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 (Raijman & 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 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 & 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 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 1990's.

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 poverty, I estimated a model using a logistic regression. The model 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. 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 recent immigrant (those immigrating 11 years ago or more), and equals zero for a recent immigrant (those immigrating 10 years ago or less).

The data set for the analysis consists of 46,458 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 poverty in the sample between 1996 and 2001. The panel of the table reports the percentage of children who fell into 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.

[Table 1 about here]

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 detailed 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 not recent immigrant heads).

[Table 2 about here]

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. 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 re-estimated 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-head 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 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.

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 downward 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 sociodemographic, 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.

Children's poverty dynamics are influenced in predictable ways by conventional factors. 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. Time since 1996 indicates that children became significantly more likely to slip into poverty. Availability of income sources, such as interest, educational benefit, and child support help children to escape poverty.

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. Restricting access to public assistance for recently arrived immigrants may trap immigrant children in poverty for a long time.

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, D.C.: 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.

Eggebeen, 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, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Fix, M. & Passel, J. (2002). *The scope and impact of welfare reform's immigrant provisions* (Discussion Paper 02-03). Washington, D.C, 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. & Eggebeen, 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 underemployemnt: Another disadvantage for nonmetropolitan workers? *Rural Sociology,* 64(3), 417-438.

La Londe, 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. & Eggebeen, 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.

Raijman, 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, D.C.: 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.

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 $(b_1 - b_2)/(SE_{b1}^2 + SE_{b2}^2)^{1/2}$.

Table 1 Children Falling into Poverty by Generation and Year (%)

Year	Native	Second Generation		First Generation	
		Citizen	Noncitizen	Citizen	Noncitizen
1996–2001	4.9	5.2	12.5	9.0	12.3
1996–1997	5.3	5.3	20.1	3.0	8.9
1997–1998	5.1	5.7	9.9	20.9	18.8
1998–1999	4.1	5.7	11.4	10.6	15.5
1999–2000	5.2	4.3	10.9	1.2	10.3
2000–2001	4.9	5.1	10.2	10.3	8.6

Source: 1996–2001 March Current Population Surveys

Table 2 Logistic Regression Models of Downward Transition

	All Generation Model 1		Native		Second Generation Citizen		Second Generation Noncitizen		First Generation	
	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio	b	Odds Ratio
Generation										
Native	–									
SG head citizen	.028	1.03								
SG head noncitizen	.024	1.02								
FG head citizen	−.029	.97								
FG head noncitizen	−.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 noncitizen	–								−.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 Coeffecient significantly different from that for natives at p<0.1

移民&外国人労働者に関する国際機関の動向
－社会政策との関連を中心として－

勝又幸子

要旨

移民や外国人労働者について、代表的な国際機関（国連：ILO　欧州委員会：EC 経済協力開発機構：OECD）が近年どのような報告や活動をしているかについて文献サーベイをもとにまとめた。ILO は労働者の権利を守る立場から、人権に配慮した内外人に平等な就労条件が保障されるためにはどのような課題があるのかを示している。特に、労働者と雇用主と行政の３者が協力して条件整備をする必要を強調している。多様な経済的水準にある国を対象にしている国際連合という機関の組織に位置づけられている ILO は、移民労働者の送り出し国と受け取り国の両方に、技術的な援助をしている。その上で、移民労働者特有の問題としてだけでなく、ジェンダー格差の是正や社会的包摂（ソーシャルインクルージョン）の議論も人権擁護の立場から重要視している。EC は域内労働者の移動の円滑な実現という観点から、社会的包摂を住民サービスや社会保障サービスなど実行上どのように向上させるかに関心を寄せており、より具体的な検討と加盟国相互の経験の共有化に関心をもっている。OECD では移民労働者の経済効果が関心の中心である。労働力不足や IT 産業の強化など経済的発展のために最小のコストで最大の経済成長効果を上げる移民労働者の受け入れが関心の中心だ。また経済活動のひとつとして外国人労働者の母国への送金についても、金融企業の保護と不正送金による犯罪の防止などに関心が広がっている。

はじめに

外国人労働者は移民労働者として、国際人口移動という人口学の分野で取り上げられてきた国際的なテーマである。一方、社会保障政策はきわめて国内的トピックであり、とくに外国人労働者の受け入れに消極的でありつづけた日本では、社会保障政策研究において取り上げられることの少ないテーマだった。[1] それが最近「人口減少時代」の到来という近い将来の労働力不足への懸念と、製造業における人手不足の現実から、にわかにクローズアップされてきた。しかし、その背景には日本のゆがんだ労働市場が抱える問題の顕在化がある。すなわち、非正規雇用労働者と正規雇用労働者との労働条件における大きな格差である。製造業における請負労働者や季節労働者、サービス業におけるパートタイマーと呼ばれる時給労働者の増加である。パートタイマーの社会保険加入率は低く、近年適用を厳しくしてきたとはいえ依然として勤労者としての通常得られる保障（健康保険・年金保険・雇用保険）もないまま低賃金で働いているのが現実である。その結果、正規労働者を基準にしてきた日本の労働組合組織率は下落の一途をたどり、もはやその影響力さえ危ぶまれている。そのような状況を背景として、労働組合からも危機感をもって外国人労働

[1] 社会保障研究所編（1991）が諸外国の外国人労働者と社会保障の関係についてまとめている数少ない文献である。