeis, Wan-Ling Hsu, and Jason Schachter. 1999. "Slipping Into and Out of Underemployemnt: Another Disadvantage for Nonmetropolitan Workers?" *Rural Sociology* 64(3): 417-438.

La Londe, Robert, J., and Robert H. Topel. 1991. "Immigrants in the American Labor Market: Quality, Assimilation, and Distributional Effects." *The American Economic Review* 81(2): 297-302.

Landale, Nancy S., and Daniel T. Lichter. 1997. "Geography and the Etiology of Poverty among Latino Children." *Social Science Quarterly* 78(4): 874-894.

Lichter, Daniel T. and David J. Eggebeen. 1994. "The Effect of Parental Employment on Child Poverty." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56(August): 633-645.

Massey, Douglas S. 1995. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United

States." *Population and Development Review* 21(3): 631-652.

Oropesa, R.S. and Nancy S. Landale. 1997. "Immigrant Legacies: Ethnicity, Generation, and Children's Familial and Economic Lives." *Social Science Quarterly* 78(2):399-416.

Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger. 1999. "Immigrants, Past and Present: A Reconsideration." Pp. 223-238 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. De Wind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro ed. 1996. *The New Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

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

Raijman, Rebeca and Marta Tienda. 1999. "Immigrants' Socioeconomic Progress Post-1965: Forging Mobility or Survival?" Pp. 239-256 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. De Wind. New York: Russell sage Foundation.

Rank, Mark P. and Thomas A. Hirschl. 1999. "The Economic Risk of Childhood in America: Estimating the Probability of Poverty Across the Formative Years." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(4): 1058-1067.

United Nations Children's Fund. 2000. A League Table of Child Poverty in Rich Nations. Florence:

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Current Population Survey: Design and Methodology*. Technical Paper 63. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2001a. *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000*. Current Population Reports, P23-206. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2001b. *Poverty in the United States: 2000*. Current Population Reports P60-214. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/)

U.S. Department of Justice. 2001. 2000 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration

and Naturalization Service.

Van Hook, Jennifer. 2000. "SSI Eligibility and Participation among Elderly Naturalized Citizens and Noncitizens." *Social Science Research* 29: 51-69.

Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 975-1008.

Notes

[1] Children are defined as those aged between 0 and 17 years of age.

[2] The requirements to become a citizen include length of residency, which is three years for the spouses of citizens, and five years for others. Applicants must also demonstrate a modest level of English language and civics knowledge. Minor children automatically become citizens when both parents naturalize (U.S. Department of Justice 2000).

[3] Note that native children in their study refers to children of each ethnicity, who are third generation children or higher. Among Latino children (Mexicans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Colombians and Salvadorans), the odds of poverty decline substantially from first generation to second generation but their risks of poverty do not decline from the second to third generation. Among Asian children, Chinese and Korean children showed a monotonic decrease in the odds of poverty across generations, but no consistent pattern of poverty decline across generation is observed for Filipino, Indian, Japanese, and Vietnamese children.

[4] Instead, the Census asks the ethnic ancestry of a person's parents.

[5] Also, a question on the number of years lived in the United States is not available in the CPS. A question on the year of arrival is only available, and using this variable requires an assumption that the individual has lived in the United States since the year of entry.

[6] The citizenship variable is entirely based on self-reporting by the respondents, and may not reflect the real situation. I have deleted some cases that are not consistent with generational definitions of children, such as individuals who claim to be born in the United States but are reported to be naturalized citizen.

[7] Other race includes native Americans and Eskimos.

[8] Actually, when only race/ethnicity, family head's education, number of weeks worked, and central city are included, all immigrant children except for second generation children with noncitizen family heads become insignificant.

[9] The statistical significance of coefficient differences across generation-specific models is computed by the formula $(b_1 - b_2)/(SE_{b1}^2 + SE_{b2}^2)^{1/2}$

[10] The result of the analysis is available upon request.

[11] Indeed, when only female-headed family is included in Model 1, the significant and positive effect of being immigrant children of citizen heads turn insignificant irrespective of generation.

Table 1 Means of Independent Variables included in Analyses

	Transitions into Poverty					Transitions out of Poverty				
		Second Generation		First Generation			Second Generation		First Generation	
	Native	Citizen	Noncitizen	Citizen	Noncitizen	Native	Citizen	Non-Citizen	Citizen	Noncitizen
Race/Ethnicity										
White	83.8	42.2	21.4	18.3	25.4	50.2	19.0	8.1	19.6	12.3
Black	11.2	6.6	9.0	11.1	8.9	36.2	6.9	7.7	15.6	8.0
Latino	3.2	19.5	48.3	23.6	31.4	9.2	45.4	71.0	45.4	57.2
Asian and Other	1.8	31.7	21.3	47.1	34.3	4.4	28.8	13.2	19.4	22.5
Head's Age	38.6	40.8	37.3	43.2	41.5	34.0	40.0	35.3	39.8	38.9
Head's Education										
Less than high school	7.0	11.6	39.4	20.7	32.5	32.6	32.5	42.8	61.7	63.0
High school only	32.6	19.8	25.4	24.5	20.1	41.4	41.1	26.8	16.9	17.6
More than high school	60.5	68.6	35.1	54.9	47.4	26.0	26.4	30.4	21.5	19.4
Number of Children	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.8	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.0
Type of Family										
Other than female-headed	86.0	94.0	91.2	90.7	90.9	36.7	35.9	66.2	82.6	70.6
Female headed	14.0	6.0	8.8	9.3	9.1	63.3	64.1	33.8	17.4	29.4
Weeks worked by parents	77.0	80.0	73.5	75.9	67.1	29.1	33.5	35.3	38.0	34.7
Residence										
Other than central city	83.4	70.7	61.7	58.4	61.6	69.7	53.2	46.9	32.1	53.7
Central city	16.6	29.3	38.3	41.6	38.4	30.3	46.8	53.1	67.9	46.3
Region										
Northeast	19.0	23.6	23.6	29.6	26.8	18.4	17.0	20.1	15.2	20.1
Midwest	29.7	14.0	11.4	9.2	11.9	24.2	8.2	6.8	19.0	8.9
South	33.0	24.9	22.2	24.4	26.2	40.8	28.6	22.5	17.7	22.4
West	18.4	37.4	42.8	36.9	35.1	16.6	46.2	50.7	48.1	48.7
Years since 1996	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.6	2.0	1.9
GDP growth rate	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8
Income Type Received										
Earnings	87.5	95.7	96.4	95.8	94.4	65.5	66.7	72.3	59.8	76.4
Self-employed income	15.0	15.2	9.2	13.4	7.7	9.8	13.8	6.1	14.0	5.5
Educational benefit	7.1	6.5	4.4	10.7	7.0	7.1	6.6	3.6	3.6	4.0
Interests and dividends	70.0	68.7	42.0	58.8	46.6	14.8	18.4	7.9	14.3	8.8
Child support	11.4	3.8	4.6	2.2	2.3	18.8	7.7	5.9	1.0	2.4
Public assistance	3.3	3.3	6.1	8.8	4.6	40.0	34.0	35.4	28.5	22.8
N	40460	3008	2136	203	651	6035	440	993	75	365

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

Table 2 Poverty Transitions of Children by Generation and Year (%)

	Transition into Poverty					Transition out of Poverty				
		Second Generation		First Generation			Second Generation		First Generation	
Year	Native	Citizen	Noncitizen	Citizen	Noncitizen	Native	Citizen	Noncitizen	Citizen	Noncitizen
1996–2001	4.9	5.2	12.5	9.0	12.3	38.0	44.7	34.6	54.2	38.8
1996–1997	5.3	5.3	20.1	3.0	8.9	38.6	43.3	28.3	52.1	27.1
1997–1998	5.1	5.7	9.9	20.9	18.8	35.6	28.1	30.8	37.5	37.9
1998–1999	4.1	5.7	11.4	10.6	15.5	38.6	48.2	41.9	45.4	42.6
1999–2000	5.2	4.3	10.9	1.2	10.3	38.8	53.7	40.2	50.0	44.0
2000–2001	4.9	5.1	10.2	10.3	8.6	38.3	53.5	38.7	86.1	42.8

Source: 1996–2001 March Current Population Surveys

Table 3 Logistic Regression Models of Transition from Non-Poor to Poor

	Model 1 b	Odds Ratio	Model 2 b	Odds Ratio	Model 3 b	Odds Ratio
Generation						
Native	–		–		–	
SG head citizen	.061	1.06	.069	1.07	.098	1.10
SG head noncitizen	1.015 ***	2.76	.316 ***	1.37	.301 ***	1.35
FG head citizen	.653 ***	1.92	.273	1.31	.251	1.29
FG head noncitizen	.995 ***	2.71	.351 **	1.42	.390 ***	1.48
Race/Ethnicity						
White			–		–	
Black			.634 ***	1.89	.545 ***	1.73
Latino			.460 ***	1.59	.420 ***	1.52
Asian and other			.574 ***	1.78	.491 ***	1.63
Head's age			-.056 ***	.95	-.055 ***	.95
Head's age squared			.0004 **	1.00	.0004 **	1.00
Education of Head						
Less than high school			–		–	
High school only			-.470 ***	.63	-.333 ***	.72
More than high school			-1.353 ***	.26	-1.102 ***	.33
Number of children			.347 ***	1.42	.324 ***	1.38
Type of Family						
Other than female headed			–		–	
Female headed family			.454 ***	1.58	.413 ***	1.51
Parent's work weeks			-.022 ***	.98	-.020 ***	.98
Residence						
Other than central city			–		–	
Central city			.202 ***	1.22	.186 ***	1.20
Region						
Northeast			–		–	
Midwest			-.238 ***	.79	-.255 ***	.78
South			.285 ***	1.33	.251 ***	1.29
West			.043	1.04	-.002	1.00
Years since 1996			.058 **	1.06	.059 **	1.06
GDP growth rate			-.181 ***	.84	-.187 ***	.83
Receives earnings					-.036	.97
Receives self-emp income					.790 ***	2.20
Receives educational benefit					-.214 **	.81
Receives interests					-.610 ***	.54
Receives child support					-.044	.96
Receives public assistance					.746 ***	2.11
Intercept	-2.962 ***		.182		.141	
-2LL	19226.76		16173.81		15756.26	
Weighted N	46458		46458		46458	

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

*p<0.1, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01

Table 4 Logistic Regression Models of Transition from Non-Poor to Poor by Genearation

	Native		Second Generation				First Generation	
			Citizen		Noncitizen			
	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio
Race/Ethnicity								
White	–		–		–		–	
Black	.562 ***	1.75	.526	1.69	.013	1.01	.684	1.98
Latino	.290 ***	1.34	.430	1.54	.768 *** n	2.16	.787 *	2.20
Asian and other	.568 ***	1.77	.596 ** n	1.82	.193 **	1.21	.590	1.81
Head's age	-.054 ***	.95	-.110 **	.90	-.239 *** n	.79	.152	1.16
Head's age squared	.0005 **	1.00	.001 **	1.00	.003 *** n	1.00	-.002	1.00
Education of Head								
Less than high school	–		–		–		–	
High school only	-.385 ***	.68	-.423 *	.66	-.022 n	.98	-.851 **	.43
More than high school	-1.155 ***	.32	-1.413 ***	.24	-.332 n	.72	-1.499 ***	.22
Number of children	.329 ***	1.39	.417 ***	1.52	.403 ***	1.50	.333 **	1.40
Type of Family								
Other than female headed	–		–		–		–	
Female headed family	.446 ***	1.56	.707 **	2.03	-.380 n	.68	.826	2.28
Parent's work weeks	-.019 ***	.98	-.025 ***	.98	-.024 ***	.98	-.019 ***	.98
Residence								
Other than central city	–		–		–		–	
Central city	.096	1.10	.400 **	1.49	.374 **	1.45	.563 ** n	1.76
Region								
Northeast	–		–		–		–	
Midwest	-.165 **	.85	-.682	.51	-.744 ** n	.48	-1.639 *** n	.19
South	.302 ***	1.35	.832 *** n	2.30	-.388 n	.68	-.258	.77
West	.092	1.10	.319	1.38	-.563 ** n	.57	-.724 ** n	.49
Years since 1996	.096 ***	1.10	-.145 n	.87	.009	1.01	-.404 ** n	.67
GDP growth rate	-.225 ***	.80	.188 n	1.21	-.408 **	.67	.761 ** n	2.14
Receives earnings	-.033	.97	.424	1.53	-.473	.62	-.480	.62
Receives self-emp income	.693 ***	2.00	1.863 *** n	6.44	.707 **	2.03	.718	2.05
Receives educational benefit	-.135	.87	-.001	.99	-1.797 ** n	.17	-.750	.47
Receives interests	-.604 ***	.55	-.497 **	.61	-.540 ***	.58	-.725 **	.48
Receives child support	-.081	.92	.468	1.60	.577 n	1.78	.125	1.13
Receives public assistance	.799 ***	2.22	.026 n	1.03	.584 **	1.79	.705	2.02
Head citizenship								
Naturalized citizen							–	
Noncitizen							-.078	.93
Intercept	.103		-.647		5.479 ***		-5.282	
-2LL	12993.8		986.14		1171.3		447.15	
N	40460		3008		2136		854	

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, * p<0.01

n Coeffecient significantly different from that for natives at p<0.1