

8. 研究成果の刊行に関する 一覧表

研究成果の刊行に関する一覧表

雑誌

発表者氏名	論文タイトル名	発表誌名	巻	号	ページ	出版年
千年よしみ	Transitions into and out of Poverty: A Comparison between Immigrant and Native Children	<i>Journal of Poverty</i>	9	2	63-88	2005
小島 宏	Return Migration of Japanese Managers and Their Health	<i>Korean Journal of Industrial Relations</i>	15	2	35-65	2005
井口 泰	[諸外国の外国人政策と地方自治体の対応]	全国市町村国際文化研究所 『国際文化研修』	13	2	pp.30-37	2005年7月
井口 泰	「欧州統合と移民・外国人政策－政策転換の展望」	『歴史と経済』	18	3	pp31-36	2005年4月
井口 泰*	「東アジア域内における人の移動の決定要因と経済連携協定の課題」	『経済学論究』	58	3	pp.461-486	2004年12月

* 平成17(2005)年報告書未掲載のため、掲載

Transitions into and out of Poverty: A Comparison Between Immigrant and Native Children

Yoshimi Chitose

ABSTRACT. How do the levels of children's poverty transitions differ between native and immigrant children? What factors account for these differences? Using the 1996-2001 Current Population Survey, I estimate models of year-to-year poverty transitions for both upward and downward movements. I find that: (1) immigrant children are not particularly more likely to fall into poverty relative to native children, but immigrant children with non-citizen heads are significantly less likely to exit poverty than their native counterparts; and (2) the length of residence of the family head plays a crucial role in the downward transition of immigrant children, while the citizenship status of the family head is more important in the upward transition of immigrant children. [Article copies available for a fee from *The Haworth Document Delivery Service*: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@haworthpress.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2005 by *The Haworth Press, Inc.* All rights reserved.]

KEYWORDS. Children, poverty, immigrants, first generation, second generation, citizenship

Yoshimi Chitose, PhD, is Senior Researcher, Department of International Research and Cooperation, National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Tokyo (NIPSSR), Hibiya Kokusai Building 6th Floor, 2-2-3 Uchisaiwai-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan 100-0011 (E-mail: y.chitose@ipss.go.jp).

Support for this research was provided by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) of Japan.

The author would like to thank the project members for their support and assistance. The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of NIPSSR or MHLW.

Journal of Poverty, Vol. 9(2) 2005

Available online at <http://www.haworthpress.com/web/JPOV>

© 2005 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

Digital Object Identifier: 10.1300/J134v09n02_04

The 1996 welfare reform is said to have been a success (Blank, 2000). Indeed, the number of households receiving public assistance, as well as the number of people in poverty, have declined dramatically since 1996 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001a). The child poverty rate also dropped significantly from 22.7 percent in 1993 to 16.2 percent in 2000, the lowest poverty rate since 1979 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001a). Yet, the share of children living in poverty is considerably higher than those of working-age adults and the elderly. Numbering 11 million, children comprise one of the most impoverished groups in the U.S. Moreover, the prevalence of poverty among children in the U.S. is one of the highest among industrialized nations (United Nations Children's Fund, 2000).

The growth of child poverty in the 1980s and 1990s has led to numerous studies that revealed relative disadvantages among children of female-headed families (Eggebeen & Lichter, 1991), minority children (Eggebeen & Lichter, 1991; Landale & Lichter, 1997), rural children (Jensen & Eggebeen, 1994), and children of working families (Lichter & Eggebeen, 1994). Contrary to the abundance of studies analyzing child poverty, little research focuses on poverty and poverty dynamics of immigrant children, despite the rapid increase of their numbers in the 1990s.

There are some reasons for this neglect. Primarily, researchers studying the children of immigrants have been hampered by a lack of nationally representative data that allow a thorough appraisal (Jensen, 2001). Second, scholarly concern for immigrants has centered on the economic performance of immigrant adults rather than their children. Third, the focus of policy concern has almost always been on the use of welfare by immigrants rather than their poverty. This concern culminated in the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), which included provisions that limit the access of legal non-citizens to public benefits, despite research results showing that immigrants are not particularly more likely to use public assistance than natives when demographic and socioeconomic characteristics are adjusted (Jensen & Chitose, 1997; Hao & Kawano, 2001; but Van Hook, 2000 shows that SSI use may be an exception). The neglect of poverty among immigrant children is unfortunate, given that one in five children in the U.S. today are either immigrants or the children of immigrants (Jensen, 2001).

To fill this gap, I address the following questions. First, how do the levels of children's poverty transitions differ between native and immigrant children? Second, to what extent can differences in poverty transi-

tions between native and immigrant children be explained by demographic, family, and contextual factors? Using the Current Population Survey (CPS), I address these questions by tracking the changing poverty status of children from 1996-2001. In this paper, the definition of immigrant generation follows that of previous studies (Jensen, 2001; Jensen & Chitose, 1997). Native children are those who are native-born and have native-born parents. Native children also include children born abroad to American parents, as well as children born in Puerto Rico and other U.S. protectorates. Second generation refers to children who are native-born and have at least one foreign-born parent. First generation comprises children who are foreign-born and have foreign-born parents. I use the term immigrant children for both first- and second-generation children.

POVERTY OF THE POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN

The immigration reforms in 1965 eliminated quotas that favored European immigrants, and instead, family reunification was the first priority for entry. Following this change, the volume of immigrants rose sharply and the major countries of origin shifted from Europe to Latin America and Asia. Between 1961 and 1970, 3.3 million immigrants entered the U.S. with about half of them from Latin American and Asian countries. In contrast, between 1991 and 2000, 9.1 million immigrants entered the U.S., of which almost 80 percent were from Latin American and Asian countries (U.S. Department of Justice, 2001).

The immigrant population tends to have a higher poverty rate than the general population. Immigrants are more likely to be unemployed and earn less (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001a). The economic disadvantage of the immigrant population translates into economic hardship for immigrant children. The poverty rate of foreign-born children (aged 0-17) is 29.4 percent, almost twice as high as the rate of their native counterparts (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001b).

Past studies on child poverty indicate that the risk of poverty among children is particularly sensitive to race/ethnicity, family structure, parental education, and parents' employment circumstances (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2002; Gottschalk & Danziger, 2001; Rank & Hirschl, 1999). In addition to already well-known demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of children in poverty, immigration-related features of parents, such as country of birth, nativity, citizenship, and length of time

lived in the U.S. play a crucial role in the economic well-being of immigrant children (Jensen, 2001). For example, according to the most recent data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2001b), the poverty rate of native-born children in families with foreign-born householders is 24 percent, while that of native-born children in families with native-born householders was 15 percent in 1999. Among foreign-born children, the poverty rate is 30 percent for those whose householder is foreign-born, which compares to 12 percent for those whose householder is native-born. These data indicate that the poverty rate is higher for children living in families with a foreign-born householder, regardless of the children's nativity.

The poverty rate of foreign-born declines with length of time lived in the U.S. Among the foreign-born population, the poverty rate ranges from 10 percent for those who have lived in the U.S. for 20 years or longer, to 24 percent for those who have lived in the U.S. for less than 10 years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001b). This implies that among immigrant children, the second generation is less likely to experience poverty than the first generation, because the average number of years lived in the U.S. is usually longer for parents of the second generation than those of the first generation.

Citizenship of children's parents is expected to affect the child poverty rate, because the poverty rates of foreign-born individuals differ markedly by citizenship.¹ The available data indicate that the poverty rate of naturalized citizens is 9 percent, while that of non-citizens is more than twice as high, reaching 21 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001b). The calculation using the 1994-1997 Current Population Survey shows that the poverty rate among the first generation with naturalized parents is 15 percent, while 39 percent of the second generation with non-citizen parents lives in poverty (Jensen, 2001).

Poverty rates of children by country of birth also underscore the highly diverse circumstances faced by children (Jensen, 2001). Among Asian children, just under 8 percent of the first generation of Filipino parents are poor, while over half of first-generation Laotian/Cambodian children are poor. Among the first generation of Latin American parents, Cubans are comparatively advantaged relative to other groups with a child poverty rate of 21.1 percent.

ECONOMIC ASSIMILATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Research on the economic mobility of immigrants provides some insights explaining differences in child poverty by generation. The pio-

neering work of Chiswick (1978) based on the 1970 census shows that the earnings of immigrant white males exceed those of comparably skilled natives within a relatively short time. Holding some human capital variables² constant, the earnings of foreign-born whites are 9.5 percent lower than native-born whites after five years in the country. Yet, the earnings of the foreign-born and native white males converge after 13 years, and even exceed those of natives by 6.4 percent after 20 years. The idea that immigrants will eventually assimilate into the native population within two generations has long supported the view that immigrants will move up the economic ladder with time in the U.S. across generations. Recent studies on the wage growth of immigrants also indicate that the growth rate of wages for immigrant men exceeds that of natives, which provides some evidence for this optimistic view (Duleep & Regets, 1997; LaLonde & Topel, 1991).

This expectation of an eventual assimilation into the American mainstream, however, has been challenged recently by arguments such as segmented assimilation (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Zhou, 1997) and second-generation decline (Gans, 1992). Some claim that the conventional straight-line assimilation theory was not applicable in the first place, even for the earlier immigrants (Perlmann & Waldinger, 1999). Borjas (1999) contends that the wage level of immigrants does not reach parity with natives within a generation, and even questions if it ever will. He stated that a comparison of wage levels between the first and second generations at a single point in time does not correctly measure economic mobility across generations. By comparing wages of first-generation workers from the 1940 Census to those of second-generation workers from the 1970 Census, he found that the economic mobility of immigrants across generations was much more modest than expected.

Currently, there is considerable debate on the eventual fate of the post-1965 immigration to the U.S. The argument is prompted by striking changes in the composition of immigrants, and a fundamental shift in the economic structure of American society. First, the composition of immigrants has changed from European to Latin American and Asian. They are at a higher risk of facing racial discrimination because they are phenotypically and linguistically quite distinct from the native-born population (Portes, 1996). The gap in educational levels between immigrants and natives is widening, mostly due to an increase in the educational levels of the U.S.-born population (Rajman & Tienda, 1999). The skill mix of new immigrants is bifurcated. There are some highly skilled immigrants, but the proportion of immigrants with low skills has

also increased (Borjas, 1999). New immigrants are concentrated in certain geographic locations, creating large cultural communities in various areas of the U.S. (Massey, 1995). The prevalence of these distinctive conditions raises concern over whether or not the economic assimilation model based largely on the experiences of early immigrants from Europe is applicable to today's immigrants.

Second, the American economy has changed fundamentally, such that much of the manufacturing sector that provided stable entry-level jobs for immigrants has moved its base overseas where cheaper labor is abundant (Portes, 1996). Under the current economy, the labor market favors workers who have valuable skills to offer. In addition to the striking change in the structure of the American economy, the receptive mode of the U.S. has also changed so that it now casts economic hardship to immigrants, especially to those who are not naturalized (Raijman & Tienda, 1999). For example, the 1996 PRWORA was the first law to discriminate against non-citizen legal immigrants as regards receiving federal means-tested public benefits, effectively conditioning those benefits on citizenship (Fix, 2001). These changes in the economic structure and the receptive mode of American society imply that post-1965 immigrants have a weaker economic footing for their children's upward mobility relative to immigrants in the early part of the twentieth century (Portes, 1996; Massey, 1995).

The recent debates on the economic assimilation of immigrants suggest that downward mobility is a possibility for some groups of post-1965 immigrant children. Scholars studying the assimilation process of these new second-generation children have focused on educational attainment and identity issues (Hirschman, 2001; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). However, not many studies look into the economic circumstances of these children. A study by Oropesa and Landale (1997) found that changes in the likelihood of children's poverty over generation differ markedly by country of origin.³ They found that immigrant children from Asian countries are advantaged in comparison to those from Latin America in terms of poverty. The effect of generation and country of origin on poverty, however, might have been attenuated had they included some measures of economic assimilation of their parents.

Because it is still too early to reach firm conclusions on the socioeconomic mobility of post-1965 immigrant children given their relative youth, I analyze how the likelihood of transitions into and out of poverty differs across children of different generations, and what factors account for these differences. Despite the fact that the economic well-being of children significantly affects their future achievement (Duncan,

Yeung, Brooks-Gunn, & Smith, 1998), few studies have examined the economic circumstances of today's immigrant children using nationally representative data. While empirical evidence implies that immigrant children are disadvantaged in poverty transitions, assimilation theory suggests that immigrant children are not disadvantaged once immigrant characteristics such as the family head's citizenship and length of time in the U.S. are controlled.

METHODS

Data

Researchers studying the children of immigrants have always been challenged by a lack of nationally representative data that allow a thorough appraisal of the children's socioeconomic situation. While public-use files of the U.S. Census have been widely used, and much has been learned about the children of immigrants (Hirschman, 2001; Oropesa & Landale, 1997), census data preclude a precise identification of a person's generation, a key variable in the study of immigrant children, due to the exclusion of a question on the birthplace of a person's parents beginning from the 1980 Census.

In this study, I analyze the 1996-2001 U.S. Current Population Survey (CPS) March files. The CPS is the source of the official Government statistics on employment and unemployment. The CPS sample is nationally representative of the civilian non-institutional population of the U.S., including roughly 50,000 households and the 130,000 individuals residing within them. The CPS contains detailed demographic and labor force data including work experience, income, and cash benefits. Another feature of the CPS is that it is a monthly survey of an overlapping and rotating sample of U.S. households (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Households in a sample are interviewed for four consecutive months, dropped out for eight months, and then return for another four months. With this procedure, about half of the households in March of year t are overlapped in March of the following year $t + 1$.

I analyze the 1996 to 2001 CPS files for two reasons. First, the CPS is the only source of data that allows us to precisely identify the generation of children. Beginning from 1994, information on a person's birthplace, as well as the birthplace of the person's parents became available in the CPS. These data are indispensable for determining the generation of children. In addition, questions on citizenship and year of arrival in the

U.S. were also included from the 1994 survey. Second, using the CPS it is possible to match the same individuals and observe changes. With this feature, I am able to analyze the determinants of change in the economic well-being of children by comparing the poverty status of the same individual across two consecutive years. Matching individuals over the surveys, however, is not possible between 1995 and 1996 due to the change in the sample design. Consequently, I decided to analyze the CPS files starting from 1996.

In this analysis, child is used as the unit of analysis. From the CPS data, I selected own children aged 0-17 years in primary and sub-families. Individual level records of parents and household information were appended to those of their children. Through a matching process, children observed in both year t and year $t + 1$ are selected. The matching of children across consecutive surveys is conducted in the same way as in previous studies (see Jensen, Findeis, Hsu, & Schachter, 1999). The CPS contains household identification numbers that identify the same individuals across surveys since 1996. To ensure that the same individuals are correctly matched, I use sex, race/ethnicity, and age (age x at year t , age $x + 1$ at year $t + 1$), in addition to household identification numbers. In this study, I analyze five matched files beginning from 1996-1997 pairs to 2000-2001 pairs, covering children in the latter half of the 1990s.

Measures

To examine how a family head's degree of economic assimilation affects the likelihood of the children's poverty transitions, I classify immigrant children by generation and the family head's citizenship. I focus on citizenship rather than length of time lived in the U.S. because recent welfare reform has drawn a line between citizen and non-citizen by limiting access to some means-tested programs for non-citizen immigrants. This distinction is assumed to have some impact on the economic well-being of non-citizen permanent residents. Indeed, there are some reports that the number of applications for naturalization has increased since the 1990s (Borjas, 2001). Second, citizenship also partly measures the length of residence in the U.S. because the number of years resided in the U.S. is one of the requirements to become naturalized. To measure child poverty, the official U.S. Census Bureau's definition of poverty is closely followed. Children are defined as being in poverty if their total family income in a given year is less than the official poverty line of that year. The official poverty measure compares the

pre-tax cash income of families to poverty thresholds adopted by the Social Security Administration in 1965. The poverty thresholds are updated annually to account for inflation. Note that the CPS data on employment and income refer to the preceding year, while demographic data refer to the time of the survey.

Models and Variables

To assess children's generational differences in the transition into and out of poverty, two sets of models are estimated using a logistic regression. The first set of models focuses on children who moved downward from non-poor to poor between year t and $t + 1$. Necessarily, these models are restricted to children who were not poor in year t . If non-poor children in year t fall into poverty in year $t + 1$ then the dependent variable equals one. If non-poor children in year t remain non-poor in year $t + 1$, then the dependent variable equals zero. The second set of models looks at children who moved upward from poor to non-poor between year t and $t + 1$. In this model, the dependent variable equals one if poor children in year t escape poverty in year $t + 1$, and equals zero if poor children in year t remain poor in year $t + 1$. All independent variables included in both sets of models are measured at year t .

The generational characteristics of children are included as five dummy variables: (1) native (reference category), (2) second generation with citizen family head, (3) second generation with non-citizen family head, (4) first generation with citizen family head, and (5) first generation with non-citizen family head. I expect that native children are least likely to fall into poverty, and are more likely to exit poverty. Among immigrant children, I expect that second-generation children with citizen family heads are least disadvantaged and first-generation children with non-citizen family heads are most disadvantaged.

Control variables included the following: characteristics of children, family heads, family, contextual variables, and income sources. The characteristic of children include race/ethnicity. Children are grouped into four race/ethnicity categories: White, Black, Latino, and Asian and others. It is expected that compared to whites, non-white children are disadvantaged in terms of both upward and downward movements. Characteristics of family heads included are the head's age and education. The head's age squared is also included to account for the nonlinearity in the effect of the head's age on changes in children's economic well-being. The education of family heads is classified into three categories: less than high school, high school only, and more than high

school. It is expected that the higher the head's education, the lower the likelihood of falling into poverty and the higher the likelihood of moving above poverty.

Family socioeconomic factors include number of children in a family, type of family, and total number of weeks worked by parents in the previous year. The number of children in a family refers to number of children aged 0 to 17 in that family. It is expected that number of children is negatively associated with poverty transitions. The type of family is a dichotomous variable indicating whether a child's family is female-headed or not. The reference category consists of children whose parents are both present and a small number of children with only the father present. It is assumed that children in a female-headed family are less likely to escape poverty relative to the reference group. The total number of weeks worked by child's parents in the previous year is also included. Because a past study shows that parents' employment conditions child poverty (Lichter & Eggebeen, 1994), it is expected that the higher the number of weeks worked by parents, the more likely it is for children to get out of poverty, and less likely to drop into poverty.

Contextual factors included are central city residence, region, time, and macroeconomic indicator. Residence is grouped into two classifications: residence in inner city and other than inner city (reference group). Region is included as four dummy variables: Northeast (reference), Midwest, South, and West. Time trend is measured as years since 1996. The value of this variable ranges from zero for the 1996-1997 pair to five for the 2000-2001 match. Because national economic trends shape the likelihood of entering or escaping poverty, the percentage change of real GDP as measured by 1996 dollars is added. The inclusion of real GDP growth rate also helps to measure the independent effect of time on children's poverty transitions.

To assess how income types received affect poverty transitions, a set of income types received is introduced. These are included as dichotomous variables, indicating whether or not a child's family receives income from specified sources. These include earnings, self-employment earnings, educational assistance, interest and dividends, child support, and welfare. Earnings refer to wages and salaries. Child support is money received from a parent for the support of their children following divorce or legal separation. Public assistance includes payment such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), general assistance, and supplemental security income.

The disadvantage of children with non-citizen family heads may be due to the effect of length of residence, because a naturalized citizen is expected to reside in the U.S. longer than a non-citizen. To test this possibility, a dummy variable that measures the length of residence of the family head is included. This variable equals one if the family head is a non-recent immigrant (those immigrating 11 years ago or more), and equals zero for a recent immigrant (those immigrating 10 years ago or less).

The sample for the downward models consists of 46,458 children, while that of the upward models contain 7,908 children. The analyses are weighted using sample weight divided by mean sample weight so that a weighted number of cases is approximately equal to sample size.

RESULTS

Table 1 reports the percentage of children who moved into and out of poverty in the respective samples between 1996 and 2001. The left panel of the table reports the percentage of children who fell into poverty, and the right panel lists the percentage of children who moved out of poverty. Table 1 indicates that on average, about 5 percent of native children fell into poverty during 1996-2001. The percentages of children who made the downward transition are all higher for immigrant children than that of natives. In particular, the percentages are very high for children with non-citizen family heads. More than 12 percent of immigrant children with non-citizen family heads moved downward, irrespective of generation.

In terms of upward transition, 38 percent of native children successfully exited poverty. The percentages of children who moved upward are higher for immigrant children with citizen heads than natives, irrespective of generation. However, the percentages of children who moved upward do not differ much between immigrant children with non-citizen heads and natives. Table 1 shows that although the percentage is small, immigrant children are disadvantaged in terms of downward transition relative to natives.

Transitions into Poverty

Table 2 lists the logistic regression model of children's downward transition. Unexpectedly, Model 1 reveals that there is no statistical difference in the likelihood of making a downward transition across native and immigrant children, when all of the variables are included. A de-

tailed analysis (not shown) indicates that length of residence is the key. When the variable Recent Immigrant is not included, the likelihood of falling into poverty is 1.4 times higher for second-generation children with non-citizen heads, and 1.5 times higher for first-generation children with non-citizen heads compared to natives. The result indicates that children of recent immigrants are more than twice as likely to make a downward transition relative to their counterparts (natives and immigrant children with non-recent immigrant heads).

As expected, Model 1 reveals that non-white children have higher risks of falling into poverty. Black, Latino, Asian and other children are about 1.5 to 1.7 times more likely to fall into poverty compared to white children.⁴ The age of family head and 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 a probability decrease at an increasing rate. The estimates for the head's education show that the higher the level of education completed, the lower is the likelihood of their children falling into poverty. The number of children in a family also has a significant detrimental impact on downward transition. Children in a female-headed family are extremely vulnerable to a downward transition. They are 1.5 times more likely to fall into poverty than children who are not in a female-headed family. As previous studies suggest (Lichter & Eggebeen, 1994), parental employment conditions children's downward movement. The estimated coefficient indicates that the chance of falling into poverty decreases by 2 percent when parents work an additional one week.

Geographic variables do affect children's likelihood of falling into poverty. Children in inner city areas 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 Years Since 1996 indicates that the likelihood of a downward transition has increased since 1996. The negative effect of the real GDP growth rate suggests that when GDP grows by 1 percent, the likelihood of making a downward transition decreases by 17 percent.

The effects of income types and cash benefits are important in poverty transition. Educational benefits and interest do have an ameliorative impact on the transition into poverty. In particular, children in a family receiving interest and dividends in the preceding year are 46 percent less likely to fall into poverty than those without income from this source.

TABLE 1. Poverty Transitions of Children by Generation and Year (%)

Year	Transition into Poverty			Transition out of Poverty		
	Native	Citizen	Non-Citizen	Native	Citizen	Non-Citizen
1996-2001	4.9	5.2	12.5	9.0	12.3	38.0
1996-1997	5.3	20.1	3.0	8.9	38.6	43.3
1997-1998	5.1	9.9	20.9	18.8	35.6	28.1
1998-1999	4.1	5.7	11.4	15.5	38.6	48.2
1999-2000	5.2	4.3	10.9	1.2	10.3	53.7
2000-2001	4.9	5.1	10.2	10.3	8.6	38.3
						53.5
						38.7
						54.2
						38.8
						27.1
						37.5
						42.6
						50.0
						44.0
						86.1
						42.8

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

TABLE 2. Logistic Regression Models of Downward Transition

	All Generation		Native		Second Generation				First Generation	
	Model 1		b	Odds Ratio	Citizen		Non-Citizen		b	Odds Ratio
	b	Odds Ratio			b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio		
Generation										
Native	-									
SG head citizen	.028	1.03								
SG head non-citizen	.024	1.02								
FG head citizen	-.029	.97								
FG head non-citizen	-.175	.84								
Race/ethnicity										
White	-		-		-		-		-	
Black	.546***	1.73	.562***	1.75	.535	1.71	.067	1.07	.671	1.96
Latino	.419***	1.52	.290***	1.34	.428	1.54	.844*** n	2.33	1.094*** n	2.99
Asian and other	.465***	1.59	.568***	1.77	.584** n	1.79	.105	1.11	.616	1.85
Head's age	-.053***	.95	-.054***	.95	-.100*	.91	-.174**	.84	.207	1.23
Head's age squared	.0005**	1.00	.0005**	1.00	.001*	1.00	.002** n	1.00	-.003	1.00
Education of head										
Less than high school	-		-		-		-		-	
High school only	-.343***	.71	-.385***	.68	-.456*	.63	-.032 n	.97	-.869**	.42
More than high school	-1.12***	.33	-1.155***	.32	-1.440***	.24	-.328 n	.72	-1.546***	.21
Number of children	.329***	1.39	.329***	1.39	.412***	1.51	.435***	1.55	.343***	1.41
Type of family										
Other than female-headed	-		-		-		-		-	
Female-headed family	.423***	1.53	.446***	1.56	.686**	1.99	.300 n	.74	.792**	2.21
Parent's work weeks	-.019***	.98	-.019***	.98	-.025***	.98	.023***	.98	-.018***	.98
Residence										
Other than central city	-		-		-		-		-	
Central city	.186	1.20	.096	1.10	.394**	1.48	.390** n	1.48	.702*** n	2.02
Region										
Northeast	-		-		-		-		-	
Midwest	-.241***	.79	-.165**	.85	-.657	.52	-.681**	.51	-1.541*** n	.21
South	.258***	1.29	.302***	1.35	.809*** n	2.25	-.328 n	.72	-.272	.76
West	.032	1.03	.092	1.10	.337	1.40	-.396* n	.67	-.680** n	.51
Years since 1996	.059**	1.06	.096***	1.10	-.131 n	.88	-.020	.98	-.375** n	.69
GDP growth rate	-.190***	.83	-.225***	.80	.185 n	1.20	-.406*	.67	.712** n	2.04
Receives earnings	-.048	.95	-.033	.97	.397	1.49	-.453	.64	-.545	.58
Receives self-emp income	.786***	2.19	.693***	2.00	1.871*** n	6.49	.637**	1.89	.801*	2.23
Receives educational benefit	-.208**	.81	-.135	.87	.034	1.04	-1.767** n	.17	-.795	.45
Receives interests	-.608***	.54	-.604***	.55	-.472**	.62	-.538***	.58	-.695**	.50
Receives child support	-.046	.96	-.081	.92	.470	1.60	.573 n	1.77	.374	1.45
Receives public assistance	.750***	2.12	.799***	2.22	.022 n	1.02	.681***	1.98	.689	1.99
Head recent immigrant	.752***	2.12			.692**	2.00	.930***	2.53	1.019***	2.77
Head non-citizen	-								-.439	.65
Intercept	.057		.103		-.908		3.287**		-7.228**	
-2LL	15717		12993.8		981.47		1145.3		436.21	
N	46458		40460		3008		2136		854	

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

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

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

the first generation, but this variable does not have an influence on natives. The negative effect of inner city residence appears to be particularly strong for the first generation. The patterns of regional effects are quite different across groups. The second generation with citizen heads in the South are significantly more likely, while the second generation with non-citizen heads in the South are significantly less likely to make a downward transition than natives. In contrast, the latter group is much more advantaged in the West.

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

Among types of income received, the positive effect of interest and dividends is strong for all groups. Children in a family with income from self-employment are significantly more likely to drop into poverty, and this effect is especially strong for the second generation with citizen heads. The beneficial effect of receiving educational benefits is particularly strong for the second generation with non-citizen family heads. The association between public assistance and likelihood of falling into poverty is not observed for the second generation with citizen heads, and the effect of public assistance on their likelihood of falling into poverty is notably weaker.

Transitions out of Poverty

Next, I turn to an analysis of the upward transition of children. The models in Table 3 parallel those in Table 2, but show the effects of predictors on children's upward mobility from poor to non-poor. Model 1

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 of these income sources, children in a family with income from self-employment and public assistance are more than twice as likely to make a downward transition. The association between receiving public assistance and the probability of remaining in poverty is also noted by Gottschalk and Danziger (2001), and my results are consistent with their findings. This ironic result may be rooted in the nature of public assistance itself. Only the very poor and those at the very bottom of income distribution qualify for public assistance. Together with the meager amount received, this result implies that those receiving public assistance find it difficult to sustain themselves above the poverty threshold.

To observe how the effects of these predictors differ by children's generations, Model 1 is reestimated separately for natives, second generation, and first generation by family head's citizenship. Because there is an insufficient number of cases for independent analyses for first-generation children, I pooled all first-generation children regardless of the head's citizenship. Then, I created a new dummy variable that equals one if the heads are non-citizens (the reference is citizen) and included it in the model for first-generation children. I also conducted significance tests for differences in the coefficients between native and immigrant models, respectively.⁵ Because the first- and second-generation models are not strictly the same as the native model, however, caution is warranted when making a comparison between natives and first generation.

The 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 generations. For natives, the factors that influence the downward transition generally mirror those in Model 1. For immigrant children, the determinants of poverty transition are diverse. Among individual characteristics, the negative effect of being Latino is significantly stronger for the second generation with non-citizen heads and the first generation than natives. Interestingly, the beneficial effect of the family head's education is much weaker, and the detrimental effect of being in a female-headed family is much weaker for second-generation children with non-citizen heads than native children.

Differences in the effects of coefficients across generations are also found in contextual factors. The detrimental effect of residing in the inner city is stronger for the second generation with non-citizen heads and

TABLE 3. Logistic Regression Models of Upward Transition

	All Generation		Native		Second Generation				First Generation	
	Model 1		b	Odds Ratio	Citizen		Non-Citizen		b	Odds Ratio
	b	Odds Ratio			b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio		
Generation										
Native	-									
SG head citizen	.191	1.21								
SG head non-citizen	-.259**	.77								
FG head citizen	.518*	1.68								
FG head non-citizen	.318*	.73								
Race/ethnicity										
White	-		-		-		-		-	
Black	-.156**	.86	-.151*	.86	.601	1.82	.151	1.16	-.306	.74
Latino	-.180**	.84	-.089	.92	.084	1.09	.283	1.33	-.113	.89
Asian and other	-.303***	.74	-.630***	.53	.247	1.28	.518 n	1.68	-.765	.47
Head's age	.015	1.02	.013	1.01	.084	1.09	-.125 n	.88	.090	1.09
Head's age squared	.00003	1.00	.00006	1.00	-.001	1.00	.002** n	1.00	-.0005	1.00
Education of head										
Less than high school	-		-		-		-		-	
High school only	.369***	1.45	.271***	1.31	1.214*** n	3.37	.852*** n	2.35	.487	1.63
More than high school	.869***	2.39	.753***	2.12	1.934*** n	6.92	.844***	2.33	1.495***	4.46
Number of children	-.271***	.76	-.265***	.77	-.375***	.69	-.410*** n	.66	-.250***	.78
Type of family										
Other than female-headed	-		-		-		-		-	
Female-headed family	-.641***	.53	-.641***	.53	-.666*	.51	-.498**	.61	-.737**	.48
Parent's work weeks	.013***	1.01	.013***	1.01	.002	1.00	.023*** n	1.02	.006	1.01
Residence										
Other than central city	-		-		-		-		-	
Central city	.125**	1.13	.091	1.10	.040	1.04	.006	1.01	.463*	1.59
Region										
Northeast										
Midwest	-.194**	.82	-.142	.87	.916	2.50	-.830*	.44	-.511	.60
South	-.189**	.83	-.159*	.85	.317	1.37	-.350	.71	-.740*	.48
West	-.036	.96	.081	1.08	.011	1.01	-.139	.87	-.292	.75
Years since 1996	-.029	.97	-.038	.96	.322* n	1.38	-.057	.95	.095	1.10
GDP growth rate	.074	1.08	.018	1.02	-.120	.89	.471** n	1.60	.061	1.06
Receives earnings	.185**	1.20	.169**	1.18	1.313*** n	3.72	.441	1.55	.275	1.32
Receives self-emp income	-.210**	.81	-.120	.89	.817 n	2.26	-1.317*** n	.27	-.885	.41
Receives educational benefit	.021	1.02	.149	1.16	-1.183** n	.31	-.569	.57	-.926 n	.40
Receives interests	.576***	1.78	.549***	1.73	.095	1.10	1.636*** n	5.13	-.032	.97
Receives child support	.146*	1.16	.162**	1.18	-.547	.58	.188	1.21	.440	1.55
Receives public assistance	-.674***	.51	-.662***	.52	-1.977*** n	.14	-.178 n	.84	-.747**	.47
Head recent immigrant	.166	1.18			1.354***	3.87	-.193	.83	.382	1.47
Head non-citizen									-.827**	.38
Intercept	-.730*		-.436		-2.377		-.952		-2.163	
...2LL	8854.88		7010.81		372.56		856.33		446.13	
N	7908		6035		440		993		440	

Source: 1996-2001 March Current Population Surveys

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

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

in Table 3 is the full model that indicates the relationship between the transition out of poverty and children's generation and family head's citizenship with other variables. First-generation children with citizen heads are 1.7 times more likely to exit poverty than natives. On the other hand, both first- and second-generation children with non-citizen heads are 23 to 27 percent less likely to escape poverty. First-generation children with non-citizen heads are particularly less likely to make an upward transition. The disadvantage of immigrant children with non-citizen heads lies in types of income received. In the model without income types and whether head is a recent immigrant (not shown), immigrant children with non-citizen heads show no disadvantages, while the advantages of immigrant children with citizen heads were evident. Because a higher share of natives receive self-employed income and public assistance, which are associated with a lower likelihood of upward mobility, controlling income sources decreased the likelihood of upward movement for immigrant children with non-citizen heads.

Effects of demographic and socioeconomic variables broadly mirror those of Model 1 in Table 2. The exceptions are observed in the effects of head's age, inner city, Midwest, years since 1996, and GDP growth rate. While an increase in head's age is associated with a lower likelihood of a downward transition, this variable has no effect on upward transition. Residents of inner cities appear to experience a poverty transition more frequently than suburban or rural residents. Inner city residents are more likely to experience both downward and upward transitions than their counterparts. On the other hand, residents of the Midwest are less likely to experience both types of transition compared to Northeast residents. While children as a whole have become more likely to fall into poverty since 1996, the likelihood of moving out of poverty has remained the same since 1996. GDP growth rate has no influence on upward transition, while economic growth is closely associated with children's downward transition.

Effects of income types on upward transition also differ in part from those on a downward transition. Earnings and child support are significant contributing factors to upward transition, although both income types are not significant in a downward transition. On the other hand, the educational benefit that alleviated the downward transition does not make a difference in the upward transition.

Another important difference is shown in recent immigrants. Table 2 shows that children of recent immigrants are at a higher risk of falling into poverty. In contrast, the likelihood of moving upward does not dif-

fer between the children of recent immigrants and their counterparts (natives and children of not recent immigrant heads).

However, the generation-specific models in Table 3 show that the determinants of the exit from poverty differ across native, second generation, and first generation. Among sociodemographic predictors, the effects of the head's education, the number of children, and the number of weeks worked by parents are worth noting. The beneficial effect of having a well-educated family head is much stronger for second generation children regardless of the head's citizenship. The negative effect of having a large number of children is particularly evident for second-generation children with non-citizen heads. On the contrary, the beneficial effect of the number of weeks worked by parents is much stronger for the latter group than natives.

Among contextual factors, the effect of time is positive and strong only for second-generation children with citizen heads. The result implies that only for this group did the likelihood of moving upward increase significantly since 1996. Second-generation children with non-citizen heads are particularly sensitive to the GDP growth rate. The probability of an upward move becomes 60 percent higher when the economy grows by 1 percent.

The effects of income variables also show diverse patterns by group. Among second-generation children with citizen heads, the beneficial effect of earnings is significant and much stronger than for natives. On the other hand, the negative effect of educational benefit and public assistance is significant and much stronger than for natives. Among second-generation children with non-citizen heads, self-employment income is associated with less likelihood of upward movement, and this effect is significantly stronger than for natives. In contrast, having interest income contributes significantly more to upward transition than for natives. Among first-generation children, surprisingly, all income types are not associated with upward movement.

Both length of stay in the U.S. and head's citizenship status are important factors in poverty transition. Unexpectedly for second-generation children with citizen heads, second-generation children whose family heads are recent immigrants are 3.9 times more likely to move out of poverty than their counterparts. For second-generation children with non-citizen heads and first-generation children, the head's length of stay in the U.S. does not contribute to the upward transition. Among first-generation children, the head's citizenship status does have an important impact on upward transition. First-generation children with

non-citizen heads are only 62 percent as likely as children with citizen heads to escape poverty.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

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

The picture of poverty transitions is strikingly different when socioeconomic, contextual, and income factors are taken into account. The percentage falling into poverty is higher for the children of immigrants, but further analyses reveal that immigrant children are not particularly more likely to fall into poverty when control variables are included. The percentage is higher for immigrant children, mainly because their family heads tend to be relatively recent immigrants.

For upward transition, the percentages of children escaping poverty are higher for immigrant children with citizen family heads than for native children, while the percentages of immigrant children with non-citizen heads are about the same as natives. It turns out that immigrant children with non-citizen heads are significantly less likely to exit poverty than natives when all controls are included. For the upward transition, a family head's length of residence in the U.S. has no effect. To summarize, a family head's length of residence plays a crucial role for immigrant children's downward transition, while the family head's citizenship status is probably more important for immigrant children's upward transition. However, caution is warranted. My findings are preliminary given the short time frame of the study.

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. The national economy behaves as expected by showing detrimental effects of low

growth and beneficial effects of high growth. The effects, however, tend to influence the downward transition, and the magnitudes of the effects differ by group. Time since 1996 indicates that children became significantly more likely to slip into poverty, but shows no impact on children's upward transitions. Availability of income sources, such as interest, educational benefit, and child support help children to escape poverty in both upward and downward transitions.

Although independent analyses of first-generation children by the family head's citizenship status were not possible, my results consistently reveal that immigrant children with non-citizen family heads are disproportionately exposed to economic hardship. These results suggest that economic disadvantages faced by the children of immigrants may be related less to generation *per se* than to family head's characteristics such as citizenship status and length of residence in the U.S. The results imply that the 1996 welfare reform, which restricted access to public assistance based on citizenship, has potentially adverse effects on the economic well-being of the children of non-citizen immigrants. While early indications of the effects of the 1996 reform are that the number of immigrants applying for public assistance is decreasing (Fix & Passel, 2002), the strong economy has been critical to this early success. My findings suggest that as economic growth slows, immigrant children with non-citizen heads will be at greater risk of sliding into poverty.

What can we say about the implications of the results for public policy? First, the welfare reform to curb welfare use by non-citizens, particularly among recently arrived immigrants, may be detrimental to their economic well-being. The results reveal that recent immigrants are more likely to fall into poverty, but length of residence in the U.S. does not contribute to exiting from poverty. Restricting access to public assistance for recently arrived immigrants may trap immigrant children in poverty for a long time, without prospects of exiting from poverty with length of time in the U.S. Second, the gap in the risks of living in poverty may not only widen between immigrants and natives, but may also widen between immigrant children with non-citizen family heads and citizen heads. Having citizen family heads appears to be associated with higher probabilities of exiting poverty. For first-generation children with citizen family heads, the chance of an upward transition is even higher than that of natives. The results imply that the risks of living in poverty may widen even among immigrant children by family head's citizenship status.

NOTES

1. 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 ability and knowledge of civics. Children who are minors automatically become citizens when both parents become citizens.
2. Human capital variables include education and years of labor market experience.
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 the first generation to the 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. Other race includes Native Americans and Eskimos.
5. The statistical significance of coefficient differences across generation-specific models is computed by the formula $(b_1 - b_2) / \sqrt{SE_{b_1}^2 + SE_{b_2}^2}$.

REFERENCES

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2002). *Children at Risk: State trends 1990-2000*. (PRB/KIDSCOUNT Special Report). Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Blank, R. M. (2000). Fighting poverty: Lessons from recent U.S. history. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(2), 3-19.
- Borjas, G. J. (1999). *Heaven's door: Immigration policy and the American economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Borjas, G. J. (2001). Welfare reform and immigration. In R. M. Blank & R. Haskins (Eds.), *The new world of welfare* (pp. 369-385). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Chiswick, B. R. (1978). The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 86(5), 897-921.
- Duleep, H. O. & Regets, M. C. (1997). Measuring immigrant wage growth using matched CPS files. *Demography*, 34(2), 239-249.
- Duncan, G. J., Yeung, J. W., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Smith, J. R. (1998). How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children? *American Sociological Review*, 63(3), 406-423.
- Edgebeeen, D. J. & Lichter, D. T. (1991). Race, family structure, and changing poverty among American children. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 801-817.
- Fix, M. (2001). Comment to Borjas. In R. M. Blank & R. Haskins (Eds.), *The new world of welfare* (pp. 385-390). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Fix, M. & Passel, J. (2002). *The scope and impact of welfare reform's immigrant provisions* (Discussion Paper 02-03). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Gans, H. 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, P. & Danziger, S. (2001). Income mobility and exits from poverty of American children. In B. Bradbury, S. P. Jenkins, & J. Micklewright (Eds.), *The dynamics of child poverty in industrialised countries* (pp. 135-153). Cambridge University Press.
- Hao, L. & Kawano, Y. (2001). Immigrants' welfare use and opportunity for contact with co-ethnics. *Demography*, 38(3), 375-389.
- Hirschman, C. (2001). The educational enrollment of immigrant youth: A test of the segmented-assimilation hypothesis. *Demography*, 38(3), 317-336.
- Jensen, L. (2001). The demographic diversity of immigrants and their children. In R. Rumbault & A. Portes (Eds.), *Ethnicities: Children of immigrants in America* (pp. 21-56). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jensen, L. & Chitose, Y. (1997). Immigrant generations. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, & N. Landale (Eds.), *Immigration and the family: Research and policy on U.S. immigrants* (pp. 47-62). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Jensen, L. & Edgebeeen, D. J. (1994). Nonmetropolitan poor children and reliance on public assistance. *Rural Sociology*, 59(1), 45-65.
- Jensen, L., Findeis, J., Hsu, W., & Schachter, J. (1999). Slipping into and out of under-employment: Another disadvantage for nonmetropolitan workers? *Rural Sociology*, 64(3), 417-438.
- LaLonde, R. J. & Topel, R. H. (1991). Immigrants in the American labor market: Quality, assimilation, and distributional effects. *The American Economic Review*, 81(2), 297-302.
- Landale, N. S. & Lichter, D. T. (1997). Geography and the etiology of poverty among Latino children. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(4), 874-894.
- Lichter, D. T. & Edgebeeen, D. J. (1994). The effect of parental employment on child poverty. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 633-645.
- Massey, D. S. (1995). The new immigration and ethnicity in the United States. *Population and Development Review*, 21(3), 631-652.
- Oropesa, R. S. & Landale, N. S. (1997). Immigrant legacies: Ethnicity, generation, and children's familial and economic lives. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(2), 399-416.
- Perlmann, J. & Waldinger, R. (1999). Immigrants, past and present: A reconsideration. In C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, & J. De Wind (Eds.), *The handbook of international migration: The American experience* (pp. 223-238). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A. (Ed.). (1996). *The new second generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rajiman, R. & Tienda, M. (1999). Immigrants' socioeconomic progress post-1965: Forging mobility or survival? In C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, & J. De Wind (Eds.), *The handbook of international migration: The American experience* (pp. 239-256). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rank, M. P. & Hirschl, T. (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: UN.
- 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). *Poverty in the United States: 2000* (Current Population Reports P60-214). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2001b). *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. Department of Justice. (2001). *2000 statistical yearbook of the immigration and naturalization service*. Retrieved March 24, 2003, from <http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/Yearbook2000.pdf>
- Van Hook, J. (2000). SSI eligibility and participation among elderly naturalized citizens and noncitizens. *Social Science Research*, 29, 51-69.
- Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.

産業関係研究
 第15巻第2号, 2005. 12, pp. 35-65
 © 韓國勞使關係學會

Return Migration of Japanese Managers and Their Health

Hiroshi KOJIMA *

This study has analyzed the determinants of health conditions of Japanese managers having returned from their overseas assignment, applying logit models to data from the 2001 NIPSSR survey. The analysis shows that the health condition immediately after return is likely to be bad among those in their late 40s and those in home company of 10,000-19,999 employees. However, those whose job immediately after return was sales are also more likely to have bad health immediately after return when we control for health during mission. This variable also has a similar effect on change in health conditions.

▶ **Keywords:** Japanese managers, overseas assignment, return migration, health, spouses

1. Introduction

Japanese MNCs (multinational corporations) has been in competition with Western MNCs as well as other Japanese MNCs for a couple of decades in the global market. They have been more often successful thanks to the competent Japanese personnel on overseas assignment. More recently, they are increasingly more likely to

투고일 : 2005년 8월 11일, 심사위원회 : 2005년 9월 9일, 심사완료일 : 2005년 11월 30일

* National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, h-kojima@ipss.go.jp

face competition with Korean and Chinese MNCs. However, a recent study has revealed that Japanese major corporations have a lower proportion of managers with an experience of overseas assignment than Korean and Chinese counterparts, which can reduce the competitiveness of Japanese MNCs in the global market in the near future.

Perhaps to correct this situation, Keidanren (Japan Business Federation, 2004) published a report, "Strategic Approach to Overseas Transfer of Japanese Employees: Building a successful model of overseas assignment". The report is explicit about the physical and mental health as one of the major attributes for successful managers on their overseas assignment and their health maintenance as one of the major support to be provided by the home company. It also mentions the support for the health maintenance of their family during the mission. However, it does not mention anything about the support for health after the return migration of Japanese managers and their family even though health is also one of the major attributes for their success in the home company.

In addition, while the 1988 revision of the Occupational Safety and Hygiene Law prescribed the health examinations before and after the overseas assignment of six months or longer, only about a third of those returnees had post-assignment health examination while most of them had a pre-assignment health examination. While its 1996 revision required the follow-up by the industrial doctors after the examinations, only a small percentage of returnees have been subject to the follow-up, considering the low percentage of those examined upon return. The situation may be even worse for their family because there are no legal health-related requirements for the family in the law.

Japanese managers on their overseas assignment face various kinds of challenges in adjusting/adapting themselves to another society upon their move. Upon their return, however, they also have to face other kinds of challenges in readjusting/re-adapting themselves to their "own" society. Personnel managers should pay more attention to returnees because they may be facing greater risk than those staying abroad, including health risk and because health is a determinant and an outcome of adjustment/readjustment. It is also because they can be competent core personnel for global management as Keidanren report (Japan Business Federation, 2004) indicates.

As we shall see later, there is increasing number of studies on their adjustment, including health, during the mission, but there are few studies on the health after

return. There are even fewer studies on the adjustment and readjustment of their spouse, while there is relatively large number of studies on the adjustment and readjustment of their children particularly with regard to their education. A few studies on health are mainly based on small number of clinical evidence. Few studies with larger number of cases depend on the self-rated health of respondents. However, even health scientists often use self-rated health as dependent or independent variables and they found, for example, self-rated health to be one of the best predictors of life expectancy of the elderly.

Thus, in this study, we analyze the determinants of self-rated health of Japanese managers and their accompanied spouse (wife) during their overseas mission, immediately after their return to Japan and at the time of survey and the determinants of changes in health conditions between these three periods, based on the 2001 survey of Japanese managers having returned from overseas mission within past five years. We also refer to the effects of health on the adaptation/re-adaptation of managers and their accompanied wife in the conclusion. Before these analyses, we review related studies and surveys, examine analytical frameworks and present hypotheses.

This study is exploratory in nature due to the lack of past theoretical and empirical studies on the health of managers and their accompanied spouse during and after overseas assignment and also due to the lack of demographic and socioeconomic background information in the survey data, making it difficult to apply existing analytical frameworks for determinants of health or work-related adaptation. However, this study is original in the sense that it tries to clarify the effects of work-related variables on the health of managers and their accompanied spouse during and after overseas mission and their spouse particularly because health and spouses have been often neglected by researchers and corporations in spite of the relevance to the competitiveness of Japanese MNCs in the global market.

II. Literature Review

1. Review of Relevant Studies

The number of studies on the adjustment and readjustment of Japanese managers

on overseas mission seems to have increased significantly since the 1980s after a rapid increase in foreign direct investments by Japanese corporations in the late 1970s. In the 1980s, however, they mainly consisted of psychiatric case studies and theoretical work. Inamura (1980) analyzed the adjustment of Japanese in a comprehensive and systematic way in his book for general audience, *Maladjustment of Overseas Japanese*. He cited seven factors of adjustment: 1) duration of stay, 2) personality, 3) food habits, 4) language, 5) life history, 6) age and sex, and 7) others such as accompanying of the family and health. He did not restrict his analysis only to managers on overseas mission and included their family. He dealt with mental health out of his psychiatric interests, but he did not pay due attention to physical health as a factor of adjustment.

Ishida (1985, p.148) focused on Japanese managers on overseas mission and suggested that Japanese corporations tend to emphasize only "job satisfaction" as a factor of motivation, but neglect "concern and dissatisfaction regarding daily life (children's education, family relationship, security, health and health care)". Hanami (1987, p.115, p.156), however, discovered through his field study of corporations that the largest problem cited often by their employees is children's education, but the second one is medical care and health. His field study of trade unions had similar results. As a consequence, Japanese companies took various measures in the areas of children's education, security, health and medical care, but Japanese researchers conducted relatively few studies on these issues except children's education. One of the major reasons for a relative lack of studies on health, particularly those on the spouse may be relative neglect of the spouse by Japanese corporations, as indicated by a relatively lower proportion of Japanese managers on overseas mission, citing the spouse as a reason for the failure of their missions, in comparison with Americans.

Shiraki (1994), based on the results of Tung's (1988) comparative study of managers on overseas mission in multinational corporations (MNCs) based in Japan, the U.S. and Europe, argues that American managers tend to have a higher proportion of early return and failure of their overseas mission because of their spouse's physical and mental inadaptability to the local environment and other family-related reasons. While the spouse's inability is also a prominent reason among European managers on overseas mission, Japanese managers on overseas mission tend to have a lower proportion of failure that mostly originates from themselves. He also suggests that a low-

er proportion of failure among Japanese managers is partly brought about by their spouse's role and status (perseverance during the mission) that are imposed by the Japanese culture as argued by Tung, but that it is also due to a higher incidence of leaving the family at home. He also argues that the spouse's adaptation and satisfaction with the local society have played a major role in the performance of managers and predicts that Japanese corporations can no longer sustain the policies on overseas assignment of managers by ignoring their spouses. Even though Shiraki does not mention, the role and status imposed on the spouses are presumed to be sources of their stress which can cause mental and physical health risk.

However, there has not been too much increase in studies on spouses of managers on overseas mission since then in Japan. One of the reasons for the relative neglect of spouses in Japan may be due to the relative lack of interests in the spouse's effects on the adaptation of managers on overseas mission in English-speaking countries. Actually, Cerdin (1999, pp.225-226) revealed, based on his empirical analysis, that the interpersonal adaptation of French managers on overseas mission has positive correlation with that of their spouse as in the case of Americans, but that their general adaptation has positive correlation with that of their wife, which is different from the case of Americans.

On the other hand, there have been a few books for general audience on mental health of managers on overseas mission, including Inamura (1980) and Munakata (1994) and a relatively large number of scientific articles as reviewed by Suzuki et al. (1997). Even though a lot of studies are expected to exist on physical health, only a few studies in the field of industrial medicine can be found (e.g., Izumo, 1996; Katsuyama and Tsuchiya, 1996). In addition, industrial medicine research tends not to study the spouse. Thus, there have not been any theoretical or empirical studies which can be directly applicable to the empirical analysis drawing on the particular survey data set to be used in this study and we have to rely on past empirical studies for hypotheses about independent variables selected comprehensively for this exploratory study.

2. Review of Relevant Surveys

There have been a larger number of surveys on the adjustment/readjustment of chil-

dren of Japanese managers staying abroad or having returned from abroad (cf., Employment Research Center (1990) and Chitose and Abe (2002) for reviews). However, there have been fewer surveys on the adjustment/readjustment of Japanese managers and their spouse during and after overseas assignment, particularly those which collected information on their own and spouse's health. Most of the surveys conducted in the 1980s are reviewed by the Employment Development Center (1990) and Watanabe (1991). They revealed that large-scale surveys were conducted by the government, trade unions and employers' associations in the late 1980s when increasingly more Japanese corporations started foreign direct investment following the reevaluation of Japanese yen after the Plaza Accord.

Even though these reviews somehow failed to mention, there was a more socio-logically oriented survey conducted in 1987 on 1,000 businessmen who had experienced overseas mission and 700 businessmen who had not by Iwauchi et al. (1992) as a part of research project funded by the Nippon Life Insurance Foundation. But we are not sure about health-related information in this survey because we could not find the survey report.

Perhaps, independently from the 1987 NLIF survey the Economic Research Institute of the Machinery Promotion Association (1990) conducted in 1990 a survey on Japanese managers who had been on overseas mission. Its usable sample was 647, but it asked few questions related to health. Since then, there do not seem to be any large-scale surveys on the returnees, except those conducted on MNCs and their unions. The 1987 NLIF survey and the 1990 MPA-ERI survey seem to be the only two that are directly comparable to ours in the sense that their respondents are returnees.

On the other hand, there have been more surveys on Japanese staying abroad. In 1988 the Japan Institute of Labour (currently, the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training) conducted its first survey on Japanese managers on overseas mission, which was conducted through the Japanese Chamber of Commerce all over the world and it has repeated the survey in 1993, 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004 through the funding from the Japan Ministry of Labour (currently, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare). The JIL surveys asked those staying abroad a few questions related to health (MOL/JIL, 1989; JIL, 1994, 1999, 2001, 2003). While the JILPT 2004 survey had a separate questionnaire for the spouse for the first time, they did not ask ques-

tions about the spouse's health conditions (JILPT, 2005).

Similarly, a group of family sociologists conducted a relatively large-scale survey on the adaptation process of Japanese managers on overseas mission and their family in 1991/1992 drawing on the scientific grant from the Ministry of Education (Okamoto, 1994). It had a usable sample of 3,400 families staying abroad and 700 separated families in which men stay abroad by themselves. It collected a lot of information on adaptation which is closely related to health.

In addition, the project team headed by Murakata (1994) conducted a specialized survey on the mental health of those on the overseas mission and their family in 1989, with a usable sample of 1,099. The team also interviewed personnel managers in private companies and government administrators in 1991 regarding the provision and support for the mental health of those staying abroad. Since it is difficult to get health-related information from the 1987 NLIF survey and the 1990 MPA-ERI survey for returnees, we mainly rely on these surveys of those staying abroad to build hypotheses below.

III. Hypotheses

1. Analytical Frameworks

As an analytical framework for health, that developed for infant mortality by Mosley and Chen (1984) has been often used in health sciences and demography, but it is not readily applicable to analyses of the health of adult international migrants particularly when basic background information is missing. On the other hand, the analytical framework for job adaptation of those on overseas assignment, which was devised by Black et al. (1999), and his preceding ones have been used often in the study for international human resource management. Nagai (1999) applied the intercultural adaptation model devised by Black et al. (1991) to managers on overseas mission and Nagai (1994) applied it to the intercultural adaptation of their wives. Cerdin (1999) also applied and expanded the model by Black et al. (1991) for the adaptation of wives. But considering the limitation of information in our survey, which mainly asked questions regarding work, as well as the distance between health and adapta-